An investigation of writing in a primary class using drama

Submitted by Christiana Christou to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Education
in January 2011

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature: [Signature]

1
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigation of drama and writing process has been a long and fascinating journey. Numerous individuals, directly or indirectly, have inspired and helped me on the way. To all these people I express my sincere and deepest gratitude.

My thanks also go to the Cyprus Ministry of Education and Culture for allowing me to embark on the journey and the Head Teacher of my school, Ms Chrystalla Ioannou, for believing in my work, supporting and facilitating me in every way possible.

I cannot but say a very special ‘thank you’ to the pupils in my class for their co-operation and willingness to participate in this study. It was a great pleasure working with them all, capturing some of their spirit, vibrancy and enthusiasm. I also thank the parents of the children for their understanding and co-operation.

My very special thanks to my supervisors, Dr Ros Fisher and Ms Sarah Hennessy, whose invaluable guidance and support have been the main driving force throughout my doctoral studies. To Dr. Ros Fisher, who so persistently and patiently challenged and scrutinised all parts of my work, I am truly deeply indebted. My appreciation and thanks also go to Ms Cherry Dodwell, my Master’s drama tutor, who showed so much interest in my work, always willing to advice, encourage and support me.

I also need to thank two friends who, in the role of critical friends, played devil’s advocate with my thinking and decisions regarding the conduct and write up of this thesis. Andreas Kyprianou and Androulla Athanasiou were always ready to pose questions, offer constructive criticism and discuss all issues.

Finally, eternal gratitude goes to my parents Charalambos and Eleni who have made it possible for me to reach this point, through their financial support and unfailing love every step of the way. Equally, my heartfelt thanks and gratitude go to my husband Marios for the admirable tolerance, encouragement and faith he showed in me.

Above all, I thank God for giving me the strength and patience to endure all difficulties and get through the project.
Dedicated to my parents and husband

As you set out for Ithaca, hope the road is long,
full of adventure, full of discovery…
(C. Cavafis, 1911. *Ithaca*)
ABSTRACT

The thesis explores issues in the writing development of primary school children where drama was used as a teaching and learning pedagogy. It is based on a case study carried out in 2005-2006 in a Greek primary school Y4 class in Cyprus where the author was teaching and investigates the nature and relationship of the two processes when used together.

The project involved twenty drama sessions (over six months), each followed by a writing task that stemmed from the contents and children’s participation in drama. The overall aim was to describe ‘what happens when drama is integrated in a writing classroom’. Informed by the Vygotskian theory of learning, it sought to investigate the impact of using drama on children’s: (a) attitudes and views towards writing, (b) engagement with writing tasks and (c) quality of writing.

A qualitative case study methodology and multi-method approach to the design of the study were adopted on the basis of what can best investigate the issues raised by the research questions. Questionnaires, interviews, observations, writing samples, video recordings and researcher’s log were used to collect data throughout the year, before (Sept-Dec) and after (Jan-Jun) drama integration in writing lessons.

The collected data were analysed by quantitative and qualitative methods. Findings indicated positive changes in children’s attitudes and views towards writing following the introduction of drama and progressively positive improvements in most children’s engagement in writing. Additionally, analysis of writing samples provided indications of positive contribution of drama towards children’s writing and insights into the interaction between drama and writing content.

On a theoretical level, this thesis suggests that the concept of mediation is central in interpreting the interactive relationship between drama and writing. It also indicates the impact of drama as a sociocultural setting on children’s agency in their development as writers and raises questions for further research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 PREFACE

The inspiration for this study originated at the meeting point between a personal frustration stemming from my personal experience as a primary school teacher and the realisation of the potential of drama in writing development during my master studies.

My three-year teaching experience as a primary school teacher gave me the impression that children had difficulties when they were given a writing task and that most of them had a negative attitude towards writing. It seemed to me that children were perceiving and treating writing as a chore, as a school job that has to be done. It was frustrating for me to watch reluctant writers and read voiceless writing lacking ideas and emotions considering how much time I was spending before writing preparing a class through discussion and notes/ideas on the board about the writing task in hand. Research evidence (Stainthorp, 2004) seems to support my first impression about children’s problems in their writing but there is no research evidence about my second impression regarding their attitude to writing being negative. At the same time, in my home context, the Cyprus Education Authority’s circulars and policy recommend that children’s learning needs to be reinforced by imaginative and creative teaching. In this context, ‘How could I, as a teacher, enthuse and trigger children’s interest for writing? How could I, actively engage children in the writing process, motivate them and help them to improve their writing, have a more positive attitude to it and provide them with a meaningful context that fosters imaginative and creative writing?’ These questions were in my mind, but it was not until I went to Exeter to study for a master’s degree that I decided to do something about it.

My quest for a more imaginative and creative teaching practice and my faith that arts can have a significant, real contribution to children’s learning led me to Exeter, to study drama in education within a creative arts course. During the course I realised that arts can enable children to express themselves without constraints (Abbs, 2003), they can give them a ‘different voice’, another pathway for effective communication. In parallel, I realised that drama is the only art form that focuses on language, social interaction and engagement with the world through both real and imagined experience.
My own personal experience as a participant in drama workshops led by my enthusiastic drama tutor Ms Cherry Dodwell made me realise the potential of drama in language development. Interacting and collaborating in drama in a lively enjoyable atmosphere with international and native English speaking students was a real boost to the development of my listening and oral communication skills. However, it was just after my participation in the drama workshop based on the poem “The Magic Box’ by Kit Wright that I realized the great potential of drama in writing development. Inspired by this drama lesson, I went back to my university accommodation and I wrote my own poem titled ‘My Magic Box’. This was my first attempt to write a poem in English. I have never before felt the inner need to express myself poetically in English and this was quite an exhilarating feeling especially after I received a flattering feedback from Ms Dodwell. This personal encounter was a critical point for my decision to investigate the potential of educational drama in children’s writing development.

My personal interest in drama and my readings provided me with evidence of the positive impact of educational drama on children’s writing in English speaking countries. Studying the literature provided me with more indications for the positive impact of drama on children’s writing, attitudes and engagement. Booth (1994) argues that when you generate a context which has significance for the writer, the writing skills themselves are enhanced and improved. He points out (1994, p.123) ‘As they [children] try a more complex imaginative understanding of what is happening in drama, their writing generally becomes more complex and their language deepens’. Based on these research findings, using them as a platform and as a motivation for my own investigation I sought to investigate in more depth children’s writing development when drama was integrated in a primary writing class. Literature searches confirmed that this area was under-researched and this together with the fact that in my own home context (Cyprus) drama was not considered to be an integral part of the Greek language lesson encouraged me to undertake this direction of inquiry.

What follows is a brief presentation of the context of my study.

1.2 STUDY CONTEXT

The context is important for this study, in terms of understanding the integration of drama in the class writing and the role of situational factors involved. Thus, before proceeding to
the next chapter, to enable the reader gain a better understanding of the situational factors related to the interpretation of the data, I make a brief reference to the structure of the Cyprus educational system and to the Cyprus Curriculum, focusing mostly on the teaching of language in general and writing in particular.

1.2.1 The structure of Cyprus educational system & Curriculum

Cyprus educational system consists of four levels: pre-primary (1 year), primary (6 years), secondary, split into lower-secondary (gymnasium, 3 years) and upper-secondary (lyceum, 3 years), and higher education (3 or more). Primary education (ages 6-12) and lower-secondary (ages 12-15) are compulsory for all Cypriot citizens. All levels are served by public and private institutions. The main language of instruction in all public institutions is Modern Greek. Enrolment to private institutions, whose main language of instruction is often a foreign language (usually English) requires payment of fees, while public compulsory education is provided free of charge.

The curriculum development, as well as other research and training activities, is a responsibility of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), and the Pedagogical Institute (PI). A new curriculum developed by the MOEC directorate, the Pedagogical Institute, and the Teachers’ Union (POED) was put in practice in the academic year starting in 1992 and it is still in place. Basic ideas underlying this curriculum are: democratisation (individualization of instruction, respect to others, equality of opportunities) and ensuring that the teacher’s role is one of a child’s ‘guide, facilitator, and collaborator (Cyprus Curriculum, 1996, p.28). It also includes ideas on childrens’ active participation, environmental awareness, affective development (emphasis on the development of values, interests and attitudes). Also, the integration of subjects (rather than compartmentalization of subjects), summative and formative assessment, the enrichment of teachers’ work and training with educational technology. The official website of the MOEC also emphasizes the need for continuous curriculum development: ‘There is no “fixed” or “stable” curriculum that will suit every school forever. Teachers are encouraged to modify and adjust it, according to their environment and the particular needs of the children’ (www.moec.gov.cy).
1.2.2 Language Curriculum

Regarding the teaching of Language, the Cyprus Primary Education adopts the Greek Language Curriculum and the same Greek textbooks that are used in Greece.

According to the Curriculum the:

General aim of the language lesson is the language development of pupils within the limits of their capabilities with the acquisition of the expressional richness of the Modern Greek language and the comprehension of its foundations for effective communication and facilitation of their intellectual development (as translated from Cyprus Curriculum of Primary Education, 1996, p. 79)

Language Curriculum supports a uniform approach to the teaching of Language. However, in the Curriculum, the teaching of the Greek language is divided into several specific components for facilitating a holistic development. These components are: listening and oral expression, reading, writing, spelling, grammar, good handwriting, study skills and best use of learning resources.

In the Curriculum, for each of these components there is a general aim and its objectives in the form of prescriptive statements of what needs to be accomplished every two years of the six-year primary education.

1.2.3 Writing - Aim, Teaching and Assessment

For the ‘Writing’ component of the Greek language lesson, the Curriculum (1996, p.84) states that: ‘The acquisition and development of pupils’ capability for written expression is a fundamental objective of the language lesson. With this, children are helped to express their inner self in a creative way and to produce every kind of text necessary for their communicational needs’.

This is followed (as for every other component) by the general aim which is: ‘The pupils to express themselves in writing with fluency, clarity, accuracy, completeness and creativity for effective communication’, (ibid.) and finally by the bi-annual objectives of the component in the form of prescriptive statements.
The teaching of writing is an integral part of the language lesson. Children are first introduced to writing in pre-primary school but they do not learn to write or acquire the writing skills until the first grade of primary school. In primary schools teachers assign to children short writing tasks during the language lesson, usually based on the day’s taught text. The tasks, most of the times are completed by the children individually and rarely in collaboration. However, there is an extra curriculum time of 80 minutes each week for the teaching of writing in a curriculum activity called ‘Think and Write’. During this time, the teacher introduces a writing task to the class and then discusses with the whole class the possible contents of the task. The teacher helps children to understand the task better with some pre-writing activities such as thought showers, lists of useful words, phrases or questions and alternatives on content and structure. In general, teachers initiate and lead the discussion to provide children with different kind of scaffolds depending on the task in hand.

The philosophy that mainly underpins the teaching of writing in Cyprus today is based on the Genre theory perspective of writing (see section 2.4.4 for details). Within this perspective, the learning of writing is achieved through explicit teaching of the characteristics of each text-type and good writing is considered not just the correct writing, but writing which fits linguistically the purpose it is serving (Ivanic, 2004). Teachers teach and model writing on the characteristics of a predefined text-type and children are asked to follow each text type’s characteristics to construct their own writing (see section 2.4.4.2 for more details).

As far as the assessment of writing is concerned, there are no standardised tests or examinations that assess primary school pupils’ level of writing acquisition. Nor are there any formal criteria or scales to assess children’s quality of writing. Teachers are not allowed to use any numerical assessment; instead they assess pupils’ writing basing their assessment on their subjective judgment (what they think is more important) and give mostly written feedback in the form of descriptive statements.

1.2.4 Language Curriculum and Drama

Within the Cyprus Curriculum, Drama is not a component of the Language lesson. The Curriculum calls for creativity and fun in teaching and learning and circulars to teachers from MOEC highlight the importance of creative teaching and ways to meaningfully
engage children in the learning process. However, the only references made that are
related to the use of educational drama appear in the objectives of ‘Listening & Oral
Expression’ and ‘Writing’ as follows:

(a) ‘[The pupils] to make creative improvisations and take on diverse roles from every
day life, from stories, fairy tales, e.t.c.’ (Cyprus Curriculum, in Listening & Oral
expression, p. 80).

(b) ‘The pupils to write theatrical scenes to expressively represent the happenings in
the story’ (in Writing, p. 85).

In practice, to achieve the above objectives of the language lesson, the teachers ask
pupils to dramatise stories from their language books by taking on the roles of the
characters and either repeating their words or improvise based on existing dialogues. In
the case of the writing objectives, children are asked to write scripts based on a written
story/narrative.

1.3 OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the study, outlining the background of how this
particular research interest emerged and providing the reader with an overview of the
thesis.

Chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework and the argument for the need of this thesis.
It mainly focuses on the theory of learning and the theory and research pertaining to
writing and drama that underpin the study. It also discusses the study’s conceptual
framework, general research aim (main research question) and sub-research questions
that shape the investigation.

Chapter 3 discusses and justifies the methodological considerations and decisions taken
in the design and conduct of this study. The chapter is divided into eight sections that
discuss in turn: research paradigms and theoretical assumptions, research methodologies
and methods used, research context, design, trial of the instruments, research process,
data analysis, validity-reliability and trustworthiness and finally research ethics.
Chapters 4 and 5 concern the data analysis and the synthesis of findings. Chapter 4 describes the analysis process and presents the findings of each data set separately whilst chapter 5 describes the synthesis of data and findings. It also includes the portraits of three focal children.

Chapter 6 discusses findings and their theoretical and educational implications and chapter 7 presents the summary of the study and the conclusions derived.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Situated within a social constructivism understanding of teaching and learning, this study investigates the use of educational drama in a primary writing class in Cyprus. In this chapter, I shall consider both the theory and research related to writing and drama as the main components of my study. At the same time, I shall also consider the theory of learning within which this research study is located. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section discusses the theory of learning that informs the study. The second section discusses theory and research pertaining to writing while the third section discusses theory and research pertaining to Drama in Education. Finally, the fourth section presents the argument for the need of this study and discusses the conceptual framework and research questions.

2.2 THEORY OF LEARNING

On a more general, theoretical level, the present study is located within a social constructivist theory of learning and is informed primarily by concepts of Vygotskian theory of learning and Bruner’s concept of scaffolding. Therefore, it is essential in the first section of the literature review to present the social constructivist view of learning and the concepts of the Vygotskian theory of learning that constitute the theoretical underpinnings of this research project. My objective is to provide the general theoretical framework against which this project draws understandings and principles for action in the specific research context within which I will make informed decisions for the use of drama in the teaching of writing in my class.

2.2.1 Social constructivist view of learning

A social constructivist view of learning perceives the individuals as constructors and negotiators of meaning, who are at the same time participants and re-creators of the culture within which they operate. Within the social constructivist theory the learner is
revealed as an active agent who uses language “to connect with others, to understand his world, and to reveal himself within it” (Lindfors, 1999, 14), and one who plays a pivotal role in his/her cognitive and social development. Social constructivist theorists, researchers and practitioners agree that language is an essential component of student learning, and envision the communicational context of classrooms as a forum where the participants are expected to bring in their ideas and experiences, and to honestly engage in a common dialogic endeavor to deal with the issues at hand. In such an environment, knowledge is viewed as a social construction, the presentation of multiple perspectives is celebrated, and the power to affect the conversation is distributed among the participants (Bruner, 1986 and 1990; Langer, 1995 & 1999; Vygotsky, 1978 & 1986). In this drama/writing project language is central; it is more than a means for communication and meaning-making. Either spoken or visual (non-verbal) in drama or written in writing, language mediates understandings; it is a mediatory tool leading to learning and development.

Moreover, social constructivist theory views learning as dual-agentic: that is, learner and teacher through their perspectives and experiences define the boundaries of the specific social context they find themselves in and co-construct their learning. Within this perspective, teachers should provide instances for active co-construction of meaning and understanding. They should use suitably phrased, open-ended questions and set open-ended tasks that require pupils to use skills and apply ideas which employ a variety of communicative methods. Such methods are concept mapping, drawing, role play and the use of artifacts (Assessment Reform Group, 1999, p. 8). The latter two are directly related to the design of my project since they both are in fact extensively used drama strategies.

Furthermore, in a formal educational social-constructivist setting, interactions between the participants are not confined to teacher-pupil, but they also extend to pupil-pupil interactions. Taking advantage of peer approaches to learning provides possible answers to the problems of encouraging and enabling primary-age pupils to take gradually more control over their own learning (Adams, 2006). Peer approaches are also useful in creating the ‘common knowledge’ which is required if pupils are to recontextualize the everyday, common-sense knowledge of the home into the school environment. Creating opportunities for pupil-pupil interaction based on learners’ prior experiences and knowledge are high priority provisions not only of a social constructivist-oriented teacher but also of a teacher working with drama methodology. A drama context fosters and encourages pupil-pupil interaction through the various drama strategies and contents.
Social constructivist theory has tremendous implications for education, as it discredits traditional perceptions that treat students as passive receptors of information and teachers as knowers whose duty is to transmit knowledge to their students. Instead, the student-learners are actively engaged in the learning process and teaching and the teacher’s role are reconceptualised to fit the theory of learning envisaged by social constructivism. The teacher is positioned as an organizer and potential source of information (Hanley, 1994; Crowther, 1997). Her/his role is that of a facilitator (Copley, 1992), working to provide students with opportunities for authentic activities within a collaborative and social environment (Jonassen, 1994; Rice & Wilson, 1999) in which ‘student knowledge construction and social mediation are paramount’ (Adams, 2006, p.250).

2.2.2 Vygotskian theory of learning and concepts that inform the present study

The Vygotskian notions of social interaction, internalisation, mediation, language, writing, play and zone of proximal development, (1978 & 1987), together with the strategy of scaffolding proposed by Bruner (1986 & 1990), are central in instructional methods based on social constructivism. These notions and their contribution to the theoretical framework of this thesis are defined and discussed below.

2.2.2.1 Social interaction and the internalisation process

Central to Vygotsky’s theory of learning is the view that development of the individual cannot be understood without taking into account his or her interaction with other people. As Vygotsky taught, we are both the subject and the object of our learning, we learn from interacting in the social world then use that knowledge in the world (Vygotsky, 1978).

In parallel, for Vygotsky, social relations underlie mental processes. The child internalizes the mental processes initially made evident in social activities and moves from the social to the individual plane, from interpsychological functioning to intrapsychological functioning. ‘Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first on the social level and later, on the individual level; first between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological)’ (Vygotsky, 1978, p.57). He calls this process “internalization”.
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Drawing from Vygotskian thinking, this research project presupposes the importance of social interaction and internalization in children's language learning. Given its social and collaborative nature, drama will be used both as a social process, as a medium for interactions between the participants and as a tool for facilitating internalization process to take place first in the drama context and then in writing. In this chapter, I will show that the research literature indicates that talking and interacting with peers and teacher in the context of drama, gives children ideas and language to use as content for their subsequent writing.

2.2.2.2 Mediation

Vygotsky (1978) viewed the concept of mediation as being central to his account of mental functioning. For Vygotsky (1978, cited in Daniels, 2008, p.7), tools, signs and artifacts act as mediators which could be used to 'control behaviour from the outside'. These mediators 'serve as the means by which the individual acts upon and is acted upon by social, cultural and historical factors in the course of ongoing human activity' (Daniels, 2008, p.4). Vygotsky (1981, cited in Daniels, 2008, p.7) described psychological tools as devices for mastering mental processes. They were seen as artificial and of social rather than organic or individual origin.

In this thesis, mediation refers to using a means or a medium as intervention to prompt an action or produce an effect. Drama and language are both employed to mediate learning to children.

2.2.2.3 Language

As in the case of social constructivism, language is also central in the Vygotskian theory. Language, Vygotsky asserted, is at the heart of the interactions; it is the container holding and passing thoughts from one individual to another (Vanderburg, 2006, p.375). He identifies language as the most powerful psychological tool of mediation (Hasan, 2005, cited in Daniels, 2008, p.6). Language is central in this thesis too. It is the currency of learning through drama. As O'Neil (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) argues, the significance of drama context 'is achieved through situation, role, and task, but above all through the language initially modeled by the teacher but claimed gradually by the students as their own' (in foreword).
Vygotsky sees language as a means for engaging in social and cognitive activity. In his terminology, language is a symbolic, psychological tool, which not only mediates inter-psychological activity (through social interaction) but also mediates intra-personal activity. He (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986) maintains that human learning, as it relates to higher psychological functioning, is shaped by the use of language, that through language the mind engages in what is specifically human (see also Brockmeier, 1996; Vygotsky, 1986).

2.2.2.4 Writing

Writing was assigned a special place by Vygotsky: that is the learning of a secondary symbol system becomes the critical turning point in the cultural development of the child (1986; 1977). Vygotsky (1977) referred to the teaching of writing as cultivation rather than the imposition of the skill. He emphasizes that writing should be taught as the learning of a language, written language as opposed to letters. For him, written language develops through “inner speech” (Vygotsky, 1978) and is dependent upon the functional use of written symbols instead of sound (Vanderburg, 2006, p.375).

Vygotsky (1986) views writing as a tool that shapes children’s cognition and as a developmental, non-linear activity with the teacher just providing the appropriate conditions and environment to encourage children to write. The teacher needs to ensure that writing tasks relate to every-day life and are meaningful to children. This is the only way to teach them the written language and not just the writing of letters as Vygotsky so strongly emphasizes (1978).

Vygotsky’s proposal that writing is a more complex linguistic system than speech and ‘requires abstraction from the sound of speech and abstraction from the interlocutor’ (1978, p.181) deserves special attention. The implication of this double abstraction is twofold: first, in written language, we have to create the equivalent situation and represent our audience internally. Secondly, the motivation in writing should be internal rather than external as in the case of speech (Moll & Kurland, 1996, cited in Lacasa, Del Campo & Reina, 2001; Schultz, 2000, cited in Lacasa et al., 2001). This implication becomes a point of reference for the conceptual framework and design of this research. From my point of view, drama use aims first to contextualize language learning through meaningful situations for children and secondly to scaffold children’s writing by providing them both
with content and audience; or, using Vygotsky's words, by helping them to create 'the equivalent situation and represent [their] audience internally' (1978, p.181).

2.2.2.5 Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

According to Vygotsky, at any given moment, an individual is at a point where there are certain tasks s/he can accomplish independently, and some other, somewhat more complex tasks s/he can accomplish with the support of a more knowledgeable other. The latter types of tasks are said to be located within the individual's "Zone of Proximal Development" (ZPD) and, according to Vygotsky that is exactly where the focus of the educational process should be. For Vygotsky (1978):

The zone of proximal development defines those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic state. These functions could be termed the "buds" or "flowers" of development (p.89).

Useful instruction, according to Vygotsky, "impels or awakens a whole series of functions that are in a stage of maturation lying in the zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky,1987, p.212, cited in Gredler & Shields, 2003, p.22). As Valsiner points out (1988), the effectiveness of instruction is dependent upon its timing relative to the learner's state of action and thinking, which is, of course dependent on the learner's previous level of development. However, the Vygotskian notion of ZPD is seen by some as over-restrictive (Moll, 1990) and as posing problems, namely how to ascertain each student's ZPD and how to deal with multiple students' ZPD at the same time.

Considering the notion of ZPD in this project, drama process and language produced could be envisioned as the specific 'type of the socio-linguistic intervention' (Holme, 2004) that will 'target' the ZPD. In these terms, the contents and the process of drama need to carefully provide for learning opportunities and activities that are within children's ZPD, but not beyond their next stage of development, to maximise the child's development 'instead of ensuring pedagogical failure by moving outside its capacity and under-exploiting the same' (ibid.). This thesis argues/presupposes that drama methodology facilitates working in both individual and collective ZPD. In drama, the students have all the assistance from the teacher and peers that is required and maximum time for exploration and negotiation of issues that arise.
2.2.2.6 Scaffolding

Inspired by the notion of the ZPD, Bruner (1975) proposed that the teacher should engage in scaffolding. Scaffolding is conceptualized as a process of providing higher levels of initial support for students as they enter the ZPD with the gradual dismantling of the support structure as students progress towards independence (Harland, 2003).

During scaffolding, a teacher takes on Vygotsky’s role of the “more knowledgeable other,” models the task, and subsequently provides support that allows the learner to assume increasingly more control of the task being learned. The “buds” that develop into “fruits” in the ZPD occur when more developed individuals create a scaffold, questions, cues, and hints, to help less developed individuals (Wood & Middleton, 1975, cited in Vanderburg, 2006) through challenging activities.

For Vygotsky (1978), the process of scaffolding is the basic requirement needed to teach well. In the context of my project, the role of the teacher is the same as the role assumed by social constructivist pedagogy, that is an organizer and facilitator of the learning process. In drama, particularly through the drama strategy of teacher-in-role, the teacher scaffolds children’s learning.

2.2.2.7 Play

Vygotsky sees play/fantasy as a leading factor in development, the pathway to cognitive thinking. Play is seen as the imaginary, illusory world where, contrary to the real world, action is subordinated to meaning. ‘From the point of view of development, the fact of creating an imaginary situation can be regarded as a means of developing abstract thought’ (1967, p.553).

In this research context, much of the motivation and interest in drama stem from its essence as play. Due to their affective engagement created in the drama process, learners tend to forget they are in a learning context. They learn willingly within a fictitious dramatic environment. Vygotsky tells of the way in which a child, in play, knows how to do things but does not know that he knows. He points out the paradoxes that (1) the child operates with ‘an alienated meaning in a real situation’, (2) s/he adopts the line of least resistance but learns to follow the line of greatest resistance by subordinating himself/herself to rules (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 99). In drama the situation is the same. Students work simultaneously
between the real and the imaginary, within the boundaries of the workshop and within the rules of the drama task in hand.

Vygotsky (1967) sees instruction at school as a continuation of pretend play in the preschool child and explicitly says that, while playing, the child quite spontaneously creates a ZPD:

...play also creates the ZPD of the child. In play the child is always behaving beyond his age, above his usual every day behaviour; in play he is, as it were, a head above himself. Play contains in a concentrated form, as in the focus of a magnifying glass, all developmental tendencies; it is as if the child tries to jump above his usual level. The relation of play to development should be compared to the relation between instruction and development...Play is a source of development and creates the ZPD ([van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991]).

2.2.2.8 Imagination

In Vygotskian agenda, imagination and development are inextricably linked (Vygotsky, 1978). For Vygotsky, imagination represents ‘a specifically human form of conscious activity’ (1978, p.93), it is play without action. Imagination is essential to dramatic engagement. The drama process, more than any other art form, draws upon children’s natural ability of ‘thinking imaginatively’, to suspend disbelief and create imaginary situations through which to explore real experiences (Bowell & Heap, 2000). In this project, participants’ imagination will presumably be engaged in the context of drama through fictional story making in action. If the fictitious drama environment succeeds in engaging participants’ imagination, pupils will continue to be imaginatively engaged in their follow-up writing which in turn will be itself an imaginative outcome of the whole engagement.

2.2.2.9 Creativity

Vygotsky argued (2004) that creativity is a social process which requires appropriate tools, artifacts and cultures in which to thrive. According to Daniels (2008) he rejected the notion of creativity as the product of sudden inspiration, and he argued that the development and active promotion of creativity was a central function of schooling.

[We] should emphasise the particular importance of cultivating creativity in school-age children. The entire future of humanity will be attained through the creative imagination; orientation to the future, behaviour based on the future and derived from this future, is the most important function of the imagination. To the
extent that the main educational objective of teaching is guidance of school children’s behaviour so as to prepare them for the future, development and exercise of the imagination should be one of the main forces enlisted for the attainment of this goal. (Vygotsky, 2004, pp. 87-8, cited in Daniels, 2008)

The importance of creativity is recognized and highlighted in this project. Drama process itself is essentially a creative process. Children in drama are faced with dilemmas and problem-solving situations. Creativity along with imagination are essential parts of this process. Participants in drama need to be creative and imaginative, to come up with ideas, language and actions, to make their own dramas and put forward the story (on which drama activities are structured).

2.2.2.10 Motivation and learners’ agency in their learning

According to Vygotsky, motivation is the driving force for internalization and creative thought, no meaningful action can exist without a motive (1987). Vygotskian theory emphasizes that the initial move for engaging in any activity is what determines its outcome. In parallel, within a Vygotskian framework, the idea that the learner is agent in his/her learning is central to the developmental process. No amount of cognitive prowess or well thought out strategies will suffice if the learner is not interested.

In this thesis, the playful nature of drama, its topics/stories and the contextualization of language within them will be used to motivate and engage pupils in the learning process. The learners will be able to use language meaningfully, for exploring something in which they are interested, and thus motivated. Drama will give language a purpose and allow students to tackle issues in ways sensitive to their own experiences and interests. In addition, existing literature on drama supports the idea that dramatic experience has an impact on children’s affective engagement in writing. Baldwin and Fleming (2003, p. 22) argue that ‘Drama is able to motivate children’s imaginative thinking and give them the confidence to embark on what for many children can be an arduous and stressful [writing] task.’ Moreover, Kress argues (1996) that writing as intellectual reasoning is based on the writer’s intentions and agency. In Vygotskian theory, this process cannot be divorced from the social and cultural contexts which provide the motivating force. Thus, in this thesis, drama will be used as a pre-writing activity, aiming at motivating children’s subsequent engagement in meaning-making through the medium of writing.
2.3 SUMMARY OF THE SECTION

In the first section of literature review, I examined the theory of learning within which this research project is located. Discussion, in particular, concerned social constructivist view of leaning and Vygotskian theory and concepts that inform and are related to the present study. In the following section, I selectively examine and discuss theory and research related to writing.

2.4 PERSPECTIVES ON WRITING

In the second section of the literature review, I will focus on what we can learn about writing from different research discourses. I will present a concise overview of four major theoretical perspectives: cognitive, sociocognitive, sociocultural and genre theory. These perspectives, although derived from different discourses and writing traditions, need to be taken into consideration by a writing researcher. On the one hand, they inform understanding about the nature of writing and on the other hand, they enable the researcher to construct a personal view of writing and soundly locate it within the writing landscape.

Examining the range of the diverse writing perspectives and conceptualising the writing landscape as a continuum, we can identify its two ends. At one end are the cognitive perspectives which situate writing in the individual person and at the other end we find the social perspectives that situate writing in the society of which that person is a member. These perspectives are derived from cognitive psychology and sociology respectively. In parallel to these contradictory perspectives, somewhere in the middle of the continuum and closer to the cognitive ones, are situated the sociocognitive perspectives. These perspectives present an integrated view of writing which considers both the cognitive and social dimension of writing.

In what follows, I will review cognitive and social (sociocultural & genre theory) perspectives and their educational implications regarding learning, teaching and the assessment of writing. The selection of these perspectives was intentional. I have chosen
them having as criterion their impact on today’s writing pedagogy and curricula. Reviewing both theory and research on these perspectives, led to the design of my study.

2.4.1 Cognitive perspectives

From a cognitive view, writing is seen as a human problem-solving process (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001). Cognitivists regard a writing assignment as a problem that the writers are called to solve by doing a balancing act with the elements involved in the problem. These elements are complex and include the writer’s goals as well as content, style and audience (Flower and Hayes, 1981). Cognitivists feel that a writer, or at least a "good" writer, is someone who is able to "juggle" all of these things together (Flower and Hayes, 1981). More recently, still within a cognitive perspective, writing is seen as an example of human information processing in action. It is ‘a highly complex task which requires the orchestration of a number of different activities simultaneously and thereby places great demands on the cognitive system’ (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006, p.54).

Central to an understanding of the demands of writing is the assumption of a limited capacity (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006). The assumption is that the brain can only process a limited amount of information at any one time. Hence, the processing capacity is limited to a different finite amount for each individual. To complete successfully any difficult aspect of a task takes up more of the individual's finite capacity, thus leaving less capacity to be expended for other aspects of the task. As Stainthorp and Flynn (2006, p.55) note ‘this is particularly so if it is a highly complex task like writing’.

Cognitive psychologists and researchers using the technique of ‘think aloud’ protocol analysis (Newell & Simon, 1972, cited in Gregg & Steinberg (eds.)), that is, having their participants to express aloud their thinking and everything that occurs to them while working on writing tasks (Hayes & Flower, 1980, in Gregg & Steinberg (eds.)), gained valuable insight into the decision-making processes and metacognition of experts and novices. In these protocols, the target audience and the writing context of the individuals were acknowledged as being part of the writer’s cognitive representation of the task (Bailey, 2002). Using the knowledge gained, cognitivists developed models which describe the individual cognitive processes that take place during the writing process. In this context, the term of a writing model is considered ‘as a blueprint, a simplification, or an outline’ (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001, p. 3) which allows researchers ‘to focus on some
dimensions of the writing task, without forgetting that these dimensions belong to a complex system’ (ibid.).

Various cognitive models have been proposed to account for the complexity of the writing process (Flower & Hayes, 1980; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Berminger & Swanson, 1994, Hayes, 1996, Kellogg, 1996). Given that their emphasis is on the process of writing rather than on the product, these models represent the ‘process approach’ to writing. They show some differences in the conceptualization of details and terminology, but the consensus is that writing is a cognitively complex and interactive process made up of multiple sub-processes. The models suggest that both external and internal constraints that occur during the process often cause problems for writers, and that the quality of text depends on how effectively the writers manoeuvre a variety of small tasks while composing.

Below I will review selectively the cognitive writing models of Hayes and Flower (1980), Hayes’s (1996), Kellogg’s (1996), Berminger and Swanson (1994) and Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987). Their selection is based on their impact and contribution to writing research and pedagogy. For each of these models key components will be identified and the implications of these models on the learning, teaching and assessment of writing will be discussed.

2.4.1.1 Hayes & Flower’s Model of the Writing Process

Writing theorists and researchers (Levy, 1997, cited in Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001; Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001; Bailey, 2002; Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006) agree that Hayes & Flower’s Model of writing (1980) represents a valuable and influential contribution to the field of composition studies. In this model writing is viewed “as a process of problem-solving in which ideas are actively constructed to satisfy communicative goals.” (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999, p.94). Flower and Hayes (1980) characterize the writing process as the constant interaction of three sub-processes: planning, transcribing and revising. Planning is the stage where ideas are generated and organized. A writer then transcribes the ideas into written language, but because ideas and human language do not always directly correspond, the writer has to make revisions to the ideas or text, or both, in order to minimize the discrepancy between them. These sub-processes overlap and are repeated throughout the writing process (Flower and Hayes, 1980).
Despite the enormous influence that the model has on writing instruction and subsequent research, it has been criticized. Part of the criticism concerns the fact that the model only tries to identify the various processes rather than explain the functioning and relationship between the processes. Another point of criticism, is the fact that the model pays little or no attention to the wider social or cultural context of writing (Bailey, 2002, Riley & Reedy, 2000). Furneaux (1998) notes that the model has been criticized for being too generalized, since it suggests a uniform process for all writers and too vague since the researchers do not refer to how text is actually produced. In the same line of thought, Alamargot & Chanquoy (2001) assert that the model reflects only the cognitive processes of expert writers. Riley and Reedy (2000) note that the model does not incorporate the notion that the process of writing might vary for different types of writing. Protocol analysis has also been criticised because thinking aloud while writing interferes with the writing process itself (Furneaux, 1998, Czerniewska, 1992). As Czerniewska (1992, p.94) puts it: 'It [protocol analysis] tends to neglect the content of writing and tends to view the writer as simply a text-generator, reducing him or her to a socially isolated operator of cognitive skills'.

Following the criticism that Hayes and Flower’s model received, several other cognitive models have been proposed trying to address the aforementioned weaknesses.

2.4.1.2 Hayes’s Model of the Writing Process (1996)

Hayes, (1996) prompted by the criticism received, redesigned the original Hayes & Flower model. In the new model the social context in which writing takes place is taken into consideration. Hayes also incorporated the working memory and other processes and terms which differ in part from those proposed earlier. The new model suggests that writing depends on an appropriate combination of cognitive, affective, social, and physical conditions. Hayes (2000, cited in Indrisano & Squire (eds.)) contends that all components are highly instrumental in fully understanding writing. ‘Writing is a communicative act that requires a social context and a medium. It is a generative activity requiring motivation, and it is an intellectual activity requiring cognitive processes and memory’ (Hayes, in Indrisano & Squire (eds.) 2000, p.11). He describes this model ‘as an individual-environmental model’ (Hayes, 1996, p.5).
2.4.1.3 Kellogg’s model (1996)

Kellogg’s objective (1996) was ‘to integrate, in a unique model, writing processes and a system of information processing’ (Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001, p.19). Similarly to the Hayes and Flower’s model (1980), Kellogg (1996) explains the writing process in terms of an interaction of three processing systems. Each processing system is made up of two sub-systems: there is formulation, which is made up of planning and translating, execution, which is made up of programming and execution, and monitoring, which consists of reading and editing (Kellogg, 1996). Unlike Flower and Hayes, Kellogg provides detailed information about what goes on in each system and how the systems interact with each other (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006). In this model, ideas and language are already determined at the formulation stage. Then the ideas and language become the input to the execution system where the writer decides how to execute them. Once they are executed, the monitoring system looks for a discrepancy and a solution in conjunction with the formulation system. The formulation system starts again for new ideas or language to resolve the discrepancy detected in the previous system. Kellogg (1996) emphasizes that such interaction among these systems is ‘fundamental to the proposed model’ (p. 59).

2.4.1.4 A model for beginning and developing writing- Berminger & Swanson (1994)

According to Stainthorp & Flynn (2006), the original Hayes-Flower model (1980) and the amended model by Hayes (1996) are models of the processes of skilled writing. They (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006), suggest that the most useful model of examining writing in a pedagogical context, is the model for beginning and developing writing, proposed by Berminger & Swanson (1994) in their reformulation of the original Hayes and Flower model. This model derives from Berminger’s empirical work with novice writers and students with learning disabilities (Berminger et al., 1992). On the premise that there are developmental constraints on children and limited processing capacity, they modified the Hayes and Flower model to accommodate three identified constraints: neurodevelopmental which include motor activities, linguistic (e.g., syntax, vocabulary) and ability to plan, translate and revise.

In Berminger & Swanson’s model (1994), the three major writing processes (planning, translating and reviewing) are exactly the same as in the Hayes and Flower’s model. However, Berminger & Swanson elaborate more on the translating processes which were
not fully developed in the Hayes and Flower model because they concentrated more on the processes involved in skilled writing (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006). Children still have to learn and automate the transcription processes while developing their writing skills (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006). Therefore, as Stainthorp and Flynn (2006) argue, a considerable amount of children’s processing capacity is taken up by the transcription processes, leaving much less available for planning and reviewing. Berminger & Swanson’s model (1994), also acknowledges the central role played by working memory in writing. Similarly, as in the case of the Hayes’s model (1996), affect, motivation and social context are seen as influences on the writing processes (Stainthorp & Flynn, 2006).

2.4.1.5 Two models of composition processes-Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987)

Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), while doing research on pedagogy, developed their own cognitive model of writing. They proposed a developmental view of writing, with two models: less skilled writers operate at the level of 'knowledge telling' while more skilled writers are involved in 'knowledge transforming' (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987).

Within knowledge-telling, novice writers just write what they know about the writing topic, without much concern on goals, plans and composition. They are inclined to generate as much content as they can by asking themselves what they know about the topic (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987). They use a streamlined procedure bypassing the more complex problem-solving activities that are more evident in the composing practices of more expert writers (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987).

In knowledge-transforming, more skilled writers do not just write about their knowledge about the subject. Instead, before starting to write, they make a plan and think of what to write and how to write it in order to transform their knowledge into written material that is more appropriate to the writing task and their audience. They achieve that by ‘recycling’ their output through their processes of thought, revision, rethinking and rewriting. According to Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), the composition of text under a Knowledge Transforming Strategy is restricted to expert writers because they need to formulate plans on both the content and the rhetorics, while at the same time considering all the related inherent constraints.
This is offered as the explanation for the belated age at which a novice writer matures in terms of increased planning span (managing the goal setting activities) and Short Term Memory span (maintaining the problem-solving constraints). The two strategies are not to be considered as two distinct steps in the development of writing expertise, but as the extreme points of a development continuum, denoting the progressive change of writing strategies from Knowledge Telling to Knowledge Transforming (Bereiter, Burtis and Scardamalia, 1988, cited in Alamargot & Chanquoy, 2001, p.6).

2.4.1.6 Learning, teaching and assessment of writing within a cognitive perspective

In summary, the main characteristics of the cognitive perspective to writing, represented by the above models, are the emphasis on the processes which are involved in writing and the communicative goals that texts are designed to satisfy through these processes (planning, translating & reviewing) (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999). These processes include in particular the construction and evaluation of ideas, rather than the translation of preconceived ideas into text (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999). In addition, central to the learning of writing, is the coordination of the different processes involved in order to satisfy goals which vary according to context, task and audience (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999).

According to Ivanic (2004, p.231) the research concerning the processes of writing 'added a new way of thinking about writing to those already in play, diversifying the resources available to writing teachers.' Similarly, the change of focus from the product to the process of writing has had a significant effect on the teaching of writing. A huge number of activities have been designed to allow students to experience the process of writing. Such activities include: journal writing, peer conferencing, collaboration in small groups, brainstorming, outlining, free writing, multiple drafting, peer revision, writing for different audiences and class publication (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999).

In particular, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), based on their model and their belief that the aim of writing is the development of more intentional cognition (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1983) ('briefly defined as the setting and deliberate pursuit of cognitive goals', p.361), developed effective classroom interventions (Bailey, 2002). They designed activities aiming, at a first level, to encourage children to be aware of the variety of activities involved in writing (such as setting goals, formulating problems, evaluating decisions and planning in the light of goals and decisions) and to encourage them to
investigate and reflect upon their own strategies during the writing tasks (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1987). At a second level, teachers are advised to incorporate in their teaching, writing tasks that require children to engage in knowledge transformation (intentional writing), rather than tasks which can be achieved by simple knowledge telling. In the course of these activities, children can be helped to incorporate goals within the process by ‘procedural facilitation’ (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987), they can be offered external prompts which encourage them to consider different possible goals and courses of action at different points within the process. Then, gradually, as such procedures are internalised, the external prompts can be removed until they are capable of carrying out the process independently (Galbraith & Rijlaarsdam, 1999).

Due to the emphasis on the cognitive processes involved in writing, the assessment of the final product becomes somewhat meaningless. It is arguable whether the processes of planning-drafting-reviewing of writing can be assessed and yet it also seems pointless for the assessment to remain with the product, when the emphasis in teaching is mostly on the process (Ivanic, 2004, p. 231). However, the learning of processes involved in writing is only a means to an end since their learning aims at improving the quality of the final product and not the processes themselves. In this line of thought, Ivanic (2004, p. 232), suggests that ‘A compromise is to require not only a written ‘composition’ but also a written reflection on the processes involved in producing it, and to assess both.’

2.4.1.7 Summary of cognitive perspectives

Cognitive research has shifted its attention from the product to the processes of writing and has advanced teachers’ understanding of the organization of writing processes and how these vary between individuals. Teachers of writing began to pay more attention to the practical processes of planning, drafting and revising writing than to the characteristics of the product. This has also shed light on how proficient writers differ from less proficient ones by suggesting that good writers make use of multiple revisions in order to improve their text, whereas poor writers strive to get it right at the first attempt (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Cognitive research has also demonstrated that the move from conversation to writing in the knowledge-telling model and ultimately to knowledge-transforming is a hard one, for children as well as adults (Riley & Reedy, 2000).
The aforementioned pioneering work of cognitive researchers has focused primarily on the individual cognitive processes, aiming at the construction of theoretical models (Flower & Hayes, 1980, Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987, Berminger & Swanson, 1994, Hayes, 1996, Kellogg, 1996). Cognitive models of writing inform classroom practice and also research in writing. However, these models of writing cannot provide prescriptions of proven techniques that work for all learners (Sperling & Freedman, 2001, p. 371, cited in Juzwik et al., 2006, p.457) since they are general frameworks which do not give emphasis on the specific social or cultural context within which writing takes place (Bailey, 2002). They also do not take into consideration the individual's needs and differences in the way that individuals learn writing. Therefore, research in the field of teaching and learning to write must broaden its scope beyond the individual learner and consider the contextual parameters, that are the specific settings within which learning and teaching of writing take place.

In the following sub-section, I present a brief overview of sociocognitive perspectives of writing before extensively discussing social perspectives which are situated at the other end of the writing continuum.

2.4.2 Sociocognitive perspectives

The realisation that early cognitive models excluded the ‘social’ contextual factors led to the emergence of sociocognitive perspectives on writing like Berkenktter & Huckin’s (1993) and Flower’s (1994) which built on the latest developments in neo-Vykoskian and genre theory (Bailey, 2002). According to Freedman (1994, p.87) social-cognitive theory of writing emerged from the desire for an inclusive theory, one ‘to bring together two strands of research on writing’, the cognitive strand and the social strand. Freedman (1994) points out that the social-cognitive theory proposed in Carnegie Melon (Freedman, Dyson, Flower and Chafe, 1987) is based on Vygotsky’s (1978) notion of the social origin of human learning. Therefore, applying Vygotskian theory in the case of writing, she argues, presupposes students’ engagement in social interactions ‘that center around aspects of the task of writing that they cannot accomplish alone but they can accomplish with assistance’ (Freedman, 1994, p.88). In the same context, Nystrand, Greene and Wiemelt, (1993) maintain that sociocognitive perspectives on writing are concerned with ‘how individual intention and agency insert themselves within culturally and socially organised practices’ (Nystrand, Greene and Wiemelt, 1993, cited in Bailey).
According to Galbraith and Rijlaarsdam (1999, p.98), the emergence of sociocognitive models has been accompanied by a twofold shift in the existing cognitive study of the writing process: from examining how goals are incorporated into the writing to studying the process by which writers get to learn the goals of writing within different contexts; and from examining the purely cognitive conflicts between the various elements of the writing process to studying the conflicts between the goals experienced by writers when they try to handle conventions appropriate to different discourse communities in which they place themselves. In the same line of thought, Galbraith and Rijlaarsdam (1999, p.100), also maintain that sociocognitive perspectives still aim at defining the writing goals but without limiting them to the fixed properties of certain text forms (as in the case of genres) or general cognitive principles. They are given the latitude of properties that emerge from the interaction of the writer with the reader within the conventions of specific discourse communities.

However, most of the proponents of sociocognitive perspective, such as Flower, moved onto sociocultural perspectives of writing and became sociocultural theorists and researchers. In the following two sections, I examine selectively social perspectives on writing, research and theory that have been centred on the social and cultural dimensions of writing.

2.4.3 Sociocultural perspectives

According to Galbraith and Rijlaarsdam (1999), sociocultural perspectives of writing emerged as a critique of cognitive perspectives to the teaching and learning of writing. Critical objections to cognitive models were launched both from theoretical positions (Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1983; Nystrand, 1986, cited in Gubern, 1999) and from research findings in education (Heath, 1983; Graves, 1983; Freedman, 1985, cited in Gubern 1999) pointing out that social and contextual parameters should be taken into the reckoning in the study of writing (Gubern, 1999).

Faigley (1985, cited in Galbraith) for example, argued that individual writers do not create anew the goals that they bring to the task. Writers’ goals, instead, reflect their personal, cultural and academic background. He (ibid.) also asserts that differences between writers are not only limited to differences in their cognitive skills, but also extend to the writers’
understanding of conventions and sharing of goals within a specific community of practice. In the same line of Faigley’s argument, representative sociocultural reviews by Dyson and Freedman (2003) and Sperling and Freedman (2001), emphasize that no prescriptions of proven techniques applicable to all learners can be provided by cognitive research on composing and instruction.

Within a sociocultural perspective, that the above theses represent, writing is conceived as a set of social practices within the context of ‘literacy’ (Ivanic, 2004). Moreover, writing and its teaching are understood ‘as situated practices and activities that occur within a range of contexts, involve a range of student and teacher populations and thus are variable in consideration of such differences.’ (Juzwik et al., 2006, p.457). Sociocultural theorists and researchers support that a writer is a member of a community of practice, sharing ideas and techniques with other writers (Kostouli, 2005). They also advocate that how we write is shaped by the world in which we live in, with cultural differences affecting not just the language we use but also the assumptions we make about how the written text will be understood and used (ibid.).

In what follows, in relation to the scope of this thesis, I present first the sociocultural literature that considers children’s writing development. In this account, special emphasis will be given to the work of Anne Dyson, whose ethnographic studies provide useful insights into the diversity of children’s resources for writing and in the ways primary school children develop their writing. Subsequent discussion considers a sociocultural view of relationships between talk and writing and the teaching and learning as well as the assessment of writing within a sociocultural perspective.

2.4.3.1 Children’s writing development within a sociocultural perspective

A sociocultural perspective of writing refuses to reduce children writing to a generic ‘child writer’ (Dyson, 2001). According to Dyson children come from diverse social and cultural backgrounds and ‘yet, they are all instantiations of the complex unfolding of child writing across the grades’ (ibid, p.380). Consistent to this line of argument, important sociocultural research has been conducted in a variety of literacy contexts such as home, school and streets, to clarify the nature of the factors that influence children’s written language development. In general, research findings (Bissex, 1980, Heath, 1983, 1991, Taylor, 1983, cited in Schneider, 2003) indicate that children’s social class and home literacy
experiences and practices as well as cultural expectations on the nature and functions of writing are among the major factors that influence children's written development.

Examining school as a formal literacy context for children's writing development, sociocultural research indicates that learning to write is influenced by social interactions (Dyson, 1993; Dyson, 1997; Flower, 1994; Schultz, 1997, cited in Lacasa et. al., 2001) and reflects the curriculum and teaching methods employed in the classroom (Freedman, 1994; Lensmire, 1994, cited in Lacasa et. al., 2001). Children learn to write in their own different ways, adopting their own personal strategies and preferred genres, depending on the classroom they are in and the way they negotiate their role with teacher and peers (Dyson, 1988).

An important issue that arises from ethnographically-oriented research concerns the conflicts that children face in their writing development when they try to accommodate the formal school view of writing and expectations within their own cultural resources and repertoire of writing (Kostouli, 2005). As Kostouli (ibid.) illustrates, classroom writing reflects the various social worlds contained in the classroom, each world having its own requirements and understanding of what writing is. In a relevant investigation, Dyson (1993) differentiated between three worlds: the official school world, the unofficial peer world and the sociocultural community as realized in the classroom. According to Dyson (ibid.) these social worlds of children do not propose similar genres, themes and ways of using language. As Dyson argues, written text production in complex classroom cultures requires that children ‘differentiate not only phonological niceties and textual features but also the social worlds- the very social worlds that provide them with agency and important symbols’ (Dyson, 1999, p.396).

Due to the frequent and greatly varied differences in children's own experiences, children understand school literacy as seen through the prism of their own home literacy (Dyson, 1999) and cultural material such as children’s dramatic play, playful language, songs and stories. Dyson argues that:

Children have agency in the construction of their own imaginations; they appropriate cultural material to participate in and explore their worlds, especially through play and story. (1996, p.492)

Dyson (1999) found that first-grade children developed complicated form of text and talk by appropriating multiple forms of media. Similarly, in another investigation it was found
that children mix resources that they draw from a variety of real experiences as well as experiences shared with other children through role playing in dramatic and imaginary contexts (Dyson, 2002, p.550). Her thesis is reinforced by Kamberelis and de la Luna, (2004, p.245, cited in Kostouli, 2005, p.20), who note that developing writers draw upon prior resources ‘for imagining, negotiating and enacting practices and activities in the new contexts.’

2.4.3.2 Sociocultural view of relationships between talk and writing

From a sociocultural perspective on learning and development, learning to write is embedded within and develops from routine social interactions with literate others (Heath, 1983). Children become better writers by socializing and actively participating in meaningful literacy activities, and it is language that mediates experience (Vygotsky, 1962). To these activities children bring basic capabilities to learn and make sense and these are applied and developed within the social structures provided (McNaughton, 1995). Therefore, according to Parr, Jesson and McNaughton (2009), the research literature on talk and writing is ‘looking at how talk builds the psychological resources of the child, and at the roles of teacher, peer, and child talk within the structured literacy events of classrooms’ (p.247).

Bruner (1986, p.175) describes how more expert adults pass on children their own way of handling and using language while talking to them. Children are seen to internalize and transform what occurs on the external plane in the form of inner speech (Vygotsky, 1978) that guides their thinking (Wertsch and Stone, 1985). It is argued that such talk aids the regulation and orchestration of the complex processes involved in writing (Parr et al., 2009, p.247).

Moreover, Dyson (2006) argues that children in a classroom are supported in writing by their appropriation of adult/teacher talk; additional support derives from what she calls ‘unofficial events’. That is, the children’s participation in other every-day events that are governed by the children’s relationships with people and the language they experience during those events at home or with friends. Their appropriation draws on many voices as the words of others are ‘assimilated, reworked, and re-accentuated’ (Bakhtin, 1986, p.89). Children are trying to conform to writing’s demands when, in their interactions with each
other, they tend to imitate interactions with adults, assuming a voice that they think appropriate for the situation (Dyson, 2006).

Literacy events in the classroom, like ‘writing workshop’, are seen to contain structures that Bakhtin (1986) would call speech genres, that is stable, socially defined types of utterances and these become ways of thinking that are helpful for writing (Bomer and Laman, 2004). Similarly, the way teachers talk and respond, while interacting with children in order to scaffold their writing development, is an integral part of the social activity or event (Dyson, 2000).

Teachers use talk and joint activity to create a shared communicative space; an inter-mental development zone’ (Mercer, 2004), which is constantly reconstituted with ongoing dialogue. In relation to writing, according to Parr et al. (2009, p.246), talk and discussion led by the teacher may be used to rekindle prior knowledge in order to build content and create intertextual links-language and process links between reading and writing; also, to build metalinguistic awareness, to clarify what is to be learned and provide feedback to the children on their performance and the best way forward in their writing development.

2.4.3.3 Learning, teaching and assessment of writing within a sociocultural perspective

From a sociocultural perspective, people, by participating in social literacy events, whose social goals are relevant and meaningful to them, are seen to be led to implicit learning of writing (Ivanic, 2004). Dyson (2001) supports that learning to produce different kinds of texts is based on opportunities for oral participation in literacy events within which such texts matter. In these contexts, she argues (ibid.), learning can happen in many ways, either implicitly or explicitly. Implicitly by listening to and observing others use language orally or in text; explicitly by receiving instruction by more expert participants while engaging in literacy events, and receiving direct feedback from their audience.

Furthermore, for sociocultural theorists, learning to write goes beyond the transcriptional and linguistics aspects of writing such as handwriting, spelling, punctuation and syntax. It also involves the parameters that constitute a specific communicative situation such as by whom, how, when, at what speed, where, in what conditions, with what media as well as for what purposes texts are ‘written’ (Ivanic, p.235). Relevant to the sociocultural perspective, are theories of learning developed within the study of ‘communities of
practice’ (Wenger, 1998). According to these theories, people learn by apprenticeship, by ‘peripheral participation’ in literacy events, and by identifying themselves as members of a community that uses literacy in specific ways (Ivanic, 2004).

Learning writing through purposeful participation in literacy events does not necessarily imply a role for teachers. Therefore, Ivanic (2004) notes that sociocultural views of writing and learning to write do not interpret easily into an approach to the teaching of writing. However, Ivanic, reviewing sociocultural theory of writing, distinguishes between two types of approach to the teaching of writing. Firstly, there are what she calls ‘functional approaches’ (ibid.), which involve teaching in real or simulated contexts designed to fulfill a specific social goal. The goal is not determined by the learner but is specified or imposed by someone else such as an employer or some other bureaucratic authority. Secondly, the ‘purposeful communication’ approaches, that are less prescriptive and less focused on specific goals aiming more at involving learners in purposeful, situated activities which require writing to fulfill goals. Such approaches based on a view of writing as purpose-driven communication and are subject to all socio-political factors that affect real-life writing requiring the teacher to identify suitable situations of high communication content that involve all complex writing practices that arise in common literacy events. Teachers may also work to build a sense of community in their classrooms, which can generate its own authentic purposes for writing (Green & Dixon, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992; Yeager et al., 1998, cited in Ivanic, 2004).

According to Ivanic (2004), the criterion for good writing within the sociocultural perspective is how effective the writing is in fulfilling social goals. This can only be seen in the consequences of the writing and the effect it has on other people (ibid.). In normal everyday life, people are not concerned about the quality of their writing but only about how effectively it serves their purposes. However, as Ivanic (ibid) argues within educational settings, the effectiveness of a piece of writing is hard to assess or quantify because the assessors, mainly teachers or examiners, operate in a relatively decontextualised framework and their judgment of its effectiveness may be based on how well it engages the reader’s interest instead of how far it serves a range of social purposes. As a result, ‘effectiveness’ becomes susceptible to being overridden by other criteria of the pedagogic assessment practice.
2.4.3.4 Summary of sociocultural perspectives

Sociocultural perspectives on writing have broadened the scope of writing research by emphasizing the social nature of writing. They shifted researchers’ attention from the processes of writing within the individual, that cognitive models emphasised, to the contextual parameters of the teaching and learning situation (Gubern, 1999, p.223). Writing and the teaching of writing are seen as situated practices that take place within a range of contexts, involve a range of student and teacher populations and vary in differences (Juzwik et al., 2006). In a sociocultural context, children’s writing in the classroom is influenced by their social class, home literacy experiences and practices (Bissex, 1980, Heath, 1983, 1991, Taylor, 1983, cited in Schneider, 2003). Dyson’s (1999) ethnographic studies provide useful insights into the diversity of children's resources for writing and in the ways primary school children develop their writing by drawing on and blending resources from varied practices, both from official and unofficial worlds.

2.4.4 Genre theory

Genre theory, as in the case of sociocultural perspectives, expands the scope of what is involved in writing to include also social aspects of the writing event (Ivanic, 2004). As Bailey maintains (2002, p.41), ‘the development of genre theory represented a shift in emphasis to seeing writing as social communication within particular cultural contexts’. Within a genre theory perspective writing is seen as a set of text-types which are called ‘genres’ and are shaped by social context. Genres have been described as relatively stable textual regularities associated with and constitutive of social practices (Cope and Kalantzis, 1993), as configurations of semantic resources that members of the culture associate with a particular situation type (Christie & Martin, 1997) and as responses to social situations which are part of a socially constructed reality (Miller, 1984, 2005).

In what follows, I will first review the origins of genre theory, its rationale as a social theory of teaching writing and the criticism it has attracted. Then, I will examine the learning/teaching and assessment of writing within a genre theory perspective.
2.4.4.1 The development of genre theory

Two versions of genre theory were developed, one that originated in Australia (see Cope and Kalantzis, 1993) and the other originated in North America (Swales, 1990, Freedman & Medway 1994). The Australian genre theory grew out of Halliday’s systemic linguistics (1978; Halliday & Hasan, 1989, cited in Ivanic, 2004) and has been influential on the pedagogy of writing in Australia and in the United Kingdom. The American genre theory has not been so influential mainly because it was difficult to apply in classrooms since it emphasises the fluidity of genres instead of their stability as the Australian theory does and therefore limits their analysis and explicit teaching (Bailey, 2002).

Central to genre theory is that texts vary linguistically depending on their context and purpose (Ivanic, 2004). Therefore, linguistic features of text-types can be specified according to their type, that is, spoken or written, describing, instructing and so on and also according to how formal and certain the situation is. In this framework, genre researchers in Australia worked with school teachers in order to develop a robust pedagogy for teaching children text genres that they considered important to school literacy (Bailey, 2002). These text genres were mainly related to: report, explanation, procedure, discussion, recount and narrative. The main argument of genre theorists was that as schoolchildren come from different linguistic backgrounds (Kress, 1987) the ones that can learn and use the genres easily are only the bright and motivated middle-class children (Martin, Christie & Rothery, 1987). Because of this, the Australian genre theorists were motivated to empower groups that had a disadvantage by providing them with access to the genres of the dominant culture (Bailey, 2002). Focusing teaching on the linguistic aspects of texts within the six genres was always meant to be within a view of genres as social processes (ibid.).

The use of genre theory in the teaching of writing was the cause of strong positive and negative arguments by policymakers and researchers (Ivanic, 2004). By some it was seen as a logical, systematic and practical approach whilst others saw it as too prescriptive based on the simplistic view that texts-types are unitary and static (ibid.). Barrs (1993) argues that the principles of genre theory are not consistent with what is known about the development of children as writers. She maintains that expecting
children to write specific structures and teachers to adopt prescriptive rules for writing stifles children’s writing development. She points out that, when children write, they mix genres therefore their writing does not reflect the stereotyped genres defined by linguists and that such genres should not be considered as ‘failed adult genres’, but as developmental genres in their own right. Instead, according to Barrs (1993), children’s texts express the level of children’s conceptual development. Their spontaneous concepts need to be studied in order to support and extend their thinking. They will reveal more of their thinking and understanding if they are encouraged to write in their own voices. Kress (1982), although a leading UK genre theorist, in step with Barrs, criticizes genre theory for the loss of creativity in children’s writing. He argues that the learning of formalized and codified genres leads the child to increasingly suppress creativity, subordinating creative ability to the normalized demands of the genre. Thus, ‘the child learns to control the genre, but in the process the genre comes to control the child’ (Kress, 1982, p. 11).

2.4.4.2 Learning, teaching and assessment of writing within a genre theory perspective

As stated above, learning to write within a genre theory perspective implies that learners need to first become familiar with the linguistic characteristics of various types of text before they are in a position to reproduce them in a way that will serve specific purposes in specific contexts (Ivanic, 2004). In practice, it is possible for writers to learn, without explicit teaching, the linguistic characteristics of each genre, by learning to adapt their writing to the communicative purposes of social contexts. However, explicit teaching is a common characteristic of teaching approaches within genre theory (ibid.). While in everyday life text-types are generated by social purposes, in pedagogic settings text-types may have to be artificially specified (ibid.). More specifically, the intended text-types are modeled by the teacher through examination and comparison of their features in different texts of the same genre. Subsequently, appropriate linguistic terminology is taught in order to generalise about the nature of such texts (Bailey, 2002). Finally, learners are encouraged to use this information to construct (rather than ‘compose’) their own texts in the same genre (ibid.).

Interestingly for this thesis, Barrs (1993), recommends writing in-role as an approach to teaching the genres. She argues that children by undertaking writing in-role, as
part of drama or after their drama involvement, can write in genres considered as socially important by the genre theorists. It is evident that when children write in role, as part of a drama, they can assume voices that they never normally use by taking on roles as politicians, scientists, reporters and others (ibid.). Barrs (ibid.) attributes this association between writing in-role and the learning of genres to the fact that it may be easier for novice writers to handle certain kinds of impersonal language when they write from a character’s perspective than it is when they use their own. Moreover, she asserts that when children write in-role, they draw on their hidden writing resources and literacy experiences. In the context of this research project, drama as a learning medium can facilitate children’s purposeful acquisition and familiarization of the specific linguistic characteristics that are associated with a particular genre.

The assessment of writing within this perspective is inextricably bound to the view of writing that genre theorists share. According to Ivanic (2004), the main criterion for good writing is how appropriate the choice of linguistic features is in relation to a particular text-type. This means that, for assessment purposes a text can be rated ‘excellent’ because it displays the right text-type characteristics for the specified purpose in the particular social context, even though it contains inaccuracies and is dull in terms of content and style. In this line of thought, Fairclough (1992, cited in Ivanic, 2004), points out that the criterion of ‘appropriacy’ should always be viewed critically. The question ‘appropriate, according to whom?’ should be asked in order to challenge conventions and try to recognise alternatives to what are considered to be ‘appropriate’ conventions.

2.4.4.3 Summary of genre theory

Genre theory is a social theory of writing which is based on the notion of genres as relatively stable text types associated with social practices (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993). The key point of genre theory is that texts vary linguistically according to their purpose and context (Ivanic, 2004). Therefore, learners need to learn the linguistic characteristics of different text-types in order to be able to reproduce them in a way so that they serve specific purposes in specific contexts (ibid.). The learning of writing is achieved through explicit teaching of the characteristics of each genre and good writing is not just correct writing, but writing which fits linguistically the purpose it is serving (ibid.).
2.5 SUMMARY OF THE SECTION

In this section, I reviewed and discussed theory and research pertaining to writing and informing the design of the study. In the next section, theory and research pertaining to Drama in Education are examined.

2.6 THEORY AND RESEARCH IN DRAMA IN EDUCATION

In this research, ‘drama’ refers to Drama in Education (DiE). By ‘drama in education’, I mean any process-oriented drama, which aims to use drama as an educational tool. This kind of practice is particularly associated with the English tradition of drama education. ‘On the learning continuum of drama, with free play at one end and scripted performance at the other, drama in education is situated centrally’ (Grainger et. al., 2005, p.101). However, ‘drama employs elements of both free play and theatre, and involves the creation of shared fictitious worlds which materialize through the imaginations of both the children and their teacher’ (ibid.). The focus is not on the product, the performance of a play, but on using this art form as a teaching and learning medium in various subject areas (Hertzberg, 1996). Drama is not intended for an external audience; the learners-participants are their own audience. As Greene puts it (1996, in Foreword) ‘the focus is no longer on the object (the so called ‘art work’, the ‘text’) but on the transaction between the living human being and what is to be grasped, what is to be learned.’

Through the building of a fictional world, a safe environment is created in which students, by being ‘as if’, investigate and find solutions to the problems this dramatic environment presents. Practitioners emphasise the power of drama to seek universal truths and understandings (Bolton, 1984; Nealands, 1984). It is the process of finding a frame through which to make connections, to change understandings and to find truths to do with human nature and its consequences (O'Neil, 1995). Thus, drama is a group statement, a place where meaning is negotiated, a ‘door into knowledge’ (Bolton, 1992, p.115).

In the context of this project, drama is going to be used as a teaching and learning pedagogy. Within a known story or an imaginary scenario, language will be contextualised and used authentically and purposefully for problem-solving situations that will emerge through drama (Winston, 2004). There will not be a pre-written dramatic text, the children will ‘write’ their own play (Bowell & Heap, 2001). The drama conventions will be employed
for providing children with a context for exploration and negotiation of meanings through spoken, visual, body and written language.

This section reviews the literature, theory and research, pertaining to using Drama in Education (DiE) and will argue how current research falls short of providing a complete account, of what is happening when drama as pedagogy is integrated in the writing curriculum of a primary class. The focus of discussion concerns first the theoretical underpinnings of DiE and justifies its educational orientation. Then, key concepts that underpin the practice of drama and arguments that justify its value and potency as a learning and teaching medium are discussed. Subsequently, recent studies that have investigated the process and impact of drama in the writing classroom will be examined. It will be argued that although these studies investigated the relationship between drama and writing there is a need for a study that will illuminate further the nature of this relationship and fill the gaps of previous research.

2.6.1 Theoretical Underpinnings

This study shares the same view of drama in education as it is articulated in the English National Curriculum (DfES, 1999). This sub-section first begins with a brief review pertaining to the shifts of the educational orientation in DiE. Secondly, it identifies the claimed functions of using drama pedagogy and the explanation of why drama is appropriate in children’s learning. Thirdly, it concentrates on the educational rationale that underpins DiE.

2.6.2 Drama as pedagogy

The belief that education should involve dramatic learning goes back to the twentieth century when pioneers like Finlay-Johnson (1911) and Cook (1917) attempted to connect drama with education. In their work, as the titles suggest (The ‘Dramatic Method of Teaching’ and ‘The Play Way’), drama/play is identified as a means to teach. Later, Slade advocated children’s free play, asserting that ‘education must provide that developing dramatic experience’ (Martin-Smith, 1996). To connect drama to education, Heathcote (1984) enriched the connection of drama and education by advocating the practice of ‘drama as education’. She emphasised the methodological use of drama to bring learning to life being ‘at the service of the other areas of the curriculum’ (1984, p. 57). Accordingly,
drama as a learning medium across the curriculum, rather than ‘a subject discipline’, has also been the central notion of DiE (Hornbrook, 1989, p. 132). Gavin Bolton pushed the significance of drama to the highest point, by declaring that ‘drama should be at the heart of the curriculum’ (1984, p. 154). Two decades later, Joe Winston (2004) reiterated that drama and English is the centre of children's learning.

This brief review supports the idea that for more than a century, drama has been considered as a pedagogical tool (in England). The following section aims to draw a picture of learning claimed by looking into the shifts of the educational orientation of DiE in England. This project was undertaken in Cyprus where DiE is a relatively new field and it is not integrated in the Curriculum. Therefore there is no history or literature to justify its place as a pedagogical tool.

2.6.3 Claims for Learning

Before the 1970s, learning of drama was mainly associated with pupils' development of emotion, creativity, imagination and self-expression. Finlay-Johnson (1911) specifically associated children's play with learning. Cook (1917) initiated 'acting out' in learning dramatic literature. Slade (1954) in *Child Drama* proposed that drama provides pupils with opportunities to release and control emotion. His work was characterized by respect for the creative ability of children and minimum intervention by the teacher. His basic argument was that child drama is an art form and that drama processes begin with the ‘spontaneous, egocentric creations of the child in sound and movement that develop into the spontaneous creation of play, produced and acted by children’ (Slade, 1954, cited in O’Hara, 1984, p.315). Following Slade's philosophy, Brian Way oriented drama to promoting personal development. In his influential publication, entitled *Development through Drama*, he argued that ‘education is concerned with individuals; drama is concerned with the individuality of individuals, with the uniqueness of each human essence’ (Way, 1967, p. 3).

Resulting from the above directions, drama was viewed as a tool to develop pupils' emotions, creativity, imagination and self-expression. However, the freedom given in drama seemed to create an impression that was analogous to self-indulgence in the 1970s (Martin-Smith, 1996). In response to the disbelieving criticism of drama, Dorothy Heathcote (1984) shifted the orientation to establish drama as a critical and reflective methodology, in which the teacher's responsibility is to provide living-through experiences.
Heathcote was particularly interested in how the art form of drama could be exploited by the teacher and students to explore important issues, events or relationships (Edmiston, 1998). Her goal of teaching was 'to go for quality of experience, to plummet deep into feeling and meaning, to learn through drama’ (Wagner, 1999, p.1). This notion of drama as a ‘learning medium’ (Wagner, 1999), was a prominent aim in her work and distinguishes it from that of her predecessors (Edmiston, 1998). Rather than using drama to help students act out a story, Heathcote advocates that the teacher should isolate moments from stories to create dramatic encounters in which students of any age may be challenged into new ways of thinking. In her teaching there was 'less emphasis on story and character development and more on problem-solving or living through a particular moment in time’ (Wagner, 1999, p.1).

The introduction of drama strategy of teacher in-role by Heathcote, was one ‘of the more radical ways in which Heathcote transformed approaches to drama praxis’ (Taylor, 2000, p.103). Way suggested that the teacher guide or lead from outside the drama experience. Slade saw the teacher as a facilitator who provided the forum for children to play; yet still the teacher would facilitate from a non-participatory perspective. To halt or in any way interfere with children's play, Slade argued, would be spoiling their creativity. She challenged the notion of uninterrupted, free, and spontaneous play, and she advocated planning for reflection in drama. She pointed out the need for drama teachers to structure strategies through which experiences in drama can be examined. The teacher in role was a key structural strategy.

Later on, Bolton extended Heathcote’s idea to indicate that the scope of drama learning could go beyond school settings. For him, drama acts as a mediator between the individual and society, the link between the micro and the macro world. In Drama as Education, Bolton indicated that ‘ultimately, therefore, drama is concerned with engaging with something outside of oneself. The personal aspect of the engagement provides the dynamic... but the orientation is towards objectivity’ (1984, p.154). He suggested that drama can support pupils in objectifying their private experience, connecting it with the real world.

In recent years, there has been concern that Heathcote’s emphasis on method has done much harm in England to the disciplinary status of drama. Among those who were sceptical about the ‘assuredly evident value’ of using Drama as pedagogy, David
Hornbrook, an actor and director, challenged the assumption embedded in teachers' practice that as long as 'students were sufficiently “absorbed” in their improvisations then they were developing' satisfactorily' (Hornbrook, 1998, p. 12). He argued that the purpose of drama education is ‘cultural induction’ and he blamed Heathcote and her ‘proselytes’ for the ‘impoverishment’ of drama education since their emphasis on drama as a learning pedagogical medium has ‘denied students access to the culture and skills of the theatre’ (Hornbrook, 1991, p.21). His ‘distinct’ viewpoint instead was to pursue pupils' art form development e.g. dramatic skills, knowledge and understanding. Likewise, this view equally contributes to the range of learning from which children can benefit in drama.

Resulting from the differences of opinions as to how drama should be positioned in favour of children, the subject or method dispute has eventually settled down to a notion that both orientations should exist concurrently (Neelands, 1997; Fleming, 2001; Bowell & Heap, 2000). This view was apparent in an early governmental document, which states that drama 'can be taught as a subject in its own right and dramatic methods can be applied to the teaching of other subjects' (1989, p. 21). Neelands enriches this concept to propose a liberal and diverse practice of DiE. He argues, ‘a radical new re-conceptualisation of the field would need to be inclusive of the various claims made by different positions within it’ (1997, p. 44). The rationale behind Neelands’ argument is justified since it is grounded in the inseparable nature of drama as an art form and a tool. In essence, this is commonly believed among drama authors like Bowell & Heap (2001), Somers (1994), Winston and Tandy (2001). In other words, learning ‘through’ drama is essentially complemented with that derived from learning ‘about' drama and vice versa.

As the educational orientations suggested, the scope of drama learning is holistic, ranging from creativity, imagination, personal growth, as a method of teaching and learning, and a medium of artistic development. As Bowell and Heap (2001) conclude, drama assists children in cross-curricular learning, learning about art form, and personal and social learning. Theorists and practitioners in DiE emphasise certain aspects of learners' involvements. Neelands reinforces that drama ‘engages the emotions as well as intellect’ (1984, p. 6). Heathcote singles out her main concern to stress that ‘emotion is the heart of drama experiences’ (1984, p. 97) while other educators emphasise that drama can develop pupils' reflective, creative and critical thinking, and research ability (O'Neill & Lambert, 1982; Woolland, 1993). Later, Bowell and Heap (2001) add kinesthetic experience to children's cognitive and emotional engagement in drama. The holistic view of drama learning also appeared not only in individual claims, but also in a governmental
document, which declares, ‘drama helps pupils to face intellectual, physical, social and emotional challenges’ (DfES, 1989, p. 1). All of these repetitions, highlighting or adding values suggest that the contemporary view of drama learning is holistic. This is because the dynamic nature of drama (O’Toole, 1992) can contribute to pupils’ physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and artistic learning. In O’Toole’s words, ‘drama as an art is holistic, even in its application to learning’ (1992, p. 72).

2.6.4 Educational Claims Underpinning Drama as Pedagogy

This section aims to identify the theoretical underpinning on which to base classroom teachers’ practice of drama integration. Theoretical concepts are vital to a teacher’s practice, as Alexander reminds us, ‘without them practice is mindless, purposeless and random’ (1994, p. 17). I first consider key concepts inherent to the practice of Drama in Education and then concepts and claims that justify the pedagogical value and use of drama as a learning and teaching medium. These concepts and claims constitute the theoretical framework of Drama in Education practice and are essential in understanding the special contribution of Drama to the curriculum and to language learning in particular. As it is impossible to identify all the educational concepts and claims surrounding the field of Drama in Education, the selected concepts are intended to cover different aspects that, in my opinion, justify the use of Drama as Pedagogy.

2.6.4.1 Theoretical Concepts that underpin the practice of Drama in Education

Imagination / ‘As if’ behaviour

The nature of applying DaP entails learning through imagined experience (Heathcote, 1984; Neelands, 1992). Imagination is an essential component of any engagement with drama. The drama process, more than any other art form, draws upon children’s natural ability to ‘think imaginatively’, to suspend disbelief and create imaginary situations through which to explore real experiences (Bowell & Heap, 2000). Imagination appears to be the way to bring about action in drama. It is in an imaginative context in which all sorts of happenings or encounters can evolve. In this sense, actions are not just doing something, but taking action to pretend, ‘as if’ we were someone else.
Bolton (1984) calls this kind of imaginative behaviour ‘as if’ behaviour and he argues that in ‘as if’ lies the dramatic medium’s potency as an educational tool:

Of all the kinds of imaginative behaviours…drama is the only one that articulates inventing, anticipating, recollecting, hypothesizing, creating, musing and day-dreaming or any other mode of imagining through the medium of concrete action…Teaching is a process concerned with breaking, challenging, supplementing or eroding a child’s present achievement in conception and perception and “as if” behaviour can be the teacher’s most effective tool for doing this (p.142).

Similarly, for Heathcote & Bolton (1995), imagination is in the heart of the drama teaching. ‘It is imagination that allows both teacher and students to devise alternative modes of action, alternative projects and solutions’ (in foreword).

**Being in someone else’s shoes**

‘Being in someone else’s shoes’ (Heathcote, 1984, p.49) or the notion of enactment (Hertzberg, 2000) is central in justifying the value of drama as a learning/teaching medium. It is the process of enactment that fosters ‘perspectival learning’ (Henry, 2000, p.56) through drama by enabling participants to see things from different perspectives, to ‘experience’ someone else’s reality (Hertzberg, 1996). Enactment is especially meaningful for all of those students who need to be actively engaged in the learning process (ibid.) because ‘it increases the students’ involvement by allowing them to show outward signs of mental images’ (Schneider & Brindley, 1997, p.15). To take on the role of a particular character challenges students to develop empathy for the motivations and/ or reasons for their actions in an important way that is quite unique to drama (Hertzberg, 1996). The emotional experience is real for the students even though the activity is fictional. As a consequence, the students can be helped to reflect on their behaviour in the drama from ‘another’ person’s point of view (Neelands, 1992, p.5).

**Metaxis**

The process of developing empathy, feeling what it is like ‘to be in someone else’s shoes’ is related to *metaxis*, a term coined by Boal (1981) and used by drama theorists to mean ‘seeing two worlds at the same time’ (Bolton, 1992). This notion provides perhaps one of the most powerful reasons for using drama methodology in teaching and learning. ‘Not only does metaxis enable students to see things from different perspectives, to experience
someone else’s reality, but it may also allow better understanding and communication of feelings about their own experiences’ (Hertzeberg, 2003). The metaxis is a merging space which O’Toole considers as ‘potentially a source of learning and dramatic meanings, as well as tension’ (1992, p. 30), while O'Neill and Lambert (1982) envisage it as a locale for changes of thinking. As Winston elaborates, learning occurs because:

There is always a distance between the person I am when acting or in role and the person I am in everyday life. This does not, however, deny the validity of having children take on such roles for there is always something of me, of my ‘self’, in this ‘other’ I am pretending to be. Drawing from my knowledge of the world and my own experience I enter into a ‘third space’, one that can help me make connections between my sense of self and how it differs from or is similar to or connects me with others (2000, p. 99).

The concept of metaxis is important in drama because it ‘has a sense of applying knowledge, but lacks the consequences of real application’ (Bolton, 1992, p.33). Working within the medium of drama, children can respond to the defined context and test out a wide range of points of view and possible actions in a real way, but, as Neelands notes (1992, p.19), ‘without having to suffer the consequences of their actions as they would do in life.’ According to Hertzeberg (1996), students can explore ideas and issues such as bullying, friendship or betrayal found in books, distanced from their own lives-bringing the realities and understandings of their own experiences, but standing apart from them.

**Predominance of meaning**

Vygotsky (1978) suggests that play is the bridge that allows the pre-school child to progress from thinking solely in terms of what is present in their perceptual field to thinking beyond what is immediately present. That is, children cannot ‘think’ horse if there is no horse present, but by using an object (a stick) and an action of riding the stick, they can begin to ‘think’ horse. For Vygotsky (1978, 1933), the main function of make-believe play is the predominance of meaning while ‘action retreats to second place’ (Vygotsky, 1933, p.550, cited in Bolton, 1979). Bolton (1979) argues that the *predominance of meaning* in Vygotsky’s perspective on play, ‘is the key not only to understanding play but the key to putting drama in an educational perspective’ (p.21). In this line, he (Bolton, 1979, p. 21) proposes that the power of drama medium lies in the notion of ‘Drama seems to be doing’ instead of ‘Drama is doing’. In this line of thought, Bolton (1979) notes that drama ‘is thought-in-action; its purpose is the creation of meaning; its medium is the interaction
between two concrete contexts (externalized context-horse and actual context-riding the
stick’ (p. 21).

2.6.4.2 Arguments for the educational orientation of drama

First-hand engagement/experience

Bruner (1974) suggested that a learner needs to participate actively in the learning
process and that a child’s feelings, fantasies and values need to be incorporated into
lessons so that knowledge becomes personalized. However, as Bowell and Heap (2001)
maintain, the majority of experiences in school offer children a sort of second-hand
interaction with the world, filtered through the teacher, television producer, author and so
on. ‘In circumstances such as these, feeling is easily separated from thinking and knowing
and when this occurs the chance of information becoming personalized, and, therefore, is
reduced’ (Bowell and Heap, 2001, p.2). According to the same authors the drama process,
by its very nature, affords the chance for first-hand interactive learning experience:

In creating a world within a drama and inviting children to invest directly and
actively something of themselves in it, the teacher creates the opportunity for
understanding to be perceived which is directly transferable to the real world
(ibid.).

The Playful nature of drama

The use of drama as a teaching tool is based on the premise that an involved child is an
interested child, an interested child will learn, and drama directly involves the child (Smith,
1972, cited in McMaster, 1998, p.574). Drama succeeds in involving the child by drawing
on the child’s natural ability to play (Edmiston, 1993). Much of the motivation and interest
in drama stem from its essence as play. Drama’s playful nature is key in motivating and
directly engaging children in the learning process. Children are natural dramatists who use
make-believe as a way of understanding life around them (McMaster, 1998, p.577). They
enjoy play and take it seriously, a process through which learning takes place. Due to their
affective engagement created in the drama process, learners tend to forget they are in a
learning context. They learn willingly within a fictitious dramatic environment.


**The Child is at the Heart of Drama as Pedagogy**

Authors such as Heathcote (1984) and Bolton (1984) concur with Dewey's view in treating the child as the centre of teaching and that ‘drama should be unequivocally child-centered’ (Neelands, 1984, p. 6). In classroom practice, similarly to that in the wider field of education, drama educators believe that the objective of using drama pedagogy is in the service of a child's learning. In a similar vein of thinking, Heathcote (1984) maintains that the children's needs must be prioritised over the practical considerations of teachers when envisaging, designing or organizing any teaching preparation. She even pushes Dewey's idea forward to suggest that pupils' perspectives are more vital than those of the teacher (Heathcote, 1984).

Winifred Ward respects children's existing knowledge and affirms that ‘drama comes in the door of the school with every child’ (cited in Siks, 1983, p. 3). Children's prior knowledge is regarded as the premise of starting and planning a drama (O'Neill & Lambert, 1982; Siks, 1983; Winston & Tandy, 2001). Teachers provide children with drama experience linking their prior understanding with the world which they are unfamiliar with (Neelands, 1984; O'Neill & Lambert, 1982). In other words, in a drama-integrated classroom, students' prior knowledge should be recognised, valued, and applied (Burke, 1995; Heathcote, 1984; Neelands, 1984; O'Neill & Lambert, 1982).

**Social interaction & the ZPD**

‘Rooted in social interaction, drama is a powerful way to help children relate positively to each other, experience negotiation and gain confidence and self-esteem’ (Grainger & Pickard, 2004, p.2).

*Social interaction* is another key notion in justifying the educational value of drama. Learning occurs most efficiently within a supportive and collaborative environment. Drama process is based on the collaboration and interaction between the participants, teacher and children. The social quality is derived from the dynamics of the organisation and operation. In a drama-integrated classroom, children usually sit in a circle for whole group work, or alternatively, work in small groups interacting with each other. Pupils learn from being involved in dialogues with their teacher and peers that are either older or younger than themselves. In this sense, drama necessarily revolves around social interaction within
the group, either inside or outside the imaginative context (Bowell & Heap, 2001; McGregor et al., 1977).

As Bolton accentuates ‘It is the collective motivations of the group rather that idiosyncratic psychological desires that give the drama its dynamic’ (1998, p.186). Drama is a group statement, a place where meaning is negotiated (ibid.) and co-constructed upon the prior knowledge and experiences of the learners. This highlights that drama experience is socially and communally created by and attributed to the community of the group (McCaslin 1990, Winston & Tandy, 2001). Thus, drama process is essentially a social process that enables successful learning through social interactions to take place. According to Bolton and Heathcote (1995, in foreword), students in drama are active ‘not just cognitively but socially and kinesthetically. They are required to question, negotiate, compromise, take responsibility, cooperate, and collaborate, all in the service of something beyond themselves…responsibility for the learning is shared among the group and with the teacher.’

Moreover, drama as a social process is ideal in creating a time and space where each student’s ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) can be worked upon at the same time. Working together, each student collaborates with others to provide the best solutions to problem-solving situations that arise though drama, utilizing contributions from all individuals. The ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) is explicitly actualised since ‘as they collaborate with their peers to create an improvisation, they are pressured to behave and use language in new and previously untried ways’ (Wagner, 1998, p.67).

**Making abstract concepts concrete**

By linking the cognitive, affective and body language, drama permits students to explore key areas of human existence which are otherwise classed as abstract and inaccessible. The indeterminate area of social and moral concepts cannot be taught through ‘instructional’ teaching. Concepts such as ‘justice’, ‘prejudice’, and ‘racism’ are alien to children limited experiences and they are not a matter of ‘dictionary work’. They need to be embedded in a concrete context in order to make sense for children. Drama (eg storytelling) can provide this context and facilitate children’s learning and understanding of those value-laden and ‘abstract’ words. In this context, children can discuss and engage with complex moral and social issues (Winston, 2004).
A chance to be successful

In drama there is no absolutely right or wrong and individual contributions are encouraged and validated. Fox (1987, cited in McMaster, 1998, p.583) pointed out that “One of the loveliest advantages of drama is that it gives all children the chance to be successful” (p.4). Similarly, the dramatist Heinig (1987, cited in McMaster, 1998, p.583) agreed that:

Often children who have difficulty with other classroom tasks find success and a place for themselves in drama, a discovery that gives them a renewed interest in learning. Enjoyment and success together lead to self-confidence, a prime requisite for becoming a thinking, feeling and creative person able to face life’s challenges. (p.9)

Giving the chance to all children to be successful, to participate and have their opinions reinforced as valuable, drama is democratized learning for all learners. The educational value of drama as a medium is that it calls upon all learners and supports diversity of views and perspectives. As Barnes (1968, p.3) puts it, ‘Education should strive not for the acceptance of one voice, but for an active exploration of many voices’.

Drama and language connection

Language is the heart of the drama process and the means through which the drama is realized (Booth, 1994). Drama practitioners and theorists emphasise that drama more than any other art form ‘can make a real contribution to language and literacy development’ (Grainger and Pickard, 2004, p.2), and it can help children to develop their “tool box of literacy” (Claxton, 2000, cited in Grainger and Pickard, 2004). Fleming (1994, p.45) supports that ‘drama is able to provide contexts which both extend pupils’ use of language and, because of the fictitious situation, protect them from feelings of linguistic inadequacy.’ He also notes that ‘the importance of drama is that it extends the sphere of reference outside the familiar events of the child’s life, but the language and thinking which is employed is embedded in the sense that due attention is given to feeling, intention and motivation’ (Fleming, 1994, p.46).

The various encounters provided in drama are where both teacher and student can release their language potential by the roles they play (O’Neill & Lambert, 1982). These imagined encounters emancipate students from the restraints of merely using official, formal, and oppressive languages, to employ their linguistic reservoirs. For this effect, Moffett describes drama as ‘the matrix of all language activities’ (1968, p. 60). According to
Bruner, the only way to learn language is ‘by using it communicatively’ (1983, p. 120); drama provides children with opportunities in meeting various dramatic encounters. Everyone would agree that the members of the group will likely be required to employ diverse styles of language such as oral, written, colloquial or formal while using DaP. For this demand, Heathcote (1984) and Woolland (1993) both agree that learning through drama calls for children’s linguistic practice, which ranges from daily speech to academic discussion. Research also indicates that drama is ideally positioned as a teaching/learning activity in language lessons because in the process of ‘being in someone else’s shoes’ students often use all four modes of language-speaking, listening, reading and writing (Booth, 1987; Booth & Neelands, 1998; Hertzberg & Ewig, 1998; Wagner, 1998).

2.6.5 Research findings on the use of drama as a medium for teaching other subjects across the primary curriculum

Available research about the impact of drama on primary school's children's learning concerns its use as a medium for teaching other subjects across the curriculum. However, the majority of this research concerns the impact of drama on English language learning. In this sub-section, I first present research on the use of drama as an effective medium for teaching other subjects in primary curriculum, such as science, geometry and environmental education. Then I review research that demonstrates the positive impact of drama on language learning. From this review I will exclude research that used drama as a medium for teaching writing as this will be the focus of a whole sub-section that follows.

2.6.5.1 The impact of drama on other curriculum subjects

In an experimental case study, Littledyke (2001) used drama to support children’s learning in primary science. The research took place in an urban school of approximately 300 pupils of mixed ability and background. Throughout the school year two parallel classes in each year group follow identical schemes of work. Schemes of work in Y3 and in Y5 were developed to enhance health and environmental understanding through drama in one of the parallel classes in each year group. Comparisons in views and understanding at the beginning and end of the project were made in the classes which experienced the drama, as well as comparisons between the classes which had no drama and those which had. Taking the findings together, Littledyke notes that there was evidence that the teaching programmes in the test groups had been successful in enhancing affective and effective responses. More specifically, pupils showed particularly high motivation and interest,
showed enhanced scientific learning (Y5) and increased ability to reason and justify their points of view (Y5 and above average Y3 pupils). The drama activities provided a forum for the children to present their points of view which in turn provided a clear connection between the science concepts learnt from classroom activities and issues which had direct importance to their own lives.

In another experimental study, Duatepe & Ubuz (2004) investigated the development and the use of drama based instruction in 7th grade geometry at a state elementary school. To teach angles, polygons, circle, and cylinder, 17 lesson plans were developed according to drama based instruction. The study showed that drama based instruction compared to the traditional teaching made a significant difference to the students' achievement on geometry, geometric thinking level, and mathematics and geometry attitude.

In a small-scale qualitative research study, McNaughton (2004) sought to examine the use of Educational Drama in Education for Sustainability in the upper stages of the primary school (10- and 11-year-olds). She taught a series of drama lessons based on environmental themes. The lessons link with some of the key aims in Education for Sustainability-to help young people to develop awareness, knowledge and concepts, to encourage positive attitudes and personal lifestyle decisions and to help them to acquire action skills in and for the environment. The data collected took the form of field notes, children's evaluations of their work and learning, observation schedules, taped interviews with participants and observers and videotapes of the lessons. The researcher notes that there is substantial evidence to suggest that the drama was instrumental in helping the children to achieve the learning outcomes set for the lessons. In particular, McNaughton observes that ‘the immersion in the imagined context and narrative, integral to the ‘stories’ in the drama, allowed the children to feel sympathy for and empathy with people who are affected by environmental issues and problems. She concludes that by giving the children a context for research and in helping them to plan solutions and suggest alternatives, drama allowed the participants opportunities to rehearse active citizenship and facilitates learning in Education for Sustainability.

Wright's (2006) study was an investigation into personal development and drama education where the constructs of self-concept, self-discrepancy and role-taking ability were considered in the light of an in-school role play-based drama program. The participants were 123 students from 5 different classes drawn from provincial city and rural village schools with a mean age of 11.5 years. The subjects were pre-tested using the
Chandler Story Task on role-taking ability; the Self-Discrepancy Questionnaire for self-discrepancy; the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (revised) for vocabulary, and the Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scales for self-concept. The subjects were then tested following the completion of a 10-week drama program. Results indicated a significant growth in role-taking ability, vocabulary and an improvement in self-concept. The study supports the use of drama in schools as a means of personal and social development.

2.6.5.2 The impact of drama on language learning

Hertzberg (2003) carried out an action research project in a Year 5 class of 10- and 11-year-old students in a suburban school in Sydney, Australia. In her article, *Engaging Critical Reader Response to Literature Through Process Drama*, she presents findings that illustrate the learning possibilities of using process drama methodology, particularly the drama strategy of ‘still image’, as a teaching and learning activity within literature-based reading programs. Hertzberg, drawing on children's responses to interviews following their drama engagement, argues in favor of the use of drama as an activity integral to the reading of a text and not as a follow up activity to it. Her study shows that when drama is used during the reading of a text, it develops children’s ability to challenge and interrogate text; it engages children in critical reading practices and at the same time sanctions genuine response (Hertzberg, 2003).

Sherry DuPont (1992) sought to find whether a program of creative drama integrated with children's literature contributes to the growth of reading comprehension skills of fifth-grade remedial reading students. Her experimental study looked at three groups of 17 fifth-grade students in remedial reading classes that demonstrated comparable skill levels in both the California Achievement Test and the Reading Diagnostic section of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MATE). Groups One and Two received a structured remedial reading program for six weeks using six selected children's stories. Group One used creative drama to support story comprehension. Group Two used "traditional," non-remedial methods to support story comprehension. They read the same stories as Group One, followed by vocabulary exercises and teacher-led discussions, Group Three was the control group and continued the ongoing remedial program. Group One was taught by the researcher: Groups Two and Three were taught by their regular teachers. This study found that fifth-grade remedial reading students engaging in a six-week course of literature-based ‘creative drama’ show significantly greater gains in story comprehension than students in a discussion-based program and a control student group.
Goodman (1990) sought to investigate ‘How is literacy used within dramatic play and why’. She carried out a study in a preschool classroom with 17 children, ranging between just under 5 to 6 years of age. The class used dramatic play on a nearly daily basis over five months. Ninety-seven play episodes were observed. Themes within dramatic play ranged from the very common (house, family, school, stories) to the occasional unique subject (fishing, concert). The researcher used traditional ethnographic methods to categorize themes of the children's drama and to explore the literacy activities of children during dramatic enactment. The findings of this study support the use of dramatic play in literacy learning in that children are frequently using literacy on their own as well as with teacher direction. Goodman notes that ‘the use of literacy by children in drama suggests a significant ‘opportunity benefit, namely supplanting non-learning, self-directed time with the literacy-rich activities of drama.’

Using an experimental approach, Page (1983) sought to answer whether story dramatization enhance story comprehension among first-graders. Her study tested for differential effects on story understanding brought through dramatizing stories versus listening to adults reading stories. The study showed that several key ingredients of story understanding are better conveyed through drama: main idea, character identification, and character motivation. Another finding was that children were more engaged during dramatizations than when just listening. Beyond the main treatment versus comparison group effects, drama had more effects on the younger (grade one) students than the older students (grades two and three). The author notes that drama in this study was more beneficial for less developed readers than for more developed readers, signified at first by the grade-level distinction.

Parks & Rose (1997) investigated the impact of a collaboratively developed reading comprehension/drama program on reading skills, standardized test scores, and drama skills. Four elementary schools representing diverse mixes of student race/ethnicities and differing geographic areas served by the Chicago Public School System were chosen for participation. A 10-week drama program, two hours per week, engaged four classes of fourth-grade students in each of four schools, which were then compared to four control classes, one in each of the respective schools. Ninety-four fourth-graders participated and 85 students made up the control group. Professional artists worked together with the classroom teachers. At the end of the 10 weeks there was a specific theater presentation exercise along with a performance assessment. In the spring prior to the program year and in the spring at the close of the program year students were given a section of the Iowa
Test of Basic Skills designed to measure reading comprehension. This study supports general rationales for including drama programs in the reading and communication curricula for elementary schools. Participant students’ reading comprehension scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) improved three months more (in the standard grade-level metric) than the control group, with high statistical significance. ITBS scores improved the most with respect to student ability to identify factual information from written text. On the formal performance assessment created by the collaborating team, the program students improved significantly more than control students in reading comprehension, drama skills, and nonverbal expression of information inferred from a written text. Participants also improved three times more than the control group in nonverbal ability to express factual material. Program students did not improve relative to controls in reading ability measured through verbal expression in contrast to a written assessment.

In another context, Schaffner, Little & Felton (1984) investigated the impact of drama on fifth- and sixth-graders' language development in Tasmania. Eleven classes of fifth- and sixth-graders were included in the study on the basis of teacher interest. After permitting teacher experimentation and trials during the first three months, researchers spent two school terms documenting dramatic activities in all of the classrooms by audio taping every session in all participating classrooms. Teachers were instructed to gather samples of language and verbal exchanges from all of the children, with even attention to each child in the classroom over time. From all transcripts, a total of 280 language samples containing drama in action, planning discussion, and post-improvisation reflection were obtained—representing all classrooms evenly for each type of language sample. The researchers analyzed the resulting 'word samples' using formal criteria for classifying and describing the children's use of language. The main classifications of interest concerned the predominant purpose of the sampled language: expressive, interactional, or informational. The authors conclude that language use in imaginary drama exercises not only differs from language use in regular classrooms but also encourages desirable types of thinking and cognitive development. The reasons given are the observed characteristics of language in drama: speculation, reflection, explanation, and evaluation. The author considers the overriding difference between children's language in normal classroom activities and language in their dramatic work is that regular classroom language is overwhelmingly informational: in contrast, the language of imaginary drama is only half informational, and half expressive and interactional. Schaffner and colleagues argue that drama provides opportunities for children to use language for a wider variety of purposes.
than otherwise typically occurs in classrooms. Drama provides an opportunity to develop expressive language, which, as heard in the reflections segments, helps uncover feelings as well as develop opinions and thoughts. The authors found that drama encourages critical child-to-child exchanges and reflection on social interactions. The reflection phase had tendencies to bring up issues related to moral values in the otherwise information-based curriculum. As the authors maintain, ‘Drama puts back the human content into what is predominantly a materialistic curriculum.’

2.6.5.3 Literature review on drama and writing

There is a plethora of literature that supports the thesis that primary school children’s involvement in dramatic activities within a language curriculum provides ample opportunities for a meaningful and effective contextualisation of spoken and written language and thus children’s writing is enhanced. However, most of this literature is not based on research evidence and it is not the result of rigorous and systematic research. It is rather advocacy literature, based on the experiences and up-close observations of teachers in the schools. There is a scarcity of research evidence that supports the relationship between drama and writing. However, research evidence stemming from experimental and interpretive research designs reinforces the argument that drama can promote and motivate primary school children’s meaningful engagement with writing tasks and enhances their writing. More specifically, the argument that supports the positive impact of drama on children’s writing and its inclusion as a teaching method in a writing classroom seems to be based on the following premises:

i. Drama promotes children’s writing development and enhances the quality and quantity of their writing in more effective ways than discussion or other traditional methods of teaching writing. Drama promotes children’s writing in certain areas (ideas-content, vocabulary, linguistic choices, sense of ‘voice’, register, sense of audience, length of writing).

Researchers in the field of drama and writing sought to investigate whether drama is an effective teaching method for writing. They used experimental research designs for enabling comparisons between drama ‘treatment’ and traditional methods for teaching writing. The evidence produced from this research methodology is based mostly on quantitative analysis and shows that children involved in drama lessons (experimental group) write ‘better’ than their peers (control group) involved in other methods of teaching
writing. These findings suggest that drama is an effective teaching method for a purposeful rehearsal of ideas for writing.

In parallel, using both experimental and interpretive designs, researchers and practitioners have sought to investigate in what ways drama impacts on children’s writing (Pellegrini, 1984; Wagner, 1986; Moore and Caldwell, 1990, 1993; McNaughton, 1997; McKean and Sudol, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002; Bearne et. al., 2004; Cremin, Gooch, Blakemore, Goff & Macdonald, 2006). These research findings seem to suggest that drama creates strong investment in writing by providing primary children with substantial ideas for their writing and the right sort of language, the register, to express these ideas on paper. Moreover, research evidence suggests that drama has a more direct impact on the aspects of writing that are related to the making of meaning and not just on basic, transcriptional aspects of writing such as grammar and spelling (Winston, 2004).

In Pellegrini’s (1984) study, sixty-five kindergarten children were each observed during five 20-minute play sessions over the course of a four-week period. The study showed that drama helped children develop their vocabulary. Pellegrini found a significant correlation between children’s dramatic play and word-writing fluency. However, this is only shown through single dictated words which limits the implications of his work.

Wagner (1986) studied the effect of drama on persuasive writing. The study provides evidence of the value of drama as a pre-writing activity. She showed that children in the experimental group, who had first experienced role-play, produced ‘significantly better’ letters than control groups who received a lecture or had been given no instruction. However, the study looked at the impact of role-playing, a single drama strategy, on a specific type of writing only.

In their study, Moore and Caldwell (1990, 1993) recognised how cognitively demanding is the writing process for novice writers. Their hypothesis was that since drama conveys meaning instantaneously, it can reduce the information processing demands of writing and enable children to gain control of the process of generating and organising ideas and content before beginning to write. Their study explored the use of drama as planning activity for writing by comparing the effects of drama and discussion as planning activities for narrative writing. Repeated measures ANOVA revealed that the writing quality of the drama group was significantly higher. It was concluded that drama is a viable and effective form of rehearsal for narrative writing at the 2nd and 3rd grade level, and can be more
successful than discussion. More specifically, they found that drama planning activities can improve the overall quality, ideas, style, organization, and context of narrative writing. However, there is not presented any evidence by the researchers (either of experimental or control group) of children’s actual writing samples to support and justify the positive impact that drama as a planning activity had on children’s writing.

In another experimental study, McNaughton (1997) worked with four primary school classes over two terms. She herself taught two groups of similar ability children, in the same class, using drama with the first group and just discussion with the second. Children were set the same written tasks. She observed that children, who engaged in drama before writing, wrote more effectively and at greater length than those who engaged in discussion alone. ‘Drama seems to have given this group something ‘extra’ to say in writing and ‘extra’ language to say it with’ (p. 85). In particular, she noted that drama enriched the vocabulary chosen, which contained more emotive and expressive insights and more natural speech patterns; she also perceived that the children’s writing reflected a better understanding of the issues and had a clearer sense of voice. However, her analysis is based mostly on the total writing output of each group and there was not any focus group children so that she could trace the impact of drama on individual children’s writing and compare it with similar ability children’s writing in the control groups. Had she done this, we could draw more convincing evidence and conclusions about the impact of drama.

Additionally, McKean and Sudol (2002), sought to understand if and in what ways the use of drama in a writing-to-learn unit improved 5th grade students’ writing as measured by the 6+1 Trait Writing scale (NW Regional Education Laboratory, 2001; http://nwrel.org). Sixteen drama lessons were designed by the first author and were taught by the second in only one of her two parallel classrooms, for enabling comparisons between drama and control group. In their findings, taken together, the scores of the students’ writing in the drama group indicate that drama had a positive impact on student writing, especially in the areas of ‘ideas and content’, ‘word choice’, ‘organization’ and ‘voice’. Moreover, the authors noted that the scores indicated that there was not a measurable difference in the scores of high ability writers in the drama and control group. However, comparison between the scores of medium and low ability students in drama and control group, indicated that there was a measurable difference in favour of drama group. According to McKean and Sudol (2002, p.30) this finding suggests that ‘drama engages students who do not excel in traditional school activities and allows them the opportunity to express
themselves in ways that do not rely on standard paper and pencil-type activities.’ However, in the report of the study, there is a lack of transparency in the analysis of students’ writing samples and insufficient evidence since there have not presented any writing samples produced either by drama or control group children. It would have been informative and have provided us with more convincing evidence if in the research report there were extracts from children’s writing showing in what ways individual children’s engagement in drama reflected on their writing.

In the same line of argument are the findings of ‘The Reader in the Writer’ project (2001). The collaborative team involved in the project utilised literacy approaches to teach writing using literacy texts. Drama was among these approaches. Barrs & Cork (2001) point out that the drama work on the story of Green Children ‘was “a watershed in the project” as in most classrooms drama work led to writing which was “thoroughly imagined and qualitatively different from what had gone on before” (p.209).

Crumpler & Schneider (2002), in a cross-case analysis, drawing upon five small-scale interpretive studies of process drama and writing, concluded that children’s writing is enhanced by participation in drama. In particular, they found that children’s written work had more depth and detail and their understanding of the narrative was enriched by the multiple interpretations and transactions of drama. They also found that children can ‘take on multiple perspectives and use vocabulary that they may not otherwise use, and they are also engaged in the reading, writing, thinking, responding process—[their] whole being is engaged’ (Crumpler & Schneider, 2002, p. 78). In addition, the researchers showed that drama provides ways for young writers to negotiate their literacy/textual, personal and imaginative experience though their writing engagement. Their analysis suggests that ‘drama provides ways for young writers to compose and negotiate meaning on multiple levels, including the text, transaction between the text and reader, and personal meaning system’ (Crumpler & Schneider, 2002, p.76).

In the ‘Raising Boys’ Achievements in Writing’ collaborative research project (Beame, Grainger & Wolstencroft, 2004), drama and visual approaches were used for improving the writing standards of underachieving boys. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods of analysis, the project concluded with some interesting findings. In less than a term, assessment showed that the writing of nearly three quarters of the pupils progressed at least a third of a level. The examination and analysis of the writing samples showed that the length and quality of the pupil’s writing had benefited from their engagement and
willingness to write. Improvements were evident in all assessment aspects and, overall, the samples revealed progress in producing interesting and imaginative texts that showed higher awareness of writing for specific readership and purpose. A striking improvement was the use of appropriate signposts and a range of cohesive devices to lead the reader through the text structure. The use of specific words, the structure of sentences according to the required writing style and the addition of detail using complex sentences was evidence of the stimulus received by the pupils from both video and drama and its effect on their choice of style and language. Overall there was a high incidence of underachieving boys being much more in control of viewpoint, voice and pace in their writing.

In a naturalistic collaborative inquiry, Cremin, et al. (2006) sought to understand the nature of the support that drama offers children as writers and to identify the connecting threads between these symbolic modes that facilitate effective writing. The teachers collaborating in the project taught eight drama sessions in each of the four participating classrooms. By adopting the working frame of ‘seize the moment’ writing, they gave the learners free choice in terms of form, perspective, audience and purpose, seeking to ensure that the writing was embedded in the drama work. In their findings, they concluded that drama offers children a supportive scaffold which can foster thoughtful, imaginative and effective writing. The researchers identified the following three links forming effective bonds between drama and writing: tension, emotional engagement and incubation, and strong sense of stance and purpose gained partially through role adoption. It was noted that in the drama sessions motivation and commitment was increased, learners were more at ease and concentrated in composing, ultimately producing writing of high quality.

ii. Involvement in drama leads to powerful writing in-role from a particular perspective which gives children’s writing increased purpose and strength.

Wagner (1998) argues that writing in-role provides children with a more authentic voice than when they write as themselves, since they often perceive themselves as ‘relatively powerless or insignificant’ (p. 122). Research findings stemming from interpretive research seem to support Wagner’s argument. They suggest that primary school children’s involvement in drama leads to a powerful writing in-role.

In their study, Cremin et al. (2006) sought to examine the qualitative features of writing which regularly surfaced when children write in role. They observed that:
Writing in role from a particular perspective during process drama, seemed to provide the learners with an extended opportunity to examine and develop that stance as they reflected upon the events of the fiction (Cremin et al., 2006, p.285).

Therefore, they noted, writing in-role appeared to strengthen children’s writing and increase its purpose and effectiveness.

Barrs & Cork (2001), in their report of the ‘Reader in the Writer’ project, also draw attention to the relationship between drama and writing in-role. They noted that drama encouraged children to take on different voices and use language that they did not normally use. Also, by writing in role in first person, they came up with texts that were different from their normal texts. Writing in role allowed children to write from a standpoint within the story, identify themselves with the heroes of the story and explore more fully the characters of the heroes and their personalities. Overall, it was concluded that writing in role seemed to be ‘a real aid’ to children’s progress and development as writers.

iii. Drama promotes children’s engagement with writing tasks

Engagement with writing tasks, that is children’s behaviour during writing, within the context of involvement in drama was another point of interest for researchers. Using observations as a method for keeping systematic records, they sought to investigate if and in what ways children’s involvement in drama has an impact on their engagement with writing tasks. Research findings seem to agree that drama does promote children’s engagement.

Cremin et al. (2006) note that children’s engagement in drama affected positively their engagement with writing tasks. In ‘seize the moment’ writing, motivation and concentration was evident in all children who seemed ‘to plunge into it almost without realising they are writing’ (p.281). Moreover, children’s involvement in process drama and tense dramatic encounters seemed to enhance their ability to concentrate, focus and follow through their writing. They were motivated to write and they did so in a relatively fluid manner and ease, deriving from the imagined context. Their output written work was often full of ‘stance and scenario’ (Bruner, 1984, p.198, cited in Cremin et al.) that reflected their deep engagement, commitment and attention to detail.

Observations in the ‘Raising the Boys’ Achievements in Writing’ collaborative research project (PNS&UKLA, 2004), added to the research evidence which suggests that involvement in drama provides greater engagement with writing. The teachers observed
that the pupils required less adult support when writing following their involvement in drama and visual approaches. They noted that there were obvious general and individual improvements in the boy’s willingness to improve their writing and their ability to sustain their commitment to the end of the task.

iv. Drama enhances motivation and helps children improve their writing attitudes

Using questionnaires and observations, researchers also sought to explore the impact of drama on writing attitudes and motivation. For identifying any changes in attitudes, they used questionnaires twice, before children’s introduction to drama and after their drama involvement, at the end of a drama/writing project. Research findings suggest that drama enhances children’s motivation and helps them improve their attitudes to writing.

Neelands et al. (1993) explored the effect of drama on the writing development of adolescents for four months. They concluded that drama and writing have a complimentary, interactive and mutually reinforcing relationship. They observed that, when ‘writing is embedded in a context that has personal significance for the writer, the motivation for writing changes drastically’ (Neelands et al., 1993, p. 10). They also found that student attitudes toward writing improved when drama was used. However, the students’ attitudes toward writing were only investigated by administering questionnaires and presenting the answers in the form of descriptive statistics. No other method was used for providing qualitative evidence to reinforce the argument regarding the shift in student’s attitudes.

The ‘Raising Boys’ Achievements in Writing’ project (Bearne et al., 2004), was designed to raise boys’ engagement, motivation and achievements in writing. The findings of the project (Bearne et al., 2004) reinforce the argument that learners who have been underachieving in writing benefit by positive changes and improvement in their attitudes, motivation, and attainment. Changes in boys’ attitudes to writing were investigated through a perceptions survey administered before and after the project and also through observations. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of survey responses provided evidence of positive improvements in boys’ attitudes. There was also very strong observational evidence of improvements in the boys’ attitudes to writing and to themselves as writers. There were also noticeable improvements in enthusiasm, motivation and confidence as well as consequent developments in their independence as writers. The comparison of the questions before and after the project indicated the success of the project in all three
participating areas with significant gains in the boy’s attitudes to writing and their engagement with writing tasks.

2.7 PRESENT STUDY’S POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD LITERATURE

The review of previous research in the field of drama and writing suggests that drama and writing relationship has been investigated focusing primarily on the quality of children’s writing and in particular writing in-role. In contrast, fewer studies have explored children’s engagement in writing and their attitudes following their involvement in drama. Furthermore, the full potential of this relationship, as witnessed by the existing literature, has not been investigated thoroughly through a single study. A review of previous research indicates that there has not been a qualitative study carried out as a systematic inquiry by a single individual practitioner, in his/her own school class; that is, an inquiry over a reasonably long period of time, that explored the relationship between drama and writing development in the areas of attitudes, quality of writing and engagement. Instead, the teaching of drama was mostly carried out for a rather limited length of time (e.g. 2-3 weeks) as an ‘intervention’ by an ‘outsider’ researcher, a drama specialist, not familiar with the class culture; or, in the best case, by a class teacher supported by a research team that included drama specialists. As a consequence, the class curriculum and regular timetable were disrupted and adapted to meet the needs of the research, compromising the normal authentic nature of the class.

Moreover, the review of existing research in the field of drama and writing indicates a gap in considering children’s/participants’ perspectives on the relationship of drama and writing. There is a lack of evidence as to how participants in the drama/writing process made sense of their experience or how they understood, acknowledged and valued the contribution made by drama to their writing. This absence of the ‘voices of participants’ to illustrate the findings is, in my opinion, a missing link in existing research.

As an in-service teacher and practitioner, I was interested in investigating my own context and contributing to the specific field of drama and writing. Considering the existing research and the gaps that are identified above, I designed this case study research informed by a social constructivist theory of learning and Vygotskian concepts. By
researching my own practice rigorously and systematically over a six-month period, in a natural whole-class setting and following a common, reasonable timetable, I had a double aim: To carry out a naturalistic inquiry and in parallel to provide a different perspective to the field literature, the perspective of the ‘teacher as researcher’ (Stenhouse, 1975). Using multiple data collection methods, including questionnaires and interviews with focal children (‘voices of the participants’), my analysis and my research’s findings were based on the convergence of information from different resources (Yin, 1994 p.91). Using rich data, both quantitative and qualitative, my case study aims at providing the field with a “thick description” (Geertz 1973, cited in Cohen et al. 2000, p.22) and a more complete picture regarding the relationship between drama and writing. Documenting my interpretations of this rich data puts me in a better position to speculate on the impact of drama on children’s writing and possibly creates an opportunity to introduce drama in a context such as Cyprus where it is a relatively new pedagogical concept and way of working.

2.8 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research project seeks to investigate ‘What is happening when drama is integrated in a writing classroom?’ Figure 2-1 diagrammatically represents the conceptual framework of the study. As seen in Figure 2-1, the relationship between drama and writing is represented through the Vygotskian triangle of mediation. Drama is conceptualized as the tool, the artifact, the mediator between teacher and pupils/learners. Teacher mediates learning and interacts with pupils through drama. Writing is the object and the outcome of this process. The process is dynamic and is based on the interactions between the participants, pupils and teacher that are mediated through the drama context.

Based on this conceptualization, this research focused within the framework shaped by the following questions:

1. Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?
2. How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?
3. What is the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing?
2.9 SUMMARY

In this chapter, I discussed literature pertaining to this research inquiry. I first examined the social constructivist theory of learning and Vygotskian concepts within which this research project is located. Secondly, I selectively reviewed writing theory and research related to cognitive, sociocognitive, sociocultural and genre theory perspectives of writing. Then, I discussed theory and research pertaining to Drama in Education. In particular, I discussed research findings on the use of drama as pedagogy for writing. Finally, I considered the potential contribution of this study and presented its conceptual framework and research questions.

The next chapter describes the research Methodology of the study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I discussed literature pertinent to the study inquiry and which illuminate the need for my research. In this chapter, I discuss and justify the methodological considerations and decisions taken in the design and conduct of this study. The chapter is divided into eight sections that discuss in turn: research paradigms and theoretical assumptions, research methodologies and methods used, research context, design, trial of the instruments, research process, data analysis, validity-reliability and trustworthiness and finally research ethics.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGMS AND THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Educational researchers should be aware of the complexity of educational practice, be both ‘eclectic’ [and ‘reflexive’] ‘in their search for the truth’ (Pring, 2000, p.33) and make informed choices of research traditions and their assumptions. In the discourse of educational research there are different approaches used to investigate an inquiry. These approaches are referred to by the literature as research paradigms. Different research paradigms are suitable for different research purposes and questions (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000, p.2).

According to Cohen et al. (ibid.) research paradigms, represent two strikingly different ways of looking and interpreting social reality. They stem from two different conceptions of social reality and reflect two competing views of the social sciences: the traditional scientific view and a more recent interpretive view (Cohen et al., 2000). These two conceptions of social reality correspondingly reflect the scientific and interpretive paradigms. These research paradigms, represent the two main theoretical and philosophical stances that educational researchers need to take into account for making informed decisions for their chosen methodology. Research paradigms and their underpinned epistemological and ontological assumptions will be examined below.
3.2.1 Scientific paradigm

The scientific paradigm or positivism stems from the conception that there is a single independently existing reality that can be accessed by researchers adopting an objectivist approach to the acquisition of knowledge (Cohen et al., 2000). It reflects the traditional view of social sciences and ‘may be characterised by its claim that science provides us with the clearest possible ideal of knowledge’ (ibid., p.9).

Researchers adopting scientific paradigm share the belief that human behaviour is governed by general, universal laws and characterised by underlying regularities (Cohen et al., p. 19). They generally favour ‘scientific’ methods and therefore tend to utilise experiments, large-scale surveys and quantitative techniques (Scott & Usher, 1999, Cohen et al., 2000). Moreover, positivist researchers tend to conflate objectivity with measurement and equate both with the ‘objective truth’, they view objectivity as impersonal and subjectivity as only personal. Assuming a value-neutral approach, they seek the ‘objective truth’ by attempting to eliminate the effect of their preconceptions, personal views and value judgements on the research process (Sarantakos, 1993). According to Crotty (1998, p.67) ‘A positivist [scientific] approach would follow the methods of the natural sciences and, by way of allegedly value-free, detached observation, seek to identify universal features of humanhood, society and history that offer explanation and hence control and predictability.’ However, the scientific paradigm seems to be problematic for educational researchers who are researching real people in real contexts. As Cohen et al. observe:

Positivism [scientific paradigm] is less successful in its application to the study of human behaviour where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of social world. This point is nowhere more apparent than in the contexts of classroom and school where the problems of teaching, learning and human interaction present the positivistic researcher with a mammoth challenge (2000, p.9).

The above point was a critical consideration for me as an educational researcher that I wished to investigate the relationship of drama and writing in a real class setting: in my own classroom. To make an informed choice for the research paradigm that would inform my research practice I had to refer to interpretive paradigm and its underpinned assumptions.
3.2.2 Interpretive paradigm

The interpretive paradigm ‘emerged in contradiction to positivism in attempts to understand and explain human and social reality’ (Crotty, 1998, p.66). It stems from the conception that reality is a ‘social construction of the mind’ (Pring, 2000) and that research can result in different or ‘multiple realities’ (Pring, 2000; Cohen et. al., 2000). This conception reflects the more recent interpretive view of social sciences and emphasises ‘how people differ from inanimate natural phenomena and, indeed, from each other’ (Cohen et al., 2000, p.5). In contrast to its scientific counterpart, the interpretive paradigm, is characterised by a concern for the individual. ‘Its central endeavour is to understand the subjective world of human experience’ (Cohen et al., 2000, p.22).

Interpretive researchers, reject the belief that human behaviour is governed by general, universal laws and characterised by underlying regularities (Cohen et al., p. 19). They agree that the social world can only be understood from the standpoint of individuals who are part of the ongoing action being investigated (Cohen et al., p.20). They generally favour more qualitative methods, although quantitative methods can be utilised within an interpretive paradigm (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). Interpretive researchers accept the influence of their values and they argue that individuals’ behaviour can only be understood by the researcher sharing their frame of reference (Cohen et al., 2000). Therefore they tend to utilise approaches such as unstructured interviews and participant observation because these approaches make no attempt to separate the researcher from the researched in order to maintain objectivity as in the case of scientific approach.

Beck (1979, cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p.20) expresses fluently the theoretical stance of interpretive paradigm:

The purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their views shape the action which they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies behind social sciences, they must work directly with man’s definitions of reality and with the rules he devises for coping with it. While the social sciences do not reveal ultimate truth, they do help us to make sense of our world. What the social sciences offer is explanation, clarification and demystification of the social forms which man has created around himself.
3.2.3 Epistemology

‘An epistemology is a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know’ (Crotty, 1998, p.3). According to Burrel and Morgan (1779, cited in Cohen et al., p.6), epistemological assumptions ‘concern the very bases of knowledge- its nature and forms, how it can be acquired, and how communicated to other human beings’. Epistemological assumptions are aligned with research paradigms. Different epistemological assumptions underpin different research paradigms.

Objectivism is the epistemological stance that is aligned with scientific paradigm. It seeks objective truths and law-like generalisations and holds that ‘meaning, and therefore meaningful reality, exists as such apart from the operation of any consciousness’ (Crotty, 1998, p.10). Positivist researchers subscribe to the view which treats the social world like the natural world as if it were a hard, external and objective reality. They view knowledge as hard, objective and tangible and their concern is to discover relationships and regularities between selected factors in that world (Cohen et al., 2000).

On the other hand, constructionism the epistemology that interpretive researchers tend to invoke, rejects the objectivist view of human knowledge. In constructionism, there is no objective truth waiting for us to discover it and the nature of knowledge is the constructions of the human mind. Interpretive researchers subscribe to the alternative view of social reality which ‘stresses the importance of the subjective experience of the individuals in the creation of the social world (ibid., p.7). They become ‘part of the world to be researched’ (Pring, 2000, p. 81) and they view knowledge as personal, subjective and unique. Their primary concern is the ‘understanding of the way the individual creates, modifies and interprets the world in which he or she finds himself or herself’ (Cohen et al., 2000, p.7). In constructionism, different people may construct meaning in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon (Crotty, 1998).

3.2.4 Ontology

Ontology concerns ‘the very nature or essence of the social phenomena being investigated’ (Cohen et al., p.5). According to Burrel and Morgan (1779, cited in Cohen et al.), ontological assumptions are associated with questions about the nature of social reality, whether it is external to individuals-imposing itself on their consciousness from
without – or it is the product of individual consciousness. Ontological issues tend to
emerge together with epistemological issues (Crotty, 1998). Different ontological
assumptions underpin different research paradigms.

Realism is the ontological stance that is aligned with scientific paradigm or positivism. It is
‘the view that there is a reality, a world, which exists independently of the researcher and
which is to be discovered’ (Pring, 2000, p.59). This positivist ontology sees the world as a
world of causes and effects with meaning existing in objects independently of any
consciousness.

On the other hand, relativism is the ontological stance that implies interpretivism. It holds
that reality is “socially constructed” and there are as many realities or “multiple realities” as
there are social constructions’ (Pring, 2000, p.60). In relativism, multiple socially
constructed realities can be studied only holistically so inquiry into these multiple realities
will inevitably diverge.

3.2.5 My position

Reference to the research paradigm that informs a research and to the epistemological,
ontological and methodological assumptions of the researcher provides the basis of a
research project and informs the reader about the researcher’s perspective. According to
Haberman & Miles (1994, cited in Dickson & Green, 2001, p.246) ‘the intentions, beliefs
and assumptions of the researcher are important so that not only is there transparency of
method (Haberman & Miles, 1994) in a study but also transparency of external researcher,
allowing the other participants and readers of the study to take that influence into account.’

Different research projects are suitable for different research paradigms. The choice of
project depends on the kind of the questions that the researcher needs to answer and on
the philosophical assumptions that underpin the research context. According to Cohen et
al. (2000, p.2) ‘fitness for purpose’ must be the guiding principle for the chosen paradigm.
As Pring (2000, p.6) puts it: ‘the nature of the subject matter determines what kind of
research is valid or relevant.’

To make an informed choice of my research methodology I considered the purpose of my
study and my own theoretical assumptions. My research focus set out to illuminate how
drama as a teaching pedagogy enhances children’s writing development. The purpose of my research is to illuminate practice by investigating and describing what is happening when drama is integrated in a writing classroom. Without trying to attribute causal relationships between drama and writing, my research was aimed at revealing possibilities regarding the relationship between drama and children’s writing. It did not aim to provide clear-cut answers as to ‘how things really are’ or ‘how things really work’ (Crotty 1998, p. 10) as in the case of scientific paradigm. Moreover, being part of my investigation myself and involved with the participants of my study, I acknowledge that I was the main data collection instrument, telling my own story, and providing my own interpretation of the researched reality. This understanding and interpretation were based both on my own constructions of the specific classroom context reality and on participants’ voices.

In parallel, this study views education as a social practice rather than a technical process. Its target audience is ideally other practitioners who are open to innovation and willing to learn from the practice of fellow professionals. In this line of thought, the study shares Stenhouse’s view that positivist research procedures are unsuitable and problematic for evaluating and researching into such areas as education and educational practice where practical deliberation is most needed.

For the aforementioned reasons, I believe that my chosen research approach should fall within the parameters of interpretive paradigm and is underpinned by a constructionist epistemology and a relativist ontology.

3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES AND RESEARCH METHODS

3.3.1 Methodology

Methodology is the research strategy or plan of action that researchers employ for the conduct of their research. It is used to provide an account of the rationale ‘for the choice of methods and the particular forms in which the methods are employed’ (Crotty, 1998, p.7). Methodological assumptions are concerned with how the researcher can go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known (Guba & Lincoln, 1998). Kaplan (1973, cited in Cohen at al., 2000, p.45) suggests that methodology helps us to understand, in
overall terms, not the products of scientific inquiry but the process itself. In his words the aim of methodology is:

to describe and analyse these methods [the methods used for data-gathering], throwing light on their limitations and resources, clarifying their presuppositions and consequences, relating their potentialities to the twilight zone at the frontiers of knowledge. It is to venture generalisations from the success of particular techniques, suggesting new applications, and to unfold the specific bearings of logical and metaphysical principles on concrete problems, suggesting new formulations.

The basic ontological and epistemological assumptions held by any researcher shape the kind of methodology which those researchers adopt (Crotty, 1998). Consequently different research methodologies are correspondingly adopted by interpretive or positivist researchers. Positivist researchers favour experimental and manipulated methodologies (Guba & Lincoln, 1998) such as experimental and survey research. In these methodologies ‘Questions and/or hypotheses are stated in propositional form and subjected to empirical test to verify them; possible confounding conditions must be carefully controlled (manipulated) to prevent outcomes from being improperly influenced’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, p.204). In contrast, interpretive researchers favour hermeneutical or dialectical methodologies (ibid.) such as ethnography, phenomenological research and grounded theory. These methodologies are based on the notion of the social construction of knowledge and manifest that ‘individual constructions can be elicited and refined only through interaction between and among investigator and respondents’ (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, p.207).

Consequently as an interpretive researcher, who wanted to make informed decisions for the design of her project, I had to choose a research methodology that was aligned with interpretive paradigm and its ontological and epistemological assumptions. Such a methodology should enable my interaction with the research participants and findings should be based on the assumption that knowledge and understanding are socially constructed. In what follows, the methodology of the present study is discussed.

3.3.2 My research methodology

The review of the drama and writing literature suggests that there has not been a study carried out as a systematic inquiry by a practitioner, in his/her own school class, for a
considerable period of time, that explored the relationship between drama and writing. Instead, the teaching of drama was carried out for a limited amount of time as an ‘intervention’ by an ‘outsider’ researcher, a drama specialist, not familiar with the class culture. As a consequence, the class curriculum and regular timetable were disrupted and adapted to meet the needs of the research, compromising the natural and authentic nature of the class.

In my case, as an in-service teacher and practitioner, I was interested in investigating my own context and contributing to the specific field of drama and writing. By researching my own practice, in a natural whole-class setting and following a common, reasonable timetable, I had a double aim: To carry out a naturalistic inquiry and in parallel to provide a different perspective to the field literature, the perspective of the ‘teacher as researcher’ (Stenhouse, 1975). In this inquiry, the research questions were answered from within the ‘normal’ class and writing curriculum. The teaching of drama and writing was done routinely by a practitioner with ‘improved insight to the situation and people involved’ (Wellington, 2000, p. 20).

However, I appreciate that researching my own practice was subject to certain limitations and disadvantages as well. My ‘personal relationship’ and ‘familiarity’ (Wellington, 2000, p.20) with the children might have adversely influenced my subjective interpretations and judgements in the research context. Even so, by being a class teacher working with the children almost all the time, I believe I was in a better position to understand the relationship between drama and children’s writing. Another possible limitation is that of the ‘observer effect’, which may lead those being observed to behave differently than normal when they know that they are under observation (Descombe, 2003). However, in my case, the fact that the children were observed by their familiar class teacher for a long time has probably helped to overcome the ‘observer effect’ (Descombe, 2003).

The above considerations, together with my epistemological and ontological assumptions led me to the choice of a naturalistic and qualitative case study research. In what follows, the advantages of qualitative case study in relation to its relevance to the present study are discussed.
3.3.3 Qualitative case study

‘The case study allows an investigation to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events’ (Yin, 1994, p.3), and ‘in contrast with another research method, it is ‘strong in reality’ and therefore likely to appeal to practitioners, who will be able to identify with the issues and concerns raised’ (Adelman et al., 1976, cited in Nunan, p.78). Moreover, according to Denscombe (1998, p.30) case study is an *in-depth study* with ‘the prospects of getting some valuable and unique insight by studying things in detail; it also allows the researchers to use *multiple sources and multiple methods* in their investigation’.

The relevance of case study approach to my study is also reinforced by the distinctive elements of the qualitative orientation of case study as defined by Merriam (1988):

> Qualitative case study can be defined as an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit. Case studies are particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic and rely heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources (p.16)

In parallel, the nature of drama process itself influenced my choice in favour of case study methodology. According to Carroll:

> Drama by its very nature is a negotiated group art form, in a non-reproducible experience...The case study is useful when, as is usual in drama, the researcher is interested in, and deeply involved in, the structures, processes and outcomes of a project ( 1996, p.77).

In addition, Winston, a prominent drama educator in the UK, argues that in case study methodology:

> drama educators can find a form of research that not only can respond to their practical needs but, perhaps more significantly, can chime with the forms of knowledge generated by the art form of drama itself... (2006, p.43)

According to Stake’s (1995) classification of case studies, my case study is both intrinsic and instrumental. Being part of an investigation that interests me and at the same time provides insights in the relationship between drama and writing, I had both an intrinsic and instrumental interest in it. It was an intrinsic case study because I have an intrinsic interest in investigating the way(s) (the hows and whys) that drama as a teaching method impacts...
on children’s writing. However, since drama as a teaching method is not currently used in Cyprus in classes for the teaching of writing, my case study was also instrumental. By studying the particular case of drama integration in the writing lesson, I could draw some tentative conclusions about the impact of drama on writing in similar cases of classes that share the same characteristics with the class of my study.

3.3.4 Considerations about using other research approaches

Action research was the other research strategy that I considered using. However, the characteristics of action research do not fit in well with the characteristics and purposes of my research. Kemmis & McTaggart (1988) argue that the three characteristics of action research are that it is carried out by practitioners rather than by outside researchers; secondly, that it is collaborative; and thirdly, that it is aimed at changing things (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988, p.6, in Nunan, 1992, p.17-18). Cohen and Manion (1985) offer a similar set of characteristics. Thus, a piece of descriptive research that is carried out by a teacher in his or her classroom, without the involvement of others, which is aimed at increasing our understanding rather than changing the phenomenon under investigation, would not be considered by these commentators to be ‘action research’ (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988, p.6, in Nunan, 1992, p.18).

In these terms, I believe that the case study research was a better methodology to adopt since I wanted my investigation not to be seen as an attempt by a practitioner to ‘change matters’ by putting forward a ‘solution’ to an existing issue or a problematic situation (Denscombe, 1998, p.73). Instead, my intention was to teach writing differently, using drama within a natural normal teaching practice and, by broadening my understanding of this case, to provide new insights for practitioners and policy makers. Moreover, my study could not be an action research because the focus of the investigation was not my practice as such. It was not how to improve my teaching of writing using drama pedagogy. Instead, the focus was on the class and particularly on individual class children (focus group children). In this framework, the inquiry was concerned mainly with how these individuals experienced the integration of drama in their writing sessions regarding their attitudes, engagement and quality of writing.

As I would be researching my own practice, I would be part of the case study myself. Therefore, I had to consider whether my case study could have been defined as
ethnographic. As an ‘insider’ in the research setting I was part of the culture under investigation and thus my study contained elements of ethnography. However, I could not consider myself as an equal member of the class community because of my role as class teacher and the different power relationship between myself and the children that this role implies. Within this line of thought, my case study cannot be described as ethnographic.

In summary, the naturalistic and qualitative case study approach enabled me to investigate the relationship between drama pedagogy and writing development. I believe that it was an appropriate methodology to address the research questions in hand, it suited the scope and purpose of my research and enabled the kind of understanding (epistemology) that the research sought to obtain.

Research methods are another consideration that I needed to take into account as a researcher. They are discussed in the next sub-section.

### 3.3.5 Methods

Research methods are a set of procedures and techniques for gathering and analysing data in educational research (Cohen et al., 2000). Each method approaches the collection of data with a certain set of assumptions about the nature of the social world and the kind of data that can be produced to increase knowledge about the world (Denscombe, 2003). The choice of research method, according to Descombe (ibid., p.131), should be influenced by the research methodology itself, ‘but it will also reflect preferences about the kind of data that the researcher wishes to obtain and practical considerations related to time, resources and access to the data.’ He (ibid.) advocates that when it comes to choose a method, researchers should determine which method best suits the data collection of the current task much in line with the proverbial ‘horses for courses’.

Research methods are more autonomous in relation to epistemological and ontological assumptions that underpin a research approach (Bryman, 2001). According to Guba and Lincoln (1998, p.195), both qualitative and quantitative methods can be used appropriately in any paradigm. Interpretive and scientific research methods that are used to gather qualitative or quantitative data respectively need to be seen as complimentary rather than competitive in the research design (Descombe, 2003; Cohen at al., 2000). ‘They can be combined to produce differing but mutually supporting ways of collecting data’ (Descombe,
2003, p.132). However, there are certain research methods that are more likely to be found in the agenda of a positivist or an interpretive researcher. Positivists favour quantitative research methods, such as surveys and experiments, while interpretive researchers - as I call myself - favour more qualitative methods such as unstructured interviews and participant observations.

3.3.6 My project's methods

Case studies investigate a problem in depth rather than in breadth, aiming to acquire a full and deep understanding of the problem. Stake (1978 and 1985), Yin (1984) and Merriam (1988) agree that the case study objective of exhaustively studying the bounded instance under study dictates the use of a variety of data collection tools. The assumption is that by examining the experience under study through the different vantage points afforded by each data collection instrument, more aspects of the experience are highlighted and a more complete and thorough understanding is achieved.

For the purposes of this research, I investigated the impact of drama on the writing development of a Year 4 primary class, rigorously and systematically over a full academic year employing multiple methods both qualitative and quantitative. Questionnaires, interviews, observations, writing samples and video recordings were used. The choice of each of these methods will be discussed in detail in section 3.5.

3.4 RESEARCH CONTEXT

3.4.1 Setting and participants

The research setting was my own Year 4 (eight and nine year olds) mixed-ability primary school class in a large inner town public school in Larnaca, a south coast town of Cyprus. Neither the school nor the class were chosen deliberately. The school was the school that I was posted to upon my return from the UK. The class was allocated to me by the school principal following my request to be a class teacher of children that already knew how to write. I had already obtained approval from the Ministry of Education and Culture to conduct my research in my own school setting.
Participants were the 29 class pupils, 14 boys and 15 girls. Five of the children had Greek as their second language and four of these children still needed assistance in the Greek language. Several of the children had some emotional difficulties (but not severe) resulting from home situations. One of the children was described as having special needs in terms of learning difficulties and he hardly read or wrote without individual assistance, so he could not produce any writing samples of use in this study. The range of the writing ability of the rest of the class varied with the overseas children having more difficulties coping with the writing tasks.

3.4.2 Aims and objectives

This research project was seeking to explore 'What is happening when drama is integrated in a writing classroom?' Therefore, the research project’s overall aim was to investigate and understand the relationship between drama and children’s writing development, in the context of Greek language lessons in a public primary school in Cyprus.

The research objectives were to examine and analyse how drama as a teaching pedagogy impacted on:
(a) children’s attitudes and views of writing
(b) children’s engagement in the writing process
(c) the quality of children’s writing

3.4.3 Research questions

The following specific questions related to the research objectives were formulated:

- Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?
- How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?
- What is the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing?
3.5 DESIGN

3.5.1 Project design

The project design of the present study was based on the premise that drama should be incorporated in the planning of the writing lesson as a teaching pedagogy for stimulating and enhancing children’s writing development. To make possible this project design and ensure the internal validity of the study and its ethical conduct I had to take into account the following four practical considerations.

Firstly, I had to ensure that the project scope and objectives would be within the normal class curriculum and regular timetable, meeting the writing objectives and requirements of curriculum for the Year 4 group, the specific group I would be teaching. I wished to work as far as possible under the same constraints of curriculum, time and space as the other class teachers, colleagues in their everyday professional practice. This I saw as important if the work was ever to speak directly to those primary teachers who I hope will eventually benefit from the research findings.

Secondly, since I was a novice drama teacher, I needed to reassure myself that I was going to make well informed decisions on the choice of stories and drama techniques that I would be using in my drama teaching. For this reason, I based, as much as possible, my planning and teaching of drama on professional work of drama lessons that prominent drama educators had tried out and presented in published bibliography work (Neelands, 1984, 1992; Cremin & Grainger, 2001; Winston, 2004).

Thirdly, I needed to ensure that the research supplemented and enriched my own, everyday professional practice and did not become too much of an additional burden. I wanted this research project to be enjoyable to both myself and the children and a challenge to my daily routine and school life.

Last but not least, for the design of my project, I needed to take into account the needs and abilities of children in the class and adjust my teaching accordingly to provide opportunities for all children to be involved in drama activities.
3.5.2 Time allocation and structure of drama-writing sessions

In the Greek Language curriculum the allocated time for any long writing session of the type ‘Think and Write’ is eighty minutes weekly, or two periods of forty minutes each. In parallel, in Year 4, there is another period of forty minutes allocated to the subject of literacy. During this 40-minute period, there is not a predefined schedule or a text book that teachers should follow. It depends on the individual teacher to organise and plan the lesson for cultivating children’s interest and love for literature and story book reading.

In designing my drama-writing lessons, I decided to use both the time allocated to writing and ‘Library Studies’ that is three 40-minute periods or 120 minutes in total. My decision to use the time allocated to ‘Library Studies’ was justified on the premise that drama-writing lessons, drama activities and follow-up writing tasks would be based on stories. Also, storytelling would be the basic drama strategy that would structure the rest of the drama. This initiative could be seen in the framework of the holistic view of language learning and teaching. Thus, my drama-writing lesson had the following structure: A 40-minute drama session followed by a 60-minute writing session. Most of the time of the writing session children were preoccupied with their writing task with only a little time spent for questions or clarifications on some task details.

3.5.3 Research Design

A design for qualitative research as the case study in hand, is usually a structure which is flexible enough to enable pertinent changes to be made to its design in order to accommodate important developments which might arise during the process of collecting data. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the design of a naturalistic inquiry…cannot be given in advance; it must emerge, develop, unfold…’ (p.255). But a word of caution is needed in that the very dynamic quality which promotes qualitative research could also be its weak link. Thus, it was necessary to the investigation that I balanced the advantage of a flexible design and the need to ensure that data was collected rigorously and systematically at certain points throughout the project (see Table 3.1). Therefore, the appropriate research instruments were determined prior to fieldwork with their precise content to be decided only after trialling them when possible. However, fine tuning of data collection decisions such as the need to include another set of interviews (set 3) to
investigate children’s views of the contribution of drama towards their writing was decided as the study progressed (3.6.4).

A multi-method approach (Cohen & Manion, 1994) to the design of this case study was decided on the basis of what can best investigate the issues raised in the research questions and what can best provide insightful and reliable information. Underlying this approach is the concept of triangulation which means looking at a research issue from more than one standpoint. Triangulation is based on the assumption that a simultaneous examination of data gathered through different venues can lead to the development of stronger analytical constructs, either by supporting interpretations emanating from each different data source, or by making available disconfirming evidence that lead to a change in the direction of the analysis (Cohen & Manion, 1994).

However, triangulation is not a relevant concept in my project or in any other interpretive study which values multiple interpretations, perspectives and constructions of the world. My aim was not to validate the findings derived from one research method through the findings that I found using other methods and provide the right answers. Instead, through utilising different methods of inquiry pertinent to the research aims, my aim was to obtain a broader and more informed understanding of the research context by synthesising findings from different spectrums. In my interpretive study, the use of multiple-methods was underlined by the same assumption that underpins case study methodology. The assumption that multiple aspects of the experience surface and a deeper understanding is achieved by examining the experience through various prisms afforded by each data set, collected through different instruments. That would be my contribution to the field, to illuminate the relationship between drama and writing and interpret it in relation to its practical and theoretical implications.

Adhering to the principles of the case study methodology and interpretive paradigm and aiming at a thorough understanding of the research context, each one of the three research questions guiding this study were simultaneously addressed by at least two sources of data. More specifically, the question regarding the children’s attitudes and views of writing was examined through the analysis of a questionnaire and the interviews. The question regarding quality of writing was examined through children’s writing samples and video data of drama sessions, whereas the question regarding children’s engagement in the writing process was examined through observations during writing and video data of drama sessions.
The methods and sequence of data collection used during the whole of the project are shown in the Data Collection Chronology Table (3.1) below. The qualities and relevance of each method are then discussed in the sections that follow.

Table 3.1: Data Collection – Chronology Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATASET</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Drama Integration</td>
<td>Teacher/Researcher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sep-Dec 2005</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher’s Log</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sep-Dec ’05</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Set 1</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sep-Dec ’05</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Samples Set 1</td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dec ’05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Set 1</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dec ’05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews Set 1</td>
<td>Teacher/Researcher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jan-Jun ’06</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Video Recordings</td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jan-Jun ’06</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Set 2</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jan-Jun ’06</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Samples Set 2</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Jan-Jun ’06</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Set 2</td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jun ’06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Set 2</td>
<td>Focus Grp Children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jun ’06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Set 3</td>
<td>Focal Grp Children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jun ’06</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.4 Research process

I worked with my own primary school class for a full academic year. In the first term (Sep-Dec 2005), I taught writing without using any drama. In parallel, I introduced children to several drama techniques and we worked with drama as a cross-curriculum teaching pedagogy, without asking children to produce any writing related to drama work. During children’s writing, I was observing them and took notes on their writing behaviour and engagement with the tasks. I also interviewed the previous year’s class teacher and asked her to provide me with her assessments of the children’s writing and her views about the class writing development. At the end of the term and before the beginning of incorporating drama into the teaching of writing, I selected 8 children - based on the CLPE Writing Scale 2 classification- which would constitute my focus group (see 3.5.5). At the same point in time, I administered to all children the questionnaire, and I carried out individual interviews with the focal children.

In the next two terms (Jan-Jun 2006), I used drama pedagogy as an integral part of the class language curriculum and I asked children to complete writing tasks that arose from their involvement in drama. In the context of the research, the focus was on the types of writing required by the Cyprus writing curriculum for the particular age group and on writing in-role. In parallel, I was observing the focal children during their writing session.

At the end of the research period, the same questionnaire was administered again to all the children of the class. Then, the focus group children were interviewed twice. The first time, children were asked similar questions to the ones they were asked in their first interviews before the integration of drama. The second time, they were asked questions about the relationship between drama and their writing.

3.5.5 Selection procedures for the Focus Group Children

The rationale behind the selection of the eight pupils was to represent diverse writing experience and development. My intention was to gain a deeper insight of how the integration of drama in writing could have an impact on individual children. Of course, this does not mean that these focal children were representative of the whole class, but they could still provide us with an indication of how individual children may react or not to such
integration. In the process of choosing the individual children, I used the first four levels of the CLPE Writing Scale 2 (1997, see Appendix 5), leaving out the ‘exceptionally experienced writer’ level, since none of my pupils fell under this level. This selection was based both on the assessment of their writing samples and on their writing behaviour that emerged from my unstructured observational data. The gender of the children did not have any influence on the selection. I then selected four children whose writing behaviour and outcomes best matched the descriptive statements of each of the four levels of the CLPE scale, thus selecting 16 children in total. Then I cross-referenced the level of the pupils with the previous year’s teacher and selected a focus group of children, two children from each level, thus 8 children in total. Finally, I created a similar second list with substitute children in case any of the selected individuals on the first list decided not to participate in the study.

3.6 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

3.6.1 Questionnaires

‘Questionnaires work on the premise that if you want to find out something about people and their attitudes you simply go and ask them what it is you want to know, and get the information ‘straight from the horse’s mouth’ (Descombe, p.145, 2003).

Questionnaires have a number of advantages. They are economical in the sense that they can supply a considerable amount of research data for a relatively low cost in terms of materials, money and time (Descombe, p.159, 2003). Their advantage is that they supply standardised answers, to the extent that all respondents are posed with exactly the same questions. There is little scope for the data to be affected by ‘interpersonal factors’ slipping in via face-to-face contact with the researcher (ibid.). Structured questionnaires can provide quantitative and qualitative data which can be analysed using suitable statistical or qualitative analyses (Oppenheim, 2000; Ary, 1979; Black, 1999). This is because they encourage pre-coded answers as closed questions provide answers that fit into a range of options offered by the researcher. These allow for the subsequent speedy collation and analysis of data by the researcher. They also have an advantage for the respondents, who, instead of needing to think of how to express their ideas, are faced with
the relatively easy task of picking one or more ready-made answers that are applicable to them (ibid.).

However, questionnaires are not without limitations as pre-coded questions can be frustrating for respondents and, thus, deter them from answering. While the respondents might find it less demanding merely to tick appropriate boxes they might, equally, find this restricting and frustrating (Descombe, p.160, 2003). In addition, pre-coded questions can bias the findings towards the researcher’s way of seeing things rather than the respondent’s (ibid.).

The researcher can select several types of questionnaire from highly structured to unstructured (Cohen et al, 2000, p.248). Structured questionnaires consist of closed questions whereas less structured questionnaires consist either of open-ended questions or a mixture of both closed and open questions.

Closed questions structure the answers by allowing only answers which fit into categories that have been established in advance by the researcher (Descombe, p.156, 2003). The main advantages of closed questions is that they are quick to complete, they are straightforward to code (Cohen et al., p.248) and do not discriminate unduly on the basis of how articulate the respondents are (Wilson and McLean, 1994, p.21, cited in Cohen et al., p.248). However, the closed questions do not enable respondents to add any remarks, qualifications and explanations to the categories, and there is the risk that the categories might not be exhaustive and that there be bias in them (Oppenheim, 1992, p.115, cited in Cohen et al., p.248).

On the other hand, open questions enable respondents to write a free response in their own terms, to explain and qualify their responses and avoid the limitations of pre-set categories of response (Cohen at al., p.248). The advantage of open questions is that the information gathered by way of the responses is more likely to reflect the full richness and complexity of the views held by the respondent (Descompe, p.156, 2003). However, the responses are difficult to code and classify. The issue for researcher is one of ‘fitness for purpose’ (Cohen at al., p.248).
3.6.2 Questionnaire in my research

‘An attitude statement is a single sentence that expresses a point of view, a belief, a preference, a judgement, an emotional feeling, a position for or against something’ (Oppenheim, 1992, p.168).

As teacher of the children I was interested in more than the assessment results of their writing samples. I was interested in their attitudes and views of writing and more specifically in the following constructs:

1. pupils’ disposition towards writing - this refers to a ‘person’s predisposition to undertake or avoid writing tasks’.
2. pupils’ views on their difficulties in writing
3. their perceptions of writing
4. their confidence in writing
5. their writing strategies
6. their writing preferences

The present study employed a semi-structured questionnaire to investigate the above constructs. This was after considering the advantages and disadvantages of using questionnaires, always in relation to their ‘fitness for purpose’ (Cohen at al., p.248) to my project aims and research questions. A semi-structured questionnaire is a powerful tool situated between a completely open and a completely structured questionnaire. As Cohen at al, note (2000, p.248) it ‘sets the agenda but does not presuppose the nature of the response’.

The selection of a questionnaire in the present study is justified by two reasons: First it is a common method for investigating attitudes and views and thus data obtained could be analysed for providing insights into the first research question (Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change after the introduction of drama?). Second, it is an instrument that can be administered twice. In this way, it enabled the collection and analysis of two comparable sets of data obtained from the same group of children at two ‘critical’ times of the project: before the beginning of the project and after its completion. The two data sets compared for drawing conclusions in relation to any changes in the questionnaire
constructs. For these reasons, the use of a questionnaire was chosen as a method of gathering data on the whole class’ attitudes towards writing and views of writing.

As far as the type of the questionnaire is concerned, it was thought best to use a semi-structured questionnaire, including both closed statements and open-ended questions. An advantage of using semi-structured questionnaires in research is that certain aspects or constructs may also emerge which have not been previously determined or identified by the researcher and which may be used (in structured questionnaires) in further research (Cohen and Scott, 1998, p. 28), in my case in the semi-structured interviews with the focal children.

For the purposes of this research, the devised questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part provided measurable data. It was composed of attitude statements followed by a five point Likert scale which is specifically suited to study attitude patterning (Oppenheim, 1992, p. 189). The Likert scale offers a scale of 5 (running from “strongly agree” through to “strongly disagree”) on which learners place themselves on an attitude continuum for each statement (ibid., p.195). The reliability of this scale is good since a coefficient of .85 is often achieved (ibid., p.200). For developing Part A of the questionnaire, I used ‘My reading/writing history questionnaire by Barrs and Cork (2001, p.229, see Appendix 2) and the ‘Writing Attitude Survey’ by Neelands et al. (1993, p.20, see Appendix 2). The statements of Part A were related to disposition towards writing (statements 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 16, 20), confidence (statements: 8, 9, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24), strategies (4, 5, 6, 7), difficulties (10, 11, 12, 13) and perceptions of writing (17, 18). Part B of the questionnaire investigated children’s writing preferences. The children were asked to tick the boxes that matched their likes and dislikes. The development of this part was based on the ‘Pupil Questionnaire - Writing’ by Bearne (2002, p.162, see Appendix 2). Finally, Part C consisted of five open-ended questions based on the same constructs as Part A, (disposition, difficulties, strategies and perceptions) Their purpose was to enrich the data with qualitative information about children’s attitudes and views on writing and also to validate the findings of Part A.

3.6.3 Interviews

The research interview has been defined as ‘a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and
focused by him [sic] on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation (Cannell & Kahn, 1968, p.527, cited in Cohen et al., p.269). According to Descombe (2003, p.164) ‘The use of interviews normally means that the researcher has reached the decision that, for the purposes of the particular project in mind, the research would be better served by getting material which provides more of an in-depth insight into the topic, drawing on information provided by fewer informants’. Interviews are useful in that they allow individuals to give their interpretations of a situation from their point of view. ‘In these senses the interview is not simply concerned with collecting data about life: it is part of life itself, its human embeddedness is inescapable’ (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 267).

Interviews have a number of advantages and disadvantages that need to be taken into consideration by a researcher that is in the process of selecting the data collection methods. According to Descombe (2003, p.189) interviews as a research method (a method of collecting and analysing data) have a number of advantages:

Interviews require only simple equipment and are built on conversation skills which researchers already have. They are particularly good at producing data which deal with topics in depth and detail and are probably the most flexible method of data collection. Adjustments to the lines of enquiry can be made during the interview itself and the researcher is likely to gain valuable insights based on the depth of the information gathered and the wisdom of ‘key informants’. Subjects can be probed, issues pursued and lines of investigation followed over a relatively lengthy period. Interviews are a good method for producing data based on informants’ priorities, opinions and ideas. Informants have the opportunity to expand their ideas, explain their views and identify what they regard as the crucial factors. Direct contact at the point of interview means that data can be checked for accuracy and relevance while being collected. Also, interviews can be a rewarding experience for the informant so, as Oppenheim (1992, p.81-2) suggests, interviews have a higher response score than questionnaires because respondents become involved and hence motivated to respond.

However, according to Descombe (2003, p.190) interviews have also a number of disadvantages:

The face-to-face encounter and use of the tape-recorder can inhibit the informant by creating feelings of insecurity or of having his/her privacy violated. The impact of the
interviewer and the context means that consistency and objectivity are hard to achieve. The data collected are, to an extent, unique, owning to the specific context and the specific individuals involved. This has an adverse effect on reliability. At the same time, due to the 'interview effect' the data from interviews are based on what people say rather than what they actually do. The two may not consistently tally as what people say that they do, or prefer or think cannot be automatically assumed to reflect the truth. In particular, interviewee statements can be affected or influenced by the identity of the researcher. This is particularly relevant in my research where the respondents are pupils in my class. Analysis of data can be difficult and time-consuming. The transcription and coding of interview data is a major task for the researcher which occurs after the data have been collected. As the interview method tends to produce non-standard responses, the resultant data (that are not pre-coded) can have a relatively open-format and require considerable resources to format and analyse.

Interviews, like questionnaires, are distinguished into three types (Nunan 1992, p.149): structured, semi-structured and unstructured. Structured interviews are carried out by using a list of questions predetermined by the interviewer (ibid.). These kinds of interviews are typically used in social survey research and the questions included are very specific in nature and posed to all respondents in the same order (Bryman, 2001, p.107). In semi-structured interviews, the interviewer plans a set of questions, which are of a general nature on the topic researched. However, s/he does not necessarily pose these in order (ibid.). On the contrary, it is not the questions that guide the interview but the topics and issues which arise. The interviewer may also follow up on the interviewees’ interesting responses. Finally, in unstructured interviews, the interviewer has little or no control and they are mainly guided by the responses of the interviewee (Nunan, 1992, p.149). In general though, in an interpretive enquiry, like the present study, semi-structured interviews are favoured due to their flexibility (Bryman, 2001).

3.6.4 My interviews

In terms of the research paradigm and theoretical assumptions (ontology and epistemology) that underpin this study, the meanings that people attribute to the social situations in which they find themselves are important data (Radnor, 1994, p.13). Similarly, in this line of thought, the Focus Group children’s perspectives and authentic ‘voices’ were of particular value in the study. Therefore, it was decided that semi-structured interviews
with focal children suited the specific needs of the project and thus they were used as one of the main data collection methods of the study. The choice of the use of semi-structured interviews was based on the premise that although the researcher still has an interview agenda, there is room for more flexibility on behalf of the researcher in terms of the order in which the topics (questions) are considered and perhaps more significantly, in terms of letting the interviewee develop ideas and speak more freely on the issues raised by the researcher. The answers are open-ended, and there is more emphasis on the interviewee elaborating points of interest (Descombe, p.167, 2003).

Interview Sets 1 and 2 that were respectively used before and after the integration of drama in my teaching, were used alongside other data collection methods as a way of supplementing the study’s data; also, to add detail and depth regarding children’s attitudes towards writing, views on writing and their engagement with writing. Whilst aware that in many interview situations subjective rather than objective responses are forthcoming (Banister et al, 1994, p.50), semi-structured interviews were used as ‘a conversation with a purpose’ (Kahn & Kannell, 1957, p.149). More specifically, interview Sets 1 and 2 with the focus group children, were used as a follow-up to the questionnaire, for exploring issues that were raised and needed further clarification. In this sense, interview data complemented the questionnaire data (Descombe, 2003, p.166) with the ‘voices’ of a representative group of class children and enriched the case study with more individualistic data. The interview agenda of sets 1 and 2 was largely based on the questions found in ‘My reading/writing history questionnaire by Barrs and Cork (2001, p.229, see Appendix 2) The duration of interview sets 1 and 2 was between 15-20 minutes.

Moreover, a third set of interviews at the end of the study (which had been decided as the research project progressed) was also used for enhancing the data with the children’s views about the drama/writing relationship and to complement the findings of the analysis of drama videos and children’s writing samples. This interview agenda was based on questions about children’s favourite piece of writing throughout the year and its relationship to the research context. The duration of this interview was between 7-10 minutes.

All interviews with pupils were carried out by myself and were recorded on audiotape. They took place outside the classroom, in a small quiet room nearby. I tried not to influence them or put words in their mouths. This was initially much harder than I had
thought, but became much easier with practice. The design was helpful as it allowed for new questions to be introduced and for particular answers to be expanded.

3.6.4.1 Limitations of interviews in the present study

Given that interviewees were only nine years old, the interview data collected can be described rather as thin data. The children could not elaborate much on the questions they were asked and the majority of their responses were very brief. This posed a limitation on the analysis of the data, mainly the inductive analysis of the data and the generation of new categories. Moreover, it was obvious in some cases that children with their responses tried to satisfy me, their teacher, by being more positive towards writing as far as their attitudes and engagement with writing were concerned. In addition, another limitation of interviews in the present study was the inequitable relationship between interviewer-interviewee (Nunan, 1992). Nunan (ibid.) considers this as an asymmetrical relationship and a source of bias, as far as the power status is concerned, between the researcher who poses the questions and the respondent-child who answers the questions. The researcher is seen in a more dominant role over the respondent. In this way, data may be affected by the dynamics of power play between researcher and respondent.

3.6.5 Observation

‘Observation, as a distinct way of collecting data, draws on the direct evidence of the eye to witness events first hand. It is based on the premise that, for certain purposes, it is best to observe what actually happens’ (Descombe, p.192, 2003).

Cohen et al., (p.305, 2000) note that observational data are attractive as they afford the researcher the opportunity to gather ‘live’ data from ‘live’ situations. This enables researchers to understand the contexts of programmes, to be open-ended and inductive, to see what might otherwise be unconsciously missed, to discover things that participants might not freely talk about in interview situations, to move beyond perception-based data and to access personal knowledge.

The kinds of observations available to the researcher lie on a continuum from unstructured to structured, responsive to pre-ordinate (Cohen et al., p.305, 2000). A researcher using
unstructured observation will not be clear on what exactly she should be looking for, She will have to go into the investigated reality to determine the significance of the actions taking place and focus on them accordingly. With semi-structured observation, the researcher will have an agenda of issues that have to be examined but she will gather data as she goes along, not in a strictly predetermined manner. When using highly-structured observation, the researcher will have prepared in advance a list of things that she should look at, with all observation categories already worked out.

Structured observation takes much time to prepare but the data analysis is fairly rapid, the categories having already been established, whilst the first two, less structured approaches are quicker to prepare but the data take much longer to analyse. Structured observation operates within the agenda of the researcher and looks selectively at situations while the unstructured and semi-structured observations operate within the participants’ agenda and are responsive to the events that unravel. The observer adopts a passive, non-intrusive role, merely noting down the incidence of the factors being studied. Notes on what is observed are entered on an observational schedule (Cohen et al., p.306, 2000).

Gold (1958, in Cohen et al, 2000) offers a well-known classification of researcher roles in observation that lie on a continuum. At one end is the complete participant, moving to the participant-as-observer, thence to the observer-as-participant and finally to the complete observer. The move is from complete participation to complete detachment. Complete participants are privy to the rituals, the understandings and, in general, to the culture of the community. However, exactly because of the participants’ extreme closeness to the culture, their interpretations of it are inevitably excessively biased. On the other hand, complete observers are individuals who are outsiders to the community and who in no way participate in communal activities. Their “distance” from the community affords observers with a degree of objectivity but also hinders the process because the observer status can inhibit natural behavior from the participants and can disallow accurate comprehension of communal practices (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995; Thorne, 1983). The mid-points of this continuum strive to balance involvement with detachment, closeness with distance, familiarity with strangeness. Participant observation represents an effort to combine the benefits of the participant and observer positions in a way that minimizes their limitations. Selecting a particular point upon that continuum should be a decision that considers the particular circumstances of the specific research project.
In participant observational studies the researcher is part of the social life of participants and documents and records what is happening for research purposes (Cohen et al., p.310). She stays with the participants for a substantial period of time to reduce reactivity effects (the effects of the researcher on the researched), recording what is happening, whilst taking a role in that situation. By staying in a situation over a long period the researcher is also able to see how events evolve over time, catching the dynamics of situations, the people, personalities, contexts, resources, roles, etc (Cohen et al., p.311).

3.6.6 Observations in the present study

In the context of this study where the emphasis was on obtaining data, recording events as they occurred in the natural setting of the case site, it was necessary for the teacher-researcher to come in direct contact with the participants and observe them during their writing. At the end of drama session the subject of the writing task was set and children had about 45 minutes to accomplish it. During children’s writing I was observing the focal children, one or two such children (sitting next to each other) in every writing session. I was sitting quite close to the observed child but far enough to be unobtrusive and not interfere with the child. The duration of the observation covered the whole session but given my role as the teacher of the class at the same time, I had to briefly interrupt the observation in favour of attending and supporting other children in the class. However, I was consciously trying to devote the first and last ten minutes of the session fully to the observed children. I observed each focus group child while writing during four writing sessions over the duration of the study: one before the drama integration and three during the period of drama integration.

The observation schedule for this study was structured by the research purposes and more specifically by the need to obtain relevant data for answering the third sub-research question: ‘How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?’ The use of a structured observation schedule was aiming at providing a framework for observation which would enable me to be alert to the same activities and to look out for the same things recording data systematically and thoroughly (Descombe, 2003, p.194). In parallel, the use of a structured observation schedule was thought to be necessary because of the limitations in observing the focal child given my parallel role as the teacher of the rest of the class.
For the development of the observation schedule, I went back to the literature and identified how other researchers analysed and coded children’s engagement in the writing process. I mostly considered the categories and their definitions used to record young writers’ behaviour in the PNS&UKLA research project (Beame et al., 2004). This project was set to investigate changes in boys’ engagement in writing after the use of visual stimuli and drama. The researchers coded children’s engagement in writing using the following categories: commitment, independence, enthusiasm, motivation and confidence.

To define better the focus and structure of my observation schedule and settle on the present study’s categories of analysis, I also collected unstructured observational data by taking notes during the whole class writing before the integration of drama. The rationale behind these unstructured observations was to help me first identify how individual children were engaged in the writing process and classify them into the four categories of CLPE Writing Scale 2 (Appendix 5) and second, to define better the focus and structure of my observation schedule.

Considering both the studies discussed in chapter 2 and my unstructured observations, I decided on the structure of my project’s observation schedule and settled on the present study’s categories of analysis. The development of the schedule was based on the categories of concentration, independence, motivation (willingness & readiness) and confidence (see Appendix 4).

However, the use of an observation schedule in the study did not prevent me from keeping an eye for anything unusual that happened during my observation. In parallel with my schedule, I was trying to be alert and note down any critical incidents and events. Critical incidents (Flanagan, 1949, cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p.310) and critical events (Wragg, 1994, cited in Cohen et al., p.310) are particular events or occurrences that are critical in that they may be non-routine but very revealing; they offer the researcher an insight that would not be available by routine observation. They are frequently unusual events. Wragg (1994, p.64, cited in Cohen et al., p.310) writes that these are events that appear to the observer to have more interest than other ones, and therefore warrant greater detail and recording than other events.

As far as the type of my observation in relation to the role of the researcher is concerned, it was a participant observation. In general, as it was mentioned before, participant observation can be viewed as a point on a continuum between the two endpoints of
participation and observation. Selecting a particular point on that continuum should be a decision that considers the particular circumstances of the specific research project. In my case, during the drama session I was operating close to the participation end of the continuum while during the writing session I was operating close to the passive observation end. I was part of the researched community both in the case of drama and writing session, albeit not participating in the writing activity.

3.6.7 Writing samples

The collection and analysis of writing samples was aimed at answering the sub-research question: ‘What is the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing?’ This led to a large amount of data: a set of 84 writing samples, 3 samples from each of the 28 class pupils before the introduction of drama and a set of 160 samples, twenty samples from each of the eight focus group children at the end of the project (one for each of the drama-writing sessions that took place during the project). Writing tasks were allocated at the end of the drama sessions as a follow-up activity of drama. Writing tasks were concerned mostly with writing in-role but also with other types of writing as suggested by the curriculum writing objectives for the specific year group. In the case of writing in-role, the role taken was the role played by the pupils in the drama session. Different text types were requested from the pupils: letters in-role, scripts, interviewing the principal character of drama, story-writing in-role and outside role and poems. Generally, the purpose was to engage children in writing tasks that involved the imaginary context experienced in the drama sessions.

3.6.7.1 Development of assessment scheme

For assessing children’s writing samples, I needed an assessment scheme. As there was no such a scheme in the Cyprus Curriculum (1994), I had to develop one myself based on the literature and on the the study’s educational context that the research took place. Therefore, for the development of the criteria and scales of this assessment scheme, I carried out - in September- a small-scale inquiry within my school colleagues asking them to provide me with their own criteria for assessing writing and to justify these criteria using actual writing samples of their class children. In parallel, to complement my understanding and to develop a more reliable assessment scheme I referred to the CLPE Writing Scale 2
(1997) which consists of descriptive statements that refer to the quality of writing. The final form of the scheme consisted of writing criteria and scales which focused on the word, sentence and text level. These criteria were used as predetermined categories for the quantitative analysis of writing samples. (See Appendix 6 & 7 for further details).

3.6.8 Lesson Plans

A series of twenty drama/writing lesson plans were prepared for the purposes of the study. For the development of their contents and activities I considered first the class’s lack of experience working with drama methodology and also the language and writing objectives of the Cyprus Curriculum for the particular age group (year 4). Secondly, I went back to the literature and looked for particular lesson plans designed and executed by educational drama specialists that suited the particular age group I would be teaching. I also revisited my notes on the lesson plans that I participated in during my Master's degree in Exeter University. As a newcomer to the field of drama, I tried to base my plans as much as possible on the lesson plans I found in the literature or in which I had participated myself. However, this was not possible at all times since I had to consider the particular cultural and social context in which my research was taking place and plan accordingly in order to accommodate the demands of the Curriculum. This led me to develop myself 8 drama lessons that I considered suitable. (Sample lesson plans can be seen in Appendix 15).

3.6.9 Video recordings of drama

Drama workshops were recorded every week by video camera. This was important since as an insider researcher I was an integral part of the drama and not always able to observe what was happening at all times. The collection of both visual and audio data captured what happened objectively (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p.85). The purpose of video recordings was to provide me with insights and evidence for answering the second and third sub-research questions:

- What is the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing?
- How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?
Visual and audio-visual recordings provide opportunities for the researchers to record verbal and non-verbal interactions (and unnoticed language events) whilst at the same time saving them from the burden of a detailed manual recording of events. In the present study, the use of video-recordings was essential and crucial for its conduct. Since it was a practitioner research with the teacher being the researcher at the same time, video recordings of drama enabled me to fully participate in the drama activities. That would have proved very difficult and perhaps impossible if I had the sole responsibility to record data without the use of a video recorder. Moreover, video data is particularly useful when drama is the medium of teaching, as it documents non-verbal action and communication (Hockings, 1975). Thus, audio-visual recordings of the drama sessions afforded me the potential for further reflection on certain drama activities after the activities had been concluded. By reviewing the material recorded, I was making more sense of the data and I had the opportunity to take notes on episodes that attracted my attention but that I was not previously aware of.

3.6.9.1 Considerations in using video camera

If a natural setting is utilized the participants are more likely to act in a less inhibited way. However, in order to sustain the natural classroom setting, I had to sacrifice some of the quality and contents of the video recordings, by having the video camera unobtrusively fixed in a corner of the classroom. Therefore, the visual and audio quality of the recordings was not of the same standard at all times, since, due to the nature of drama lessons, children had to move around in the classroom. Nevertheless, video data was considered as a valuable source of data for this study. In the analysis, descriptions of the drama lessons enabled me to track connections between the contents of drama, the focus group children’s involvement in drama and their subsequent writing and engagement in the writing process. In this way, I was able to link the contents of drama to the contents of writing and draw inferences on “how” the drama impacts on children’s writing.

3.6.10 Researcher’s log

According to Strauss and Corbin (1996, p.99) ‘keeping a journal of the research experience is a useful way to keep track of what one is thinking during data gathering and analysis.’
In the present study, I kept the researcher’s log to record my own understanding and experience of the research process. It was kept for the whole duration of the project (Sept-Jun). In particular, I was keeping a weekly record in the form of field notes of the drama-writing lesson and its evaluations. In these field notes I recorded my reflections and assessments about what happened in drama and writing and my understanding of the participation of the focus group’s children in the context. I deliberately tried to update my log as soon as possible after each drama/writing session while I had fresh in my mind how I and the children responded to the context. In keeping my log I was watching and referring to the drama videos to justify my interpretations of the process. After the completion of the project, my log was used to fulfil two purposes: To help me acknowledge and record my subjective stance at the time of data collection and, as an additional data set, to give me extra information for illustrating my subsequent analysis and findings.

3.7 TRIAL OF THE INSTRUMENTS

A trial of the instruments was included into the research design and conducted before the integration of drama in the teaching of writing. It was thought necessary to be included in the research process for checking whether the contents of the research instruments were comprehensible by the children and/or they were appropriate to the research aims and questions, providing the right sort of evidence for understanding the research context. The trial included the trial of the questionnaire and the basic interview agenda for interview set 1 and 2, the trial of observation schedule and the writing assessment scheme devised for assessing children’s writing. In the next sections, the trial of each of my data collection instruments is discussed.

3.7.1 Questionnaire

‘Questionnaires presuppose careful and appropriate designing according to the context and the learners they will be distributed to’ (Descombe, 2003, p.).

Longer versions of the questionnaire were trialled twice in two different classes of the same-year in another school. The main purpose of trialling the questionnaire was to find out whether the language was clear and understandable and to check if the layout of the
questionnaire was appropriate for the specific year group. Another reason was to check how long it would take to be answered and then consider whether it was reasonable to expect the Y4 children (specific target group) to focus attention for the required amount of time supplying the answers (Descombe, 2003).

The first trial of the questionnaire was aimed at checking and assessing the duration time for its completion. It was administered by myself. It took 45-50 minutes to be completed, which was considered as too much time especially for children, so changes were made mainly in its length. The attitude statements in Part A were reduced from 31 to 24. This decision was taken because the questionnaire was too long and some questions were deleted as they were considered not to add much new information. The second time, the questionnaire was administered again by myself and its contents were reconsidered. Then changes were made mainly in the wording and phrasing of some attitude statements in Part A of the questionnaire. The changes were made based on the clarifications that children asked during the completion of the questionnaire. The two pilots of the questionnaire led to a new and shorter questionnaire, more friendly and comprehensible to its target year group (see Appendix 1).

3.7.2 Interviews

Using the interview agenda that I designed for my project I conducted interviews with 6 of the children of the same-year class that I administered the second pilot questionnaire to. These children were chosen by their class teacher with the criterion of their writing experience (CLPE Writing Scale 2, 1997). They were an experienced boy and girl, a moderately experienced boy and girl and a less experienced boy and girl. The interview questions were based primarily on the children’s responses in the questionnaire and on the basic interview agenda of this study. The trialling of interview agenda and the children’s responses led to some amendments in the wording and phrasing of the questions. The trial of interview agenda was valuable for the conduct of interviews in the actual project since it gave me the opportunity to check how understandable the questions were for the specific year group and made me realise how flexible I could be in asking more questions in the light of children’s responses to the basic agenda of my interviews.
3.7.3 Operating the Writing Assessment Scheme

The writing assessment scheme, that I developed with the help of 5 other colleagues for the purposes of this study, has been trialled in October 2005 with the help of 10 student-teachers at the University of Cyprus. The writing criteria and scales of this assessment scheme were explained to them and then they were asked to assess the same three writing samples and comment on any point they were not sure how to go about with. When I had their markings back, I checked the agreement level between the different raters and considered their written feedback on the scheme. Subsequently, I made some changes on the explanations given for each criterion used in the scheme to make them more comprehensive and reliable.

I then checked the inter-rater reliability of the assessment scheme. More specifically, I trained four other colleagues in the use of the criteria and scales in the assessment scheme (see Appendix 6 & 7). Then, the aim for them was to assess 16 writing samples of the focus group children of my class that I had already assessed myself. Every rater was given 8 writing samples to assess in such a way that the samples of each child were assessed by two raters. At the end of this process, the marking of each one of the four raters and myself were compared and a satisfactory ‘consensus’ of 72% was achieved (see Appendix 8). That was considered as a good inter-rater reliability of the assessment scheme and allowed the use of assessment scheme in the actual study.

In addition, during the trial of the instruments, I collected and assessed writing samples from all of the children in the class, using the writing assessment scheme. This had a two-fold aim: To make me familiar with the assessment scheme in hand and secondly to help me determine the writing experience of each pupil before the beginning of the project.

3.7.4 Video Recordings

Based on Townsend’s (1991) suggestion, during the five-week period preceding the first official recording, and in between the recordings I frequently set up the recording equipment in the classroom and performed numerous dry runs. These runs were important as they served to familiarize the participants with the presence of recording equipment in their classroom and to limit acting-to-the-camera behaviours. In addition, they helped conceal the official recordings, as the participants did not know when the camera was
recording and which of those recordings would actually be analyzed for my research. Finally, the dry runs were valuable in giving me the opportunity to experiment with various recording practices and to find ways to optimize the quality of the recordings.

3.8 DATA ANALYSIS

A common element among the various qualitative methods is that the kind of questions asked and answers sought disallow formulaic approaches to research. Each research situation is unique. Consequently, the qualitative researcher does not begin the research with a preconceived notion of an idea to be verified. Rather, the effort is to discover. Qualitative researchers are sensitive to the effects of their presence and/or actions, and they employ a recursive approach to research, engaging in data analysis as the collection of data progresses. This mode of operation is conceptualized by Oldfather and West (1994) in a metaphor of qualitative research as jazz. In the core of the analogy lies “knowledgeable improvisation,” based on which researchers/jazz players combine their knowledge and skills in novel ways in search for functional and effective solutions to problems. They constantly reflect upon, and judge the effects of their actions on the audience/subjects and readers and make informed decisions for subsequent actions. In this sense, the researchers themselves are qualitative research’s most important data collection instruments (Wellington, 2000). They immerse in, and attune to the specific situation under study and render informed judgments upon every turning point of the research. That was exactly the ideal I worked towards during the data collection and analysis processes of this research.

However, I acknowledge that by being a full time practitioner and at the same time a part-time researcher and participant in the research I had some limitations in the time I could spend on interpreting and interrogating the data at the time of collection. Therefore, although initial data analysis of each data set was integrated with the data collection, more in-depth data analysis began after the completion of the project when I stood back and looked at my data both as separate sets at first and as a whole afterwards. In what follows, I present the stages of data analysis that I went through after the completion of the data collection.
3.8.1 Stages in Data analysis of the present study

Data analysis is the process of bringing order and structure and meaning to the mass of collected data. It is a messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative and fascinating process. It does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat. Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships among categories of data; it builds grounded theory.

(Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p.112)

My approach to data analysis was informed by the stages that Wellington (2000, p.135) suggests in the process of data analysis. It was not a discreet stage-by-stage process but one with overlapping stages and iterations:

**Immersion**

This involves getting an overall sense or feel of the data (ibid.) and hearing what your data have to say to you (Riley, 1990; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). At this stage, I transcribed and made several readings of my interview transcripts, I watched the video recordings of drama over and over again, I went through my lesson plans and focal children’s writing samples, their quantitative and descriptive assessments; I revisited my observation records and notes in my log. During this stage, I was writing notes (memos) in the margins to remind me later of my initial understanding of the data.

**Reflecting**

The next stage is taking time out to consider what the data are saying. At this stage I tried to ‘stand back’ from my data and let the issues simmer at the back of my mind.

**Analysing data**

The next stage involves breaking up the data into manageable components, selecting what can be used, categorising or coding these components, fitting subsequent components into these provisional categories or developing new ones (Wellington, 2000). At this stage, I tried to ‘make sense’ of each set of my data separately. I analysed and reduced my data into meaningful units by using coding frames that consisted of either predetermined (from literature) or ‘emerging’ categories of analysis.
**Synthesising data**

This stage involves searching for patterns, themes, irregularities, contrasts and also looking for relationships and links between categories. At this stage, I synthesised my data together, by looking for links and relationships between related findings. In doing so, I revisited my research questions and tried to illuminate them using findings from different data sets. In particular, I tried to synthesise research findings related to the same research question, by looking for links and relationships between categories of analysis.

**Relating and linking data to existing theory and literature**

This stage is to integrate the data so that they ‘hang together’ and also to begin to locate one’s own data within existing literature. This activity can only be done from a position of knowing and understanding existing research (Wellington, 2000, p.138). At this stage, I aimed to illuminate the main research question and provide the ‘whole picture’ of my research inquiry. I integrated all my findings together and contrasted and compared them with existing literature. At the end of this stage, I considered the research contribution by discussing educational and theoretical implications.

More details and explanations about the stages of analysis that I followed in the present study for one or more data sets (in the analysis and synthesis stage respectively) are given in the next two chapters.

### 3.9 RELIABILITY, VALIDITY & TRUSTWORTHINESS

#### 3.9.1 Reliability

Reliability is essentially a synonym for consistency and replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents. It is concerned with precision and accuracy;

(Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000, p.117)

Reliability is in essence connected with quantitative research, in which case there is a concern about whether the measures used are consistent or not (Bryman, 2001, p. 29).
In relation to qualitative research, however, LeCompte and Preissle (1993, p. 332) note that there are certain limits to reliability. The reason for these limits lies in the fact that qualitative research is carried out in natural settings, where constant change occurs, and therefore fails to produce identical results, even if an exact replication of research methods is used (ibid.). ‘[S]o replication is only approximated, never achieved’ (ibid.). Additionally, according to LeCompte and Preissle (ibid.), reliability of qualitative research may not be achieved due to the differences in the traditions and ideologies of people in a particular context. However, Denzin and Lincoln (1994 cited in Cohen et al., 2000, p. 119), suggest three ways in which reliability may be approached in qualitative research:

- **stability of observations** (whether the researcher would have made the same observations and interpretation of these if they had been observed at a different time or in a different place);
- **parallel forms** (whether the researcher would have made the same observations and interpretations of what had been seen if she had paid attention to other phenomena during the observation);
- **inter-rater reliability** (whether another observer with the same theoretical framework and observing the same phenomena would have interpreted them in the same way)

In relation to these three suggested ways, it cannot be claimed that the present research achieved full reliability. That is, the **stability of observations** cannot be guaranteed because, as LeCompte and Preissle (1993, p. 332) point out, this would depend on whether the participants at another time or at another place would carry the same or different ideologies. Additionally, carrying out the study in another place may involve other factors, for example a different educational system, which would entail different requirements from that of Cyprus primary education. Secondly, as far as **parallel forms** are concerned, this has been achieved to some extent, since a variety of methods have been used to collect data, and an extensive analysis of these data took place, trying to cover all possible perspectives in relation to the present study. However, it cannot be stated with certainty that these observations and/or interpretations would be the same if other phenomena were also paid attention to, since the data could also be examined from a different angle, which would probably entail changing the initial focus of the study.

Finally, **inter-rater reliability** could not be reached, because it was not possible to find another observer with the same theoretical framework to observe the same phenomena.
However, even if there was such a possibility, *inter-rater reliability* might not have been guaranteed, since according to Cohen et al. (2000, p.119), ‘two researchers who are studying a single setting may come up with very different findings but both sets of findings might be reliable’.

### 3.9.2 Validity

‘Validity is concerned with the integrity of the conclusions that are generated from a piece of research’ (Bryman, 2001, p. 30).

According to Cohen et al. (2000, p.105), validity is a significant element in both quantitative and qualitative research. They argue that the connotation given to validity in earlier thinking on qualitative research was the same as that for quantitative research: namely, whether a method measures what it intends to measure (ibid.). Validity in quantitative research can be reached through the use of appropriate instrumentation, sampling, and statistical analysis (ibid.). Some scholars (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982; Kirk and Miller, 1986, referred to in Bryman, 2001, p. 31) attempted to apply this concept in qualitative research, but Hammersley (1992, p. 144) argues that this does not comply with qualitative practice. Instead, it is argued nowadays that qualitative research practice can reach validity through the participants’ honesty, the data’s richness, depth and scope, as well as through triangulation and the researcher’s objectivity (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 105). Maxwell (1992, p. 281), moreover, adopts a realistic approach towards validity, suggesting that *understanding* is a more appropriate term than *validity* for qualitative research. That is, according to Cohen et al. (2000, p. 106), the importance lies in what is said and how the data are interpreted rather than on the validity of the methods and the data themselves. However, as they further suggest, researchers can keep trying to achieve validity (ibid.).

### 3.9.3 Validity And Reliability Of Case Study Research

According to Nunan (1992) there are researchers who feel that, while internal validity is important, external validity may be irrelevant. On the other hand, other researchers take a different view, arguing that tests of validity should be as stringently applied to the case study as to any other type of research (ibid.).
Stake (1988) represents the first view:

The principal difference between case studies and other research studies is that the focus of attention is the case, not the whole population of cases. In most other studies, researchers search for an understanding that ignores the uniqueness of individual cases and generalises beyond particular instances. They search for what is common, pervasive, and lawful. In the case study, there may or may not be an ultimate interest in the generalisable. For the time being, the search is for an understanding of the particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity (p.256).

In the same line of thought, Guba and Lincoln (1981), argue that internal validity takes precedence over external validity because without internal validity results are meaningless, and ‘there is no point in asking whether meaningless information has any general applicability’ (p.115).

Yin (1984), however, believes that reliability and validity are just as important for case study research as for any other type of research. He suggests that four critical tests confront the case study researcher. These are:

**Construct validity:**
It involves establishing correct operational measures for the concepts being studied. In the present study, construct validity was sought by defining the main concepts under investigation, that is attitudes towards writing, quality of writing and engagement during writing.

**Internal validity**
It involves establishing a causal relationship, whereby certain conditions are shown to lead to other conditions, as distinguished from spurious relationships. In the present qualitative case study, working within an interpretive paradigm, in a complex setting such as a classroom, my aim was to illuminate and explore the relationship between drama pedagogy and writing and not to look for causal relationships between them. Thus, ‘internal validity’ as described by Yin was not targeted in my case study. However, I believe that internal validity was adequately achieved by examining systematically and rigorously relationships between drama and the analysis of the writing samples that followed (see section 6.3).
External validity
Involves establishing the domain or population to which a study's findings can be generalised. ‘Generalisability of the findings’ was not in my agenda as an interpretive researcher who studies a particular educational context. Even though, the research will conclude with tentative research findings that could be conditionally generalised to a certain population under certain given conditions.

Reliability
Involves demonstrating that the study can be replicated with similar results. In the present kind of study, reliability as described by Yin is not feasible as different investigators, with different or even the same backgrounds, unavoidably bring in their own perspectives and interpretations to the research context. However, I have tried to argue my analysis systematically and fully so that others can follow my thought processes.

3.9.4 Trustworthiness
As an alternative to reliability and validity, Lincoln and Guba propose the concept of trustworthiness in 1985 in Naturalistic Inquiry. According to Bassey (1999, p.75) this concept of trustworthiness successfully illuminates the ethic of respect for truth in case study research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) introduce some additional ethical concepts regarding case study respect for truth, or trustworthiness. In summary, they discuss the following eight questions that a case researcher has to address in order to reassure the trustworthiness of his/her research.

1. Has there been prolonged engagement with data sources?

‘Prolonged engagement’, according to Lincoln and Guba (ibid,) means spending enough time on a case in order to be immersed in its issues, build the trust of those who provide data and try to avoid misleading ideas.

In the present study, ‘prolonged engagement’ with the participants and researcher immersion in its issues can be warranted, on the grounds of the duration of the research project that lasted for an academic year and on my particular relationship with the participants. By being both the class teacher and researcher I had constant contact and involvement both with the children and the issues emerging in the case.
2. Has there been persistent observation of emerging issues?

‘Persistent observation’ is about thorough searching for tentative salient features of the case and then focusing attention on them, either to discover that they are not relevant or to try to gain some clear understanding of them.

In the present study, I was part of the research context, an insider researcher and a participant observer. I tried to meet the concept of persistent observation, by not focusing only on the categories of my observation schedule and the repeatable events that happened in the context of a drama-writing session, but by also being flexible looking out for irregularities and critical incidents. I reckon that the keeping of my researcher’s log and the careful analysis of the video data strengthened more the trustworthiness of my project as far as the persistent observation is concerned.

3. Have raw data been adequately checked with their sources?

It is good practice after an interview to take the report back to the interviewee to check its accuracy and get the interviewee’s consent for it to be used in the research. Recorded observations can sometimes likewise be offered for comment.

This practice has been considered but was not exercised in my case given the young age of the focus group children and my teacher-pupil relationship with them. Even so, the interview data provided by the interviewees did not contain any sensitive information that might damage the interviewees. Furthermore, the principles of anonymity and confidentiality were strictly followed (see next section) that reassured the privacy of the interviewees.

4. Has there been sufficient triangulation of raw data leading to analytical statements?

In the present qualitative case study, the concept of triangulation (as discussed in section 3.5.3) was not considered relevant. However, provisions were made for enabling interrogation and synthesis of research findings from different sources of data. All the research questions were investigated at least by two different research methods.

5. Has the working hypothesis, evaluation or emerging story been systematically tested against the analytical statements?
In the present study, findings derived from the data analysis have been systematically contrasted and compared against existing literature.

6. Has a critical friend thoroughly tried to challenge the findings?

Lincoln and Guba (1985) called this ‘peer debriefing’. This is someone who plays devil’s advocate in questioning the research process and outcomes. It requires a friend giving the researcher some of his/her precious time. And it requires openness and humility in order to ensure that the friendship survives. It is invaluable in strengthening a research project.

Having a critical friend was pursued in the present study and it proved to be most valuable especially in my case given that I was working away from the university community and feeling rather isolated. I was lucky enough to have two such friends over the duration of the study as well as my supervisors who constantly challenged my thinking.

7. Is the account of the research sufficiently detailed to give the reader confidence in the findings?

The writing of a case study report needs to strike the balance between saying too much and saying too little. But if the case study is to be of value it must convey a justification for its end point.

Throughout the writing-up of this thesis I kept in mind the need to provide the reader with sufficient explanations, clarifications and justifications of decisions taken regarding the conduct of this research project, especially the way I went about analysing my data and formulating my interpretations or understandings.

8. Does the case record provide an adequate audit trail?

In addition, Glesne & Peshkin (1992) discussing the concept of trustworthiness note that ‘part of demonstrating the trustworthiness of your data is to realise the limitations of your study. Your responsibility is to do the best that you can under certain circumstances.’

Acknowledging the limitations of the present study was an on-going and conscious concern, since it was felt that by referring to those prevalent circumstances would help the reader to have a better understanding of the research context and the nature of data.
3.10 RESEARCH ETHICS

Ethical considerations, that is ‘being clear about the nature of the agreement you have entered into with your research subjects or contacts’ (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 1996, p.146) must be in the top listed priorities on the agenda of an educational researcher for securing trustworthiness and credibility of the research process. Educational research has influences on people’s life; in my case, on the life of children who are particularly vulnerable. Therefore, as a researcher I needed to ensure the ethical status and conduct of my research. For the purpose of the present study certain significant issues were considered and negotiated, in order to ensure the appropriate conduct of the study, and to avoid any breach of the ethical principles as set by professional associations such as the British Educational Research Association (BERA).

The issues that have mainly been dealt with in this study include informed consent, access and acceptance, privacy, anonymity and confidentiality, as is further discussed below.

Access and acceptance
Access and acceptance are of great importance when carrying out research (Cohen et al., 2000, p.53; McDonough & McDonough, 1997, p.68). That is, the researcher needs to gain access into the institution where s/he intends to carry out his/her research and acceptance by the people s/he needs to participate in order to conduct the research. According to Cohen et al. (2000, p.54), the first step that needs to be taken into consideration is to gain official permission from the appropriate authorities. For the purposes of the present study, official permission was obtained from the Cyprus Ministry of Education and Culture after I wrote to the Minister of Education and Culture, explaining the aims of the research, its design and research methods and providing him with my research instruments, questionnaire and writing assessment criteria. Obtaining the Minister of Education’s permission gave me the green light to go ahead with my project within the context of the school that I was posted to and the class that I was assigned to. The next step, according to Cohen et al. (2000, p.55), is to gain acceptance by making contact with the participants. In my case, the participants were the children in my class and their acceptance (and that of their parents) was readily obtained as explained below.

Informed consent
Silverman (2001, p.271) specifically outlines four points, which he has adapted from Kent (1996, p.19-20), as to what informed consent is. These points are:
Giving information about the research which is relevant to the subjects’ decisions about whether to participate

Making sure that the subjects understand that information

Ensuring that participation is voluntary

Where the subjects are not competent to agree, obtaining consent by proxy

These points highlight the necessity of providing participants with as much information as possible before deciding whether they want to participate in a study.

However, given that the participants in the present study were primary-school children aged 8-9, informed consent by children could not have been considered enough for ensuring the ethical conduct of this research. I needed to obtain informed consent by proxy (see Appendix 9). To this direction, a little after the school opening in September, I invited my class parents to a parents’ evening, in the presence of the school Headmistress. During the meeting, I gave them all the necessary information that they needed to know about the conduct of my research. I emphasized that the research context would neither go significantly beyond normal curriculum practice nor ‘result in any educational disadvantage’ (School of Education Ethics Policy, see Appendix 9) for children. I explained to them that the use of drama as a teaching pedagogy was based on the belief of its effectiveness on children’s writing development. I pointed out that their children could be excluded from having any of their data recorded for the project. All parents gave their consent. In parallel, I talked to the children about their role in the research and I obtained their consent and willingness to participate.

Privacy- Anonymity and confidentiality

Cohen et al. (2000, p. 60-61), place great emphasis on participants’ privacy, by indicating that the researcher should by no means act so as to breach his/her promise of not publicizing personal issues that the participant will not allow. ‘Privacy is, in part, about secrecy’ (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p.293). This privacy may therefore be protected through anonymity and confidentiality (Cohen et al., 2000, p.61-63). In terms of anonymity, the researcher has the obligation not to reveal the participants’ identity. In terms of confidentiality, the researcher promises not to publicize information that a participant has given, by means of which he/she can be identified.
In the present study, personal or sensitive information provided by individuals was protected by retaining anonymity, (Cohen et al. 2000, p.61) as children’s names were changed when discussing the data. As far as the dissemination of the research findings is concerned, I made sure that both the anonymity of children and the school was maintained as well as that all personal data arising from the project were kept strictly confidential.

By being open and honest and adopting a self-critical stance towards ethical considerations I believe and hope that I addressed successfully the ethical issues that emerged in the context of my research.

3.11 SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have attempted to outline and explain the research methodology I adopted in the present study. Initially, I identified that the study falls within the parameters of interpretive paradigm and is underpinned by a constructionist epistemology and a relativist ontology. Then I explained and justified the choice of qualitative case study and multi-methods as the appropriate relevant methodology to investigate my research questions. Then, I discussed the research context and design, the trial of the research instruments prior to the project and explained the research process and stages of data analysis that I carried out. Additionally, the related issues of reliability, validity and trustworthiness, and their various forms, were discussed and finally, the last section of this chapter, was dedicated to the ethical issues relevant to the study.

The following chapter concerns the data analysis and findings.
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I describe the first stage of the analysis process and present the findings of each data set separately. In this first stage of analysis my aim was to make sense of my data by reducing it to manageable and meaningful units (Wellington, 2000, p.135). In doing so, I analysed each of the data sets separately by using coding frames based either on predetermined or ‘emerging’ categories. In what follows, I present the process of analysis and the findings from each of the data sets collected in this study: questionnaires, interviews, writing samples, drama videos, observations and researcher’s log.

4.2 QUESTIONNAIRE

The same questionnaire (Appendix 1) was administered before and after the integration of drama in the class writing lessons.

The analysis of the questionnaire data aimed at:
(a) providing preliminary evidence for the whole class’ attitudes and views of writing before and after the integration of drama

(b) providing evidence to complement the findings of interview analysis and enable the comparison between the two data sets which eventually leads to the understanding and interpretation of the 1st research question: ‘Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?’ and

(c) getting an idea of how closely the FGC represent the whole class

In what follows, I discuss the analysis process and the findings of each part of the questionnaire. It should be noted that findings that resulted from the questionnaire analysis, are based on what children aged 8-9 chose as statements (in Parts A & B) or
responses (in Part C) that were supposed to genuinely represented them. However, it cannot be assumed for certain that children responded with the answers that truly represented them or they chose an answer that they thought would please the teacher. Consequently, any derived findings especially of part A (Likert scale statements) of the questionnaire can only be considered as possible indications of the children’s real choices.

4.2.1 Questionnaire Part A

For Part A of the questionnaire (Appendix 1) a score was given to each statement of the questionnaires before and after drama giving the maximum of 5 points to every positive response of the type “I strongly agree” and the minimum of 1 point to every negative response of the type “I strongly disagree”. For the statements that have negative wording the scoring scale was reversed.

All the statements of Part A were taken to be indicative of the whole class attitudes and views of writing before and after the introduction of drama in my teaching. In parallel, all the statements were grouped according to their content into five categories: disposition, confidence, strategies, perceptions and difficulties. These were the predetermined categories of analysis that informed both the design of the questionnaire and the design of the first interview agenda. A note should be made at this point, that the 5th statement in Part A ‘I discuss my ideas about what I have to write at school with one of my classmates’ was considered inapplicable and was excluded from the analysis as discussion in pairs before writing was not practiced in this particular class.

Taking all the statements of Part A to be indicative of the whole class’ attitude and views towards writing, the scores of each statement was entered and analysed in SPSS.

Table 4.1 - Analysis of Overall Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGC</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis showed that the overall average attitude of all children after the introduction of drama increased from 3.62 to 4.07, showing a positive change of 0.45. A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the integration of drama on pupils' scores on attitude. There was a statistically significant increase in attitude scores from Time 1 (before drama) ($M=3.62$, $SD=0.6$) to Time 2 (after drama) ($M=4.07$, $SD=0.43$), $t(27)=-6.86$, $p<.0005$ (see Appendix 10, Pallant, 2001, p.185). This finding means that children's attitude and views of writing became more positive after the integration of drama. In parallel, the overall average attitude of the eight Focus Group Children (FGC) after the introduction of drama increased from 3.87 to 4.34 showing a positive change of 0.47.

Changes in children's attitude were further investigated through analysis in SPSS of the scores of the statements related to each of the questionnaire categories before and after the integration of drama. This analysis showed that there was a significant change ($p<.0005$) in children's disposition, confidence and views of their difficulties (see Appendix 10). The changes in the categories of strategies and perceptions, although positive, were not significant.

Moreover, changes in the average scores of individual questionnaire statements before and after drama were also investigated in SPSS. The SPSS analysis (Appendix 10) showed that the following 13 statements had a significant change after drama integration:

- St 3: I like to write when I am at school
- St 4: Before I start writing, I first think of ideas about the subject
- St 8: I like to read out what I have written in the classroom
- St 9: I like to have my writing displayed on the wall.
- St 10: When I write, I have difficulty in thinking of ideas about what to write
- St 12: When I write, I have difficulty with the words (vocabulary) that I need to use for the subject
- St 13: I find it difficult to write as if I were another person (in-role)
- St 14: Writing at school makes my life harder
- St 16: Writing in-role (as if I were another person) is boring
- St. 19: My mind seems to go blank when I start to writing
- St 20: I look forward to writing down my ideas
- St. 22: I like to have my teacher read what I have written
- St. 24: I am afraid of writing
4.2.2 Questionnaire Part B

For Part B of the questionnaire a table was created showing the class’ writing preferences, as expressed by the most common answers, before and after drama by the FGC, the rest of the class and the total class.

Table 4.2 - Writing Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCES</th>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>AFTER</th>
<th>CHANGE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGC</td>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I like writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Real stories</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Imaginary/fiction stories</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Poems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In role</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Dialogues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Letters to friends/relatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Letters to unknown people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing children’s writing preferences before and after the introduction of drama there is a noticeable increase in the total number of preferences in almost all writing types after the integration of drama. Before drama the total number of preferences was 94 compared to 134 afterwards, showing an increase of 42.6%. This increase might indicate that the whole class after the introduction of drama had a more positive attitude in undertaking a larger variety of writing tasks (more risks with their writing).

Comparing specific writing types, there is an increase in the number of preferences related to poetry writing, in-role writing and dialogues. As the table shows, 8 children selected poetry writing before the introduction of drama and almost double that number, 15 children selected this type of writing afterwards. Moreover, 15 children preferred dialogues before the introduction of drama whilst 24 children chose this option afterwards. However, the biggest increase in the number of preferences concerned writing in-role. Only 8 children
out of 28 selected in-role writing before the introduction of drama where more than twice that number, 20 children, selected in-role writing afterwards.

Examining separately the preferences of the focus group children there was also an increase in the number of children that showed preference to poetry writing, in-role writing, dialogues and informal letter writing. The biggest increase in their writing preferences after the introduction of drama is noted in poetry and in-role writing. The number of children who showed preference for these increased by three children which represents 37.5% of the total (8).

Taking all the data of Part B together and considering children’s preferences before and after the introduction of drama, it seems to indicate that there is an increase in the number of children who preferred particular types of writing. This finding might indicate the impact of drama on children’s writing preferences given that the particular writing preferences, in-role writing, dialogues, poetry and letter writing concerned types of writing that the children often undertook in the context of their drama-writing sessions.

4.2.3 Questionnaire Part C

For the analysis of Part C of the questionnaire, which consisted of ‘open ended’ questions, children’s responses were condensed into short phrases (see Appendix 11). These coded responses were used in a number of analysis tables to examine the variations in children’s responses before and after drama. Where appropriate, similar or related responses are grouped together and presented as a single item. The findings of this analysis are presented and discussed in individual tables for each question below.

*What helps me most with my writing is…*

The first question was related to strategies or resources that children considered helpful for their writing. The responses to this question were coded in four headings according to their content as shown in Table 4.3 below:
Table 4.3 - What helps me most with my writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES / RESOURCES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference to teacher</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to themselves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to strategies provided outside classroom (reading books)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to a strategy provided within classroom (discussion, drama)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of children’s responses before the introduction of drama, indicate that they relied mostly on teacher’s ideas and notes for their writing. Responses afterwards indicate that children relied mostly on strategies that were provided for them within the classroom, such as role-play and ideas presented or discussed in the context of their drama work.

**What causes me most difficulties when I am writing is...**

The second question of part C was related to the difficulties that children faced in writing. The responses to this question were coded in four headings according to their content as shown in Table 4.4 below:

Table 4.4 - What causes me most difficulties when writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULTIES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas/Content</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation/Spelling/Handwriting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in-role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of children’s responses before the introduction of drama indicate that children faced more difficulties in relation to the content of their writing and particularly in thinking of ideas. Their responses after the introduction of drama indicate that children faced equal
difficulties regarding the content of writing, transcriptional aspects of writing such as punctuation, spelling and handwriting and noise in the classroom. However, fewer children (8) had difficulties in finding ideas after the introduction of drama than before (11). None of the children’s responses referred to having difficulties in writing in-role before drama but two of the children responses indicate that they did after drama. This might be so because a lot more writing in-role was undertaken during the period drama was being used.

**The thing I like most about writing is:**

The third question of part C was related to children’s likes about writing. The responses to this question were coded in five headings according to their content as shown in Table 4.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express/Think of my ideas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Writing with teacher and peers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in-role</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of children’s responses before as well as after the introduction of drama, indicate that children liked more to think of and express ideas. Their responses before drama also indicate that children liked sharing their writing and writing stories whilst afterwards apart from story writing they also liked in-role writing and dialogues.

Children’s favouring writing in-role and dialogues could be justified in relation to the fact that the experiences and ideas gained while working in role and carrying out dialogues within drama might have facilitated their follow-up writing which involved such types of writing.
The thing I dislike most about writing is:
The fourth question of part C was related to children’s dislikes about writing. The responses to this question were quoted in five headings according to their content as shown in Table 4.6 below:

Table 4.6 - The thing I dislike most about writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation/Spelling/Paragraphs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ideas/Write a lot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whole class’ responses before and after the introduction of drama indicate that children disliked the same things such as noise in the classroom, transcriptional aspects of writing such as spelling, punctuation and writing in paragraphs. They also disliked the lack of ideas, writing a lot and writing specific types of writing tasks such as writing in-role, letter writing or real story writing. Children’s dislikes are related to the difficulties they faced in writing.

In my opinion, I can improve and become a better writer if:
The fifth question of part C was related to children’s perceptions of improvement in writing. The responses to this question were quoted in three headings according to their content as shown in Table 4.7 below:
Table 4.7 - Ways to improve and become a better writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies referring to their behaviour before writing in the classroom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies referring to their behaviour or classroom conditions ('silence when writing') during writing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies referring to their behaviour outside classroom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole class’ responses indicate that children’s notion of improvement in writing was related to specific strategies or resources that they could practice or take advantage of. These strategies relate to: (a) their own efforts before writing in the classroom such as listening to the teacher, paying attention to drama. (b) strategies that relate to their efforts during writing such as concentrating, trying to write more, being careful with transcriptional aspects of writing, not rushing. (c) strategies that relate to their own efforts outside classroom such as reading of story books and practicing writing at home.

Whole class children’s responses before the introduction of drama indicate that most of the children seemed to correlate improvement in writing with their own efforts during their writing engagement. However, after the introduction of drama, children’s responses indicate that alongside their own efforts during writing, they also considered paying attention to drama as helpful for improving their writing. This finding seems to suggest that children appreciated working with drama as helpful or facilitating for their follow-up writing engagement.

Summary of questionnaire

SPSS analysis of Part A of the questionnaire showed that whole class attitudes and views of writing became significantly more positive after the integration of drama. In particular, changes in children’s disposition, confidence and views of their difficulties are shown to be significant. In parallel, analysis of Part B of the questionnaire indicates that after the integration of drama, there was an increase in the number of children’s preferences related to specific writing types undertaken. Finally, analysis of Part C of the questionnaire indicated changes in children’s perceptions of ‘helpful strategies’ in writing and ‘improvement in writing’, disposition (likes and dislikes) and views of difficulties. These
changes seemed to be positively related to the introduction of drama in the class curriculum.

4.3 INTERVIEWS

Three interviews, one before and two after drama, with each of the eight Focus Group Children (FGC), produced a very large volume of pages containing transcribed interview data. These were the biggest input to my investigation and of particular importance too as they informed the project with children's own views and voices.

The interview data of the first two sets of interviews (see transcript samples in Appendix 12) was particularly investigating children’s attitudes and views towards writing. It was analysed in two phases. The first phase was deductive analysis of the data based on predetermined categories employed in the project’s design. The second phase was inductive analysis of the responses that referred to the use of drama in the particular research context. Based on the research aims and questions, this data was analysed using a coding frame that was developed following Strauss and Corbin's (1996) guidelines for qualitative data analysis.

The third set of interviews was particularly examining children’s own views about the contribution of drama towards their writing. It was analysed inductively, based on the aims of the investigation and following Strauss and Corbin (1996), guidelines.

In what follows, I present and discuss the analysis process and findings of the aforementioned analyses. As in the case of questionnaire data, findings are based purely on what the children (aged 8-9) said. It should be noted that one cannot be absolutely certain that what the children told me represented their true feelings or even that they understood enough to articulate their true thoughts. Moreover, given my relationship with them as their class teacher and interviewer I have to acknowledge that the children might have been trying to please me with their responses. Consequently, I can only report what children said in their interviews and deliberate on the likely interpretations.
4.3.1 First phase of analysis: Deductive Analysis

A preliminary analysis of the data was made before the main deductive analysis. This preliminary analysis was focused on the number of positive and negative responses about writing made by children in the first two interview sets.

This analysis revealed that, overall, after the introduction of drama, FGC made more positive statements about writing (83%) than before (70%), an increase of 13% (see table 4.8 below).

Table 4.8 - Statements about writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>81 (70%)</td>
<td>88 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>35 (30%)</td>
<td>18 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both sets, positive statements were weighted towards liking writing at school and at home, towards statements relating to their preferences at school and at home; also towards statements relating to themselves as writers. In the second set of interviews children also held newly positive views of writing in relation to the use of drama in the class. Indicative positive responses towards writing are summarized in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9 - What children liked about writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT CHILDREN LIKED ABOUT WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What they liked about writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing at school and at home (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like everything that you ask us to write at school (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like writing stories and letters at school (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What they liked about being a writer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy writing at school and at home (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to writing my ideas (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like expressing my ideas (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like sharing my writing with others (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy when you ask us to write (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer writing at school because we do drama and drama helps us to have more and better ideas to write about afterwards (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get ideas from what we did in drama before…The roles we take and dialogues (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to writing my ideas after drama When I go back home I write my own stories with drama heroes (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of negative statements also differed in the two sets of interviews. The analysis revealed that after the integration of drama children made fewer negative statements about writing (17%) than before (30%), a decrease of 13%.

Negative statements at the beginning of the year (interview set 1) were about not finishing on time, using correct punctuation, about having to work in a noisy environment and about writing in-role. At the end of the year (interview set 2) there were fewer negative comments about lack of ideas, using punctuation, about not finishing on time and writing in-role and more comments about using paragraphs and noise in the classroom. Indicative negative responses are summarized in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10 - What children did not like about writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative feelings about writing</th>
<th>I feel unnerved because I might not finish my writing on time (Set 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At school I feel a bit anxious that I will not make it in time (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t like reading out my writing to the rest of the class. I feel sad when I do it (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties faced In writing</td>
<td>I can’t think of ideas to write (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have difficulty when to put commas, full stop and question mark (Set 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can’t write as much as I want when there is noise in the classroom (Set 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deductive analysis of the project’s interviews was based on the predetermined categories of attitude and views of writing which I identified in the literature and wanted to investigate further in the context of drama and writing process. These categories guided and informed both the design of the project’s questionnaires and interview agenda. They are coded and shown in Table 4.11 below along with their definitions:
Table 4.11: Deductive analysis - Coding frame of predetermined categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY LABEL</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disposition</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern pupils’ attitudes towards school and home writing, preferred writing environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern strategies that children referred to as facilitating for their writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern pupils’ perceptions about good writing, good writers and improvement in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern pupils’ feelings about writing and sharing their writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern difficulties that children faced during writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ writing preferences at school and at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each one of these categories related to a number of different interview questions. Therefore, for this analysis, I tabulated children’s responses in both interview sets, before the introduction of drama and after, by copying statements from my interview transcripts. This process enabled me to have a comprehensive picture of all the focus group children’s responses in relation to the same predetermined categories of questions in both interview sets.

At this point, it should be noted that some of the questions in the interview agenda are related to more than one of the predetermined categories or that there are overlaps between the findings of some of the questions within or outside a given category. Consequently, in the analysis process and in the presentation of the findings, I had to decide under which category to better fit each of the questions based on the coding frame.
and definitions used. Also, in certain tables the number of total responses may appear to exceed the number of FGC (8). This is because more than one answer was included in some of the children’s responses.

The findings, as related to the predetermined categories, are analysed, displayed and discussed below. For each category, I first list the interview questions pertaining to that category, and follow with a table for each of the listed questions showing the children’s relevant responses to that question with their number (count of responses) before and after drama. The tabulated results are then discussed or clarified as necessary.

Note that in the presentation of the findings, I refer to FGC using pseudonyms for confidentiality reasons (see 3.10). I also use the letter (B)oy or (G)irl to indicate the gender of the child followed by a number 1-4 that indicates the level of the child’s writing experience as per CLPE Writing Scales 2:

1: Inexperienced writer  
2: Less experienced writer  
3: Moderately experienced writer  
4: Experienced writer

For reasons of brevity, where in my text I use the terms: ‘experienced’, ‘inexperienced’, ‘moderately experienced’ or ‘less experienced’ referring to a child, I refer only to the level of the writing experience of the child, unless otherwise stated.

**Disposition**

a. Do you like writing?  
b. Where do you like to write?  
c. When do you like to write?  
d. Apart from doing homework do you do any writing outside school?
a. Do you like writing?

Table 4.12 - Do you like writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, children’s responses to this question indicate that most of them (6/8) had a positive attitude towards writing whilst two of them (2/8) said that they liked writing ‘sometimes’. In particular, the two experienced girls of the group seemed to be more enthusiastic than the others. Their responses were: ‘I like writing very much, because I can express my ideas, learn new vocabulary and practice my spelling’ [Eliz, G4] and ‘I like writing very much. I am excited about writing’ [Ria, G4]. The children (2/8) who appeared to be less positive about writing said: ‘I like writing but not all of the times…only when I know what to write’ [Rios, B2] and ‘Sometimes I like writing, sometimes I don’t’ [Nik, B1].

In interview set 2, all children responded positively even the ones who appeared to be less enthusiastic about writing in interview set 1. Indicative responses were: ‘I like writing very much. I like writing at length and having nice ideas’ [Chris, G3], ‘I like writing because I express my ideas’ [Bros, B3] and ‘I like writing because we write about stories’ [Rios, B2].

b. Where do you like to write? and c. When do you like to write?

These two questions were asked one after the other. Their purpose was first to investigate where the children liked to write, their preferred writing environment and then to investigate whether their preferred environment was related to a specific period of time or activity. Although the responses to these questions were coded separately, in some instances children referred to ‘when they liked to write’ in response to the question about their preferred writing environment.
In interview set 1, most of the children (5/8) said that they liked writing at school. Indicative responses of this type were: ‘I like writing at school where we all write together [Mirka, G1] and ‘At school. I don’t like writing at home when I have homework’ [Geos, B2]. Two children said that they liked more to write at home: ‘I like more to write at home because I have as much time as I need and I’m not in a rush and I can write a lot, At school I feel a bit anxious that I will not make it in time [Eliz, G4] and ‘I like writing at home because I am not in a rush’ [Nik, B1]. Only one experienced girl appeared to be positive towards both writing at school and at home. She said: ‘I like writing anywhere. Both at school and at home’ [Ria, G4].

In interview set 2, responses changed in favour of writing at school. All the FGC said that they mostly liked to write at school. Three of the children were more specific by also stating that they liked to write in the context of their drama work. Their responses were: ‘…I prefer to write at school because we do drama and we have more ideas to write about afterwards’ [Eliz, G4] and ‘At school, because drama is fun and I like writing in-role’ [Ria, G4] ‘At school because we all get ideas from drama [Chris, G3].

These responses seem to suggest a positive impact of drama on children’s attitude towards writing and they will be analysed further in the second phase of interview analysis.
c. When do you like to write?

Table 4.14 - When do you like to write?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spare time at home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Language Activities Block at school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Think &amp; Write Writing Block at school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After drama at school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, when the children were asked when they liked to write their responses varied. Two of the three children who said that they liked writing at home-in the previous question, said that they liked writing in their spare time (e.g. ‘At home, when I have nothing to do’ [Ria, G4] and the third one that she liked writing at the weekends (‘the weekends I write about what I do with my family’ [Nik, B1]). The rest of the children said that they liked writing at school either in the language activities (3/8) (e.g. ‘I like writing after we read and explain a text in the Greek language lesson (Chris, G3)’ or in the Think and Write block (2/8) (e.g. I like writing when we write in the ‘Think and Write’ time’ [Geos, B2].

In interview set 2, children’s responses changed. All the children responded that they like writing as a follow up to their drama work. They made statements such as the ones referred to in the previous question above. Additional responses were of the type: ‘Every Friday at school because we do drama and we have more ideas [Geos, B2] and ‘I like writing after drama [Bros, B3].

These responses too seem to suggest a positive impact of drama on children’s attitude towards writing and they will be examined further in the second phase of interview analysis.
d. Apart from doing homework do you do any writing outside school?

Table 4.15 - Apart from homework do you do any writing outside school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, responses revealed that only the two experienced girls of the group were undertaking writing outside school with their own initiative. The rest of the children said that they did not undertake any other kind of writing apart from what the teacher asked them to do as homework.

In contrast, in interview set 2, most of the FGC (5/8), responded positively towards writing at home under their own initiative. Apart from the experienced girls of the group, three more children said that they sometimes undertook writing at home.

Children’s writing at home before and after the integration of drama, was investigated further in a follow-up question which concerned their writing preferences at home (What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework?).

**Strategies**

**What helps you in your writing?**

Table 4.16 - What helps you in your writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference to teacher (Teacher’s ideas and notes on the board)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to classroom pre-writing activities (Discussion / Drama)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to outside school activities (Books, TV)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to self (Own ideas)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In interview set 1, FGC’s responses show that children considered ‘discussion’, ‘teacher’s ideas, notes on the board’, their ‘own ideas’ and ‘ideas obtained from books’ as facilitating strategies for their writing. According to what they said ‘teacher’s ideas and notes on the board’ were the most facilitating strategies. Indicative responses were: ‘Before we begin writing we discuss and then you help us by writing ideas on the board or reading texts that help us’ [Eliz, G4], ‘When we discuss, you give us new ideas that we can’t think of ourselves and we can use them later when we write. I find very helpful the ideas that we discuss and the new vocabulary that you teach us [Ria, G4], ‘I sometimes get ideas from the books I read’ [Chris, G3] and ‘What we discuss before and my own thoughts’ [Bros, B3].

In interview 2, FGC’s responses differed from their responses in interview 1. All the children responded in favor of ‘drama’ as a classroom resource and strategy for their writing. They responded like: ‘Drama gives me ideas when I do not know what to write’ (Eliz, G4), ‘I get ideas from what we did before, in drama...The roles we take in drama and the dialogues we do with our groups’ [Chris, G3], ‘When we do drama I think of ideas, watch others’ ideas and then I write them’ [Bros, B3] and ‘I get my ideas from what we discuss in our groups in drama [Ria, G4].

FGC’s responses after the integration of drama seem to indicate the impact that drama had on their writing. They will be examined further in the second phase of interview analysis:

**Perceptions**

a. *What is good writing for you?*
b. *Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?*
c. *What can you do to become a better writer?*
a. What is good writing for you?

Table 4.17 - What is good writing for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional aspects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional aspects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s responses in both interview sets indicate that their notion of ‘good writing concerned both transcriptional/secretarial and compositional aspects of writing.

In interview set 1, responses indicate that children considered as ‘good writing’ the writing that corresponds successfully either to the transcriptional or both to the transcriptional and compositional aspects of writing. They either referred only to transcriptional aspects of writing or to both transcriptional and compositional aspects together in the same response. Most of the children’s references (7/12) concerned transcriptional aspects of writing such as neat writing, punctuation and spelling and fewer references (5/12) concerned compositional aspects such as vocabulary, ideas and paragraphs. Reference to compositional aspects was made only by the experienced and moderately experienced children of the group.

Children made statements such as: ‘Neat writing, with good ideas and without any spelling mistakes’ [Eliz, G4], ‘Writing with nice words and paragraphs’ [Ria, G4], Neat writing, with fullstops, commas and paragraphs’ [Chris, G3], ‘Neat writing, with punctuation and good ideas’ [Bros, B3] and ‘Writing with fullstops, commas and question marks’ [Nik, B1]

In Interview set 2, children’s responses indicate a shift in their perceptions about ‘good writing’. All the children referred to both transcriptional (mechanics) and compositional aspects of writing in their responses but they seem to have given less emphasis on neatness spelling and punctuation and more emphasis on the contents of writing such as quality (e.g. imagination) and quantity of ideas and paragraphs (organisation of content). Interestingly, Bros (B3) referred to ‘meaningful writing’ for the first time.

Indicative responses that show this shift in children’s perception are:
‘Writing with good ideas, which is written correctly and without spellings mistakes’ [Eliz, G4], Writing with good ideas, paragraphs, correct punctuation and dialogue’ [Ria G4], ‘Writing with good meaning and ideas, in a way that you understand what it says and paragraphs’ [Bros, B3], ‘Good spelling and punctuation and good ideas and imagination [Mirka, G1].

From this data, it appears that children were showing a wider understanding of good writing at the end of the year than at the beginning. This finding can be justified on the basis of the instruction that children received over the year and the fact that they were more mature at the end of the project than at the beginning.

**b. Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?**

Table 4.18 - Who is a good writer and how do you know that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in drama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s responses in both interview sets indicate that they were aware of the more able writers among them.

In interview set 1, FGC’s responses revealed that they perceived as good writers the ones that write neatly and lengthy and the ones that have good feedback from the teacher and are asked to read out their writings. Indicative responses were: ‘[names of the good writers] - They are good writers because they write neatly and you ask them to read aloud their writing’ [Geos, B2] and ‘[names of the good writers] - Because they write a lot and you say good things about their writing’ [Nik, B1].

In interview set 2, there was a shift in children’s perceptions about good writers. Alongside teacher’s feedback on their peers’ writing, five of the children mentioned as a criterion for good writers the active participation in drama and the ideas that good writers had in the context of the drama sessions. Indicative were the following responses: ‘They participate and say their ideas when we do drama and they always write a lot’ [Eliz, G4], ‘They are
good writers because they think of many ideas and are acting them out within their group in drama’ [Bros, B3], ‘They are good writers because they watch carefully the teacher when we do drama’ [Mirka, G1] and ‘They are good writers because they are good in drama’ [Rios, B2].

These responses related directly to the impact of drama in children’s understanding of writing and they will be further considered in the second phase of analysis.

c. What can you do to become a better writer?

Table 4.19: What can you do to become a better writer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay attention to teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice at home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Drama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, FGC’s responses revealed that most of the children considered ‘improvement in writing’ as something related mostly to the school context. Five of them made reference to teacher and particularly to ‘watch and listen to the teacher’ during the lesson. They made statements such as: ‘If I watch and listen carefully to my teacher, I will become a better writer’ [Mirka, G1] and ‘If I listen and watch carefully what the teacher says and writes on the board before we start writing’ [Rios, B2]. One experienced child referred both to ‘attention to teacher’ and also to ‘practice at home’. She said: ‘If I watch how the teacher writes the spelling, if I watch her and get more ideas and if I practice more at home’ [Eliz, G4] The ‘reading of books’ was another response that was mentioned by three children. Their responses were: ‘If I read books and get ideas and learn new words’ [Ria, G4], ‘If I read books at home I will have more ideas in my writing at school’ [Bros, B3] and ‘I will become better If I read books and write without noise around’ [Chris, G3]. The last response also indicates that for this child writer concentration in writing was a means for improvement.
In interview set 2, FGC’s responses indicate that the introduction of drama had an impact on their notion of improvement in writing. Although they referred again to ‘attention to teacher’ and ‘reading books’ and ‘practice at home’, their responses seem to suggest that they mostly considered participation in drama and getting ideas out of drama to lead to improvement in writing. Indicative of this shift are the following responses: ‘I can become better writer if I am more attentive in drama and listen to others’ ideas and if I read more books and write at home’ [Eliz, G4], ‘I can become better writer if I am more attentive in drama and concentrate more when I write’ [Nik, B1], ‘I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and have more ideas to write’ [Chris, G3].

These responses seem to imply the impact that work in drama had on children’s perceptions of competence in writing and they will be examined further in the second phase of analysis under the category of competence.

**Confidence in writing**

*a. What do you feel when the teacher says “we're going to write...”??*  
*b. Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?*

*a. What do you feel when the teacher says “we’re going to write…”?*

Table 4.20 - What do you feel when teacher says “we’re going to write”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feelings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, most of the children said that they felt happy when the teacher announced a writing task whilst two of them appeared to have negative feelings towards writing. Positive responses were of the type: ‘I feel happy because I like writing’ [Chris, G3] and ‘Happy, I like writing in my ‘Think and Write’ notebook’ [Geos, B2]. Negatively disposed children said: ‘I feel unnerved because I might not finish my writing on time’ [Rios, B2] and ‘I feel unnerved because I might not write enough and not finish on time’ [Nik, B1].
In interview set 2, there were no negative feelings. All children expressed positive feelings with more positive wording than in interview set 1. Indicative responses were: ‘I feel happy and enthusiastic’ [Ria, G4], ‘I’m looking forward to writing my ideas [Bros, B3] and “I’m very happy because I like writing” [Geos, B2]. Even the two boys who had negative feelings before drama seem to have become more positive after the drama period. Their responses were: ‘I feel good when you ask us to write something, because I will get better every time and I will learn new words’ [Nik, B1] and ‘I feel good because I like writing about stories’ [Rios, B2].

b. Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?

Table 4.21: Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, FGC’s responses indicate that most of the children (6/8) liked to share their writing with the rest of their class. Indicative were the responses of the experienced girls who said: ‘I like very much reading out my ideas to the others’ [Ria, G4], ‘I feel very proud of myself when I read aloud my writing’ [Eliz, G4]. Two of the children responded rather negatively. They said: ‘I don’t like reading out my writing to the rest of the class. I feel sad when I do it’ [Chris, G3] and ‘sometimes I like sharing my writing, sometimes I don’t’ [Nik, B1].

In interview set 2, all the children appeared to be more positive and eager to share their writing than in interview set 1, even the children who appeared to be negative before. Their responses referred both to communicating their ideas and also receiving feedback from their audience. Indicative responses were: ‘I’m looking forward to reading out my writing and get the comments of my peers’ [Eliz, G4], ‘I like reading out my writing and then the other children say if they like it’ [Mirka, G1], ‘I like reading my writing because I think the others like what I write’ [Nik, B1] and ‘I like to read out my writing because now I write more and better ideas’ [Chris, G3].
**Difficulties**

*What difficulties do you find when writing?*

Table 4.22 - What difficulties do you find when writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics (Spelling &amp; Punctuation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contents (Lack of ideas)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, children’s responses indicate that all the FGC, whatever their writing attainment level, had some difficulties in their writing. Children’s difficulties concerned transcriptional and compositional aspects of writing and environmental conditions (noise). Most of the children (6/8), referred to difficulties related to the contents of writing (compositional aspects) such as ‘lack of ideas’, ‘writing in paragraphs’, ‘writing in-role’ and ‘how to finish writing’ with ‘lack of ideas’ being the most often mentioned. Indicative responses were: ‘Sometimes I don’t know how to begin and how to finish’ [Eliz, G4], ‘I do not have ideas’ [Chris, G3], ‘I cannot think of ideas’ [Rios & Geos, Bs2], ‘I forget to write in paragraphs’ [Chris, G3] and ‘I find it difficult writing in-role’ [Nik, B1]. Half of the children referred also to difficulties related to the mechanics (transcriptional aspects) of writing such as spelling and punctuation. Children made statements such as: ‘Spelling and punctuation trouble me’ [Bros, B3], ‘I find difficult to use punctuation marks’ [Mirka, G1], ‘When I don’t know the spelling of a word I stop for a long time’ [Nik, B1]. Three Children also mentioned that ‘noise’ in the class troubled them while writing. They said: ‘When I write and my classmates talk I cannot think’ [Ria, G4] and ‘I can’t write when there is noise in the classroom’ [Bros, B3].

In interview set 2, children’s responses indicate that they still faced the same kind of difficulties (mechanics, contents and noise) in their writing as at the beginning of the project. However, children referred less to difficulties related to the contents and mechanics of writing (spelling and punctuation) and more to difficulties related to the classroom conditions such as the noise made by their peers during writing and the impact of a noisy environment on their thinking of ideas. Indicative responses were: ‘The noise made by my peers during writing troubles me and sometimes I don’t write as much as I
want to’ [Eliz, G4], ‘When my peers talk in the class I find it difficult to think of ideas’ [Bros, B3] and ‘When some children talk loud I forget my ideas’ [Nik, B1].

**Writing preferences**

*a. What do you like to write about at school?*

*b. What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework?*

*a. What do you like to write about at school?*

Table 4.23: What do you like to write about at school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama features (dialogues, letters in-role, interviews with drama heroes)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, children’s responses indicate that the two experienced girls were positive to all the writing tasks given by the teacher (e.g. ‘I like writing about everything you ask us to write’ [Ria, G4], whilst half of the FGC were positively disposed towards story writing (e.g. ‘I like writing real stories’ [Mirka, G1], ‘I like writing fiction stories’ [Rios, B2] and the remaining two preferred personal writing (e.g. ‘I like writing about my family’ [Chris, G3]).

In interview set 2, responses showed a shift in children’s preferences. Children’s preferences became more specific. They particularly said that they liked writing poems, letters, dialogues/scripts with drama story heroes and interviews with drama story heroes. Children’s responses seem to indicate that their participation in drama had an impact on their writing preferences at school. Indicative responses are: ‘I like writing poems and
letters’ [Ria, G4], ‘I like writing dialogues’ [Rios, B2, Mirka, G1] and ‘Interviews because I like asking other people questions, like Hose (drama character)’ [Nik, B1]

**b. What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework?**

Table 4.24 - What do you like writing about at home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story writing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing inspired by drama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In interview set 1, as mentioned in a previous question (*Apart from doing homework do you do any writing outside school?*) only the experienced girls of the group were undertaking writing under their own initiative at home. When they were asked about their preferences they said: ‘I like writing summaries of the stories I read and what I like most from the story books that I read at home’ [Eliz, G4] and ‘I like reading stories and then rewriting them again with my own words’ [Ria, G4]. Their responses indicate that most of their out of school writing was a follow up of their reading of story books.

In interview set 2, apart from the two experienced girls of the group, three more children said that they sometimes undertook writing at home. When they were asked about their preferences they said: ‘I like writing poems and stories similar to the stories we say in drama’ [Eliz, G4], ‘I read stories and then I take a role of a character and write the story again in the role of this character. I also write interviews with story heroes’ [Ria, G4], ‘At home I keep a diary’ [Chris, G3], ‘I sometimes write stories with drama heroes’ [Mirka, G1] and ‘I like the stories we do in drama. When we do a new story, I like to go back home and write this story in my own words’ [Nik, B1]

These responses seem to portray the impact that work in drama had on children’s writing outside school and they will be examined further in the second phase of analysis under the new category of initiative and repertoire.
Summary of deductive analysis of interviews

Deductive analysis of interview responses, before (set 1) and after drama integration (set 2) indicates positive changes in the FGC’s attitudes and views towards writing in all the predetermined categories. In most of the categories of analysis, improvements in children’s attitudes seemed to be related to the impact of drama.

4.3.2 Second phase of interview analysis: Inductive analysis

The second phase of analysis was inductive analysis or open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1996) of children’s responses in the second set of interviews that referred to the use of drama. Focusing only on aspects that have relevance to drama and guided by the sub-research questions, this analysis was aiming at investigating changes in children’s attitudes and views towards writing in relation to the introduction of drama. It was based on new categories that grounded on the data (ibid.), on what children said about drama in the particular research context.

My analysis was guided by Strauss and Corbin (1996) guidelines for open-coding data in the form of text. I first coded children’s responses into concepts, then I grouped similar concepts together and I labeled each group of concepts with a name of a working/tentative category. Going several times through the responses related to each category I settled down on the following final emerging categories of analysis:

a. Purpose
b. Initiative & Repertoire
c. Competence

Based on these emerging categories and their definitions in the particular research context, I developed the following coding frame:
Table 4.25: Coding Frame of 2nd Phase of Interview Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Category type</th>
<th>Explanation-Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern pupils’ understanding of the purpose of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative &amp; Repertoire</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern children’s self-initiated writing and preferred writing repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Relates to statements which concern children’s judgments about good writers and improvement in writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings related to the emerging categories are displayed and discussed below. In the presentation of supporting quotes and indicative responses of the children (in the same way as in the preceding deductive analysis), I use the initials B/G with a number 1-4 (see section 4.3.1).

**Purpose**

Children’s references to writing and their drama work in interview set 2 reveal a change in their understanding of writing. Children talked more about ‘ideas in writing’ and they valued drama as a resource, as a facilitating strategy to ‘get more’ and ‘better ideas’ for their writing. Their responses show a development in their understanding in terms of what the purpose of writing is. That is, whereas they initially placed emphasis on ‘how to do writing’, after the introduction of drama, they talked more about ‘what to write about’, viewing writing primarily as content and communication of ideas.

Supportive quotes from the interviews that illustrate this shift in children’s understanding of the purpose of writing in relation to their drama participation are related to a number of questions. These questions and illustrative responses are presented below.
Where do you like to write? and When do you like to write?

'I like writing at school after drama. Drama helps us to have more and better ideas to write about afterwards' [Eliz, G4]

'At school, because drama is fun and I get ideas for writing in-role' [Ria, G4]

'At school because we all get more ideas from what we do in drama' [Chris, G3].

'At school after drama. Because at home there is a lot of noise and at school we all get ideas from drama' [Geos, B2].

What helps you in your writing?

'When I have the role of somebody in drama and then I have to write in the role of this person' [Ria, G4]

'The drama we do and the story you tell us help me a lot. Drama stuff and the dialogues we do help me to have more ideas' [Chris, G3]

'To have the role of somebody else in the drama we do and the ideas of my peers' [Rios, B2]

'When I do not know what to write drama gives me ideas' [Eliz, G4]

'When we do drama I think of ideas, watch others’ ideas and then I write them.' [Bros, B3]

'I get ideas from my peers when we do drama' [Geos, B2]

In the above responses, children in general talk about the ideas they get out of drama and use in their subsequent writing. These responses are of particular interest given the link that children made between their writing and their drama work, role-taking and ideas developed in the context of drama. They indicate that this shift in their understanding of the purpose of writing as a matter of ‘ideas’ is related positively to their understanding of the purpose of their participation in drama. These responses seem to imply that they recognise as the essence and purpose of the drama process the derivation of ideas that they could use in their subsequent writing.
Initiative and Repertoire

Children’s responses in interview set 2 regarding writing out of school indicate a shift in their understanding and also in their motive for undertaking writing. Whereas at the beginning of the year, only two of them, the experienced writers, undertook writing at home apart from homework, at the end of the year most of them, 5 out of 8 said that they undertook self-initiated writing. This finding indicates first, that at the end of the year more children understood writing as an activity not limited to the school context and second it might indicate that children were more ‘self-driven’ towards doing writing at home apart from homework. Moreover, as already mentioned in the preceding deductive analysis, examination of children’s responses referring to their preferred writing at home indicate a positive relationship between the writing undertaken by children under their own initiative and the written work undertaken in the context of drama at school. Whereas, before the introduction of drama children (experienced writers) said that they undertook writing as a follow-up of their reading a story book, after the introduction of drama their writing repertoire was enlarged and it was based on particular stories and characters dealt with in the context of drama. This change in children’s motive and writing preferences and its link to the drama/writing process is supported by the quotes that follow below.

It should be noted that in their interviews children were first asked if they undertook any writing at home apart from homework; if they responded positively I was going on asking them to specify what they actually wrote about and elaborate on their responses. In the first phase (deductive analysis) I just identified the relationship between self-initiated writing and drama without presenting the rest of the responses that followed, leaving them to be examined afterwards in the inductive analysis phase.

What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework? Can you explain a little bit more? Can you give me an example of the writing you did so far at home?

‘I like writing poems and stories similar to the stories we say in drama’ … After we wrote "My magic box" [a poetry writing task/poem which was a follow up activity to a drama session based on the poem ‘My magic box’] at school I wanted to write more poems, so I asked my dad to buy me a children’s poetry book. I read a poem and then I write mine’. [Eliz, G4]
‘I read stories and then I choose a character and write the story again in the role of that character. I also write interviews with story heroes’… After I read the Hercules story at home, my granddad took on the role of Hercules and I was interviewing him and then we changed roles. At the end I wrote down this interview’ [Ria, G4].

‘I sometimes write stories with drama heroes’ … I wrote a story with Tom Thumb who left home and went to the forest’. [Mirka, G1]

‘I like the stories we do in drama. When we do a new story, I like to go back home and write this story in my own words’ … I wrote the stories of ‘Blodin the Beast’ and ‘Selfish Giant’ and I read them to my brother’ [Nik, B1]

The above children’s responses seem to suggest that their involvement in drama activities at school acted as an extra stimulus for their engagement with self-initiated writing. They also indicate that by the end of the year, they increased their repertoire of self-initiated writing. Apart from writing story summaries as they used to do before the introduction of drama, they undertook other more creative tasks of different writing types such as poems, stories and interviews with story heroes. Moreover, their responses point to the impact that drama work and especially storytelling and hot-sitting (interview with story heroes) drama strategies had on their initiative and repertoire.

**Competence**

Children’s responses in interview set 2 indicate a change in their perceptions about good writers (Q: *Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?*) Whereas at the beginning of the year, their judgments about good writers were related equally to the pupils’ neat writing and good feedback from the teacher, at the end of the year, most of their judgments referred to pupils’ participation in the context of drama. In parallel, as already mentioned in the preceding deductive analysis, responses in interview set 2 indicate also a change in pupils’ notion of improvement in writing (Q: *What can you do to become a better writer*). Whilst in their first interviews improvement was related mostly with attention to teacher (e.g. *If I watch and listen carefully to my teacher, I will become a better writer*), in their interviews after the introduction of drama they referred to their attention and active participation in the context of drama. This change in children’s perceptions seems to indicate a change in their ‘sense of competence’ which at the same
time, is positively related to integration of drama in the class writing. This change in FGC’s view of writing competence is illustrated by the following quotes:

**Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?**

‘They participate and say their ideas when we do drama’ [Eliz, G4]

‘I think I am one of the good writers because I participate in drama and share my ideas with others’ [Ria, G4].

‘Good writers think of many ideas and are acting them out within their group in drama’ [Bros, B3]

‘They are good writers because they watch carefully the teacher when we do drama’ [Mirka, G1]

‘They are good writers because they are good in drama. I think I am a good writer now, because the roles that we take on in drama helped me’. [Rios, B2].

**What can you do to become a better writer?**

‘I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and listen to others’ ideas and if I read more books and write at home’ [Eliz, G4]

‘I can become a better writer if I am more careful in drama and concentrate more when I write’ [Nik, B1]

‘I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and have more ideas to write’ [Chris, G3].

Examining together all the responses related to children’s perceptions about good writers and improvement in writing, reveals the impact that the drama/writing context had on children’s understanding of writing. Children’s understanding of ‘competent writers’ and their understanding of ‘becoming competent writers’ are in agreement and most importantly, they indicate a link between children’s view of competence and the introduction of drama. At the same time, the above responses indicate that these
children’s understanding of writing did not go beyond the school context, it was limited to the context of their drama and writing experience at school. However, this can be justified given that the majority of children’s writing either in the context of Greek Language Lessons or in other curricular areas was taking place in the course of drama and writing session.

Summary of inductive analysis of interviews

Inductive analysis of FGC’s responses related to drama indicates changes in children’s attitude and views towards writing resulting from the use of drama. These changes are related to the children’s views of the ‘purpose’ of writing and writing ‘competence’; also to their attitude towards writing outside school and their preferred repertoire. In particular, the findings of inductive analysis support that after the integration of drama children perceived ‘having ideas’ as the purpose of writing and they appreciated that this purpose was fulfilled through their participation in drama. In addition, inductive findings suggest a positive change in children’s initiative in writing which is related to an increase in the number of children who undertook self-initiated writing at home. Examination of children’s self-initiated writing indicates the impact of drama on children’s repertoire. Finally, the findings of inductive analysis support that the introduction of drama had an impact on the children’s view of writing competence, that is their perceptions about ‘good writers’ and ‘improvement in writing’ were mostly restricted to the context of their participation in drama.

4.3.3 Interviews - 3rd Set

After the completion of the project, a second interview agenda was developed and a 3rd set of interview data was gathered (see transcript samples in Appendix 12). This set of interview data was aiming at complementing the data with children’s own views of the relationship between drama and writing. In this agenda I focused exclusively on the use of drama in the project aiming at investigating children’s views and understanding of the drama/writing process and especially how the FGC, as participants in the project, made sense of their drama/writing experience and the contribution of drama on their writing quality and engagement. The second interview agenda can be found in Appendix 3.

Before the interviews, I asked FGC to have a look, at home, at all of their writing in the “Think and Write” notebooks and choose a piece of writing they liked most and think of why. Then, the following day at school, during free time, I interviewed each child in turn for
a period of 5-10 minutes. It was very convenient and helpful that all the pieces of writing chosen by the children as their favourites were pieces that they wrote during the integration of drama (without being asked to do so). The data derived from the 3rd set of interviews was analysed inductively according to Strauss and Corbin (1996) guidelines for open-coding and the coding was grounded in the data (children’s responses) and based on the research questions and aims.

The preliminary analysis of the 3rd set of interviews revealed that children held positive views about their drama experience and its contribution towards their writing. Children’s responses showed that they considered as their favourite piece of writing, one that was integrated in the context of drama and writing process and the contents of this writing were based on the children's experience in drama.

Further analysis of the data was focused on what children actually talked about during their interviews. In this analysis, I analysed their responses line by line according to Strauss and Corbin (1996) guidelines and the responses were first coded using ‘in vivo’ codes. Examining all ‘in vivo’ codes together revealed that children talked about ‘role’, ‘story’, ‘action(s), ‘group work’, ‘what we saw’, ‘what we/they did’, what we/they said’, ‘our ideas’. In general, children talked about how their drama experience and ideas generated in drama facilitated their writing.

To make more sense of children’s understanding of the process, a more selective coding (ibid.) followed in vivo coding. In this coding, where possible, I grouped together in vivo codes, where it was possible, into broader and more abstract categories. The categories of this coding frame are presented in the table below together with their definitions in the specific research context.
Enactment

References by children to their ‘roles’ concerned mostly what they said and what they did while working in-role. Therefore, I chose to frame all of these responses using the word ‘enactment’ which implies acting behaviour using speech, action and gesture. References by children to enactment were made mostly in two occasions in the interviews. First, in the responses that concerned the contribution of drama to children’s writing in the question: ‘What helped you to write this piece?’ Second, in the responses that concerned the evaluation of drama as pedagogy for writing, in the question: ‘What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?’

Indicative responses to the question ‘What helped you to write this piece?’ were:
‘…our role as Tom and when we showed with mime how he climbed down the stairs. I found also useful the dialogue that Paul (a peer) in the role of Tom had with another child who was Tom’s mum’. [Ria, G4]

‘The questions that we wrote first with my group and then practiced taking the roles of reporters and Hosea’. [Nik, B1]

‘The roles that me and my classmates took and presented the difficulties that Hosea found in the desert, up on the mountains and in the forest’. [Geos, B2]

‘I was writing and ideas came to my mind from what my peers said when we took the roles of Blodin and Sanga.’ [Rios, B2]

Indicative responses to the question ‘What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?’ were:

‘I like drama more because we take roles in the story and we all say our ideas and then we have more and better ideas to write’. [Eliz, G4]

‘Drama and then present our roles to the class’. [Nik, B1]

‘Drama, because we do drama and you tell us the story and we take roles and these help to have more ideas when I write’. [Chris, G3]

Taking all of these responses together seems to indicate that children considered ‘enactment’, acting out a role using speech and action, as facilitating for their writing. They considered as facilitating not only their own enactment but also their peers’ and teacher’s. Moreover, their preference of working with drama, seem to suggest that children liked working in-role and that this was the element of drama that they were more attracted to. Also, the way that they talked about their roles seems to suggest that their first hand experience in drama, their ‘living through the story’ by being both physically and verbally engaged had a notable impact on their writing.
**Visual images**

Children’s references to ‘what we saw’ or ‘what we/they presented’ in drama indicate that they considered a helpful resource of ideas for their writing the ‘visual images’ created in drama. Responses that referred to the ‘visual images’ overlap in some cases with responses that belong to the ‘enactment’ category, as enactment is also a visual representation of ideas. To overcome this problem, I considered as ‘visual images’ only the responses that represented specific visual elements of children’s enactment.

References to the ‘visual images’ of drama were made mostly by FGC when they were asked **‘What helped you write this piece?’**

Indicative responses to this question were:

‘…when we showed with mime how he [Tom] climbed down the stairs.’ [Ria, G4]

‘When I was writing I was thinking of what I saw in drama, how Hosea crossed the river and ran away from Blodin and what we presented with my group’. [Bros, B3]

‘What we did with my group and what I saw in drama helped me to write it.’
[- What do you mean what you saw in drama helped you?]
‘The roles that me and my classmates took to present the difficulties that Hosea found in the desert, up on the mountains and in the forest.’ [Geos, B2]

‘The protest that we did with my group and the slogans we shouted and wrote on the boards and the Greek flag that we put back in its place at our school.’ [Mirka, G1]

Children’s responses seem to indicate that they appreciated the contribution of the ‘visual images’ created in drama towards their writing. This finding will be investigated further in the following chapter (5.3) where the relationship between drama lessons and children’s writing is considered.
**Story**

Children talked a lot in their interviews about ‘story’. In their responses, references to ‘story’ concerned both the contents of drama and writing. They concerned either the drama story, the story on which the drama activities were built on, or a particular story that they wrote as a follow-up of their participation in drama. References by children to ‘story’ were made mostly in three occasions in the interviews. First, in the responses that concerned the choice made by children about their favourite piece of writing: ‘Why you chose this piece of writing?’ Second, in the responses that concerned the contribution of ‘drama story’ to children’s writing in the question: ‘What helped you to write this piece?’ Third, in the responses that concerned their preferred pre-writing activity in the question: ‘What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?’

Illustrative responses to these questions were:

**Why you chose this piece of writing?**

‘I liked the story you told us in drama and that we took the role of Tom Thumb and we wrote his story’ [Ria, G4]

‘Because we gave our own ending to the story and because it had action and imagination and it had magical things such as Sanga’s carpet…’ [Bros, B3]

**What helped you to write this piece?**

‘The story’. [Ria, G4]
- In what way did the story help you? Can you explain it?
‘I used words from the story in my writing’. [Ria, G4]

‘I got ideas from the story’. [Mirka, G1]

**What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?**

‘Drama, because… I like fiction stories….Drama is about stories’. [Ria, G4]

‘I like that we sit in a circle and listen to the story’. [Eliz, G4]
‘Drama. Because we do drama and you tell us the story and we take roles and these help me to have more ideas when I write’. [Chris, G3]

Children’s references to the ‘story’ seem to indicate the impact that the use of story as a foundation of drama work had on their participation in drama as well as the contribution that the story contents had on their writing. Children’s responses also seem to imply that they were attracted and engaged in the process by the use of stories with fictional elements and action. The use of story, a familiar teaching strategy to children, engaged children’s interest and intellect and stimulated their imagination and make-believe of the imagined context.

**Collective Ownership**

Children’s references to ‘we’, to what they did and said in their groups, and what they and others presented in drama were notably many in this set of interviews. Children’s references to their group work, collective ideas and actions might suggest the impact that their collaboration and team work had on their participation in drama and their subsequent writing. In parallel, responses indicate that children shared responsibility and took ownership of the drama process. They inhabited the process with the roles they were taking and their speech, intellect and actions. Therefore, I chose to frame all of these responses under the category of ‘collective ownership’, which implies that in their drama participation children worked collaboratively and collectively to take ownership of the process.

Indicative references by children to ‘collective ownership’ were made throughout their interviews as shown below:

**Which is your favourite piece of writing this year?**

‘The end of the story of the Blodin the Beast, when we finished the story ourselves from the point that stopped’. [Bros, B3]
Why you chose this piece of writing?

‘Because we gave our own ending to the story and because it had action and imagination and it had magical things such as Sanga’s carpet’… [Bros, B3]

What helped you to write the end of the story?

‘The end of the story that we presented with our groups in drama gave me ideas’. [Geos, B2]

Can you explain how what you presented in drama gave you ideas?

‘When I was writing I was thinking of what I saw in drama and what we presented with my group’. [Geos, B2]

And how what they presented helped you in your writing?

‘I did not know what to write but I was thinking about what they said and I was writing’. [Geos, B2]

What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?

‘Drama’. [Mirka, G1]

Why? Can you explain?

‘Because we all work together and we discuss and then we have more ideas and we know how to write them’. [Mirka, G1]

The above children’s responses indicate the collaborative nature of their participation in drama. They indicate that in drama children were working and interacting together as member partners in a group and not as individuals towards common ends. In parallel, responses indicate that children were aware that the drama process belonged to them, it was a collective enterprise built on their imagination and creativity.

An interesting finding transpires that in children’s responses almost no mention was made of the teacher’s role or contribution towards their writing. This finding reinforces the idea that children had ‘collective ownership’ of the drama process and is in agreement with previous interview findings that, after the integration of drama, children were not any more relying so much on the teacher for their writing.
Summary of the 3rd set of interviews

The purpose of the 3rd set of interviews was to investigate children's views about the impact and contribution of drama on their writing. Children's responses were analysed inductively. The findings of this analysis indicate that children considered as helpful for their writing their 'enactment' in drama, the use of the 'story', the 'visual images' created and their 'collective ownership' in the context of their drama participation.

4.4 DRAMA VIDEOS

The purpose of drama videos in the present study was to provide relevant research data to illuminate the second and third research question and provide evidence to support or challenge my emerging findings.

More specifically, drama videos were used first to help obtain evidence and insights for analysing and understanding the nature of FGC’s participation in drama. Analysis of FGC’s participation will subsequently enable drawing links and relationships between participation in drama and engagement in writing and thus lead to an understanding of the second research question: How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process? Second, to provide evidence of what actually happened in the context of drama lessons and eventually (in the synthesis stage, see section 5.3) to help illuminate, along with the writing samples, the third research question which concerns the impact of drama on writing: What is the contribution of drama towards children’s writing?

Adhering to the above research aims, drama videos were analysed in two stages. In the first stage of analysis, which is discussed in this chapter, I focused my attention on exploring the nature of FGC's participation in drama lessons in relation to the second research question. In the second stage of analysis, which is presented in Chapter 5 the focus was on the contents of drama session in relation to the third research question. Particularly, on the description of the activities and strategies that structured children’s work in drama and the language (verbal and non-verbal) and interactions generated in the drama context.
In the first stage of analysis, I watched each video several times and just recorded the behaviour of the whole class, the teacher and the focal children (see sample in Appendix 13) avoiding to add any interpretations. Then I went through all the descriptive behaviour statements that I wrote down about the focal children and tried to group them together under a label for each group according to the nature of information that its statements conveyed about the participation of the children. I should acknowledge here, that in grouping andlabelling these ‘participation statements’ together I had in mind the pre-determined ‘engagement categories’ of the observation schedule. My though was that by using the same or similar categories in both data sets would facilitate the investigation of children’s stepping from drama to writing and the comparison between children’s participation in drama and their follow-up engagement in writing.

I settled on the following categories:

a. Concentration
b. Collaboration
c. Motivation
d. Confidence
e. In-role

These categories formed the coding frame for the analysis of FGC’s participation in drama as shown in the table 4.26 below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Explanation-Definition</th>
<th>Evidence-Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concentration</strong></td>
<td>Relates to aspects of pupils’ concentration during drama and commitment to the imaginative context</td>
<td>‘listens carefully to the storytelling’ ‘looks around’ ‘watches performance &amp; presentations of others’ ‘talks to classmate(s) during drama work’ ‘takes seriously teacher in-role’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>Relates to aspects of pupils’ collaboration in groups during drama work</td>
<td>‘shares ideas with others’ ‘discuss ideas with others’ ‘listens to ideas of other members’ ‘encourages other group members’ ‘suggests movement to other member of group’ ‘waits for others to suggest ideas’ ‘leads the group’ ‘takes the final decisions’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ willingness and readiness to actively participate in drama</td>
<td>‘participates enthusiastically in the activities’ ‘contributes ideas enthusiastically’ ‘complaining during drama work’ ‘wants to perform ideas in front of the class’ ‘shares ideas with others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ readiness to take risks and share work and ideas in front of others</td>
<td>‘performs &amp; shares in-role individually or with group in front of the class &amp; teacher using language and movement’ ‘takes risks’ ‘Feels proud of own/group work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-role</strong></td>
<td>Refers to pupils’ ability to sustain the role of the character and identify with him/her.</td>
<td>‘uses character’s in-role language’ ‘shows/presents character’s movement’ ‘shows character’s feelings-empathy’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above coding frame the analysis process led to the following findings:
**Concentration**

Analysis of drama videos indicates that FGC's concentration during drama varied. It also indicates that most of the children became progressively more attentive and sustained greater concentration than at the beginning of the project. The findings of video analysis in relation to the FGC's observed behaviour in drama are discussed in more detail below.

Video analysis indicates that the experienced and moderately experienced children were willing to sustain a high degree of concentration on the drama work and commitment to the imaginative context. Their general body language when closely observed in videos indicates that they were very attentive during storytelling and other drama activities both when their groups were acting and when watching other pupils act. They were not distracted easily from behaviours coming from their peers, only from behaviours coming from outside, e.g. interruptions, announcements, etc. They were also watching with interest their peers’ improvisations in-role and were applauding other children's acting out. Their physical involvement and verbal behaviour also indicate their commitment to drama contract as they seemed to take seriously both teacher’s and their role during acting.

The rest of the FGC, the less experienced and inexperienced children were not constantly being attentive to the drama work. Their body posture and general body language indicate that they were not always concentrating during the storytelling and other drama activities either when their groups were acting-out or when watching other pupils act. They were most of the time concentrating during group work but they were often distracted and looking around during whole class work. Moreover, as their physical involvement and verbal behaviour indicate, they were not always committed to the imaginative context. Smiling when they were supposed to be serious while in-role and their behaviour when the teacher was in-role seem to indicate that they did not take seriously their roles and teacher in-role at all times.

However, the inexperienced children demonstrated improvement in their concentration in the second term of the project (after Easter break). As their records of behaviour during drama work indicate, they had a more active engagement. They were more concentrated and not distracted easily during storytelling and whole class work. They also seemed to take more seriously drama conventions, their and teacher's in-role involvement. Beside their physical engagement and use of body language they started using more their verbal language, especially in their in-role engagement.
**Collaboration**

Findings of video analysis indicate that at the beginning of the project, in the first drama sessions, class children and among them FGC faced difficulties when they were asked to collaborate for a common task. However, as the project progressed they started to trust more each other and showed increased ability to work together towards a common goal. Even though, in terms of collaboration, FGC seemed to form two different groups, the leaders and the followers. The first group was the children that had the leading and catalytic role in their group’s work as far as ideas and actions negotiated and decisions taken were concerned. The second group was the children that had limited contribution to their group’s work. They were going along with the ideas and actions suggested by the ‘leaders’ and their involvement was limited to their role’s demands in terms of physical and verbal engagement. The findings of video analysis in relation to FGC’s observed behaviour in drama are discussed below.

More specifically, the experienced girls and the moderately experienced boy were very active during group work. They were very keen and willing to interact and collaborate with the other members of their groups. They were leading and organizing group work. They were sharing and negotiating their ideas with the other members of their groups and they were also assigning roles to the rest of the group. They generally seemed to take responsibility for their group’s work.

The rest of the FGC, were not very actively engaged during group work. They were not showing readiness and constant interest to interact and collaborate with the rest of their groups for a common task. They were distracted easily during group work, looking around and teasing each other. Their participation was limited to listening to others’ ideas and deciding their own in-role involvement, very often with the help of more active members of their groups.

**Motivation**

Video analysis indicates that in terms of motivation FGC seemed to form three different groups. The first group was the children that throughout drama integration engaged enthusiastically into the drama context and activities of each session. The second group was the children that at the beginning of the project were not participating enthusiastically
but as the project progressed showed more willingness and enthusiasm to participate. The third group was the children whose motivation was at a low level in all stages. The findings of video analysis in relation to FGC’s observed behaviour in drama are discussed below.

Analysis of FGC’s behaviour indicates that the experienced girls and the moderately experienced boy were highly motivated during their involvement in drama. As evidenced by their use of verbal and body language, most of the time they were actively immersed into the process, physically and verbally. They were showing great enthusiasm and willingness to participate in drama sessions. They were welcoming all the activities and they were readily contributing their ideas and ‘solutions’ to the problem-solving situations that arose in the context of drama. They were voluntarily taking on any single role needed during storytelling and they were willing to perform in-role either individually or in groups. They were also watching with interest their peers’ improvisations in-role and were applauding other children’s acting out. During their drama engagement, they were being in good spirits and they seemed to enjoy it.

According to their first records of behaviour during their drama involvement, the rest of the FGC did not seem to be as motivated as the FGC mentioned above. As their physical and verbal engagements indicate, they were not showing to be very enthusiastic and willing to participate. They were not willing to perform in-role individually but only with their groups and their contribution of ideas and actions in the context of drama was limited. However, as their later records of behaviour indicate, two of these children became more motivated as the project progressed.

In particular, after the Easter holiday, Chris (G3) and Mirka (G1) seemed to be more physically and verbally engaged in the process. They were showing more enthusiasm and willingness to participate in drama and they were showing interest in the proposed activities and actions. They were also showing more readiness to contribute their ideas to the unfolding plot. They were willing to act in-role either individually or collectively and they seemed to enjoy being engaged in drama.

**Confidence**

Video analysis indicates that in terms of confidence FGC seemed to form two different groups. The first group was the children that from the beginning and throughout drama
integration appeared to be confidently and readily engaged in drama activities. The second 
group was the children that whilst at the beginning of the project did not appear to be 
confidently engaged in drama, progressively showed improvement in their confidence. The 
findings of video analysis in relation to FGC’s observed behaviour in drama are discussed 
below.

Video analysis indicates that during their drama engagement, the experienced girls and 
the moderately experienced boy were confidently settling down to tasks/activities showing 
alert posture and assured body language. According to their records of behaviour, they 
were showing more readiness and willingness to take risks and initiatives in relation to 
their physical and verbal engagement in drama. They were confidently using body 
language to express their feelings created in-role and compliment their verbal language. They 
were confidently and effectively copying or improvising on drama language that had 
either been used by the teacher in-role or had been heard in the storytelling. They were 
also willing to perform and share their work and ideas in front of the class individually. 
They seemed to feel proud of their own and group work.

The rest of the FGC were not being so confident in drama engagement at the beginning of 
the project. They were not showing readiness and willingness to take risks and initiatives 
in relation to their physical and verbal engagement in drama. They were not confidently 
using body language to express their feelings created in-role and compliment their verbal 
language. Nor were they showing interest or willingness to take risks individually or 
perform and share work and ideas in front of the class. However, as the project 
progressed, drama videos indicate that there was a shift in children’s confidence. Almost 
all of them, except from Rios (B2), appeared to be more confidently engaged in drama. In 
particular, after the Easter holiday, these children were showing more readiness and 
willingness to take risks in relation to their physical and verbal engagement in drama. 
They were more confident in using body language to express their feelings created in-role 
and compliment their verbal language and they were willing to share their individual work 
and ideas in front of the class.

**In-role**

Analysis of FGC’s behaviour during their in-role involvement in drama indicates that all of 
the FGC were able to get in role and identify themselves with the characters they were
supposed take on. However, FGC’s in-role engagement differed in the extent (duration) to which they were able to sustain the roles of the characters and in the quality of their in-role engagement (in terms of physical, verbal and affective engagement). The findings of video analysis in relation to FGC’s observed in-role behaviour in drama are discussed below.

Video analysis indicates that experienced and moderately experienced children were more able than the rest of the FGC to sustain the role of the character and identify with him/her for longer periods of time. While being in-role, they were using character’s movement based on the drama fiction, and were trying to express the character’s feelings through movement and freeze-frames. They were progressively using more appropriate language to the character, drawing words and phrases mentioned in the preceding storytelling or by the teacher in-role. When they were in-role, they seemed to be physically, verbally and affectively engaged.

At the beginning of the project, the rest of the FGC, less experienced and inexperienced children showed little ability to sustain the role of the character and identify with him/her for long periods of time. While being in-role, they seemed to be at ease with using character’s movement based on the drama fiction but they seemed to have difficulty in expressing the character’s feelings through movement and freeze-frames. They were also having difficulty in identifying with the character using verbal language. While being in role, they seemed to be mostly physically engaged than verbally and affectively.

However, as the project progressed, one of the less experienced boys, and the two inexperienced children showed increased ability to sustain the role of the character. They were showing more readiness to identify with the character using movement and speech. They were using more appropriate language and movement and making the characters appear and sound more authentic.

Summary of drama videos
Video data of drama lessons provided evidence for FGC’s participation in drama. Participation in drama was analysed focusing on the following categories: concentration, collaboration, motivation, confidence and in-role. Findings of this analysis indicate positive improvements in most children’s participation in drama throughout the project. Findings also indicate a variation in FGC’s participation in drama; different individual children appeared to be differently engaged in drama.
4.5 OBSERVATIONS

Throughout the project period, I observed each of the FGC four times; once before the integration of drama and three times after, a total of 32 observations of all the FGC. The deductive analysis of the project’s observations before and after the introduction of drama was based on the predetermined engagement categories that I settled on as appropriate for examining children's engagement in writing. These categories formed the basis of the design of my structured observation schedule (Appendix 4) and were children’s:

a. concentration
b. Independence
c. Motivation
d. Confidence
e. Length (of writing)

Table 4.28: Coding Frame of Observation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Category type</th>
<th>Explanation-Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Relates to aspects of pupils' concentration during writing, time being on the task, time being off the task, pauses and distractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Relates to aspects of pupils' independence during writing in terms of the need of reminders to settle down to the tasks, relying on self or on teacher’s/peers’ help and making choices about what and how to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ willingness to write, in terms of their enthusiasm and interest in the tasks &amp; readiness to improve work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ readiness to take risks with writing, volunteering to share work with others and feeling proud of own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Relates to pupils’ length of writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these categories relates to particular entries in the observation schedule of the project. Therefore, for the deductive analysis, I gathered together and tabulated all the observational data related to each predetermined category for each FGC. I made a table for each child with observational comments for his/her engagement before and after drama. Then, I examined all children’s data together in order to identify common characteristics within the same data set (before and after drama).

Given that I observed the children (using the observation schedule) only once before the integration of drama, I cannot argue reliably about changes in their writing engagement before and after drama. However, I could trace and comment on the changes in their engagement based mostly on my observations during the drama integration period.

The findings of the observational data after the integration of drama are presented below in relation to each of the predetermined categories.

**Concentration**

The observational data indicates that all of the FGC progressively displayed increased concentration, throughout the drama period, to a greater or lesser extent. Physical signs of this positive change were evident in their concentration while writing and also their alert posture.

The observations indicate that the experienced girls became progressively more concentrated writers. They stayed on the tasks for longer periods of time and they were not distracted easily. They showed increased ability to focus and remain focused on their written work. They were making short pauses to chat with a peer or to show their work to their peers. They were pausing longer mostly for thinking about how to proceed, for listening to the teacher’s guidelines or for showing their work to their peers when requested.

The moderately experienced boy and girl were the next most concentrated writers. Their concentration increased with time and they stayed on the tasks longer than before. However, the boy did not appear to sustain the same increased concentration during the last observation. He was distracted easily and he was making longer pauses before returning back to his writing.
Among the rest of the FGC, one of the less experienced boys, and the two inexperienced children had the greater improvements in concentration over the drama integration period, by keeping on their tasks for longer periods of time. They were still making a lot of pauses but shorter than before and mostly related to their written work.

One of the less experienced boys also demonstrated a positive change in his concentration while writing. However, he was not able to sustain uniform concentration throughout his writing over the six month integration of drama. As the observational data indicates, his concentration varied. Sometimes he was willing to sustain concentration on the task for longer periods of time; but sometimes he was not as willing, he was easily distracted and making several short or long pauses. He was making short pauses to look around, to chat with a peer, to ask to go to the toilet or he was making longer pauses to think about how to proceed.

**Independence**

The observational data indicates that almost all of the FGC became more independent in their writing engagement than before the integration of drama. Except for one less experienced boy all the FGC developed greater independence, throughout the drama period, to a greater or lesser extend.

More specifically, the observations indicate that the experienced girls and the moderately experienced boy progressively developed greater independence than before drama integration. They settled down to tasks more readily than before without needing any reminders. They were showing increased ability to plan and organize their writing without any help from the teacher or other classroom resources. They based their writing on their group’s ideas or their peers’ ideas presented and developed in the course of their drama engagement. They also showed ability to enhance their writing with their own ideas. At the same time, they were increasingly willing to take risks in composing by making choices about what and how to write. They rarely asked for teacher’s help and when they did it was mainly to make sure that they were on the right track. Also, they reviewed their work as they went along without being reminded.

The moderately experienced girl, like before drama, was still the next most independent writer of the group. After not much change over the first two months she started showing steadily higher independence in her engagement. She appeared to be more willing to take
risks in composing by being more selective in content and means of expression. She was also enhancing her writing with her own ideas. She rarely needed reminders and she rarely asked for teacher’s help; when she did it was about spelling or making sure that she organized her writing properly.

The children (B2, B1 and G1) that demonstrated the least independence before the drama integration they too showed positive change in their independence during drama integration. They settled readily to tasks without needing reminders like before. They also showed increased ability to work more independently throughout the writing tasks. Once they understood what they were asked to write, they did not need as much help as before with developing their own texts. They progressively started to become more able to make choices about what and how to write. They based their writing on ideas encountered, discussed and presented in the course of drama either by the whole class in-role or by their group’s or peers’ role play. When they got stuck they were asking for teacher’s help and not waiting for her to notice them like they did before. They also reviewed their work at the end of their writing without being reminded.

One of the less experienced boys was the only child of the group that displayed an unsteady progress in his independence over the six months of drama integration. He was rather unwilling to become more independent in his engagement with writing. He sometimes settled down to tasks without needing reminders but sometimes he needed reminders. He was not able of making choices about what and how to write and he sometimes needed a great deal of help with developing his own texts. He often got stuck and had to wait for teacher’s and peers’ help. He also needed reminders to review his work at the end of his writing.

**Motivation**

The observational data indicates that almost all of the FGC showed a positive change in their motivation over drama integration. They appeared to be more willing and enthusiastic to undertake writing. Physical signs of these positive changes were evident in their anxiousness to start writing, their posture and look of being completely immersed in their writing.
More specifically, the experienced girls who appeared to be self-motivated writers from the beginning of the project appeared to be even more motivated over the drama integration. This is evidenced by their observed willingness and enthusiasm to undertake writing either during drama or afterwards. They were asking about the subject of the writing task during their engagement with drama activities and they looked anxious to undertake writing. They seemed to willingly move from drama to writing with no delay, as a natural step forward or continuation of their drama work. During their writing engagement they looked to be more involved with their writing than before and enjoy it. They also wrote their ideas more fluently and faster, they reviewed their work as they went along and without being reminded and they tried to take advantage of all the time allowed for writing.

From the rest of the FGC, the moderately experienced children were the next most motivated writers. They seemed to be more willing and enthusiastic to undertake writing. They were looking forward to undertaking writing and they willingly moved from drama to writing with no delay (like the experienced girls). They showed interest and seemed to enjoy and be more involved in their work. They also wrote their ideas more fluently than before and were eager to take advantage of all the time allowed for writing. It is worth noting that the moderately experienced boy did not appear as willing to sustain the same motivation. He did not seem to be as willing and enthusiastic to undertake writing as he did during the first three months. His interest waned and he did not look to be as involved in writing as before. He also did not try to take advantage of all the time allowed for writing.

Mirka (G1) and Geos (B2) progressively showed signs of increased motivation. Especially the last three months of the project they were very willing and enthusiastic to undertake writing and they looked to be more involved in their task. They willingly moved from drama to writing with little delay and they seemed to enjoy writing. They also wrote their ideas more fluently than before drama integration and they were eager to make the most of the time allowed for writing.

The rest of the children (Rios, B2 & Nik, B1) did not display a uniform increase in their motivation. Sometimes they willingly moved from drama to writing, they seemed to enjoy writing and wrote more fluently their ideas than before drama. Sometimes though they did not show the same interest, they were not so willing to undertake writing and they did not seem to be engaged in their writing or able to write their ideas fluently. They were not reviewing their work as they went along but only at the end and after being reminded. Most
of the times, although they finished writing before the time allowed, they did not show willingness to take advantage of the remaining time to check and improve their work.

**Confidence**

The observational data indicates that all of the FGC showed a positive change in their confidence over the period of drama integration. They displayed (to a greater or lesser extend) increased confidence in themselves and in their abilities. Physical signs of these positive changes were evident in children’s more assured body language and alert posture during their writing engagement.

The two high and two moderately experienced children, who already were confident writers, developed even greater belief in themselves and their abilities over the drama integration period. They were settling down to tasks more confidently than before and they wrote their ideas even more fluently. Especially, they were more ready and willing to take risks using transcriptional as well as compositional aspects of writing. These children also seemed to feel proud of their writing and they were very willing to share work with others. Physical signs of these positive changes were evident in their assured body language and alert posture during their engagement.

The two inexperienced and one of the less experienced children who were lacking confidence in their writing engagement before drama integration displayed the greatest gains in confidence among the FGC. They were progressively settling down to tasks more confidently, making shorter pauses than before and writing ideas more fluently without pausing in the middle of their sentences. They also appeared to be more ready and willing to take risks either with transcriptional or compositional aspects of writing and they demonstrated readiness to share their work with others. Physical signs of these positive changes were evident in their generally more assured body language, with observational data reporting less fidgeting or idling during their engagement.

The other less experienced child showed a positive change in his confidence after drama integration but to a lesser extend than the rest of the FGC. Over the first three months of drama integration he seemed to believe more in his writing abilities. He settled down to tasks more confidently than before and he wrote his ideas more fluently. He also showed interest in sharing his writing with others. However, observational data indicate that he did
not sustain this positive change in his confidence throughout the period of drama integration. As his posture and body language indicated, over the last three months of the project, he was very reluctant in engaging with writing and he was looking to be under stress and anxious when getting stuck.

**Length**

Over the six months of drama integration, the majority of FGC’s writing was consistently of greater length than before drama integration as shown in the table below. However, this finding cannot be attributed directly to the integration of drama given that children became increasingly more mature over the duration of the project.

Table 4.29 - Length of Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Children</th>
<th>Length of writing (pages) BEFORE</th>
<th>Length of writing (pages) AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4 &amp; G4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>0.5 - 0.75</td>
<td>1.5 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.5 - 0.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 &amp; B2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 &amp; B2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of observations**

Observations of the FGC during the writing sessions over the six months of drama integration indicate progressively positive changes in their overall engagement in writing. Changes varied in rate and magnitude from child to child with the greater gains in engagement for most of the children being observed after the first two months of drama integration.
4.6 WRITING SAMPLES

The analysis of the FGC’s writing samples was aimed at investigating the impact of drama on the quality of children’s writing and shed light on the research question: ‘What is the contribution of drama towards children’s writing?’

The FGC’s quality of writing was investigated and analyzed in two phases. In the first phase, children’s writing samples were analyzed quantitatively, before and after the integration of drama into the writing lesson, using writing scales and criteria that were designed to assess primary school children’s writing (see Appendix 6). More specifically, during the project, after each writing session, all the FGC’s writings were assessed by myself on the basis of the writing scales and criteria mentioned above. Each writing was assessed against each criterion, assigning a score of 1 for inexperienced writing, 2 for average and 3 for good writing (see Appendix 7).

In the second phase, using the video data recorded during drama sessions, I examined children’s writing qualitatively by looking for evidence of any impact of drama on its content. In doing so, I looked for any links between what happened in the context of drama, both verbally and visually, if and how this experience was transferred or manifested itself in the children’s writing that followed.

4.6.1 Quantitative analysis of writing samples

In order to gain an overall picture of FGC’s writing progress over time, for each FGC child, a total of 15 writings were assessed. These were the last 3 written by the child in each of the months of Sep, Dec, Jan, Apr and Jun. The first six (Sep and Dec) were before the introduction of drama, the rest were after. All the months quoted above (and in tables) correspond to the calendar months of the school year except for Apr which in fact covered the period from mid-March to mid-April (because of Easter holidays) but it carries the heading ‘Apr’ for brevity.

The assessment data of the children’s writings was entered into a spreadsheet, against the corresponding criteria. In the subsequent analysis, the average score of each assessment criterion in relation to the time of assessment was tabulated in Table 4.30. Then, overall average percentage changes in assessment criteria for all the FGC
over time were calculated and the 5 aspects of FGC’s writing that had the greater change over time were identified.

To further reduce the data and also give another interesting view of the results, overall average scores of FGC’s in criteria over time were grouped together according to which level of writing (text, sentence or word) they were related to. Text level consists of Meaning, Organisation, Ideas, Register and Writer’s Voice. Sentence level consists of Grammar, Syntax and Punctuation. Word level consists of Vocabulary and Spelling. Table 4.31 was constructed showing the change of each level over time for all the FGC.

Table 4.30 - Overall Change in Criteria Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning/Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer's &quot;voice&quot;</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Findings - All FGC’s writing samples

The overall average percentage changes in the scores against each of the assessment criteria were calculated for three distinct time ranges: the period before drama (Sep-Dec), the period from the beginning of drama to the end of the year (Jan-Jun) and for the whole academic year (Sep-Jun).
Before drama (Sep-Dec)
As shown in the table 4.30, the five aspects of writing that had the greatest change over this period were writer’s voice, spelling, vocabulary, syntax and grammar (in that order).

During drama (end Dec-Jun)
Data show that over this period, the five aspects of writing that had the greatest change were ideas, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation and syntax.

Whole academic year (Sep-Jun)
Over this period, the five aspects of writing that had the greatest change were vocabulary, writer’s voice, syntax, organisation and ideas.

Furthermore, the criteria were separated into 3 groups, according to the level of writing they related to, that is Text, Sentence and Word and a similar analysis was performed as for the individual criteria over the same 3 periods described above.

Table 4.31 - Overall Change in Levels of Writing over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF WRITING</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis shows that in the period before the introduction of drama, children’s writing improved more at word level, having an increase of 23.53%. In the period after the introduction of drama, children’s writing improved more at text level. For the whole academic year children’s writing improved more at word level, having an increase of 45.59%.
4.6.3 Findings - Individual Writing samples

Table 4.32: FGC’s Overall Change in Quality of Writing over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD (Attainment Group)</th>
<th>Average Scores</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliz (G4)</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria (G4)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris (G3)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bros (B3)</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rios (B2)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo (B2)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirka (G1)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nik (B1)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of individual writings shows the progress over time of the overall quality of writing (average score over all criteria) of each of the focus group children. As Table 4.32 shows, over the period before drama (Sep-Dec), all children’s writing improved more than 10%, apart from the writing of Mirka (G1) which showed a decrease of -10.87%. The four children that made the greatest progress over this period were Ria (G4), Eliz (G4), Geo (B2) and Nik (B1) in that order.

Over the drama period (Dec-Jun), all children’s writing showed improvement ranging from 7.81% (Bros, B3) to a maximum of 53.66% (Mirka, G1). The four children that made the most progress over this period were Mirka (G1), Nik (B1), Chris (G3) and Geo (B2).

Over the whole academic year (Sep-Jun), all children’s writing showed improvement ranging from 18.97% (Bros, B3) to a maximum of 57.41% (Ria, G4). The four children that made the greatest progress over this period were Ria (G4), Nik (B1), Geo (B2) and Mirka (G1) in that order.
Summary of writing samples

The findings of quantitative analysis of representative writing samples obtained in five different periods, (throughout the year) indicated that during the integration of drama children’s writing improved mostly at text level and the five aspects of writing that had the greater improvement were ideas, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation and syntax.

4.7 RESEARCHER’S LOG

A researcher’s log was kept by myself for the whole duration of the project (Sep-Jun). After the completion of the project, my log was used to serve two purposes: To help me recall my subjective view at the time of data collection and, as an additional data set, to provide further support to findings. In the analysis process, the contents of teacher’s log were coded according to the analytical constructs under investigation (attitudes & views of writing, quality of writing, participation/engagement in drama and writing) to complement the findings of other sources of data.

In what follows, I present some sectional entries of my log that are related to the main constructs of the study and show the way I was recording daily events or thoughts as the project went on.

26/1/06

The way children collaborated together in their groups to end up with their group mime seems to show that they started to acclimatize themselves to the nature of the requirements of -the new to them- ‘drama environment’. They showed enthusiasm and general willingness to present their mimes to the rest of the class.

MEMO

[Participation/engagement in drama-Consider this in the context of social interaction and collaboration in drama (literature) and relation to their subsequent writing]

Children seem to like and be fascinated by the idea of working in-role [element of imagination] and have their own space and creative input in their improvisations.
Memo/Coding

[Participation in drama: in-role work, child-centered element of drama pedagogy and open-ended tasks, the process belongs to children!]

I noticed that when I mentioned during their group work (improvisation in-role) that children might need to write afterwards their own version of the adventure of Tom Thumb, most of the children responded negatively (‘nooo!’), showing negative disposition towards writing and unwillingness to undertake writing after drama.

Memo

Attitude towards writing

3/2/06

I noticed a great change in the writing of Chris (G3) and Mirka (G1). In the content of their letter to Merlin (in the role of Tom Thumb) there is an obvious influence of drama and particularly of ideas that were said and presented by their peers during drama.

Memo

Quality of writing and drama contribution

10/3/06

I was pleasantly surprised today. In the whole class meeting in-role, (I had the role of the children’s union representative and children had the role of children in the Grey City) while we were discussing what we can do about the problem that we faced [in relation to the grey cloud and pollution created because of the many cars and the lack of space for play] children from the focus group contributed ideas that were related to the previous drama stories and characters such as ‘We can call the Giant [selfish] to blow away the grey cloud and bring down the skyscrapers’ [Bros], ‘Why don’t we ask the help of magician Merlin?’ [Ria] and ‘We can send Tom Thumb to speak to the government and tell them our demands’ [Eliz]. I believe that these kind of responses are showing that stories and characters chosen for drama lessons had appealed to children and they are still on children’s mind and imagination, even if they dealt with them in previous drama sessions. Also, they reconfirm existing literature that emphasises the impact of imaginative context
on children’s cognitive engagement in drama and the co-existence of real and imaginative in the drama context.

Memo
Participation in drama: Imagination and cognitive engagement in drama

12/5/06: Blodin the Beast Part B, Hosea’s Letter to Sanga

Assessment of FGC’s writing in relation to drama contribution

Rios
He wrote better than the last time but his length of writing was again short.

Effectiveness: His writing shows that he understood the demands of the task.
Voice/Role: He successfully sustained the role of Hosea in his letter.
Ideas developed and presented in drama: 1. Tiger’s attack: This idea presented visually in group improvisations of the difficulties faced by Hosea in the wild forest.
2. Helps that Hosea had in his journey: a. little voice b. Sanga’s carpet c. wise words of Sanga
3. Hardly climbing up the mountains: This visual idea was presented by all the groups when they showed difficulties Hosea faced up on the mountains.
4. Encouragement by little voice in the head.
Vocabulary transferred from drama into writing: Little voice words: ‘Don’t stop Hosea! Don’t be afraid! Go on! You will make it.’

Summary of researcher’s log
To complement the findings of other sources of data, the contents of teacher’s log were coded according to the analytical constructs under investigation (attitudes & views of writing, quality of writing, participation/engagement in drama and writing).

4.8 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

In this chapter, I presented the stages of data analysis and the findings resulting from each data set separately. Specifically, I presented the analysis and findings of questionnaires,
interviews (sets 1, 2 and 3), drama videos, observations, writing samples and researcher’s log.

In the next chapter, I present the synthesis of data and its findings together with three of the focal children’s portraits.
CHAPTER 5: DATA SYNTHESIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In conducting this study, several methods of data collection were employed trying to collect as much data as possible regarding the whole class and individual children (of the focal group). Each of the six data sets (questionnaires, interviews, videos, observations, writing samples and researcher’s log) produced its own results that can be used and synthesized to produce the overall ‘picture’ of findings that help in getting a better insight of the issues arising from the study’s aim and research questions.

In this chapter, I present the stages of analysis and synthesis that I followed after the separate analysis on each data set was done (as presented in chapter 4). My aim was to synthesise a wider range of findings by investigating relationships between findings from all sources. In the first section, I examine relationships and compare findings of similar data sets. In the second section, I investigate and synthesise relationships between the content of drama sessions, the content of writing samples and children’s own views on the contribution of drama to their writing. At the end of the chapter, to illustrate findings further, I present the portraits of three of the focal children showing the variations of their writing profiles over the duration of the project and drama integration.

5.2 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SIMILAR DATA SETS

At this stage of the analysis process, it was thought necessary to investigate relationships between data and see how findings from different data sets compare (where they are comparable). The aim was not so much to try to verify the collected data but to provide some evidence or reassurance on data consistency between the sets. Equally interesting would be the identification of discrepancies between data derived from different sets. To this end, where possible, the same or similar categories were used in analyzing the data from different sets, without compromising the analysis in terms of what the data from each set sought to investigate.
With the above in mind, an examination and synthesis of relationships between two pairs of closely related data sets was made: (a) Questionnaires with interviews, where children’s views and voices were recorded, and (b) video recordings with the researcher’s direct observations where children’s reactions and behaviour were examined both in drama and writing. The outcomes of this examination of each pair are presented in the two sections that follow.

5.2.1 Relationships and synthesis of questionnaire and interview findings

Children’s attitudes and views of writing have been investigated primarily through data obtained at the beginning and at the end of the project by questionnaire and interview Sets 1 and 2. In the first stage of analysis, the data of both methods was analysed deductively using the same coding frame which was based on the same pre-established categories that informed the design of the questionnaire and interview agendas. References to drama in Interview data Set 2 were further analysed inductively based on changes in children’s attitudes or views of writing.

However, it should be noted that even though the design of both research instruments was based on the same categories, direct comparison between categories was not possible in all cases, given that the interview schedule covered a lot more aspects of each category under investigation.

Findings from both data sets indicate that they complement and support each other in all categories under examination, showing overall that the whole class and FGC’s attitude and views towards writing became more positive after the introduction of drama.

Children’s disposition towards writing shows a positive change in both data sets. However, questionnaires did not indicate a direct impact of drama on children, in contrast to the interviews that seem to firmly link the change in their disposition towards classroom writing to the integration of drama. In addition, interview data reveals a positive change in children’s disposition and initiative towards writing at home, something that was not evident from the questionnaire data.

With regards to the categories of strategies, writing preferences and confidence, both data sets produced almost identical findings with changes in all three categories positively
related to the introduction of drama. A shift from strategies dependent totally on the teacher, towards strategies dependent more on children’s participation and experiences in drama was evident in both data sets. Also evident was a shift in children’s writing preferences towards writing tasks undertaken during drama integration, as was the positive change in children’s confidence in writing over the same period.

Regarding difficulties faced by children while writing, both data sets indicate that after the integration of drama, children acknowledged fewer difficulties related to the content and ideas of their writing and more difficulties related to distractions due to environmental factors such as noise. These changes however cannot be directly attributed to drama.

In the case of children’s perception of good or improved writing, in both data sets children associated improvement in writing with participation and attention in drama. But, interview data provided considerable additional evidence that drama was a major reason for the change in children’s perceptions in relation to the purpose of writing and their sense of writing competence.

In summary, the findings of both data sets to a large degree converge in supporting and complementing each other without any major discrepancies that would place their compatibility in doubt. This is encouraging and helpful in crystallising the findings of the study that will form the basis for providing clues and inferences, particularly towards the first research question of ‘Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?’

5.2.2 Relationships and synthesis of video and observation findings

These two data sets do not involve children’s views or opinions. They totally represent my observations and interpretations as a researcher of what physically took place during the drama and writing sessions. I consciously tried to be objective and unaffected from any personal biases due to my familiarity with the children. Therefore, I look at the findings from this pair of data sets together for similarities, relationships or discrepancies between the nature of a child’s participation in drama and the same child’s nature of engagement in the writing session that followed (and vice-versa).
Children’s participation in the drama process has been investigated through the video recordings of all drama sessions. I watched each video recording several times trying to distinguish and note exactly what happened and what was said during the drama session. I concentrated on identifying the nature and characteristics of the participation of each focal child, within the child’s group and the whole class including the teacher. I then tried to analyse each FGC’s participation based on categories similar to the ones used in the design of my semi-structured observation schedule for watching the FGC while on their writing tasks. This I thought was appropriate, if I was to investigate the relationship between children’s participation in drama and their engagement in the follow up writing as per the second research question: ‘How does children participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?’.

Children’s engagement in writing (following each drama session) was investigated by making notes while directly observing one or two focal children during each writing session. As already mentioned, the analysis of observation data was based on predetermined ‘engagement’ categories.

Overall findings of video and direct observations seem to suggest that there was a connection and positive relationship between children’s participation in drama and their subsequent writing engagement. FGC who were actively participating in drama appeared to be more engaged in the writing task. Similarly, FGC who did not display active participation in drama, were observed to be less engaged in their writing. Findings also seem to indicate that as the participation of a child in drama improved over time, so did the same child’s engagement in writing.

After participating in the first few drama lessons, most of the FGC’s displayed more readiness and willingness to move from drama to writing without the usual moans that used to be heard before the introduction of drama. As the project progressed, children tended to view the processes of drama and writing as one naturally integrated process and appeared quite happy and motivated to start writing their ideas down. This tendency was noticeably more pronounced for children with a higher degree of active participation in drama.

Findings from both data sets also seem to indicate a positive relationship between children’s concentration in drama and their concentration during their writing tasks. FGC who were not easily distracted from their imaginative roles in drama were not easily
distracted in their writing. Children who were not able to sustain concentration and commitment in drama were not able to sustain concentration for long in writing. Subsequent improvement in children’s concentration in drama, was reflected in their subsequent improvement in concentration while writing and their commitment to the writing task.

In the case of children’s confidence, findings from the two data sets reveal a direct relationship between them. Children’s growing confidence in drama participation and role taking (through improvisations in group or class presentations) seems to have given a boost to children’s confidence and independence in undertaking and engaging in writing. This was evidenced by the observation that they were asking for much less help from the teacher during their writing tasks. They were writing longer texts, relying more on ideas and language of their own and of their peers as experienced during drama. Generally, they appeared to have more control over the writing process and took more initiatives on their own.

Notably, drama ‘leaders’, that is children who showed more collaboration and higher team spirit in contributing and sharing ideas, appeared to be more independent writers than the ‘followers’ who still needed teacher’s help and reminders to settle down to their writing tasks.

In summary, the resulting synthesis of findings from these two data sets leads to the identification of certain positive links between the imaginative context of drama and the observed traits in children’s writing engagement. These links translate into an interesting extension of the findings of each data set that can be usefully considered when attempting to answer the second sub-research question.

5.3 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DRAMA CONTENT, WRITING SAMPLES AND CHILDREN’S VIEWS

The analysis of video data (augmented by the lesson plans and entries in the researcher’s log) provided quite a detailed and accurate picture of the content of each drama session. FCG’s writing samples, pertaining to each drama lesson, were then analysed qualitatively (following their quantitative analysis as presented in Chapter 4). Subsequently, I
considered the relationships between drama and writing by synthesizing findings provided by the above two data sets. Finally, I synthesised the findings of the qualitative analysis of writing samples with children's own views on the drama contribution towards their writing.

5.3.1 Qualitative analysis of writing samples within the context of drama lessons

In the first phase of analysis (see section 4.6), the contribution of drama towards the quality of children's writing has been investigated through the quantitative analysis of representative writing samples obtained in five different periods, throughout the project duration. The analysis was based on the 10 predetermined criteria (categories of analysis) of the assessment scheme that related to text, sentence and word levels of writing (see Appendix 7). The findings of this analysis highlighted that during the integration of drama children's writing improved mostly at text level and the five aspects of writing that had the greater improvement were ideas, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation and syntax. However, quantitative analysis of writing samples does not provide evidence regarding the nature of the contribution of drama towards writing. Therefore, there was a need to analyse each writing sample by considering its situational nature, within the specific context of each drama lesson that gave rise to it. My aim was to look for links and relationships between the contents of drama and the contents of writing and draw conclusions on the contribution of drama content towards the content of children's writing.

I worked as follows: I first chose 3 drama sessions: one from the beginning of the drama integration, one from the middle and one from the end, to cover the whole duration of the project. The criteria for their selection were a. the inclusion of their corresponding writing samples in the analysis of writing samples that I did in the first stage of analysis and b. at least two of them to concern writing in-role, so this would enable later the comparison of my research findings with existing research findings that are supportive of the impact of drama on in-role writing tasks. Two of these lessons (The Selfish Giant & Blodin the Beast) are based on the drama lessons proposed by Jonh Winston (2004) in his book 'Drama and English at the Heart of the Curriculum'.

For each of these three drama sessions, I revisited its lesson plan and in parallel I went back to the video data and I described what happened during the lesson. Then I went through the specific lesson’s entries in my log. Finally, informed by all the details about the
session, I examined carefully each focal child’s writing sample looking for evidence to support the contribution of drama elements to its content.

This analysis was a two-staged process. In the first stage, I traced the ideas and sentences in the writing samples back through the drama lesson to see where the ideas originate. More specifically, I colour coded (using different colour highlighters) the contents of writing linking them to the language and different ideas generated by particular drama strategies employed in the lesson. In the second stage, I examined the contribution of drama at text, sentence and word level of the writing samples.

In what follows, for each drama lesson, I first summarise the lesson and highlight specific elements of its drama contents. Then, I present a few selected examples of FGC’s extracts pertaining to each lesson that in my opinion illustrate the influence of the highlighted drama elements on the children’s writing. In these extracts, I traced ideas and sentences back through the drama lesson to see where they originated. Although in my actual analysis, I used different colour codes on the text for each drama strategy evidenced in the writing, here, for a neater presentation, I use in parentheses a reference to the actual element of the drama contents.

Finally, drawing on the description of the lessons and the analysis of follow-up writing I illustrate with some examples the overall contribution of drama content towards writing, at text, sentence and word level.

More details about the lessons, their plans, descriptions of activities and corresponding entries from the researcher’s log can be found in Appendix 15 & 16.

5.3.1.1 Lesson 1: The Selfish Giant – Episode A

This drama lesson was the first episode of a series of four episodes based on the story of ‘The Selfish Giant’. Following the original story line the episode begins with mime work where the class children play various games in the Giant’s garden, as individuals or in small groups. Then, the children are faced with the episode’s main dramatic issue: After an absence of seven years the Giant returns, banishes the children from his garden and puts up a sign that says: ‘Children keep Out! Trespassers will be Prosecuted’.
The children leave the garden but decide to try to persuade the giant to change his mind by placing a sackful of gifts by his doorstep. The teacher, in the role of the Giant, comes to the door and sees the sack with the children’s presents. Then, talking in a grumpy voice, takes out three of the presents, looks at them with contempt and throws them back into the sack calling out to the children: ‘Ha! You’re trying to cheat me with your presents! So you think! I am not interested in your presents. It is MY GARDEN, NOT YOURS! I will not give up! Never! Go away!’

Then, the teacher takes on the Giant’s role and the children hot-seat her. Being grumpy the Giant answers children’s questions with irony and selfishness emphasizing that he will not change his mind (The garden in MINE! Only MINE! Got that?, It is MY GARDEN and I can do whatever I like!, I do not want ANY KID in my garden! ANY!, I’m not changing my mind! You are not welcome in my garden! Never!).

The teacher, out of role, asks the children to think (within their group) of what they know about the Giant, what they have learned from the hot-seating and make a feather map with the Giant’s profile. The children, in the role of a child in the Giant’s garden, write a letter to a child who is new to the neighbourhood, to inform and warn the new child about the Giant’s nasty behaviour.

My aims for this particular drama lesson were that the children should a. explore character and issues through a range of dramatic conventions including role-play, mime, hot-sitting, tableau and b. create and sustain an appropriate atmosphere through the use of sound and movement. My aims for the follow-up writing were that the children should a. write the Giant’s character profile and b. (as an extension of a) to write a letter in-role of a child in the Giant’s garden based on the profile of the Giant.

Selected examples of writing extracts

In our neighbourhood lives a selfish giant (writing activity). He was staying away at a friend’s for seven years (storytelling) and me and my friends we were going into the giant’s garden playing several games (mime).
But when the giant returned, he sent us all away from his garden and did not let us play in it any more (teacher in-role). This giant wants everything for himself. He is very bad-mannered with us (writing activity).
One night we sent him a sack full of little presents (class improvisation). But the giant, when he saw our presents, told us: ‘I know that you are hiding somewhere hereby and do not think that with your presents you will make me change my mind’, told us (teacher in-role) and slammed the door (storytelling)…

…If you pass by his house you will see a sign on the gate saying: ‘Children Keep Out! Trespassers will be prosecuted’ (visual prompt).

[Eliz, G4]

He was away for seven years (storytelling). We were happily playing many games like hide and seek, chasing, football and many others (mime).

When the giant returned he told us: ‘What are you doing here? Go away now!’ (teacher in-role). When we heard him we ran away immediately. We got too scared! (class improvisation in-role).

I want to warn you about the giant and the way he behaves. We took him many presents (class improvisation). He was too upset and he threw away our presents and told us: “Do you think that with the presents you bring me I will let you play in my garden?” (teacher in-role)

Now we can’t play in the garden. We did not do any damage (storytelling).

Be very careful now that you are moving next to the giant’s house. Don’t you ever go to play in his garden. Take care!

[Chris, G3]

Suddenly he came back from his journey and he told us: ‘go away from here, the garden is mine!’ (teacher in-role) and then we left the garden (class improvisation).

After that we gave him a sack full of sweets and he threw it away (class improvisation) and he is very selfish (writing activity). He is also very mean (writing activity) and, on top of that, he teases us too (teacher in-role). You see? He is huge in size (writing activity) and it is the first time in my life that I got so scared (feelings created in role), do you know that my friend?

[Geos, B2]
5.3.1.2 Lesson 2: Children in resistance

This was a complete drama lesson designed by myself with its storyline based on historical events of children’s involvement and contribution in the years of Greece’s occupation by Germans in the Second World War.

The drama begins with the teacher establishing the time (1942) and place (Athens) framework and the problem. She tells children that when they got to their school that morning, they found a thick strong padlock on the school gates, a huge picture of their teacher on the wall with “Wanted” written under it and the Greek flag missing from the flagpole. After a while, a child started screaming and all of them gathered near him. He had found a piece of cloth with blood all over it. The children work in groups and make a tableau to show their reaction and feelings to what they faced. The groups present their tableaus and the feelings of children that each tableau represents are discussed (Children are surprised, Children are frightened). In their groups, children discuss and speculate on what might have happened (-Where is the flag? Who took it away?-Maybe the Germans who came yesterday to our school and asked the teacher to get it down.).

Teacher in-role as children’s president initiates discussion about possible actions and prompts children to make suggestions (We must do something, we cannot stay with our hands crossed….Do you have any ideas?). The children discuss their ideas in the class. “Actions” are decided by the children who are split into groups by their president (teacher in-role) and each group plans and executes its actions. The first group are writing slogans on the ‘walls’ using the board in the class. They write: ‘FREEDOM OR DEATH’, ‘GERMANS OUT OF GREECE’ and ‘LONG LIVE GREECE’. The second group, using mime, breaks the lock of the school’s gate and the third group re-installs the Greek flag. The third group also makes a protest march shouting slogans. In the role of themselves years later, they narrate their story to their grandchildren.

My aims for this particular drama unit were that the children should a. learn through their drama lived experience some historical events about children’s involvement and contribution in the years of occupation, b. co-operate, make hypotheses and suggest ideas and c. use a range of dramatic conventions including storytelling, tableau, group
improvisation, teacher in-role and class meeting in-role. My aim for the follow-up writing was that the children should write in-role and narrate the story as they had lived it in the drama.

**Selected examples of writing extracts**

*My beloved children, in 1940 there was a war. One day we went to our school and we found the gate shut with a huge lock and a picture of our teacher saying (storytelling): ‘WANTED’ (visual prompt)! We were surprised! (tableau). A child panicked (tableau). After a few minutes we found the flagpole where our Greek flag was previously proudly waving, bare (storytelling). Our lovely flag was nowhere!_

_What happened then grandma?_

*We got really scared then (tableau)! But the worst thing was when we found that piece of cloth with blood on it (storytelling & visual prompt)! It was scaring! All of us froze (tableau)!

*We thought that it could have been from our teacher’s shirt (class meeting in-role) and we felt a knot in our heart.*

[Ria, G4]

*I was nine years old then. One day we went to school (storytelling) and what do you think we saw? The Greek flag was not in its place, they put a heavy lock on the gates and a picture of our teacher saying (storytelling) ‘WANTED’ (visual prompt)! We got surprised, scared and speechless. We did not know what to do (tableau)!

*We were suspecting the Germans did it. We decided to take action (class meeting in-role)._

*Some of us were writing slogans on the walls (group improvisation) such as: ‘FREEDOM OR DEATH’ (visual prompt) and ‘GREECE WE LOVE YOU’ (visual prompt). That night, some others broke the lock, got inside and put up another Greek flag (group improvisation).*

[Bros, B3]

*Then we found a piece of cloth with blood on it (storytelling) and we got scared (tableau) and said: ‘who put that piece of cloth here?’ (class meeting in-role).

*Then we found our teacher’s photo (class meeting in-role) which said at the bottom ‘WANTED’ (visual prompt). ‘Who put up that photo?’ (teacher in-role) we all said with fear.*
Then we were writing slogans on the walls, put another flag in its place and me and my friend Michael we were guards, watching if somebody comes but nobody came (group improvisation). We were also making protests and shouting slogans such as: Germans out of Athens!, ‘Long live Greece!’ (group improvisation) 

[Rios, B2]

5.3.1.3 Lesson 3: Blodin the Beast  Unit –Episode A

This drama lesson was the first episode of a series of five episodes based on the story of ‘Blodin the Beast’, written by Michael Marpurgo. Blodin is a huge beast who drinks oil, breathes fire and enslaves entire populations. When the story opens, there is only one village left standing. The villagers all wish to surrender to Blodin and only the wise old man Shanga and a young boy, Hosea, refuse.

The teacher introduces the story by showing a double page illustration in the book, before the tale, presenting Hosea and Shanga facing each other. She questions children about these characters. Then she reads the first two pages of the story. Page 1 introduces Blodin and his apparent indestructibility and page 2 the villagers and their panic. It ends with their pleas to Shanga to surrender to Blodin and with his refusal: ‘I will stay. I have my weaving to do.’ Children study the picture to find out how Blodin can move. Then, accompanied by music create their own Blodin who moves according to their assumptions.

Children take on the role of the villagers and discuss Sanga’s refusal and decide to try and persuade him to change his mind. The children, in the role of the villagers, try to persuade teacher (in the role of Sanga) to surrender to Blodin and save his life (We want to ask you to change your mind and come with us, Shanga! Blodin will scorch you to ashes with his fire!). He continuously refuses, providing as a reason that he has to finish his carpet (I cannot come with you! I have to finish my carpet! My carpet is all my life!) Teacher asks the children to write a script of Shanga’s and villagers’ dialogue.

My aims for the particular drama unit were that the children should a. study the picture of Blodin in the book and think of how he might be moving and then, in their groups, choose movement and create their own Blodin through the use of sound, b. make hypotheses (in the role of the villagers) about Shanga’s weaving and his refusal to go with them and c. try
to persuade Sanga (teacher in-role) to save his life. My aims for the follow-up writing were that the children should write a script based upon the villagers’ dialogue with Shanga.

Selected examples of writing extracts

Villager 1: Shanga come with us! Don't stay here! (said with a firm tone) (hot-seating)
Shanga: (very seriously) NO, I won't leave my cave! (teacher in-role)

Villager 2: But Shanga…The monster is very dangerous. If he finds you he will turn you into ashes with the fires that come out of his nostrils! (storytelling)
Shanga: I don't care! I only care about finishing my carpet! (teacher in-role)

Villager 3: The carpet is more important than your life? (hot-seating)
Shanga: Villagers, I gave you my answer. I'm not coming with you! (teacher in-role)

Villager 4: If you die Sanga, what will happen to us? Who is going to give us advice on our problems? Who is going to cure our children and us when we are sick? (hot-seating)
Shanga: You can take care of yourselves. (teacher in-role)

[Eliz, G4]

Villager 1: Shanga you should come with us, otherwise the dragon will destroy you with his fires!!! (hot-seating)
Shanga: No, I can't, I have to weave my carpet. You go, I WILL STAY HERE! Maybe I can stop Blodin destroying us (teacher in-role). I am old but wise (storytelling).

Villager 3: But what sort of carpet is this? This carpet is something magical or?… (hot-seating)
Shanga: Yes, it is a magical carpet. This carpet is all my life! (teacher in-role)

[Bros, B3]

Villager 4: Shanga, come with us and when it gets dark hide behind a big stone and weave your carpet (hot-seating)
Shanga: I cannot hide because Blodin has big eyes (visual prompt) and might see me.

Villager 5: Shanga you cannot stay here, come with us! (hot-seating)
Shanga: No, I said I'm not coming with you until I finish my carpet (teacher in-role).

Villager 6: Shanga come with us and bring your book to make a drug for Blodin (hot-seating).
Shanga: We cannot make it sleep because it is a monster (teacher in-role).
Villager 7: Shanga, what will you do if the monster eats you?
Shanga: I don't care about my life (teacher in-role).
Villagers: Bye Shanga.
Shanga: Bye.

5.3.2 Drama contribution towards writing

Qualitative analysis of FGC’s writing indicates the contribution of drama elements towards writing. Children’s writing seems to reflect the imaginative experience and understanding they had in drama. In particular, analysis of writing indicates that the use of language and linguistic choices made by these children can be traced back to what they had orally, visually and kinesthetically represented in drama. Drama work seems to have provided children with substantial ideas and experiences so that they had something to write about. It seems that drama work and fiction enabled and empowered children to make the drama story ‘their own story’ and in their subsequent writing to write their own interpretation of the story or its issues. Storytelling as a frame strategy, class improvisation, the use of visual prompts and the strategies of hot-seating and teacher in-role contributed towards the above extracts of unassisted children’s writing.

The contribution of drama is evidenced at all the levels of writing, text, sentence and word in the children’s extracts presented above. A few illustrative examples are extracted and listed below for each level, with the writer’s pseudonym and lesson number in brackets.

5.3.2.1 Text Level

Drama provided children with a story to tell and a perspective and ‘voice’ within the story to help them in the way they told the story in their writing. As their extracts indicate, they told their story in a logical sequence with detail and conviction, by reflecting back on the storytelling and the plot of drama, the tableaus they created, the visual prompts and their in-role participation. All the details they included in their writing were verbally, visually or kinesthetically represented in the drama scheme that preceded writing.
Illustrative Examples

Giving specific and relevant details
We were happily playing many games like hide and seek, chasing, football and many others. (Chris, 1)

…me and my friends we were going into the giant’s garden playing happily several games. (Eliz, 1)

…when the giant came back he sent us away from his garden and put up a sign he wrote: ‘Children Keep Out! Trespassers will be prosecuted’ (Nik, 1)

One day we went to our school and we found the gate shut with a huge lock and a picture of our teacher saying: ‘WANTED’! (Ria, 2)
But the worst thing was when we found that piece of cloth with blood on it! (Ria, 2)

We were suspecting the Germans did it. We decided to take action. (Bros, 2)

Some of us were writing slogans on the walls such as: ‘FREEDOM OR DEATH’ and ‘GREECE WE LOVE YOU’. That night, some others broke the lock, got inside and put up another greek flag. (Bros, 2)

Then we were writting slogans on the walls, put another flag in its place and me and my friend Michael we were guards, watching if somebody comes but nobody came. (Rios, 2)

But Shanga….The monster is very dangerous. If he finds you he will turn you into ashes with the fires that come out of his nostrils! (Eliz, 3)

This carpet is all my life! (Bros, 3)

Shanga, come with us and when it gets dark hide behind a big stone and weave your carpet (Mirka, 3)

Expression of feelings
I want you to know that when you see him first time, you will be afraid very very much. (Eliz, 1)
I got so scared (Geos, 1)

We got surprised, scared and speechless. We did not know what to do! (Bros, 2)

It was scaring! All of us froze! We though that it could have been from our teacher’s shirt and we felt a knot in our heart (Ria, 2)

Shanga: No, I can’t, I have to weave my carpet. You go, I WILL STAY HERE! Maybe I can stop Blodin destroying us. I am old but wise. (Bros, 3)

Appropriate register & Sense of audience
Suddenly he came back from his journey and he told us: ‘go away from here, the garden is mine!’ (Geos, 1)
Be very careful now that you are moving next to the giant’s house. Don’t you ever go to play in his garden. Take care! (Chris, 1)

My dear grandchildren, one day I went to my school, I saw the gate shut… (Mirka, 2)

One day we went to school (storytelling) and what do you think we saw? (Bros, 2)

The carpet is more important than your life? (Eliz, 3)

Good organisation and style
Villager 1: Shanga come with us! Don’t stay here! (said with a firm tone)
Shanga: (very seriously) NO, I won’t leave my cave! (Eliz, 1)

Villager 4: Shanga, come with us and when it gets dark hide behind a big stone and weave your carpet.
Shanga: I cannot hide because Blodin has big eyes (visual prompt) and might see me. (Mirka, 3)

Villager 3: But what sort of carpet is this? This carpet is something magical or?
Shanga: Yes, it is a magical carpet. This carpet is all my life! (Bros, 3)
5.3.2.2 Sentence Level

At sentence level, the contribution of drama is reflected in the structure of the sentences used by the children. They use a rich structure and a variety of sentence types, simple and complex, short and long. They use mostly indirect speech but they also employ direct speech, especially to portray dialogues or where they choose to give extra emphasis and meaning to what they are trying to communicate.

Illustrative Examples

Sentences in direct speech for a more expressive rendition of meaning

*Do you think that with the presents you bring me I will let you play in my garden?* (Chris, 1)

…*go away from here, the garden is mine!* (Geos, 1)

*I know that you are hiding somewhere hereby and do not think that with your presents you will make me change my mind* (Eliz, 1)

*A child went and told him ‘would you like it if we were in your place and didn’t let you come to the garden?’* (Nik, 1)

*‘Who put up that photo?’ we all said with fear* (Rios, 2)

Using a variety of sentence types

*But when the giant returned, he sent us all away from his garden and did not let us play in it any more.* (Eliz, 1)

*Suddenly he came back from his journey and he told us: ‘go away from here, the garden is mine!’ and then we left the garden* (Geos, 1)

*After a few minutes we found the flagpole where our Greek flag was previously proudly waving, bare.* (Ria, 2)

*That night, some others broke the lock, got inside and put up another Greek flag.* (Bros, 2)
Alternating between long and short sentences

But when the giant returned, he sent us all away from his garden and did not let us play in it any more. This giant wants everything for himself. (Eliz, 1)

He was away for seven years. We were happily playing many games like hide and seek, chasing, football and many others (Chris, 1).

I was nine years old then. One day we went to school and what do you think we saw? (Bros, 2)

5.3.2.3 Word Level

At word level, drama seems to have helped enhance children’s writing with appropriate vocabulary and facilitated their choice of words. Children’s choice of vocabulary was appropriate and can be traced back to the use of ‘unique’ or special words often used within the drama context. Such words are underlined in the examples below.

Illustrative Examples

He [the Giant] is also very mean and, on top of that, he teases us too. You see? He is huge in size and it is the first time in my life that I got so scared (Geos, 1)

We were surprised! A child panicked. After a few minutes we found the flagpole where our Greek flag was previously proudly waving, bare… (Ria, 2)

We were also making protests and shouting slogans such as: Germans out of Athens!, 'Long live Greece!' (Rios, 2)

Villager 2: But Shanga…The monster is very dangerous. If he finds you he will turn you into ashes with the fires that come out of his nostrils! (Eliz, 3)

5.3.3 Relationships between drama, writing analysis and children’s views

Furthermore, an examination of the relationship between the findings of the preceding analysis and synthesis of drama and video data and the findings of interview set 3 was made.
Comparison of what children said in the interviews and the findings of the analysis of writing samples in relation to the contents of drama, indicates positive relationships between them. In particular, certain findings of the analysis of writing samples are acknowledged by the children themselves, when they were asked about their views on the contribution of drama towards their writing.

References made by children to ‘story’ are linked to the impact of storytelling strategy on writing. As the analysis shows children structured their writing by using ideas and language heard in the storytelling. In parallel, references made by children to ‘role’ are linked to the impact that drama improvisations and work in-role had on their writing in-role tasks and the ‘voice of the writer’. Children showed ability to identify with the characters in drama and then to write from their own perspective. Moreover, references made by children to ‘visual images’ are linked to the impact that ‘tableaus’ and ‘mime’ and visual representations (while working in-role) had on their writing. In addition, children’s ‘collective ownership’ in the drama process is also reflected in the analysis of the contents of drama and writing. Their writing was based on the participants’ voices and the language created by children and teacher while working together in-role.

5.4 CHILDREN’S PORTRAITS

In this section, my aim is to illustrate more my findings by presenting three of the FGC’s portraits. The purpose of these portraits is to demonstrate the nature of the impact that the integration of drama had on individual children’s writing development. I chose to present the portraits of Eliz, Chris and Nik. The selection of these particular children’s portraits was based on the criterion that these children showed different profiles in the research context and resulting data.

In what follows, I discuss each child’s portrait in relation to the main constructs under investigation that are: (a) attitudes and views towards writing, (b) participation in drama and engagement in writing and (c) quality of writing.
5.4.1 Eliz’s Portrait

I noticed Eliz from the start of the academic year. She attracted my attention both with her enthusiasm and willingness about undertaking any writing task I was asking for and also with her writing outcomes. Eliz was rated as an experienced writer (G4) according to the assessment and classification of all children’s writing before the introduction of drama (described in Section 3.5.5).

Before the beginning of the project I wrote about Eliz in my researcher’s log:

She is an enthusiastic and self-motivated writer who can write at length and seems to perceive writing as a way to communicate her own ideas with an audience. She enjoys writing at school, she looks confident and she relies both on teacher and herself. In her writing she is drawing on her experience of reading. She can write simple narrative without my support but she needs support with the paragraphing and the structuring of more complex narrative and non-narrative forms. She concentrates during writing and she writes consistently well and imaginatively. She is developing a personal style in her writing.

5.4.1.1 Eliz’s attitudes and views of writing

Eliz had a positive attitude towards writing throughout the year. Her responses in the first questionnaire and interview together with my observational data and log book notes before the integration of drama indicate that she had an overall positive attitude and held positive views about writing at the beginning of the project. Furthermore, as indicated by the same data sets at the end of the project, she became even more positive towards writing after the integration of drama. I discuss below the changes in her attitude and views of writing that seem to be related to the integration of drama in the teaching of writing.

In both interview sets Eliz said that she liked writing very much, both at school and at home. In her first interview (before drama), she said that she preferred writing at home because at school she felt constrained by the available time. She expressed her preference about writing at home and her concern about writing at school by saying: ‘I like more to write at home because I have as much time as I need, I’m not in a rush and I can write a lot. At school I feel a bit anxious that I will not make it in time’. However, in her second interview (after drama) she was more positive about writing at school. This time,
without expressing any concern or a negative feeling about writing, she said that she preferred writing at school and she justified her change in mind by saying: 'I prefer to write at school because we do drama and we have more ideas to write about afterwards'. Observational data reconfirms the positive change in Eliz’s attitude by indicating that she became even more enthusiastic and willing to undertake writing alongside or after drama.

In both interview sets, Eliz said that she undertook writing at home apart from homework. Before the integration of drama her self-initiated writing concerned summaries of stories she was reading and events from stories that she liked. When further asked if she wrote any story on her own the answer was negative. However, after the integration of drama her self-initiated repertoire changed. She said that she was writing her own stories with heroes from the drama stories we worked with at school. It is also worth noting that one day, during the integration of drama, she came to me enthusiastically and said: ‘Ms Christiana, I’ve just finished at home my first story! It is about Tom Thumb’s adventure with some kind of little creatures. Now, I’m thinking of writing another one with the Selfish Giant in the planet XF’. Eliz’s responses are indicative of the positive impact of drama on her motivation for writing and in particular her self-initiated writing and repertoire. Observational data also confirms that Eliz became more independent and motivated during writing after the integration of drama.

Another two changes in her responses in the two interviews that are also indicative of the impact of drama concern her perceptions about good writers and improvement in writing. Whereas in her first interview she considered as good writers the ones who wrote neatly and lengthy and had good feedback from the teacher, in her second interview, alongside teacher’s feedback, she also referred to the contribution that good writers had in the context of drama: ‘Good writers are the ones who participate and say their ideas when we do drama’. In parallel, whereas in her first interview she said that she could become a better writer if she watched carefully what the teacher was saying and writing, after the integration of drama she added that she could become better if she was more careful in drama and listened to the ideas of other children.

In addition, while in both interview sets Eliz said that she felt happy reading out her writing to the rest of the class, in her second interview she stressed that she was proud and looking forward to reading her writing to her classmates and getting their comments.
5.4.1.2 Eliz’s participation in drama and her engagement in writing

Video data and analysis indicate that Eliz was actively participating in drama lessons and observational data indicates that Eliz was very engaged during her writing following drama. As both data sets suggest, Eliz’s participation in drama was positively reflected in her engagement in writing.

More specifically, video analysis indicates that Eliz was willing to sustain great concentration in the drama work and commitment to the imaginative context. Her body posture and general body language, when closely observed in videos, indicate that she was not distracted easily and she was very concentrated during the storytelling and other drama activities both when acting or while watching other pupils act.

Eliz made a significant contribution in her group’s work. She was willing to collaborate and share her ideas and she was often leading the group and assigning roles to the other members. She was always showing great enthusiasm for drama sessions by voluntarily taking on any single role needed either individually or in groups.

Eliz was confidently and effectively copying or improvising on drama language that had either been used by the teacher in-role or had been heard in the storytelling and she was willing to perform and share her ideas in front of the class. While being in-role, she looked to be able to successfully sustain the role of the character and identify with that role for long periods of time.

According to observational data, Eliz’s engagement in writing seemed to be positively related to her participation in drama. Eliz looked to be moving eagerly from drama to writing and started thinking about the task as soon as the teacher explained what they had to write about. During her writing engagement, Eliz, appeared to be concentrated and very committed to her writing. She seemed to be thinking well in advance before beginning writing and she was writing very carefully and neatly. She was not distracted easily and she was pausing only to listen to the teacher’s guidelines or to revise what she wrote. Eliz also appeared to write her ideas confidently and fluently. She was writing independently, although she wanted sometimes to have teacher’s confirmation that she was doing well or to check her spelling. She was writing and revising at the same time, pausing and reading every sentence that she wrote. She appeared a bit unnerved with the ‘5-minute’ reminder,
pausing at first and then rushing to finish. She was revising her writing at the end without needing any reminders and she was taking advantage of all the allocated time for writing, without asking for extension. After the integration of drama Eliz wrote longer pieces of writing than before.

5.4.1.3 Eliz’s writing

Eliz was consistently writing better than the rest of the class both before and after drama integration. The findings of quantitative analysis of individual writing samples (see section 4.6.3) show that Eliz’s overall writing improvement during the period of drama was only 9.88%. However, this small improvement can be justified given that Eliz had the greatest overall scores between all the FGC in all sample assessments. In parallel, on-going qualitative analysis of Eliz’ writing after each drama lesson, indicated that her participation in drama contributed significantly towards the quality and quantity of her writing, especially in in-role tasks. Drama work seemed to have provided Eliz’s writing with imagination, structure, contents and style.

In particular, the qualitative analysis of Eliz’s writing extracts pertaining to the first drama lesson (Selfish Giant, section 5.3.1.1) and the third (Blodin the Beast, 5.3.1.3), provided evidence of the positive contribution of her drama experience towards her writing. In both extracts, Eliz used substantial ideas, relevant details and vocabulary that was used in drama.

In her writing after the lesson of the Selfish Giant (see Appendix 17), Eliz, identified herself with her in-role character in drama (a child in the Giant’s garden) and wrote her letter from this perspective, in a logical sequence, showing good sense of audience (i.e. You know my friend, because I heard you are moving in nearby, I’m writing to you this letter to warn you about something serious.), being very convincing to the letter’s receiver. All the ideas and details she included in her letter, including the Giant’s length of absence (He was staying away at a friend’s for seven years, the kind of games they used to play while he was away (...me and my friends we were going into the giant’s garden playing happily several games.), Giant’s return and his refusal to let them play in his garden (But when the giant returned, he sent us all away from his garden and did not let us play in it any more. ) and feelings created while working in-role (...me and my friends we were going into the giant’s garden playing happily several games.) were verbally, visually or kinesthetically represented in the drama scheme. Moreover, she used direct speech to emphasise
meaning regarding the Giant's bad manners and behaviour (I know that you are hiding somewhere hereby and do not think that with your presents you will make me change my mind). In addition the words selfish, bad-mannered, away, sign were often used within the drama.

In the third drama lesson (Blodin the Beast) the dialogue between teacher in the role of Shanga and children in the role of the villagers, seemed to have fed Eliz’s writing with structure, ideas and the right register. Her script (Appendix 17) seemed to reflect her understanding of the drama issues. Eliz, selectively presented ideas and details in the dialogue to illustrate the arguments of both sides, even though in drama she only had the villager's perspective. Like in the drama, in the dialogue in her script, Eliz expressed quite well the mood and arguments of both sides. Shanga’s refusal to leave his cave, (NO, I won’t leave my cave! I only care about finishing my carpet!) and the villagers’ insistence to convince Shanga to leave his cave and save himself from Blodin (Shanga come with us! Don’t stay here! The monster is very dangerous. If he finds you he will turn you into ashes with the fires that come out of his nostrils! The carpet is more important than your life?) In addition, her choice of vocabulary was appropriate and is traced back to drama. The words ‘ashes’, ‘carpet’, ‘life’ and the phrases ‘scorch to ashes’, ‘magic spells’, finish my carpet’, ‘stay here’ were often used within the drama.

Moreover, the findings of the analysis of interview set 3, indicate that Eliz acknowledged and appreciated the fact that drama work contributed towards her writing. In particular, she said that work in-role and ideas discussed and presented in drama by all the children were providing her writing with more and better ideas. Indicatively, when asked about what she prefers (discussion or drama) before writing she said: ‘I like drama more because we take roles in the story and we all say our ideas and then we have more and better ideas to write. I think drama gives me more ideas’.

Eliz’s profile before and after drama, seems to indicate that overall drama had a positive contribution towards her writing development. Before the project, she was an experienced writer who held positive attitude and views towards writing and was highly engaged when writing. At the end of the project, she became even more experienced (according to the characteristics of CLPE Scale 2, 1997), held a more positive attitude and was even more engaged in writing. An overall and final comment about Eliz is that although she was the sort of child who would have improved with or without drama, her experience with drama seemed to have provided an extra dimension to her writing development motivating her further and stimulating her imaginative engagement with writing.
5.4.2 Chris’s Portrait

Chris was rated as a moderately experienced writer (G3) according to the assessment and classification of all children’s writing before the introduction of drama. Before the beginning of the project I wrote about Chris in my researcher’s log:

Chris is not a very enthusiastic writer. However, she undertakes writing willingly with no complaints. Most of the time, she looks to be concentrated during writing but she rushes to finish. She writes consistently quite well. In her writing she is drawing on her experience of reading and overall there are signs of a potentially good writer. She can write simple narrative without my support and she needs support with the paragraphing and the structuring of more complex narrative and non-narrative forms. However, most of the times she writes relatively short pieces shorter than a page long; she relies mostly on teacher’s ideas and does not expand or elaborate on her ideas. I have the impression that her writing is quite ‘dry’, lacking imagination, personal voice and feelings.

5.4.2.1 Chris’s attitudes and views of writing

Chris’s responses in the first questionnaire and interview together with my observational data and log book notes indicate that overall she had a fairly positive attitude and held fairly positive views about writing at the beginning of the project. As indicated by the same data sets she became even more positive towards writing after the integration of drama. I discuss below the changes in her attitude and views of writing that seem to be related to the integration of drama in the teaching of writing.

In her first interview set Chris said that she liked writing at school when the class was silent and when they were doing writing activities after reading a text in the Greek language lesson. She also said that she did not undertake any writing at home apart from homework because of the noise her younger brothers make. However, after drama integration she said that she preferred writing after drama sessions and she justified her response by adding: ‘because we all get ideas from drama’. She also appeared to be more positive about writing at home saying that she sometimes kept a diary.

In parallel, before the integration of drama, Chris said that she liked writing at school only about her family. In particular she said: ‘I like writing only about my family, what we do,
what we like. I do not like the other themes you ask us to write in our ‘Think and Write’ notebook. They are good but I don’t like them.’ However, after the integration of drama, she changed her mind about her writing preferences. She said that she liked writing what I was asking them to write during or after drama and in particular she preferred letters, in-role and dialogues with drama heroes. This change in her responses indicates the impact that the integration of drama may have had on her attitude towards writing.

Moreover, whereas before the integration of drama Chris said that she considered books and teacher’s notes on the board as helpful resources for ideas in writing, afterwards she considered drama as a resource for ideas. She said: ‘The roles we take in drama and the dialogues we do with our groups help me’.

Another change in her responses between the two sets that is also indicative of the impact of drama concerns her perception about improvement in writing. Whereas in her first interview she said that: ‘I will become better if I read books and write without noise around’, after the integration of drama she said: ‘I can become a better writer if I am more careful in drama and have more ideas to write’.

5.4.2.2 Chris’s participation in drama and her engagement in writing

Video data analysis indicates that although Chris was most of the time attentive to drama activities she was not very actively participating in them. In parallel, observational data after the integration of drama indicates that Chris progressively became more engaged in her writing especially after Easter.

Observations on Chris in drama videos indicate that in the first three months of the project she was not having a very active participation. Although not distracted easily and being very concentrated (especially during storytelling), she was observed not to take seriously her role and her peers’ involvement in the imaginative context of drama laughing in some cases and not being very willing to participate. Moreover, she was not willing or confident to perform in-role individually but only with her group and her contribution of ideas and actions both in the whole class work and in her group work was limited.

However, as time went by Chris’ participation in drama became more active. Drama videos indicate that she became more committed to the drama work and her in-role involvement.
She also appeared to be more physically and verbally engaged in the process. She was showing more enthusiasm and willingness to participate in drama, to share her ideas within her group and in front of the class. In particular, after the Easter holiday, she appeared to be more confidently engaged in drama using body language to express her feelings created in-role and complement her verbal language. While being in-role, she looked to be able to sustain the role of the character and identify with him/her for longer periods of time than before.

According to observational data, improvements in Chris’s participation in drama seemed to be positively related to improvements in her engagement in writing. Throughout the project, Chris looked to be moving eagerly from drama to writing and start thinking about the task as soon as the teacher explained what they had to write about. She appeared to be concentrated and not distracted easily. She also wrote her ideas independently, confidently and fairly fluently. During the first two months of the project, she was observed to be in a rush and not spending enough time to think over her ideas before writing them. She was finishing earlier than the allocated time and she needed reminders to review her writing at the end. However, in the rest of the project she was observed to be more personally engaged and committed to her writing. She was spending more time to think before writing, by pausing for a while before beginning a new sentence or paragraph and she was elaborating more on her ideas. She was also revising her writing at the end without needing any reminders. Even if she had finished writing she was taking advantage of all the allocated time for reviewing and revising, making changes in relation to punctuation and spelling and some changes in relation to the meaning of writing. Especially in the last three months of the project, she wrote her lengthier pieces of writing.

5.4.2.3 Chris’s writing

Before the integration of drama, Chris was consistently writing well but she was not elaborating on her ideas and her ‘voice’ was missing from her writing. However, the findings of quantitative analysis of her writing samples (see section 4.6.3) reveal that Chris’s writing showed improvement throughout the year (except for a little pause in April). In parallel, on-going qualitative analysis of Chris’s writing after each drama lesson, indicated that progressively she was taking more out of her participation in drama and that drama contributed significantly towards the quality and quantity of her writing. Drama work
seemed to have benefited Chris’s writing, by providing it with ‘voice’, imagination and content.

In particular, the qualitative analysis of Chris’s writing extracts pertaining to the second drama lesson (*Children in Resistance*, section 5.3.1.2) and the third (*Blodin the Beast*, section 5.3.1.3) provided good evidence of the positive contribution of her drama experience towards her writing. In both extracts, Chris relied on her experience and in-role involvement in drama and took advantage of substantial ideas, relevant details and vocabulary used in drama.

In her writing after the lesson of *Children in Resistance* (see Appendix 17), Chris, identified herself with her in-role character in drama (a child in resistance) and narrated the story from this perspective reflecting on her own and collective experience in drama (i.e. *One day, when I was a child in 1941, we went to our school and we found the gate locked.*).

Although, she did not write at length and in much detail she expressed fluently and with clarity her ideas drawing substantive ideas from storytelling and the improvisations in groups. She structured her writing in a logical sequence, beginning with the first sign of the drama issue (*we found the gate locked*) highlighting then the extension of the problem (*We found a cloth with blood on it, our teacher’s photo marked ‘WANTED’ and the Greek flag was missing from its flagpole*) and finally describing the actions that were physically, verbally and visually represented by children in drama as ways to deal with the problem (i.e. *We spitted in groups and that night we wrote slogans on the walls and we put a new flag back to its place.*).

At the same time, she embellished her writing and made it more authentic by adding the feelings that were represented visually in the drama freeze frames (*We got surprised! & We got very scared.*) and the actual slogans that she with her group called out in-role (*‘GERMANS OUT OF ATHENS!’*).

The use of short and long sentences built up some suspense in her writing and engaged the reader, demonstrating Chris’s good sense of the audience (*We broke the gate. We got inside. We found a cloth with blood on it, our teacher’s photo marked ‘WANTED’ and the Greek flag was missing from its flagpole. We got very scared.*)
The contribution of drama towards her writing is also shown in the specific vocabulary that she appropriately used to structure her writing. Words and phrases such as *gate locked*, *WANTED*, *missing Greek flag*, *protest*, *slogans* and *freedom* can be traced back to drama.

In parallel, in the third drama lesson (*Blodin the Beast*) the dialogue (see Appendix 17) between teacher in the role of Shanga and children in the role of the villagers, seemed to have fed Chris’s writing with appropriate style and structure, ideas and the right register.

Her script (Appendix 17) seemed to reflect her understanding of the story and drama issues. Chris based her dialogue in her script on the arguments of the two main parties represented in drama: Villagers’s argument about Shanga’s life (*If you stay here Blodin will scorch you with his fires!* and Shanga’s argument about the importance of finishing his carpet (*I have to finish my carpet, It is a carpet that I have to weave myself, something will happen when I finish it.*). Chris also selectively presented certain ideas and details in the dialogue to illustrate the arguments of both sides:

*Villager 5:* *Come with us and you can weave your carpet there.*
*Shanga:* *There? I wont be able to do it because we’ll be Blodin’s slaves.*
*Villager 6:* *At night you can come to your cave and weave your carpet.*
*Shanga:* *But Blodin will find out that I came over and will scorch me with his fires.*

In addition her choice of vocabulary is appropriate and is traced back to drama. The words *decision, carpet, slaves, magical, and the phrases scorch to ashes, weave myself and finish my carpet* were often used in the drama session.

Moreover, the findings of the analysis of interview set 3, indicate that Chris acknowledged and appreciated that drama work contributed towards her writing of the particular script between Shanga and villagers. In particular, she said that what ‘they (the children) did’ in drama helped her to write and when she was asked in which way what ‘they did’ helped her she said: ‘It helped me to have more ideas (the dialogue that we did in drama), when you had the role of Sanga and we had the role of the villagers’. She also mentioned that she preferred working with drama and she appreciated that drama story and work in-role were giving her ideas for their writing. She said: ‘I prefer drama than discussion, because we do drama and you tell us the story and we take roles and these help me to have more ideas when I write’.
Chris’s profile before and after drama, seems to indicate that overall drama had a positive contribution towards her writing development. Before the project, she was a moderately experienced writer who held positive attitude and views towards writing and was fairly engaged when writing. At the end of the project, she became rather an experienced writer (according to the characteristics of CLPE Scale 2, 1997), held a more positive attitude and was more actively engaged in writing. Most importantly, Chris’s participation and experience in drama provided her with confidence and an extra interest in writing which was no more viewed by her as a school job that she had to undertake but as a medium of personal expression.

5.4.3 Nik’s Portrait

Nik was rated as an inexperienced writer (B1) according to the assessment and classification of all children’s writing before the introduction of drama. Before the beginning of the project I wrote about Nik in my researcher’s log:

Nik is of Greek-Russian origin. Greek language is his second language. He mostly speaks Russian at home. He is quite a confident speaker but he faces difficulties in comprehension and writing. Nik undertakes writing with no complaints but he looks to be struggling and hesitant when he writes. Most of the times he cannot write independently and he needs a great deal of help with developing his own texts which are often brief, short or about half a page long at best. His writing is mostly close to the speech patterns, he writes long sentences and he seldom uses punctuation to mark meaning. He makes a lot of spelling mistakes and he looks to rely mainly on phonetic spelling strategies and memorized words.

5.4.3.1 Nik’s attitudes and views of writing

Nik’s responses in the questionnaire, his first interview, observational data and my own notes in the researcher’s log indicate that he had a rather negative overall attitude and held fairly limited views about writing at the beginning of the project. However, as indicated by the same data sets at the end of the project, he became fairly positive towards writing. I discuss below the changes in his attitude and views of writing.
In his first interview set, Nik, appeared to be less positive about writing at school and more positive about writing at home. He said that he sometimes liked writing at school and he explained that: ‘I like writing at school when I am in the mood, sometimes’, whilst he said that he preferred writing at home in his spare time. However, when he was asked if he wrote anything at home apart from homework, he answered negatively. In contrast to interview 1, in his second interview, he appeared to be more positive about writing both at school and at home. This time he said that he sometimes liked writing at school and he sometimes liked writing at home. He also said that he preferred writing at school after work in drama and that, at home, apart from homework, he liked writing about what he was doing the weekends and ‘stories like the ones we do in drama’ when he was alone. He further said: ‘I sometimes go back home, I tell my brother what we did in drama and then I write a little bit of the story we did in drama.’

Before the integration of drama, Nik appeared to have negative feelings about writing. When asked about his feelings before a writing task he said: ‘I feel unnerved because I might not write enough and not finish on time’. His response suggests that he was concerned about the length of his writing and its completion on time. Furthermore, when asked if he liked reading out his writing to the class he said: ‘sometimes I like sharing my writing, sometimes I don’t’. In contrast, at the end of the project, he became more confident about himself. His responses to the same questions were: ‘I feel good when you ask us to write something, because I will get better every time and I will learn new words’ and ‘I feel good because I think the others like what I write’. These responses indicate the development of a positive stance and attitude towards writing after the introduction of drama.

Moreover, whereas before the integration of drama, Nik appeared to rely for his writing both on himself (‘I found ideas in my mind’) and teacher’s help (‘what you write on the board helps me’), afterwards he considered drama as a helpful resource for ideas. He said: ‘What we say and do in drama helps me’.

5.4.3.2 Nik’s participation in drama & engagement in writing

Video data analysis indicates that whereas Nik was not actively participating in drama in the first three months of the project, for the rest three months he appeared to become more actively engaged. In parallel, observational data after the integration of drama
indicates that Nik progressively became more engaged in his writing especially after Easter. This progress in his engagement was reflected positively in his writing.

More specifically, video analysis indicates that Nik, in the first three months was not willing to sustain concentration in the drama work and commitment to the drama conventions. He was easily distracted. He appeared to be absentminded, especially during storytelling and whole class work. Video data also indicated that Nik was not actively engaged during group work and he had limited contribution to his group’s common tasks. His participation was limited to listening to others’ ideas and deciding his in-role involvement, very often with the help of more active members of his group. He was not showing to be enthusiastic and willing to participate. He was rather hesitant and very uptight. He was not willing to perform in-role individually but only with his group, whilst his contribution of ideas and actions in the context of drama was limited. Nik was not being confidently engaged in drama and he showed little ability to sustain the role of the character and identify with him/her for long periods of time. While being in-role, he was not at ease and he had difficulty in identifying himself with the character.

However, gradually, in the last three months of the project, Nik appeared to concentrate more and not be distracted easily during storytelling and whole class work. He also seemed to take more seriously drama conventions and his in-role involvement. In parallel, Nik appeared to be more physically and verbally engaged in the process and he showed increased willingness to participate in drama. He also appeared to be more confidently engaged in drama using body language to express his feelings created in-role and complement his verbal language. In addition, he showed increased ability to sustain the role of the character and more readiness to identify with the character using movement and speech.

As far as his engagement in writing is concerned, Nik did not look to be moving very eagerly from drama to writing. In the first two months, he looked to be reluctant, he was staring at the tasks for a while and he needed teacher’s prompts and encouragement to have a go. During writing, although he seemed very concentrated and involved in the task, he was distracted very easily and pausing many times. Although he needed teacher’s help during writing, he was hesitant to ask for it. Sometimes he did not understand the writing task but he did not ask for my help. Nik was not confidently engaged in writing. He looked to be uptight and he was writing his ideas very slowly and with uncertainty, whispering at times what he was trying to write. At the beginning of his writing, in the first couple of
paragraphs he was writing his ideas quite fluently but without using punctuation consistently. Afterwards, he appeared to be writing with a slower pace and less fluently. He was rushing to finish at the end and he needed reminders for reviewing his work. Sometimes he needed some extra time to finish his writing. When he was reviewing his work he mostly added some full stops.

However, Nik progressively became more engaged during writing, his concentration improved and he could stay on the tasks for longer periods of time without pausing. He also looked to be less stressed and confused and a little more confident. This looked to be a result of the improvement in his understanding of the tasks and his familiarity with writing in-role.

5.4.3.3 Nik’s writing

Nik’s writing before the integration of drama was very often meaningless and mostly close to the speech characteristics. Most of the times it was incomplete with no punctuation in it at all. It was revealing Nik’s lack of writing experience and understanding of the tasks which were related to the fact that he had Greek only as a second language.

However, during the integration of drama, Nik’s quality of writing surprisingly improved. The findings of quantitative analysis of individual writing samples (see section 4.6.3) show that Nik’s overall writing improvement during the period of drama was the second highest among the FGC. In parallel, on-going qualitative analysis of Nik’s writing after each drama lesson, indicated the contribution of drama towards his writing, even though rather limited at the beginning of the project. Drama work seemed to have provided Nik’s writing with meaning, structure and ideas.

In particular, the qualitative analysis of Nik’s writing extracts pertaining to the first drama lesson (Selfish Giant) and the second (Children in Resistance) provided evidence of the positive contribution of his drama experience towards his writing. In both extracts, written at the end of January and the end of March, Nik used substantial ideas, relevant details and vocabulary that was used in drama.

In his letter (Appendix 17) after the drama lesson of Selfish Giant, Nik, whilst in the first two paragraphs successfully identified himself with his in-role character in drama, in the
last two paragraphs he shifted to third person writing, demonstrating his difficulty in sustaining writing in-role throughout his writing. However, he wrote his ideas in a logical sequence drawing on his experience in drama.

All the ideas and details he included in his letter, including the Giant’s length of absence (*He was abroad for 7 years.*), the kind of games they used to play while he was away (*We were playing hide and seek, tennis, volley, basketball and football.*), the Giant’s return and his refusal to let them play in his garden and accept their presents (*when the giant came back he sent us away from his garden & the children put in a sack some stuff and gave them to the giant and the giant saw them and didn’t take a thing*) were verbally, visually or kinesthetically represented in the drama scheme. Moreover, to emphasise meaning regarding the Giant’s bad manners and behaviour he used direct speech using questions that the Giant was asked by the children while being hot-seated, (*would you like it if we were in your place and didn’t let you come to the garden? No, he said.*). In addition the words *mean, abroad, sign* were often used within the drama.

In his writing after the lesson of *Children in Resistance* (see Appendix 17), Nik, sustained writing in-role throughout his writing. He identified himself with his in-role character in drama (a child in resistance) and narrated the story from this perspective reflecting on his own and collective experience in drama (i.e. *One day, I went to my school. I saw the gate locked. Then we broke it.*).

Nik’s writing is short in length, but it reflects Nik’s fairly good understanding of the drama issues. He drew mostly ideas from storytelling to structure his writing and set the scene of the story. In a logical sequence, he described coherently the drama issues beginning with the first sign of the drama issue (*I saw the gate locked.*) highlighting then the extension of the problem (*We saw a cloth with blood on it. We did not find the Greek flag on its flagpole.*) and finally describing the actions taken that were physically, verbally and visually represented by children in drama as ways to deal with the problem (*We wrote slogans on the wall, we did a protest calling out slogans*).

The contribution of drama towards his writing is also shown through the specific vocabulary that he appropriately used to structure his writing. Words and phrases such as *gate locked, WANTED, flagpole, calling out protest, slogans* were traced back to drama.
Moreover, the findings of the analysis of interview set 3, indicated that Nik appreciated that group work, work in-role and dialogue between teacher in-role and the class contributed towards his writing. He said: ‘The questions that we wrote first with my group and then practiced taking the roles of reporters and Hosea and other children’s ideas helped me’.

Nik’s profile before and after drama, seems to indicate that overall drama contributed positively towards his writing development. Before the project, he was an inexperienced writer who had rather negative attitude and views towards writing not getting actively engaged in tasks. At the end of the project, he had a slightly more positive attitude towards writing, his engagement improved gradually but noticeably as did his writing quality. His experience with drama seems to have provided this writer with a better understanding of the tasks and with confidence to complete short but meaningful pieces of writing.

5.4.4 Summary of portraits

In this section, I have presented three of the FGC’s portraits. These portraits illustrate my findings by providing a closer view of how three different children responded differently to the integration of drama. Taking the three portraits together it seems that the integration of drama had an overall positive contribution towards these children’s attitudes, engagement and writing. However, this contribution varies between individual children depending on the starting point of each of the three children.

5.5 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

In this chapter, my aim was to synthesise a wider range of findings by investigating relationships between findings from all sources. In the first section, I examined relationships and compared findings of two pairs of similar data sets: questionnaires with interviews and drama videos with observations. In the second section, I investigated and synthesised relationships between the content of drama sessions, the content of writing samples and children’s own views on the contribution of drama to their writing. At the end of the chapter, I presented the portraits of three of the focal children showing the variations of their writing profiles over the duration of the project and drama integration.
In the next chapter I discuss all research findings and their theoretical and educational implications.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This study sought to investigate ‘what is happening when drama is integrated in a writing class’. This was the main research question and the aim of this thesis. In this chapter my aim is to provide an interpretation of the research process and discuss the possible theoretical and educational implications. To shed light on the main research question, I first revisit the sub-research questions and locate the corresponding findings pertaining to each of them within the existing literature. I then, integrate the findings by identifying their common thread that may explain what happened in the project. Subsequently, I consider the present study’s contribution to theory. Then, I revisit the study’s conceptual framework and revise it in the light of my new understanding of the relationship between drama and writing. Finally, I discuss possible educational implications of this study.

6.2 REVISITING THE SUB-RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this section, I revisit the study’s sub-research questions and illuminate them with findings provided by different data sets pertaining to each question. In parallel, I locate and relate their findings within existing literature in the field of drama and writing.

The sub-research questions were set out in section 2.9 and here they are brought together again to help us consider the findings of the study. As a reminder, the sub-research questions to the main research question were as follows:

1. Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?
2. How does children’s participation in drama lessons demonstrate itself in their engagement in the writing process?
3. What is the contribution of drama towards children’s writing?
6.2.1 Changes in children's attitudes and views towards writing following drama

Examination of existing literature in the particular field of inquiry (drama and writing) shows that there is a scarcity of research projects that investigated the impact of educational drama on primary school children's attitudes towards writing. Therefore, one of the aims of this study was to investigate children's attitudes following drama in more depth and detail. In parallel, the study aimed to add to the existing research by also investigating whether children’s views towards writing showed any changes following drama.

According to the literature, in past research, changes in children’s attitudes were investigated only through questionnaires (Neelands et al., 1993; Beame, Grainger & Wolstencroft, 2004). In this study however, questionnaires, interviews and observations were employed. Following the aims of the study, whole class attitudes and views of writing were investigated using data obtained through questionnaires at the beginning and at the end of the project (sets 1 and 2). Additionally, adhering to the principles of case study research, interviews were also used to investigate children’s attitudes and views before and after the introduction of drama (sets 1 and 2), concentrating on a focus group of children (FGC) that was considered to have writing experience that was representative of the whole class. The data of both methods (questionnaires and interviews) were first analysed deductively and then further investigated through inductive analysis of children’s references to drama in interview data set 2.

Questionnaire and interview findings indicate positive changes in children’s attitudes and views of writing following the introduction of drama. According to the questionnaire and interview findings, children’s attitude was improved in terms of their disposition towards writing, confidence in writing, views of difficulties and preferences. In addition, findings indicated changes in children’s strategies, initiative and repertoire.

In parallel, observational data enriched the findings of questionnaire and interviews by providing additional evidence on FGC’s attitudes towards writing. Analysis of observations indicates overall positive gains in children’s motivation, independence and confidence during their writing engagement following their participation in drama. In particular, children appeared to become gradually more willing and enthusiastic about undertaking writing, working independently without teacher’s support and taking more risks in relation to the
contents of writing; also, spending more time to review their work and using most of the time allocated for writing.

In particular, changes related to the introduction of drama concerned:

a. improvement in children’s attitude towards writing at school
b. improvement in children’s views towards writing

**Attitudes towards writing at school**

Findings indicate that in both questionnaires and interviews, children became more positively disposed towards undertaking writing at school. In particular, the interview findings reveal that the improvement in pupils’ disposition towards writing at school is very likely related to drama. In their interviews after the integration of drama, all the FGC were positive towards writing at school and in contrast to interview responses before drama, they said that they liked writing more at school than at home because at school they worked with drama and they preferred to write as part of their drama work. This finding also suggests that the integration of drama encouraged and motivated the children more to do writing at school than any other instructional method used before or alongside drama. This positive change in children’s attitude is supported by the literature (see section 2.6.4.2) that argues about the playful nature and motivating force of drama as pedagogy (Baldwin & Fleming, 2003, p.22). It is also in agreement and reinforces the findings of existing research. Beame et al., (2004), in their project observed that children’s attitudes and motivation in writing improved following the introduction of drama and other visual approaches. In the same line, Neelands et al. (1993) also found that student attitudes toward writing improved when drama was used and they concluded that when ‘writing is embedded in a context that has personal significance for the writer, the motivation for writing changes drastically’ (p. 10). However, in these research projects, students’ attitudes toward writing, were only investigated by administering questionnaires (Neelands et al., 1993; Beame et al., 2004). No other method was used for providing additional evidence to reinforce the argument regarding the shift in student’s attitudes. In contrast, in the present study evidence that justified this positive change was obtained by questionnaires, children’s interview free responses as well as through observation.

Overall findings pertaining to children’s attitudes also indicate positive changes in their confidence in writing. In both sets, children appeared to be more willing and confident in undertaking and sharing their writing with the rest of the class. In particular, in their
interview responses, when they were asked about their feelings when the teacher announces a writing task, they all expressed positive feelings whilst before drama some children appeared to have negative feelings and concerns about not finishing on time. Moreover, after drama children expressed their feelings using more positive adjectives or wording than before. They also appeared to be more positive and willing to share their writing, even the children that previously appeared to be negative. Some children also appeared to look forward to their peers’ feedback. This finding indicates that children, after drama became more confident in communicating their writing with an audience. These positive changes can be reasonably linked to the integration of drama. During drama children were used to present and share their group work in the class which was their audience. Afterwards, in writing, which was a follow-up of their drama work, they became more confident in sharing and communicating their writing work with the same audience and receiving their comments. These findings are in agreement with existing literature. In their project, Bearne et al. (2004) also noted positive changes in children’s self-esteem as writers. Moreover, positive change in children’s confidence in sharing their writing, adds to the existing literature pertaining to the impact of drama on children’s attitudes. It indicates that drama, as a way of working, may encourage children to become more confident in communicating their ideas with an audience both in the context of drama and the context of writing.

Change in children’s preferences in writing is another finding that seems to be positively related to the introduction of drama. Findings indicate that after the integration of drama children’s writing preferences were expanded and were positively related to the writing types that children were asked to undertake in the context of drama. Interview data showed that children’s writing preferences at school became more specific after the integration of drama. There was a general shift from more general types of writing like ‘writing stories’ and ‘personal writing’ to more specific types of writing. In particular, most of the children said that they liked all the writing tasks set by the teacher but expressed their preferences for particular types of writing such as letters, poems and interviews with drama heroes that they undertook during and after their participation in drama. This finding can be justified on the basis that children’s writing after drama derived from an imaginative context in which children had first hand experience. They were being involved both cognitively and physically and thus their follow-up writing had a communicative purpose derived from their own personal experience. Interestingly, most of the children indicated that they liked writing in-role, whilst only a few responded in favour of writing in-role before drama integration. Their feeling was that their participation in drama inspired and facilitated
their subsequent writing-in-role tasks. This finding reinforces existing literature that argues about the positive relationship between drama and writing in-role. Barrs and Cork (2001) propose that writing in role is accessible to children because it is close to speech, but it may also be accessible because of its immediate relevance to the imagined context. In their report of the ‘Reader in the Writer’ project, they (ibid.) concluded that writing in role seemed to be ‘a real aid’ to children’s progress and development as writers.

Interview findings also support positive change in children’s initiative in writing at home. More children said that they undertook self-initiated writing at home after the introduction of drama. This change in children’s initiative can be attributed to drama given that their self-initiated repertoire of writing was said to be mostly based on stories and characters they worked with in drama. The positive relationship between children’s initiative for writing at home and drama indicates that use of drama and stories motivated children to write out of school.

Another finding relative to the above derives from the video data of drama lessons. This finding concerns the revisiting of previous drama stories by children when they were working orally in drama. More specifically, when children were faced with a problem or an issue in whole class meetings in drama sometimes (see researcher’s log, 4.2.6) they provided solutions by recalling previous drama stories and characters. This finding indicates the impact of drama and narrative on engaging children’s cognition and imagination. Also that knowledge and understanding gained in drama were not temporary but they stayed alive, lingering in the minds of children, ready to be recalled and used again to solve new problems.

These research findings seem to corroborate Cremin et al’s (2006) findings concerning drama support for ‘incubation of ideas’. The research team found that many of their case study children in their writing journals (in other curriculum areas), were using the themes and variations of perspectives and insights experienced in past drama sessions. The research team concluded that ‘drama offered support for incubation; ideas were percolated through the extended imagined experience and were developed further when the drama was revisited in writing’ (Cremin et al., 2006, p. 282). This finding seems to be reinforced and reconfirmed by the present study’s findings which indicate that children revisited drama stories and tasks in their writing at home.
Views & Understanding of writing

An interesting finding that is not noted by existing literature concerned the children’s own view of drama as a facilitating strategy for their writing. Children’s responses suggest that children appreciated and took advantage of drama as a good resource for ideas and content for their writing. Whereas before drama children appeared to rely mostly on teacher’s initiated activities and help, afterwards they seemed to base their writing more on their drama work. They considered their work and ideas generated in the context of drama as the most facilitating strategies for their writing. Most of the FGC acknowledged that listening to others’ ideas and watching them in role helped them to have more ideas in their writing. This finding indicates that the change in children’s views of their strategies was related positively to the integration of drama. In parallel, this finding seems to suggest a turn towards self-invented strategies that were based on children’s own or collective actions in the context of drama. This finding, that drama appeared to encourage children’s independence in writing, is supported and complemented by another finding (see next section) indicating that children after drama became more independent in their writing engagement and needed less support from the teacher.

Another interesting finding not reported in existing literature closely related to children’s view of drama as a facilitating strategy for writing, concerns the change in children’s view of the purpose of writing. During the project, children’s preoccupation with the mechanics of writing, such as punctuation and spelling, shifted towards preoccupation with the contents of writing. Whereas children initially placed emphasis on ‘how to do writing’, after the introduction of drama, they talked more about ‘what to write about’, viewing writing primarily as content and communication of ideas. Findings also indicate that this shift in children’s understanding of the purpose of writing as a matter of ‘ideas’ was related positively to their understanding of the purpose of their participation in drama. Children considered drama as a helpful strategy for getting ideas for their writing and they appreciated that the purpose of their participation in drama was to get more and better ideas for their subsequent writing.

Additionally, findings indicate a change in children’s view of ‘competence’ in writing. They considered as competent writers the ones who had active participation and contribution in drama. They considered ‘becoming better writers’ or ‘improvement in writing’ to be related with improvement of their participation and attention in drama. Whereas at the beginning of the year, children’s judgments about good writers were related to paying attention to the
Children’s perception of the difficulties they face in writing seems to have shifted during the project too. Whereas responses before drama indicated that children difficulties were related more to the contents of their writing, particularly in thinking of ideas, afterwards they indicated that they faced fewer difficulties in relation to the contents and ideas for their writing. This finding is related positively to the integration of drama given that findings pertaining to the contribution of drama towards writing indicate that drama provided children’s writing with contents, ideas and vocabulary. This finding is also supported by the previous finding concerning children’s views where children considered drama mostly as a facilitating strategy that provided ideas for their writing.

Overall, findings related to changes in children’s attitudes are in agreement to and reinforce existing research in the field which supports the improvement in children’s attitudes where drama is used. Also, they are not limited only to verifying the improvements in children’s attitudes and views but also they add to existing literature by providing insights into the nature of these changes.

An interesting finding related to children’s writing experience and attitude was provided by the analysis of children’s interview responses. Examination of children’s responses indicates that experienced writers, who were already positively disposed towards writing before drama integration became even more positive and held even more positive views after the integration. However, of more interest is the shift in the attitude of an inexperienced writer. This child [Mirka, G1], although facing many difficulties in writing, she still had a fairly positive attitude before the integration of drama. Her responses after the integration of drama revealed that she became enthusiastic and positively disposed towards writing at school and she was even writing under her own initiative at home. This finding raises questions regarding the relationship between experience in writing and attitude which of course are outside the scope of this investigation. It might indicate that experience or prior achievements in writing are not a necessary prerequisite to positive attitudes towards writing.
6.2.2 Engagement in writing following participation in drama

Examination of existing literature in the particular field of inquiry suggests that children’s engagement with writing tasks following their participation in drama was another point of interest for researchers (Bearne et al., 2004; Cremin et al., 2006). Using observations they sought to investigate if and in what ways children’s involvement in drama has an impact on their engagement with writing tasks. As in the case of attitudes towards writing following drama, there is a scarcity of research projects that investigate the impact of drama on children’s engagement in writing. Therefore, another objective of this study was set to investigate how children’s participation in drama demonstrated itself in their engagement in writing.

In this study, the use of FGC, as a representative sample of the whole class, enabled the detailed observation of their engagement through drama videos and observation data for effectively linking participation in drama and engagement in writing. This project adds to previous projects by not just investigating children’s engagement in writing after drama as the previous research projects did but also examining children’s actual participation in drama sessions and relating their behaviour to their engagement in subsequent writing tasks.

Findings provided by drama videos indicate that most children’s participation in drama improved with the progression of the project but individual children’s participation varied. In parallel, findings provided by observations indicated progressively positive improvements in most children’s engagement in writing over the same period. Comparing the findings provided by the two sets, seems to indicate a positive relationship between children’s participation in drama and engagement in writing which leads to the tentative conclusion that participation in drama had a positive impact on children’s engagement with writing tasks.

The findings of observations indicate that most of the FGC became progressively more concentrated and committed to their writing. They were observed to sustain concentration and be on the tasks longer, pausing fewer times and distracted less. Improvement in children’s concentration might be related to their participation in drama given that the writing tasks that they were engaged with were integrated with their first-hand experience and imaginative context of drama. As such, they had a personal meaning for children who could understand them better and make more sense of them. However, as the
improvement in children’s concentration was gradual, it might also be related to normal developmental factors of children becoming more mature with the progression of the project.

This finding corroborates with the findings of existing research. The teachers involved in the ‘Raising the Boys’ Achievements in Writing’ research project (Bearne et al., 2004), observed that there were obvious general and individual improvements in the boys’ ability to sustain commitment to writing, to see it through to the end and be prepared to improve it. Similarly, Cremin et al. (2006, p.287) note that in ‘seize the moment’ writing, children’s involvement in process drama and tense dramatic encounters seemed to enhance their ability to concentrate, focus and follow through their writing.

While being engaged, children became more confident too. They had a more assured facial expression and alert posture and writing more fluently than before. Most of the children were also observed to erase less often. A few of them were also observed to look proud of their writing and their efforts and show their writing to their peers. This finding seems to be positively related to children’s participation in drama. Drama gave children ideas, linguistic choices and experiences so that they could use them in their follow-up writing. It seems to have helped them to know what to write and how to write it. Moreover, it provided children with an audience for their writing. Findings also indicate that confidence in drama participation related positively to confidence in writing. Children that were confidently participating in drama were also confidently engaged in writing. This finding supports previous research findings. In the ‘Raising the Boys’ Achievements in Writing’ research project, Bearne et al., (2004) noted that were noticeable developments in the boys’ self-esteem.

Moreover, findings indicate that children became more independent during their engagement in writing. While being engaged they were asking or needing noticeably less or no teacher’s help at all. They seemed to rely more on themselves than the teacher and they based their writing on their group’s or other peers’ ideas, presented and developed in the course of their drama engagement. Findings also indicate that children who were actively collaborating in drama and leading group work were even more independent that the rest of the children. This positive change in children’s independence seems to be related to their participation in drama. The drama way of working and the open-ended nature of problem-solving situations was encouraging children’s initiative and independent thinking. Working in their groups independent from the teacher and relying on their own
ideas and solutions (i.e. gaining ownership of the drama process) seems to also promote similar working and thinking in their writing. Children’s participation in drama also promoted children’s independence in writing by providing them with content for writing and better understanding of the tasks. Previous research findings also indicate improvements in children’s independence in writing. Bearne et al., (2004) observed that the pupils required less adult support when writing following their involvement in drama and visual approaches. In the same line, Cremin et al. (2006) also noted that the pupils required less adult intervention when writing.

Additionally, findings indicate that most children’s motivation in writing was gradually enhanced. They were observed to move more willingly from drama to writing. They were welcoming writing tasks and looked to be more enthusiastic and willing to undertake them than before. They were also revising their writing without being reminded by the teacher and they were taking advantage of all the allocated time to edit their writing before handing it in. Enhancement of children’s motivation might be related to their imaginative engagement in drama. Their motivation seemed to increase given that they had a personal engagement in the imaginative context within which the writing task was situated. Thus writing had a meaningful and communicative purpose for children and as such it was more interesting and easier for children to follow. In parallel, enhancement of children’s motivation in writing can be positively related to the positive feedback for their writing that most of the children received by the teacher after drama integration. Positive change in children’s motivation after drama is also indicated in existing research. Neelands et al. (1993, p.10) observe that, when ‘writing is embedded in a context that has personal significance for the writer, the motivation for writing changes drastically’. Bearne et al., (2004), noted that there were noticeable developments in boys’ enthusiasm and motivation and also there were obvious general and individual improvements in the boy’s willingness to improve their writing. Cremin et al. (2006) also concluded that ‘in ‘seize the moment’ writing, motivation was evident in all children who seemed ‘to plunge into it almost without realising they are writing’ (p.281).

Findings also indicate that in most of the cases the length of children’s writing was consistently of greater length than before drama integration. However, this finding cannot be totally attributed directly to the integration of drama but also to the children’s natural rate of maturity and progression at their age.
An overall, general finding that deserves attention is that improvements in children’s engagement after the introduction of drama came about gradually with the progression of the project and not immediately after. This may be contradictory to the findings of existing research where the researchers seem to have observed great improvements in children’s engagement in a shorter period of time. Bearne et al’s project (2004) lasted only three weeks. In the case of Cremin et al. (2006), although the main study’s duration was six months, only eight drama sessions were taught to every participating class. Gradual improvements in children’s engagement can be justified on the basis that drama was a completely new way of working for these children (in Cyprus), in contrast with their English peers who most probably had previous experience working with drama given that drama is integral part of teaching English (in the English Curriculum). Consequently, it seems that children needed their time to familiarize themselves with the new medium of drama and view writing as a continuation of drama. Observations indicated that especially the less experienced and inexperienced children needed more time to get used to the movement/transition from drama to writing and to rely more on themselves for their writing. That is because the ‘discussion’ method that was used before drama implied more guidance and help by the teacher through notes, ideas and useful vocabulary written on the board.

An interesting finding that is also worth considering is related to the engagement of individual children. Findings indicate that although improvements were noticed in the engagement of the experienced girls of the project, the greater improvements at the end of the project were noted in the engagement of the less experienced and inexperienced children of the focal group. This seems to be in agreement with a finding of McKean and Sudol’s (2002) experimental study. They found that ‘drama engages students who do not excel in traditional school activities and allows them the opportunity to express themselves in ways that do not rely on standard paper and pencil-type activities’ (p.30). This finding seems to also corroborate the findings of Bearne et al’s project (2004) who observed that there were obvious general and individual improvements in the underachieving boys’ engagement with writing tasks.

Overall, findings related to changes in children’s engagement in writing are in agreement to and reinforce existing research in the field which supports enhancement of children’s engagement with writing tasks where drama is used. Also, they contribute to existing literature by providing insights into the positive relationship between children’s actual participation in drama sessions and their engagement in subsequent writing tasks.
6.2.3 Drama contribution towards writing

Examination of existing relevant literature shows that the majority of research projects focus primarily on the impact of drama on writing and on the relationship between drama and writing (Pellegrini, 1984; Wagner, 1986; Moore and Caldwell, 1990, 1993; McNaughton, 1997; McKean and Sudol, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002). Research findings derived from both experimental and interpretive designs indicate the positive impact of drama on writing. More specifically, they support that drama enhances the quality and quantity of children’s writing in certain areas such as ideas-content, vocabulary, linguistic choices, sense of ‘voice’, register, sense of audience and length of writing.

However, even though the existing literature suggests positive gains and improvement in children’s writing following the use of drama, in most of the research reports there is insufficient evidence to illustrate the nature of the contribution of drama towards writing. There is also inadequate explanation of how the writing samples were analysed to illustrate in what ways children’s participation in drama contributed towards their writing. This is more evident in projects in which the impact of drama on writing was investigated using quantitative methods (Moore and Caldwell, 1990, 1993; McKean and Sudol, 2002).

Consequently, one of the aims of this study was set to investigate more rigorously and provide a deeper insight into the nature of the contribution of drama towards writing. In this study, children’s writing was first analysed quantitatively. Then, writing was analysed qualitatively informed by the drama sessions that gave rise to writing and the findings of both analyses were considered. These findings were also enriched with the participants’ own views on the contribution of drama, investigated though interviews of the FGC at the end of the project.

These analyses provide indications of the positive contribution of drama towards children’s writing. The findings of the quantitative analysis of writing samples indicate that, during the project, writing was improved mostly at text level with the five aspects of writing that had the greater improvement being: ideas, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation and syntax. Supporting the findings of quantitative analysis, the findings of qualitative analysis, also indicated the positive contribution of drama towards the contents of children’s writings at all levels. In addition, children themselves (in their interviews) talked about the positive contribution of drama towards the contents of their writing.
In particular, the contribution of drama towards writing concerned the:

a. Enhancement of the contents of writing
b. Enhancement of particular aspects of writing
c. Enhancement of ownership in writing

Enhancement of the contents of writing

Qualitative analysis of writing samples indicated that drama provided children’s writing with substantial ideas and relevant details. At the same time, quantitative analysis indicated that ‘ideas’ was one of the aspects of writing that had the greatest improvement during drama. Complementing these findings, children’s interview responses also highlighted, in their own words, that their work in drama contributed ideas to their writing. Analysis showed that children’s writing contents and ideas originated in drama, in what children visually, orally and kinesthetically experienced through drama activities. This finding reconfirms previous research findings which argue that drama provides children’s writing with ideas. It corroborates with the findings of the study of Moore and Caldwell (1990, 1993) who concluded that drama pre-writing activities can improve the quality of ideas and McKean and Sudol’s (2002), which indicated that drama had a positive impact on student writing in the areas of ‘ideas and content’; also with the findings of Winston’s (2004, p.26) projects who found that ‘drama work provided children with substantial ideas and experiences so that they had something to write about’ and Crumpler and Schneider’s (2002) who found that writing composed in drama had more depth and detail.

The findings of this study contribute to the existing literature by providing further evidence regarding the nature of the ideas that drama provided and their origins, in terms of the drama strategies used. In particular, qualitative analysis of children’s writing samples indicates that the contents of storytelling were a common reference for ideas by children. From storeytelling, children drew ideas to build up their arguments, to set up the scene of their writing, to engage the reader and to enrich their writing with more detail. Hot-seating strategy also proved to be beneficial to children’s writing. It was evident in their writing that dialogic exchanges in hot-seating between the main drama character (teacher in-role) and children in-role, afforded children a good understanding of the character’s perspective and the issues dealt with in the story. In addition, the strategies of mime, tableau and group improvisations, seem to have provided children’s writing with vivid visual images and ideas, such as the feelings of the characters, their mood and intentions, even their physical actions within the imaginative context. The use of visual prompts provided children with
visual images through pictures of characters in the stories, signs, banners and other specific objects used to create tension in drama. These visual images transformed into written ideas as evidenced in children’s writing and also acknowledged by the children themselves in their interviews. These findings are in agreement with Winston (2004) who found and reported that ‘some children’s writing benefited from the input that the visual qualities of drama had to offer’ (p.26).

Furthermore, the findings of qualitative analysis of writing and interview responses indicate the contribution of drama and particularly group improvisations towards ‘multiple choice of ideas’ in children's writing. In their interviews children appreciated as helpful for their writing what themselves and their peers said, did and presented in-role in drama. They also said that drama offered ‘more and better ideas’ for their writing. This finding indicates that children’s participation and experience in drama gave them the opportunity to have a wider choice of ideas from within a context that they lived through and got first hand experience from. Children's writing in these terms was polyphonic. Crumpler and Schneider (2002) observed that ‘within process drama, their [children’s] writing is open to the additional interpretations and transactions of other classmates and the teacher’ (p.78).

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses of writing samples indicate that drama had an impact on the vocabulary used by children. Quantitative analysis showed that children’s vocabulary improved greatly during drama whereas qualitative analysis provided indications that drama enhanced children’s writing with appropriate vocabulary and facilitated their choice of words. In their writing children not only used words that they heard or used in drama, but they also used them effectively to communicate and illustrate their ideas better. In some instances, drama also seems to have fed their writing with emotive vocabulary related to feelings created while they were being in-role. These findings indicate that drama contextualized vocabulary and facilitated children’s effective and appropriate use of words to describe events and express feelings in their writing. They corroborate with findings of existing research as McNaughton (1997) noted that drama enriched the vocabulary chosen, which contained more emotive and expressive insights and more natural speech patterns. Additionally, McKean and Sudol’s (2002) and Winston’s projects’ (2004) findings indicated that drama had a noticeably positive impact on student writing in the areas of ‘vocabulary richness’ and ‘word choice’. Crumpler and Schneider (2002) found that children can use an expanded vocabulary or vocabulary that they may not otherwise use, as a result of their engagement in drama activities to explore texts. The
use of specific vocabulary in writing following drama and other visual approaches was also noted in the findings of Bearne et al. (2004).

Quantitative analysis of writing samples provided an interesting finding regarding the progress of individual children. It showed that although all FGC’s writing improved during the integration of drama, the writing of inexperienced writers had the greatest overall improvement. This finding might indicate that drama as a teaching pedagogy, facilitates most the writing of children that lack experience in writing and traditionally might be labeled as ‘underachieving’. This finding seems to corroborate the findings of Bearne et al’s (2004) project which concluded that underachieving boys’ writing benefited and improved significantly when they were introduced to drama and other visual approaches.

Enhancement of particular aspects of writing

Quantitative analysis of children’s writing indicates that during drama children’s writing organisation had a great improvement. In parallel, qualitative analysis indicates that drama provided writing with structure and appropriate style. In particular, qualitative analysis of children’s writing showed that drama story, through the medium of storytelling strategy, structured and framed children’s writing by providing it (apart from ideas and vocabulary) with logical sequence and cohesion. The contribution of ‘story’ towards children’s writing was also mentioned by children in their interviews. Their references to the ‘story’ seem to indicate the impact that the use of story (as a foundation of drama work) had on the content and organization of their writing. McKean and Sudol’s (2002), findings agree that drama had a positive impact on student writing in the area of ‘organisation’.

The contribution of drama is also reflected in the structure of the sentences used by the children. Quantitative analysis shows that the structure of sentences was one of the five aspects of writing that had the greatest improvement during drama. Qualitative analysis indicates that children used a rich structure and a variety of sentence types, simple and complex, short and long. They used mostly indirect speech but they also employed direct speech, especially to portray dialogues or where they chose to give extra emphasis and meaning to what they were trying to communicate. This finding reconfirms similar findings by Bearne et al’s (2004) who found that the boys used variety in sentence structure according to the required writing style and they used complex sentences to add detail.
Qualitative analysis of writing also indicated that drama provided children's writing with the appropriate register to communicate effectively their ideas to a specific audience. Children's linguistic choices indicated that they were aware of their audience and the purpose of their writing. While working in-role and dealing with the drama issues children were using language and appropriate registers according to the communicative demands of the particular context. In the writing that followed drama they used their drama experience to choose the appropriate register to meet the demands of the tasks. This finding corroborates with the findings of Winston (2004), who found that more children demonstrated a clearer sense of audience in their writing after drama.

**Enhancement of ownership in writing**

The findings of qualitative analysis of writing indicate that drama through its fiction and live-experience provided children's writing with a ‘voice’. In their writings children demonstrated ability to identify with the characters in the story and write within the characters’ perspectives. In the analysis of children’s writing (see section 5.3.2), this finding was illustrated better through children’s writing in-role, where individual children’s voice was heard through the character’s voice making the writing sound more authentic and direct to the reader. It indicates the impact that role adoption and work in-role had on children’s writing in-role tasks. While being in-role, children were physically, verbally (cognitively) and emotionally engaged in the imaginative context and that experience filtered through to their writing in-role. This finding corroborates with the findings of existing literature. Wagner (1998) argues that writing in-role provides children with a more authentic voice than when they write as themselves, since they often perceive themselves as ‘relatively powerless or insignificant’ (p. 122). McNaughton (1997) concluded that children’s writing had a clearer sense of ‘voice’, which she defined as ‘writing-in-role where the writer appears able to “get under the skin” of the character and identify with him/her on an affective as well as cognitive level’ (p. 79). McKean and Sudol (2002), in their findings, also found that ‘voice’ was one of the areas of student writing that drama had a positive impact upon. Moreover, in the Raising Boys’ Achievements in Writing collaborative research project (Beame et al., 2004), the research team concluded that overall there was a high incidence of pupils being much more in control of viewpoint and voice in their writing. Reinforcing the same finding, Cremin et al. (2006) observed that children’s resultant written work was frequently full of ‘stance and scenario’ (Bruner, 1984, p. 198),
and ‘that writing in role from a particular stance which had been developed through drama appeared to strengthen children’s writing’ (p.287).

Moreover the findings of qualitative analysis provided indications that the use of story and the creation of fictional context in drama enabled and empowered children to have ownership of the story and a better understanding of the drama issues. It seems that drama work and fiction enabled and empowered children to make the drama story ‘their own story’ and in their subsequent writing to write their own interpretation of the story or its issues. The role of narrative in learning is widely recognized (e.g. Moffett, 1968; Bruner, 1986; Rosen, 1986) because children through story ‘shape the world in narrative structures’ (Bruner, 1999). In drama, in particular, the desire to create narrative action and construct past, present and future scenarios is very strong, so if storytelling is used as a basis for drama, then according to Iser (1978) the narrative draws the children imaginatively into the tale and encourages them to fill the gaps in the text as they negotiate and construct meaning together. In their investigation, Crumbler and Shneider (2002) found that children’s understanding of narrative form was enhanced.

Overall, findings related to the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing are in agreement with and reinforce existing research in the field which supports enhancement of writing when drama is used. Also, they supplement existing literature by providing further insights regarding the nature of the ideas and input that different drama strategies contribute towards children’s writing.

However, at this point, it is worth remembering that the aim of this study as the main research question suggests is not to show causality between drama and changes or improvements in children’s attitudes, engagement and quality of writing. Instead, according to the main research question, the aim of the study is to describe ‘what happened when drama was integrated in a writing class’ and as such to describe changes over the course of the project and speculate on the possible impact of drama without making any claims about the impact of drama on children’s attitudes, views, engagement and writing. Moreover, in an educational setting, such as the class of the particular investigation (in a Cyprus primary school), the impact of other contextual factors that co-existed along with the research process should be recognized. These changes and findings need to be seen with caution because other contextual factors and teacher’s influence come into play. Children were writing in other curriculum areas where drama was not used and also children naturally mature over time. Also, my personal impact as the children’s teacher
should be acknowledged given that my good relationship with these children probably had an influence on the feedback they gave me, maybe trying to please me with what they were saying.

6.3 INTEGRATION AND CENTRAL CATEGORY

In this section I intend to cover three important areas. First, I argue the merits of integrating data in establishing the central category. I shall then introduce and develop the concept of mediation as the central category arising from my data. Finally, I will explore how my design has enabled me to further develop this concept in the context of drama and writing.

This aspect [integration] making it all come together- is one of the most difficult things of all, isn’t it? Quite apart from actually achieving it, it is hard to inject the right mix of (a) faith that it can and will be achieved and recognition (b) that it has to be worked at and isn’t based on romantic inspiration, (c) that it isn’t like a solution to a puzzle or math problem but has to be created, (d) that you can’t always pack everything into one version, and (e) that any one project could yield several different ways of bringing it together (Atkinson, personal communication, cited in Strauss & Corbin, 1996, p.144).

According to Strauss and Corbin (1996, p.144) ‘integration of data is an ongoing process that occurs over time’. It is an interaction between the researcher and the data which includes the ‘evolution of thinking that occurs over time through immersion in the data and the cumulative body of findings’ (Strauss & Corbin, ibid). Strauss and Corbin (1996) propose that the first step in integration is deciding on a central category. They note that ‘the central category evolves from the research’ and ‘it consists of all the products of analysis condensed into a few words that seem to explain what “this research is all about”. ‘A central category has analytic power. What gives it that power is its ability to pull the other categories together to form an explanatory whole’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1996, p.146).

Looking at the whole picture, the role and impact of the social context within which the study is located made me realise the importance of the social context in children’s learning. I acknowledged that the role of social context was central in shaping children’s writing development. The classroom’s social context enabled the interaction between drama and writing to happen. In parallel, the integration of drama in my teaching was an introduction of an essentially social context to children’s learning environment. According to the findings, children’s writing and development were influenced by their experience of working and interacting within the context of drama. In hindsight, acknowledging the
impact of the social context made me reconsider the theory of learning within which this study was located at the outset of this thesis. My attention shifted from learning that comes from inside the individual towards learning that comes from outside. Given this shift in my understanding, I believe that sociocultural theory of learning (which holds that learning comes from outside experience) is a better theoretical framework than social constructivism to frame my investigation and interpret the process of my research project. Within the framework of sociocultural theory the classroom’s social context defined by drama was the outside experience that (according to this research findings) shaped children’s writing and writing development. Independent from the inside experience and cognitive processes, this outside experience was the catalyst for children’s learning and ultimately for their writing.

In the data analysis of this study (Chapter 4) I analysed my data using both predetermined and emerging categories. The synthesis of the findings provided by each data set and the relationships between categories pertaining to the same constructs under investigation (attitudes, views, engagement, quality of writing) illuminated my understanding and enabled me to integrate findings and categories, to see the process of my research project as a whole and provide my own interpretation of ‘what happened when drama was integrated in my writing class’.

The design of my research was based on Vygotsky’s view of the importance of social interaction and adopted a social constructivist framework. My data have confirmed this in my mind but have also highlighted the importance of another central concept of Vygotskian theory: Mediation. Vygotsky (1978) viewed the concept of mediation as being central to his account of mental functioning. For him (1978, cited in Daniels, 2008, p.7), tools, signs and artifacts act as mediators which could be used to ‘control behaviour from the outside’. Accordingly, for Wertsch and Ramirez (1994), the notion of mediation suggests that human action in general and mental functioning in particular are characterized by ‘the use of socioculturally evolved tools or mediational means’ (p.14). Such tools can be tangible material objects or meaning-making tools that mediate communicative and reflective actions that lead to the production of drawings, graphs, theories and literature items; of these, writing is one of the most important. In the process of this research project, mediatory tools employed within the drama context (i.e. strategies, artifacts, action, interaction, body movement) constitute the children’s outside experience that shaped their learning in general and writing in particular. Therefore, I argue that, in this study, ‘mediation’ is the central category that integrates all the other categories used in the
analysis process to make sense of the collected data. *Mediation* has the interpretive power, to explain what this research is all about or what happened when drama was integrated in my writing class.

In this thesis, *mediation* refers to using a means or a medium as intervention with social origins to prompt an action or produce an effect that leads to collective or individual learning. Integration of findings provides insights and indications that *mediation* explains the nature of the relationship between drama and children’s writing. As an outcome of this *mediation* were changes in children’s writing development after the integration of drama. Changes due to mediation were reflected in the quality of children’s writing but also in their engagement with writing tasks and their attitudes and views towards writing.

*Mediation* can explain the contribution of drama towards writing and also the progressive positive change in children’s engagement with writing tasks. If we conceptualise the whole process of using drama in the context of writing as a mediatory process, my data show that there was a 2-way *mediation* between drama and writing at two levels: content and engagement.

The first level concerned the ‘inter-textual’ *mediation* between the content of drama and the content of writing. As the data indicated, drama content fed children’s writing with content and in turn, writing illuminated their drama work and mediated support and ideas for subsequent drama activities. This *mediation* between the contents of drama and the contents of writing is evident and justified through the synthesis of findings, in particular through the qualitative analysis of writing in relation to the input of drama lessons. It can be defined as ‘inter-textual’, if we consider the drama and writing contents as ‘drama text’ and ‘writing text’ respectively. As I will further illustrate in the next sections (6.4 & 6.5) drama content fed children’s writing with content and in turn, writing illuminated their drama work and mediated support and ideas for subsequent drama activities.

The second level concerned the *mediation* between children’s participation in drama and their subsequent engagement in writing. Findings indicate that children’s participation in drama was reflected in their engagement and quality of writing and vice versa: children’s engagement in writing was also reflected in the quality of their writing. Positive feedback and praise (by teacher and peers) on their writing, in turn, seems to have encouraged them towards even more active participation and interest in drama. A kind of ‘self-feeding’ mechanism.
As observation and video data further showed, children’s level of concentration and commitment in drama were positively related to their concentration and commitment in writing. Similarly, children that were confidently engaged in drama were also confidently engaged in writing and produced better writing accordingly (see 4.4, 4.5 & 4.6.3). It is also interesting that children themselves seem to have correlated active drama participation with quality of writing. In their interviews some of them mentioned that they considered as the most competent writers among them the ones who actively participate and contribute their ideas in drama sessions. As one child put it: Good writers think of many ideas and are acting them out within their group in drama [Bros, B3].

Mediation and mediatory process between drama and writing as afforded by this research design can provide an adequate explanation of what happened when drama was integrated in the social context of my classroom. This mediatory process was not a linear straightforward process. It was a dynamic process that occurred in complex ways and provided support to either drama or writing contents at different levels. At this point, it should be noted that mediation between drama and writing describes what happened in the study without claiming or implying causality between drama and improvements in children’s writing, engagement, attitudes and views. Improvements in writing recorded over the period of the project could be related to the mediation between drama and writing but also to the mediation of other contextual factors that are outside the scope of this study.

In the next section, based on the study’s central category (mediation), I discuss the study’s contribution to theory by synthesising theory and data. In doing so, I will use my data to illustrate the mediation between drama and writing by unravelling the role and contribution of different mediatory tools employed in drama towards writing.

### 6.4 STUDY’S CONTRIBUTION TO THEORY

My project was set up to investigate the nature of the relationship between drama and writing. Much of the research discussed in chapter 2 presented writing as an internal process and argued for drama as supporting children’s internal construction of the text (Hayes & Flower, 1980; Hayes, 1996; Kellogg, 1996; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987), albeit supported by social interaction of teacher and peers (Vygotsky, 1978). This social constructivist understanding supported the development and design of my study. However,
my data indicate a more sociocultural understanding, in which social mediation with cultural or mediatory tools (as proposed by Vygotsky and sociocultural theory) is a key factor in interpreting the process of this research project and illuminating the relationship between drama and writing.

Vygotsky identifies language in all its modes as the most powerful psychological tool of mediation (Vygotsky, 1981; Hasan, 2005). In this thesis, the way language was used in drama as well as in writing could be conceptualized as a mediatory tool for children’s learning. Language, either spoken or visual in drama or written in writing, was mediating understandings; it was a mediatory tool leading to learning and development. However, in the drama/writing relationship, language was not the only mediational tool for learning and subsequent writing as conceptualized before the research was undertaken. Action, interaction, imagination, drama strategies, visual images, music, artifacts, body movement and everything else used in drama constitute the total children’s experience of working within this particular educational and social context; they could also be regarded as mediatory tools that shaped children’s writing development.

Data presented in chapters 4 & 5 and interpretation of findings indicate that the mediatory tools employed in drama are essentially social and constitute the outside and collective experience upon which young learners draw and recall when they move from drama to writing.

In particular, video data indicated that interactions between pupils themselves and between pupils and teacher when working in whole class setting generated multiple ideas and appropriate language to communicate these ideas to their imaginary audience. In turn, analysis of writing indicated that children’s collective ideas and language used in drama were reflected in their follow-up writing (see 5.3.1 & 5.3.2). For example, in ‘The Selfish Giant’ episode A (see Appendix 16) children in-role of the children in the Giant’s garden described the Giant’s behaviour towards them with phrases like: He was really furious!, He talked to us in a very bad manner and He got really upset. Many of these same phrases were reflected in their follow-up writing in-role:

*He is very bad-mannered with us.* [Eliz, G4] and *I want to warn you about the giant and the way he behaves. We took him many presents. He was too upset and he threw away our presents.* [Chris, G3]
Similarly, analysis of selected writing examples related to the strategies used in drama (see 5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.2 & 5.3.1.3) indicates that children’s physical engagement in drama such as action and movement (as required by drama strategies) seemed to have provided writing with substantial details, relevant vocabulary and vividness. Indicative is the following quote from a child’s writing after his physical involvement in-role in the ‘Children in Resistance’ drama lesson:

*Then we were writing slogans on the walls, put another flag in its place and me and my friend Michael we were guards, watching if somebody comes but nobody came (group improvisation). We were also making protests and shouting slogans such as: Germans out of Athens!, ‘Long live Greece!’ (group improvisation)* [Rios, B2]

Moreover, as the following writing extract shows, drama imaginative scenarios and in-role improvisations facilitated children’s writing in-role with the use of appropriate register and the development of a stronger sense of ‘voice’ in their writing (see more samples in Appendix 17).

*My beloved children, in 1940 there was a war. One day we went to our school and we found the gate shut with a huge lock and a picture of our teacher saying: ‘WANTED! We were surprised! A child panicked. After a few minutes we found the flagpole where our Greek flag was previously proudly waving, bare.* [Ria, G4, from ‘Children in resistance’ lesson]

Visual images too, created by children in drama, such as freeze frames and mime, were found to have fed children’s writing with vivid pictures, expressive language and emotive vocabulary that reflected children’s feelings and emotional responses while being in role (see 5.3.2.1). For example, the group freeze frame that children in the ‘Children in resistance’ lesson created in-role to show their reaction and feelings to the blood stained rag they found, was subsequently portrayed in their writing, expressing their emotional state:

*It was scaring! All of us froze! (freeze-frame) We though that it could have been from our teacher’s shirt and we felt a knot in our heart.* [Ria, G4]

Also, findings indicate that the use of teacher in-role strategy, in combination with hot-seating and interactions in-role between teacher and pupils, provided children’s writing with style, form and appropriate linguistic choices (see 5.3.1.3). Illustrative examples were scripts they wrote after they hot-seated the teacher in the role of Shanga (in the ‘Blodin the Beast’ lesson):
Villager 1: Shanga you should come with us, otherwise the dragon will destroy you with his fires!!! (hot-seating)
Shanga: No, I can't, I have to weave my carpet. You go. I WILL STAY HERE! Maybe I can stop Blodin destroying us (teacher in-role) I am old but wise (storytelling).

[Bros, B3]

Villager 5: Shanga you cannot stay here, come with us! (hot-seating)
Shanga: No, I said I'm not coming with you! Have to finish my carpet! (teacher in-role)

[Mirka, G1]

Furthermore, children's interview responses indicate the impact of story, visual images and enactment as mediatory tools for writing (see 4.3.3). For example, when asked to say what helped them to write their favourite piece of writing, they said:

*The roles that me and my classmates took to present the difficulties that Hosea found in the desert, up on the mountains and in the forest.* [Geos, B2]

*When I was writing I was thinking of what I saw in drama, how Hosea crossed the river and ran away from Blodin and what we presented with my group.* [Bros, B3]

*I used words from the story in my writing.* [Ria, G4]

Analysis of writing also indicated that the use of story provided children’s writing with structure, ideas and vocabulary, as the example from the ‘Children in Resistance’ lesson shows below (see more extracts of writing samples in Appendix 17).

*I was nine years old then. One day we went to school (storytelling) and what do you think we saw? The Greek flag was not in its place, they put a heavy lock on the gates and a picture of our teacher saying (storytelling) ‘WANTED’!* [Bros, B3]

Overall, my data reinforce the idea that mediation explains the relationship between drama and writing. Mediatory tools employed in drama facilitated the process of writing by providing inter-textual bridges between drama and writing content. While I maintain that a sociocultural framework is needed to understand the relationship between drama and writing, the contribution of cognitive and linguistic perspectives in understanding the writing process should not be ignored. The mediation of drama can indeed support elements of the writing process that were shown to be problematic for novice writers by previous studies, outside of the sociocultural perspective. In this way, looking at the whole picture and considering the contribution of this study to theory, it can be suggested that drama does support the cognitive processes involved in the planning of writing (Hayes & Flower, 1980; Kellogg, 1996; Berminger & Swanson, 1994) and reduces the cognitive load on the learner as stipulated by the cognitive theory of writing.
In parallel, considering the social nature of the mediatory tools employed in drama and the opportunities for oral participation in literacy events (Dyson, 2001) and social interaction with literate others (Heath, 1983) that drama provided children through appropriation of these mediatory tools, leads towards a sociocultural understanding of writing generated through drama. Synthesis of writing and drama presented in chapter 5 (5.3.1 & 5.3.2) indicate that oral rehearsal of ideas and interactions in drama scaffolded writing content. Talking and interacting with peers and teacher within the context of drama, had the potential to provide children with ideas and language to use as content for their subsequent writing, or to help them clarify what they wanted to say. From this viewpoint, children’s collective and individual understanding and experience as well as the language learning gained through drama interactions was reflected in their writing, transformed into a written representation. Moreover, within a sociocultural perspective of writing, drama can be described as a “purposeful communication approach” (Ivanic, 2004) whilst writing emerging from drama is ‘a situated practice and activity’ (Juzwik et al., 2006, p.457) that reflects the teaching method (drama pedagogy) employed in the classroom (Freedman, 1994; Lensmire, 1994, cited in Lacasa et. al., 2001), i.e. the whole drama input. In this framework, it can also be argued that drama supports the social processes involved in writing.

This leads to my argument that drama is a unique pedagogy for children’s writing because of the variety and quality of mediatory tools that can be employed in its context. In contrast to other learning pedagogies, the fictional element of the drama process invites participants to use these tools creatively, in ways that have both a social and a personal meaning to them and help construct or shape their writing.

However, drama contribution towards writing and mediation between drama and writing should be regarded with some caution. Drama is not a panacea for children’s writing development. My data indicate that not all children could handle successfully the ideas provided by their drama engagement. Too many ideas might confuse young writers who cannot be reflective in their choice of content and form of their writing. Thus, in some cases, children’s writing was lacking coherence in presenting their ideas. Moreover, analysis of children’s writing shows that the majority of writing was based mostly on a knowledge-telling model of writing rather than on a knowledge-transforming model (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987). Observations of children’s engagement with tasks during writing indicate that only the experienced writers at the end of their writing were making revisions beyond the surface level of transcriptional aspects (spelling and punctuation);
that is to further revise the contents of their writing in terms of linguistic choices and the meaning they wanted to communicate through their writing. These findings indicate that drama may not be the key tool to support the revision processes (Hayes & Flower, 1980; Kellogg, 1996; Berminger & Swanson, 1994) of all young writers. In the same line of thought, analysis of FGC’s writing reveals that, for two of these writers, writing in-role was a constraint even with the mediation of drama.

Nik’s writing illustrates this point by showing that whilst in the first two paragraphs he could manage writing in-role, in the last paragraph he shifted towards writing in third person:

Dear friend,

I heard you are moving to our neighbourhood. There is a giant there. He is very mean. He was abroad for 7 years. When the giant was away we were playing many games. We were playing hide and seek, tennis, volley, basketball and football and when the giant came back he sent us away from his garden and put up a sign he wrote: ‘Children Keep Out! Trespassers will be prosecuted’. The next day the children put in a sack some stuff and gave them to the giant and the giant saw them and didn’t take a thing. A child went and told him ‘would you like it if we were in your place and didn’t let you come to the garden?’ ‘No,’ he said. ‘Will you let us play in the garden?’ ‘No’.

Sociocultural perspectives on teaching and learning stress the importance of teachers as mediators of cultural practices (Fisher, 2010). Their actions impact upon learners’ responses to what is taught. Learners need to make choices about what they want to do and what they can do within the sociocultural context (ibid.). How learners respond to the possibilities that arise from cultural settings such as classrooms reflects their agency in learning (ibid.). Agency is described by Inden 1990 (in Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain, 2001) as the capacity of people to act on their world – to act purposefully and reflectively. Ratner (2000) sees agency as a potential ‘social phenomenon depending on social relations’ (p433).

For Vygotsky the idea that the learner is agent in his/her learning is central to the developmental process. No amount of cognitive prowess or well thought out strategies will suffice if the learner is not interested. In the same wavelength, a sociocultural view of agency that informs this thesis, emphasizes the way that cultural tools shape how people think and their possibilities for action within a setting (Tharp & Gallimore, 1998; Wertsch, 1991). Within this view, classroom activities, mediated by the teacher and other external influences, act both to sustain teaching and learning but also to affect learner agency.
Agency is mediated by the interaction between the individuals and the tools and structures of the setting.

Within the bigger picture of the study, the development of children’s agency in writing can be considered as a new emerging outcome of the relationship between drama and writing. Data presented in this thesis indicate the impact of the drama/writing context as a sociocultural setting on children’s agency in their development as writers. It could be argued that the way children in this project (through their engagement in the particular educational/social context) appropriated language and other mediatory tools for serving writing, provides a good indication of children developing their own agency in their learning.

How do mediatory tools impact on learner's-participants’ agency in the process of drama/writing? In which ways do they limit or promote/develop agency? Agency includes engagement in ongoing practice and therefore is essentially relational (Edwards & D'Arcy, 2004). Thus the agency of the learner can be observed in the way the child appropriates the task and makes it his/her own (Fisher, 2010).

Data indicate that children gradually became more independent in their writing engagement. With the progression of the project they needed less teacher’s support than at the beginning. They were showing increased ability to plan and organize their writing without much or any help from the teacher. They based their writing on their group's or peers’ ideas presented and developed during the course of their drama engagement. Moreover, the more experienced writers showed ability to enhance their writing using more of their own ideas.

Pupils in the project also acknowledged the potential that their engagement with drama provided towards their writing. The findings support that there was a shift in children’s strategies: from strategies dependent mostly on teacher to strategies that depended mostly on themselves and their peers’ within the context of their engagement in drama. Whereas in their interviews before the integration of drama they considered ‘teacher’s ideas’ and ‘notes on the board’ as the most facilitating strategies, in their interviews after drama integration all the FGC responded in favour of their participation in ‘drama’ as a classroom resource and strategy for improving their writing. This shift is illustrated by responses before drama such as:
When we discuss, you give us new ideas that we can’t think of ourselves and we can use them later when we write. [Ria, G4]

I find very helpful the ideas and vocabulary that you write on the board. [Eliz, G4]

And by responses after drama such as:

I get ideas from what we did before, in drama...The roles we take in drama and the dialogues we do with our groups. [Chris, G3]

When we do drama I think of ideas, watch others’ ideas and then I write them. [Bros, B3]

I get my ideas from what we discuss in our groups in drama. [Ria, G4]

In addition, children’s understanding of ‘improvement in writing’ or ‘becoming a better writer’ adds to the argument of developing their agency since children considered ‘improvement’ to mean the ‘individual’s active participation in drama’. Whilst in their first interviews improvement was related mostly with attention to teacher, e.g. If I watch and listen carefully to my teacher, I will become a better writer [Mirka, G1], in their interviews after the introduction of drama they referred to their attention and active participation in drama instead. This change in FGC’s view of writing competence is illustrated by the following quotes:

I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and listen to others’ ideas. [Eliz, G4]

I can become a better writer if I am more careful in drama and concentrate more when I write. [Nik, B1]

I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and have more ideas to write. [Chris, G3].

At the same time, it was found that drama had an impact on children’s initiative for writing outside school which again can be seen as an indication of their developing agency in writing. Whereas at the beginning of the year, only the experienced writers undertook writing at home apart from homework, at the end of the year most of the children said that they undertook self-initiated writing. Further examination of children’s preferred types of self-initiated writing outside school indicated that children undertook writing that was related to the drama stories and the types of writing they were engaged with in the context of earlier drama/writing sessions (e.g. I sometimes write stories with drama heroes’ ... I wrote a story with Tom Thumb who left home and went to the forest. [Mirka, G1]).

From the previously quoted writing extracts (at the beginning of this section) it can also be argued that enhancement of children’s ‘voice’ in writing (observed mostly in their writing in-
role) provides additional support to the argument that drama integration scaffolded children’s agency effectively (more examples can be found in Appendix 17).

In general, it could be argued that drama as a social setting provides more opportunities for learners to exercise and develop both collective and individual agency in their writing development.

6.5 REVISITING THE STUDY’S CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The study’s conceptual framework (figure 2.1) was a representation of my initial understanding as shaped by the theoretical perspectives of many of the researchers that I have read in literature who viewed learning as developing from within the individual. In this section, I revisit and revise this framework by considering how it is being informed by the process of this research itself and the integration of findings as well as the shift in my own understanding of learning, from social constructivism to sociocultural theory.

Integration of findings led to identifying mediation between drama and writing development as the central category that explains what happened in this study. Therefore, mediation needs to be incorporated in the study’s revised conceptual framework. As represented in the first diagram (figure 2.1), writing was an outcome of the Vygotskian triangle of mediation. However, as the data indicate, writing development was a social process itself, situated within the same social context that gave rise to writing and mediated through interactions between teacher and learners. Therefore, given that the two processes evolve and happen together based on the classroom’s social context, I believe that the addition of a second triangle that shares the same base with the first (teacher and pupils) as shown in figure 6.1 below, would represent more accurately my new understanding of the relationship between drama and writing.

Furthermore, if we consider the relationship between drama and writing as a mediatory process itself and writing development as the object of this process, it could be argued that the mediatory process does not terminate at the object of writing but it re-enters the first Vygotskian triangle.

The findings indicate that there was a two-way mediation between drama and writing and an interactive relationship between the contents and the nature of engagement in both contexts (drama and writing). Data justified the interaction between participation in drama
and engagement in writing. Children’s participation in drama was reflected in their engagement and the quality of their writing and vice versa: children’s engagement in writing was reflected in the quality of their writing which, with positive feedback in turn, encouraged and led to a more active participation in drama. Also, children themselves acknowledged improvement in their writing because active participation and contribution/generation of ideas in drama led to better writing.

Findings also justified the ‘inter-textual’ mediation and interactive relationship between the contents of drama and the contents of writing. Drama content through mediatory tools fed children’s writing with content. In parallel, the writing (produced either in-role or not), alongside or after drama, helped the progress of drama or provided useful material for use in the next drama session. Indicative examples are the letters in-role written by children in the role of Tom Thumb which were used as introduction to the next drama session; questions that were written collaboratively in children’s groups and subsequently used to hot-seat drama heroes such as Tom Thumb, Selfish Giant and Hosea; slogans written by children during drama (as in ‘Children in Resistance’) and heroes’ profiles that were constructed collaboratively by children and used both as a reflection on the drama and as a basis for decision making and actions forward.

This leads to an argument about the role of writing as a mediatory tool itself. The meaning and function of writing as a mediatory tool is appropriated and reconstructed by children through their understandings mediated by drama while writing itself subsequently mediates understandings by illuminating their drama work. In the past, researchers argued in favour of drama use as a means to influence children’s writing and engagement (Neelands et al., 1993; McNaughton, 1997; McKeen & Sudol, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002; Bearne et. al., 2004; Cremin et al., 2006). However, data presented in this study shows that there is an interaction between the two and thus writing as a mediatory tool itself can have an impact on the content and progress of drama as well as on children’s engagement in drama.

In the first conceptual framework there was only a one-way relationship between drama and writing development. Based on my new understanding and the interpretation of the process of this research, another arrow that begins from writing and goes back to drama is needed to represent the mutual interaction and mediation between the two processes. Also, agency, as a new outcome of the relationship between drama and writing is added to the revised conceptual framework below (figure 6.1).
In a nutshell, in this thesis I argue that, on a theoretical level, the concept of mediation, as conceptualised by sociocultural theory and Vygotsky, explains what happened in the study and the nature of the relationship between drama and writing. Looking at the whole project as a mediatory process between drama and writing led first to the identification of drama as a mediatory tool for children’s writing. As such, the role of drama is exemplified (through data) by the use of mediatory tools that are employed in its context (such as strategies, action, interaction, visual images) and the way they mediate content and form in writing. Mediatory tools employed in drama facilitated the process of writing by providing inter-textual bridges between drama and writing content. In addition, based on findings, my work suggests that the mediatory process between drama and writing is not a one-way process; it does not terminate in writing because writing, in its turn, has an impact on the progression of drama, by way of its content mediating understanding, engagement and content in drama. This leads to the concept of the dynamic mediatory process between drama and writing and also to the role of writing as a mediatory tool itself. Additionally, this thesis argues for the positive impact of drama as a sociocultural context on children’s agency in writing. Data indicate a developing sense of agency in children’s writing,
suggesting that agency can be regarded as a new outcome of the mediatory process between drama and writing.

6.6 EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Crumpler and Schneider (2002) based on literature (Wagner, 1998; Wolf et al., 1997), noted that 'Despite the promise of incorporating process drama into writing instruction, its use has not been widespread' (p.63). They provided as a possible reason that 'educators are not aware of how drama might inform their curricula and become a significant feature of teaching and learning' (Crumpler & Schneider, 2002, p.63). In the same line, Mages (2008) reviewing research on the use of drama in children's language development notes that: 'Although these claims of drama’s merits are based on classroom experiences and observations, educators and administrators in today's high-stakes academic environment are wary of this type of evidence. They look to researchers to confirm practitioners’ claims' (p.17). In this final section, I discuss possible implications of this research study on the teachers’ practice.

This study suggests that drama is an effective child/learner-centred pedagogy to scaffold children’s writing development. When drama is integrated in a writing class and used systematically it enhances positive attitudes towards writing, engagement with writing tasks and the quality of children’s writing. Thus, the outcomes of this study provide an argument for the integration of drama in the learning of writing and also provide teachers with insights for the potential of drama as an alternative pedagogy for developing young children as writers. A creative possibility, another perspective for writing, a more challenging medium to work with and create authentic purposes for engaging in writing.

Britton (1970) proposed that writing ‘takes place afloat upon a sea of talk’ (p.29) serving as a ‘recruiting ground for the representational aspects and as a regulator to support the young writer’. Dyson (2001) supports that learning to produce different kinds of texts is based on opportunities for oral participation in literacy events within which such texts matter. In this study, considering what the findings indicate in relation to the contribution of verbal language in drama context towards writing, it could be argued that drama, within a sociocultural view of learning, is an effective approach for recruiting talk to develop writing. By welcoming and valuing all children’s ideas and perspectives, drama is a safe social context that provides a space for polyphony and oral rehearsal of ideas. More specifically, in drama, children have the opportunity to be engaged orally by listening and observing the
teacher’s and peers’ talk, contributing orally and receiving feedback from both. Subsequently, children’s oral participation provides them with language and ideas to convey in their writing. Within this stance, individual children in drama can be seen as agentive whose talk either as individuals in the whole class or as a part of a group enables ‘creative expression and negotiation of meaning in oral and written forms to develop’ (Parr et al., p.249). In parallel, findings indicate that there is an inter-textual relationship between drama text and writing. It can be argued that oral interactions in drama either in role or out of role can create textual platforms, bridges between drama and writing texts. Oral participation in drama enables opportunities for ‘input’ at different linguistic levels such as ideas, structure, vocabulary, syntax, voice of the writer and the right register. Interacting with others provides a frame for using text level, sub text and word level features in writing. The spoken word is both the raw material for writing and a tool to manipulate this material (Dyson, 2000; cited in Parr et al., p.249).

Adopting educational drama as a method of teaching has implications for both teacher and learner. The teacher in her preparation of working through drama has to consider both the subject and the type of the writing task, but also the interests of the children-learners if she wants to engage them successfully in drama first and subsequently in writing. This thesis showed that by creating opportunities that bridge children’s pre-existing knowledge and experiences, with the curriculum demands, we can develop children’s writing in meaningful ways to them and give them the opportunity to exercise choice and agency in their learning to write. In this way, as Dyson argues (2002), children are given the opportunity to exploit their writing repertoire and resources and most importantly, to have agency and control of their writing. In this context, the provision of a diversity of writing opportunities that links children’s familiar literacy practices such as media texts, songs, stories and dramatic play, with school curriculum and writing experiences should be prominent in our planning. In this project, through the medium of drama and story, children were given the opportunity both to mobilize their agency by participating in a familiar childhood practice such as dramatic play and also to draw on their own literacy resources. An authentic communication drama context provided children with genuine reasons for writing.

What is evident from this project is that learners’ engagement in drama and writing is instrumental for successful learning to happen in both contexts. Imagination is key here. The success of drama lies in its potential to trigger children’s intellect and imagination and engage them both physically and cognitively in the learning process at a natural pace, enabling them to make sense of their learning experiences through interacting in
meaningful imaginative contexts. In drama, participants’ imagination is engaged through fictional story making in action. If the fictitious drama environment succeeds in engaging participants’ interest and imagination, pupils will continue to be imaginatively engaged in their follow-up writing which in turn will be itself imaginative and reflect their understanding of their drama participation and experience. Thus, the teacher needs to be creative and imaginative in introducing contexts for writing that have personal significance to learners and engage their imaginations and feelings. Extreme care should be taken in the choice of story that will be used as a foundation of drama work and the drama strategies to be employed. Story contexts and drama strategies should enthuse and hook children into the learning process.

Additionally, the teacher has to be resourceful and creative not only in the choice of drama elements (stories, strategies and physical artifacts) that she brings into the classroom but also in dealing with a totally different and challenging classroom where the traditional status-quo between teacher and pupils is reframed to suit drama pedagogy. In drama, the teacher is just another participant whose status can be less powerful than children’s when in-role.

A significant implication of this project is that, for educational drama to be used, the teacher does not have to be a drama graduate or an actor; every teacher can integrate drama in his/her teaching of writing. However, teachers who want to work with the drama medium can learn and benefit a lot from drama practitioners; they do have to be willing to experiment and learn from their mistakes. More importantly, to use their own creative imagination to invent drama situations that provide space for children’s imagination and agency. In order to do this they have to be prepared to spend time, both thinking and preparing for the drama/writing lessons and the time involved should not be underestimated. This method requires a lot of input on the part of the teacher beforehand and less ‘overt’ input in the class, mostly through the strategy of teacher in-role. In a drama class, responsibility for language and actions are mediated from teacher to children, aiming at children to be the ones who do most of the talking and not the teacher (Sierra, 1993, p.33).

However, my personal experience of working with educational drama is encouraging for teachers who want to explore its potential. After my project, I ended up with a ‘bank’ of drama sessions that I can re-use creatively by adapting them according to the age, the needs and interests of my class and the curriculum objectives for writing.
Another implication of this study is related to the assessment of writing. This thesis provides an example that analysis of writing either in the form of numbers (quantitative) or qualitative is insufficient if it does not consider the situational nature of writing, the context from which writing emerged and the effectiveness of writing in relation to its communicative purposes. This implication is particularly relevant for the Cyprus educational context where there are no prescribed levels or criteria for assessing writing. Most of the teachers place emphasis on the teaching of the mechanics of writing because they view writing as mechanics and not as a meaning-making activity. As this thesis showed, drama potential lies in the meaningful contextualization and purposeful use of language through interactions. It is not an ideal method for supporting and teaching the mechanics of writing. Rather, drama provides a scaffold for those aspects that relate to the meaning of writing (Winston, 2004) such as ideas, organization and style, vocabulary, right register and voice of the writer.

Finally, in this project children were given the time to absorb and consolidate the way of working with drama, familiarise themselves with the new medium and develop some skills while working collaboratively and interacting with drama contents, peers and teacher. The implication of this element of sustained practice is important in obtaining maximum benefits from this innovative integration of drama in our teaching.

6.7 SUMMARY

In this chapter, I tried to shed light on the main research question: ‘What is happening when drama is integrated in a writing class’ and provide my interpretation of the research process. I first revisited the sub-research questions and located the corresponding findings pertaining to each question within the existing literature. I then, integrated the findings by arguing that ‘interaction’ is the central category that may explain what happened in the project. Subsequently, I reflected on the study through a Vygotskian/sociocultural lens and considered theoretical implications. Then, I revisited the study’s conceptual framework and revised it in the light of my new understanding of the research process. At the end of the chapter, possible educational implications of this study were discussed.

The next and final chapter presents the summary of the study and the conclusions derived.
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I look back on the study as a whole. Initially I present a brief summary reminding the reader of what happened throughout the project and summarizing the main research findings. In the subsequent sections, I discuss limitations of the findings and I reflect critically on the project, considering how it could have been carried out differently based on the experience gained from its conduct. In the final section, I discuss implications of the project in future research and conclude with some final remarks.

7.2 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study has taught me about the nature of children's writing development as realized within a learning environment based on drama as pedagogy. Let me first recap on what actually happened.

This study emerged from my personal encounter with the potential of educational drama in language development, my study of literature and my belief that drama pedagogy can be an innovative and motivating way for the teaching and learning of writing with a positive contribution towards primary school children's writing development. Therefore, I set up a research project with educational drama at the centre, to investigate and evaluate the nature of drama and writing process.

Reviewing the literature, first theory and research pertaining to writing and drama as separate disciplines and then research in the field of drama and writing helped me to identify gaps in existing literature and decide the focus of my investigation. Having as a general aim to describe 'what is happening when drama is integrated in a writing classroom' and informed by the social constructivist theory of learning and Vygotskian concepts. I determined the study's appropriate conceptual framework and formulated its sub-research questions. In particular, I was interested in investigating the impact of the
integration of drama on children’s: a. attitudes and views towards writing, b. engagement with writing tasks and c. quality of writing.

The following specific questions related to the research objectives were formulated:

- Do children’s attitudes and views of writing change following the integration of drama?
- How does children’s participation in drama demonstrate itself in their engagement in writing?
- What is the contribution of drama towards the quality of children’s writing?

Considering the research aim and questions, I identified that the study falls within the parameters of interpretive paradigm and I decided that a qualitative case study was a relevant methodology to investigate my research questions. A multi-method approach (Cohen & Manion, 1994) to the design of this case study was decided on the basis of what can best investigate the issues raised in the research questions and what can best provide insightful and reliable information. Questionnaires, interviews, observations, writing samples, video recordings and researcher’s log were selected.

Adhering to the principles of case study methodology and interpretive paradigm and aiming at a thorough understanding of the research context, each of the three research questions that guided this study were simultaneously addressed by at least two sources of data. More specifically, the question regarding the children’s attitudes and views of writing was examined through the analysis of questionnaires and the interviews. The question regarding children’s engagement in the writing process was examined through observations during writing and video data of drama sessions while the question regarding quality of writing was examined through children’s writing samples and video data of the drama sessions.

The project was carried out in a Year 4 class of a public primary school in Cyprus in the context of Greek Language lessons during the full academic year of 2005-2006. The various data were collected throughout the year or at certain chronological points as thought appropriate.

The collected data were analysed qualitatively based on predetermined and emerging categories. Quantitative analysis was also performed on children’s views and attitudes towards writing in Part A of the questionnaire before and after the integration of drama and
on the assessment scores of pupils’ writing before and during the introduction of drama in my teaching.

Questionnaire and interview findings, supported by observational data, indicated positive changes in children’s attitudes and views of writing following the introduction of drama. They indicated that children became more positively disposed towards undertaking writing at school, that they appeared to be more willing and confident in undertaking and sharing their writing with the rest of the class and that their writing preferences were expanded influenced by the writing types undertaken in the context of drama. Findings also support positive changes in children’s initiative in writing at home and changes in their view of the purpose of writing. Whereas they initially placed emphasis on 'how to do writing', after the introduction of drama they talked more about 'what to write about', viewing writing primarily as content and communication of ideas. Children also considered drama as a helpful strategy and they were of the opinion that the purpose of their participation in drama was to get more and better ideas for their subsequent writing. Additionally, findings indicate a change in children’s view of 'competence' in writing. They considered as competent writers the ones who had active participation and contribution in drama. Children's perception of the difficulties they face in writing seems to have shifted during the project too. Whereas responses before drama indicated that children difficulties were related more to the contents of their writing, afterwards they indicated that they faced fewer difficulties in relation to the ideas and content of their writing.

Findings provided by drama videos indicated that most children’s participation in drama improved with the progression of the project but individual children's participation varied. In parallel, findings provided by observations indicated progressively positive improvements in most children’s engagement in writing over the same period. Comparing the findings provided by drama videos and observations seemed to indicate a positive relationship between children's participation in drama and engagement in writing which led to the tentative conclusion that participation in drama had a positive impact on children’s engagement with writing tasks. In particular, the findings of observations indicated that while writing, most of the FGC became progressively more concentrated and committed to their writing, more confident and more independent. Also, children's enthusiasm and willingness to undertake writing after drama increased. Findings indicated that although improvements were noticed in the engagement of the experienced writers of the focal group, the greater improvements at the end of the project were noted in the engagement of the moderately and inexperienced writers of the same group.
The findings of quantitative and qualitative analysis of writing provided indications of positive contribution of drama towards children’s writing. Quantitative analysis of writing samples indicated that, during the project, writing was improved mostly at text level with the five aspects of writing that had the greater improvement being: ideas, vocabulary, organisation, punctuation and syntax. Supporting the findings of quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis also indicated the positive contribution of drama towards the contents of children’s writings at all levels. Children themselves (in their interviews) acknowledged the positive contribution of drama towards the contents of their writing in the areas of ideas and vocabulary.

More specifically, qualitative analysis of writing samples indicated that drama provided children’s writing with substantial ideas and relevant details, a better understanding of the issues they were asked to write about, multiple choices/perspectives, appropriate vocabulary, organization, structure and suitable style, ‘voice’ and register to communicate effectively their ideas to a specific audience. Children’s linguistic choices indicated that they became more aware of their audience and the purpose of their writing. The findings also indicated the contribution of drama and drama story towards the structure of the sentences and logical sequence of children’s texts. Moreover, they provided evidence regarding the nature and origin of the ideas that drama provided in terms of the drama strategies used.

Integration of findings provided indications and insights of the mediation between drama and children’s writing development. I argue that there was a 2-way mediation between drama and writing at two levels. The first level concerned the ‘inter-textual’ mediation between the content of drama and the content of writing. As the data indicated, drama content fed children’s writing with content and in turn, writing illuminated their drama work and mediated support and ideas for subsequent drama activities. The second level concerned the mediation between children’s participation in drama and their subsequent engagement in writing. Findings showed that children’s participation in drama was reflected in their engagement and quality of writing and vice versa. Positive feedback and praise (by teacher and peers) on their writing, in turn, seems to have encouraged them towards even more active participation and interest in drama.

At a theoretical level, this thesis suggests that the concept of mediation is central in interpreting the relationship between drama and writing. Interpreting the findings through a
Vygotskian and a sociocultural lens, the whole process could be interpreted as a mediatory process. The way drama and language as well as writing were used could be conceptualized as mediatory tools for children’s learning (see 6.5). This leads to my argument that drama is a unique pedagogy for children’s writing because of its variety and quality of mediatory tools such as action, interaction, strategies and body movement that can be employed in its context. In contrast to other learning pedagogies, the fictional element of the drama process invites participants to use these tools creatively, in ways that have both a social and a personal meaning to them and help construct or shape their writing.

In addition, data presented in this thesis indicate the impact of the drama/writing context as a sociocultural setting on children’s agency in their development as writers. It could be argued that the way children in this project (through their engagement in the particular educational/social context), appropriated language and other mediatory tools for serving writing, provided some significant indication of children developing their own agency in conducting their writing and learning. Findings indicated that children became more independent in their writing engagement and that there was a shift in their strategies: from strategies dependent mostly on teacher to strategies that depended mostly on themselves and their peers. It was also found that drama had an impact on children’s initiative for writing outside school which again can be seen as an indication of their developing agency in writing.

7.3 LIMITATIONS OF FINDINGS

This research project was a qualitative case study. As discussed in chapter 3, this methodological choice was dictated by the exploratory nature of the questions being asked. By definition, qualitative case studies seek to intensely and exhaustively examine all the issues within the bounds of the study to attain a thorough understanding of the case. The comprehensive nature of a case study demands that the case is delimited enough for a thorough examination to be carried out effectively. As a result, the number of participants is unavoidably small and for this particular study the total number of participants was 29 pupils. At the same time, the public primary school class that participated in the study was not a randomly selected group and did not claim to be a sample representing a more general population. Rather, as discussed in chapter 3, this was a class in the school that I was posted to, that was allocated to me by the school
principal following my request to be given a class of children that already knew how to write.

Due to the small number of participants and the fact that the research did not examine a representative sample of a population, this study does not aspire or intend to make claims of generalizability as understood by quantitative approaches. However, even though the findings of this study cannot be generalized to a particular population, the research does have “extensity” (Webb, 1961). By describing, explaining, and evaluating the impact of drama on children’s writing development as realized in the learning environment of this particular classroom, the study sought to provide insights into the nature of the drama/writing process and into its possibilities in other classroom contexts.

It is important to acknowledge that the findings of the analysis presented in chapters 4, 5 and 6 are not to be understood as immediately transferable to other classroom contexts. As with any group of individuals, the particular attitudes, behaviors, context, and participants’ views on writing are particular to that group and may not fully represent a similar group in a different place or time. Therefore, improvements or positive changes in pupils’ attitudes and views towards writing or enhancement of their engagement and quality of writing identified might not be precisely replicable in another classroom and the contextual elements might not work together in the same way. However, this does not reduce the value of the theoretical insights generated by the interpretation of the data nor does it reduce its value as a guide to policy makers and teachers to the potential contribution of drama usage and therefore, as such, it does not defeat the objective of the study.

Also, another limitation that was briefly discussed in chapter 4 has to do with the use of interviews as a means of examining FGC’s attitudes and views. Even though the children were not informed about the purposes of the interviews, (thus limiting the probability of them trying to intentionally assist or hinder the research), they probably had their own theories about the aims of the research and might have been shaping their responses based on those theories. There is the possibility, due to my personal relationship and familiarity with the pupils, that they tried to please me with their interview responses. As Gubrium and Holstein (1997) note, participant self-reports should not be regarded as accurate accounts of their experiences, as interviews can only provide access to participants’ reconstructions of the experiences.
Additionally, this study has a limitation that is inherent in all types of qualitative research. Given that in qualitative studies the researcher is the major tool for considering and analyzing data, research results are inevitably a product of the researcher's interpretations. Of course, the trustworthiness of those interpretations is bolstered by practices such as the researcher's 'prolonged engagement' (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, see section 3.9.4) with the participants and immersion in its issues, 'persistent observation' (ibid.), 'peer debriefing' (ibid.) and the use of a number of sources of data, all of which have been used in this study. However, subjectivity of interpretation remains. Despite my efforts to be objective, my interpretations of events, behaviors, and utterances were inevitably influenced by my own experiences, biases, and expectations and do not necessarily accurately reflect the interpretations of the children participants. Therefore, there is a possibility that another researcher could have offered somewhat different interpretations of the results.

Finally, the question that always arises is, how do I know that it is drama itself that has led to this development in attitudes, views, engagement and quality of writing? I would answer that there is indeed a problem in claiming that the development was all due to drama. Other contextual and developmental factors that co-existed within the research context come into play, such as children's other writing in the language lessons or in other curriculum areas and also children's maturity over time. Nevertheless this project has taught me that the learner's engagement in the learning process is critical for the developmental process to take place and also that there can be positive interaction between one learning activity and another (drama-writing). Therefore, I argue that central to the study is the learner's engagement and the role of drama in affectively, physically and imaginatively engaging children in something they are interested and motivated in.

Had I wanted to prove it was drama and not some other method that produced the results of this project it would have been better to have a control group of pupils and to carry the project out in different kinds of classrooms. This though would have meant missing out on the richness of the project. Moreover, the research aim was not to investigate whether drama had an influence on the writing but what was the nature of the drama/writing process.

My suggestion is that the different kinds of stimuli provided by an educational drama context, (verbal, visual, kinesthetic) mediate learning, activate and enhance dynamically the learning process and provide a springboard to language and writing development.
It is important not to look at educational drama as a panacea or as a cure for problems in writing. It is not that the learners’ lack of competence or their negative attitude or disengagement in writing will automatically transform into competence, positive attitude and active engagement when they adopt a role in a drama session. It is the whole experience and culture of regularly working with this medium, the actions and interactions, first-hand experience, learner’s agency, multiple perspectives, participants’ voices, playfulness and creativity (all inherent in drama) that can take learners a long way towards that transformation.

7.4 CRITIQUE OF THE STUDY

This research project was carried out by a novice and inexperienced researcher. In retrospect, based on the experiences that I gained from its conduct, I reflect critically on the project as a whole and consider what I would have done differently if I had the chance to do this same project all over again.

In hindsight, as I discussed in chapter 6, sociocultural theory informs better my understanding of the learning process than social constructivism. Attitudes of children in this thesis are taken to be something dynamic that can be shaped and enhanced by the interactions and mediatory tools found in the social context of drama. At the same time, it is the engagement of the children in drama that can be actually seen while they are acting cognitively and physically upon drama’s social content. Observations of their behaviour can provide more realistic and tangible indications of the likely impact of drama on their learning and development. Thus, this project taught me that engagement is a better term to use when you describe children’s attitudes and motivation for writing. Given this shift in my understanding, ‘engagement’ with cultural tools and experience of the context as it is understood within a sociocultural view, is a more useful concept to investigate the impact or the contribution of drama on children’s writing development. Therefore, if I had the chance to carry out a similar project again I would have designed the study differently, focusing on selecting and developing methods and research instruments to collect more tangible evidence of children’s engagement both in the context of drama and in the context of writing.
For instance, I would have investigated more rigorously FGC’s nature of engagement during their group work by using suitable sound and video recording equipment. Analysis of this engagement would illuminate how children make sense of their experience and stimuli provided by the context defined by drama and in turn how this engagement is evidenced in their follow-up engagement in writing and writing outcomes. Moreover, I could have used video recordings to obtain evidence of all the FGC’s engagement in writing after each drama lesson instead of observing just one in each session. In this way, I would have a ‘thicker description’ (Geertz, 1973) of children’s engagement in writing and possibly use this data to evaluate the effectiveness of each drama lesson as a learning context, in terms of enhancing and promoting engagement with the subsequent writing task. In addition, I would have interviewed focal children during their writing. Children’s responses would have facilitated a better understanding of the nature of their engagement with writing tasks and its relation to their participation and engagement in drama.

Another point of self criticism, independent from the above, concerns the data collection and analysis process. During the project, being both a full time teacher and researcher, imposed some limitations on the time I had available to ponder over the data and make sense of it at the time of collection. That would have given me a better chance to reflect much earlier on the research process and the data collected. Instead, I left the analysis of the data until after the end of the project, while during the project, I placed more emphasis on examining and assessing the FGC’s writings and their links to the drama content. In retrospect, I feel that this was a wrong practice as I lost contact with my data nine months after the project began. I needed a lot more time to review and make sense of each individual data set at first and then of all the sets as a whole. Also, although I was keeping a log during the project, I did not try to be alert about what was happening outside of the project. That is, how children’s engagement and experience in drama was evidenced in other aspects of their engagement and way of thinking/working in other curriculum areas or outside school. Had I done that I would have had an even better understanding and insight of the impact of drama on children’s learning and development. I will also add that I regret not keeping records of the kind of writing that children initiated at home that was related to their drama work at school.

Additionally, it would have been insightful and would illuminate the findings further had I tried to obtain evidence of FGC’s writing and their engagement with writing tasks in the year that followed the project. That way I could have some indications of how children’s prolonged experience working with drama the previous year stayed with them and
reflected in their engagement and quality of writing some months later. The fact that I was posted to another school the year after the project, in combination with the fact that most of the FGC moved to another school did not encourage or enable me to trace this evidence.

7.5 IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND FINAL NOTES

When talking about qualitative case study research Edwards (1989) mentions that ‘such research is inevitably hypothesis generating rather than hypothesis testing. Its promise lies in its potential for making the dimensions of any problem much clearer and better defined’ (p.322).

This research study sought to address children’s writing development as realized in an educational context where drama as pedagogy was used. In many ways, this research aspires to be like an argument for the use of educational drama in children’s writing development. In the domain of education in general and in the field of language education in particular, there is an open conversation about the potential of drama pedagogy in children’s writing development. This study is a contribution to that conversation. It does not supply any final, absolute answers to the questions the professional community is asking. It does, however, offer an informed, thought-out contribution, supported by data, as one of the multiple perspectives to be considered in reaching a more advanced level of communal understanding. Being a contribution in the field of drama and writing especially in my own home context (Cyprus) where educational drama and its integration in the teaching and learning of writing are new and untried concepts, this piece of work also invites other perspectives to further elucidate the various aspects of the subject.

One important inquiry that should be explored by future research has to do with the nature and the kinds of children’s engagement in drama, in whole class or in group encounters. Exploring and understanding the nature of children’s engagement, verbal, visual or kinesthetic, will probably shed more light on the drama/writing learning process and on the way drama enhances learners’ agency in writing. Possible questions for this line of inquiry could be: ‘What is the nature of children’s engagement in drama as evidenced in their whole class or group interactions with teacher and peers?’ ‘How does individual and collective engagement in drama develop children’s agency in writing?’ Also, descriptions
and detailed analysis of children’s engagement in drama could provide further indications of the potential contribution of particular drama strategies and other stimuli provided by drama towards particular aspects of writing. For instance, ‘How does individual and collective engagement in drama develop voice in writing?’ In this line of inquiry it would be interesting to also investigate children’s views and understanding of their engagement in drama: ‘How do children make sense of their engagement in particular drama ‘episodes’ and how is it evidenced in their engagement in writing?’

This study investigated the impact of drama mostly on in-role writing, third person narrative and dialogues and, in two cases, poetry. The findings are encouraging on the contribution of drama towards the quality of this kind of writing. However, research is needed to find out whether drama helps and the kind of support it provides to other types of writing such as advertisements, newspaper articles, announcements, summaries. Possible questions to be asked are: ‘How does engagement in drama support writing of advertisements, newspaper articles, etc?’

In addition, it would be interesting and useful to see what the results of a similar project would be with younger or older pupils than the ones in this project (8-9 year olds). For example two years younger when they just start to learn writing or two years older, in the final grades of primary school, to consider similarities and differences between age groups.

Furthermore, this research project proposes a new framework of understanding the drama/writing relationship. This framework is not about how drama motivates children to write or how it impacts on their attitudes towards writing. Instead, it would be about the use of drama as a mediator for engaging learners from outside. Interpreting the drama/writing relationship through a Vygotskian and sociocultural lens advances our understanding of the role of teacher and curriculum in engaging children in learning. In this framework of learning, mediation is a central concept. Mediation allows development of agency, thus it allows the agency of individuals or the collective agency of the group of children to be developed through their personal investment, through a sense of ownership in the drama/writing process. In this way, this project raises questions about the role of the teacher and the curriculum as mediators to develop learners’ engagement in the learning of writing as a meaning-making and communicative process, as circumscribed by the classroom’s cultural and social context. It would be interesting in future research to explore
further (by possibly developing new research tools and methods) the impact of mediatory tools employed in drama on children’s engagement in language learning and writing.

As a final note, this research sought to investigate the drama/writing process. It attempted to do so through the integration of educational drama in the teaching of writing in a Year 4 primary class in Cyprus. It offered some insights and it raised more questions. My hope and aspiration is that it is seen as a relevant and worthwhile contribution to the dynamic and ongoing conversation about this subject and its implications amongst researchers, policy makers and educators.
APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

My thoughts about writing...

Name : ___________________________
Class : ___________________________

A. I circle the choice that suits me best

1. Some of my games include writing

   Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
   Agree nor Disagree Disagree

2. I like to write when I am at home

   Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
   Agree nor Disagree Disagree

3. I like to write when I am at school

   Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
   Agree nor Disagree Disagree

4. Before I start writing, I first think of ideas about the subject

   Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
   nor Disagree Disagree

5. I discuss my ideas about what I have to write at school with one or more of my classmates

   Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
   nor Disagree Disagree
6. When we have something to write about, it is helpful if the teacher writes some ideas on the board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. When I finish writing, I read it again and make corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. I like to read out what I have written in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I like to have my writing displayed on the wall of the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. When I write, I have difficulty in thinking of ideas about what to write

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. When I write, I have difficulty with the grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. When I write, I have difficulty with the words (vocabulary) that I need to use for the subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
13. I find it difficult to write as if I were another person (in-role)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Writing at school makes my life harder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Writing stories is boring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Writing in-role (as if I were another person) is boring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Writing in-role helps me understand other people's feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Writing helps me share my ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. My mind seems to go blank when I start writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. I look forward to writing down my ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
21. I feel confident in expressing my ideas clearly in writing

Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
Agree nor Disagree Disagree

22. I like to have my teacher read what I have written

Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
Agree nor Disagree Disagree

23. I am not good at writing

Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
Agree nor Disagree Disagree

24. I am afraid of writing

Strongly Agree   Neither Agree   Disagree   Strongly Agree
Agree nor Disagree Disagree

B. I tick the boxes that suit me best

1. I like writing:
   True stories
   Science Fiction stories
   Poems
   Writing in-role
   Plays
   Letters to people I don’t know very well
   Letters to friends and relatives
   Other things (say what they are) ……………………………….

2. I don’t like writing:
   True stories
   Science Fiction stories
   Poems
   Writing in-role
   Plays
   Letters to people I don’t know very well
   Letters to friends and relatives
   Other things (say what they are) ……………………………….
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C. I complete the sentences

1. What helps me most with my writing is:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

2. What causes me most difficulties when I am writing is:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

3. The thing I like most about writing is:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

4. The thing I dislike most about writing is:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________

5. In my opinion, I can improve and become a better writer if:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED TO PREPARE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW AGENDA

My Reading/Writing History Questionnaire

Name : 
School : 
Class : 

What kind of reading material do you like to read? (think of favourite authors, favourite texts, particular story genres, e.g. fantasy, adventure, science fiction, historical stories, poetry, etc.)

When you read, do you ever write at the same time?

When you play, do your games ever involve writing?

Where do you like to write best? (at home and at school)

What kinds of writing do you like to do? (think of stories, letters, poems, factual accounts, diaries, leaflets, posters, etc.)

Are there any particular subjects or topics that you like to write about?

Are there any people who have really helped you with your reading and writing?

Which parts of writing do you most enjoy? (think about getting ideas, planning, drafting, redrafting, talking about your writing with a friend or your teacher, making a best copy, publishing your work for an audience to read, reading your writing aloud, etc.)

Are there any particular aspects of writing that you don’t enjoy or that you find difficult?

What helps you most with your writing?

What do you do when you have difficulty with some aspect of your writing?

Are there any particular things in the classroom that you use to help you when you have difficulties?

Is there anything you don’t have in your classroom which you would like to have that would be helpful to you as a writer?

How do you think you learn best to be a writer? (who or what might help you?)

Does reading help you with your writing?

Are there any special texts that you have read which have been important to you as a reader or a writer? (think about texts you have read as a class, or your own or with parents/carers or friends)

How would you describe yourself as a writer? (what are you best at and is there anything you need to work on?)

Would you like to add any further comments? (Barrs and Cork 2001)
Writing Attitude Survey

1. I avoid writing. (-)
2. I look forward to writing down my ideas.
3. Writing helps me think more clearly.
4. Writing helps me understand my own feelings.
5. Writing helps me share my ideas and feelings.
6. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on my composition. (-)
7. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. (-)
8. Writing helps me to show people that I know something.
9. I like to write down my ideas.
10. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.
11. I like to have my friends read what I have written.
12. I’m nervous about writing. (-)
13. People seem to enjoy what I write.
15. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. (-)
16. People who write well are more influential.
17. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.
18. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.
19. I don’t think I write as well as most other people. (-)
20. I’m not good at writing. (-)

(-) = reverse score

(Neelands et al., 1993)
Pupil Questionnaire - Writing

Name: ........................................

Put a tick next to your answers

I like writing
☐ Stories
☐ Poems
☐ Plays
☐ Non-fiction
☐ Letters to friends
☐ Letters to people I Don’t know very well
☐ Other things (say what they are)

I don’t like writing:
☐ Stories
☐ Poems
☐ Plays
☐ Non-fiction
☐ Letters to friends
☐ Letters to people I Don’t know very well
☐ Other things (say what they are)

Redrafting
☐ I like redrafting my work
☐ I don’t mind redrafting my work
☐ I really don’t like redrafting my work

Checking
☐ I like checking my work
☐ I don’t mind checking my work
☐ I really don’t like checking my work

When my work is finished I like it to be:
☐ Kept in a special place, like a folder
☐ Put on the wall or in a display
☐ Taken home

The thing I like best about writing is:

The thing I dislike most about writing is:

(Beame, 2002)
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW AGENDA 1 & 2

I will ask you some questions and I would like you to answer frankly. I have to tell you that the questions are personal and that there is no right or wrong answer. All answers are correct. If you do not understand a question, don’t worry, ask me to explain it better.

Interview Agenda 1

1. Do you like writing?

2. Where do you like to write?

3. When do you like to write?

4. What do you like to write about at school?

5. Is there something you like to write about more?

6. Apart from doing homework when do you do any writing outside school?

7. What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework?

8. What helps you in your writing?

9. At home, do you talk about the writing that we do at school?

10. What do you feel when the teacher says “we’re going to write…”?

11. What is good writing for you?

12. What difficulties do you find when writing?

13. Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?

14. Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?

15. What can you do to become a better writer?
Interview Agenda 2

Which is your favourite piece of writing this year?

Why you chose this piece of writing?

What were you thinking while you were writing this piece of writing?

What helped you to write this piece?

In what way the story helped you? Can you explain it?

What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?
### APPENDIX 4: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Half of the time</th>
<th>Some Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How many</th>
<th>Teachers /Peers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>A lot / All the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>On time</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Take a 5-min extension</th>
<th>Fast</th>
<th>Slow</th>
<th>Hurried</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Unhurried</th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Fluency in writing</th>
<th>Enthusiastic</th>
<th>Bored</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Mood of the writer</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Resigned</th>
<th>Anxious</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Grudging</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Length of Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time taken to begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Time being on the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Time not being on the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Conversation with peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Asks Teacher for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Looking around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Toilet/Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Doing something else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reminders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Helps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Erases / Rewrites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Completion of task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fluency in writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mood of the writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Length of Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Comments**

**Analysis in Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 5: CLPE WRITING SCALE 2 (CLPE, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Inexperienced writer</strong></td>
<td>Experience as a writer may be limited: may be composing orally with confidence but be reluctant to write or avoid taking risks with transcription. Needing a great deal of help with developing own texts (which are often brief) and with the writing demands of the classroom. Relying mainly on phonetic spelling strategies and memorized words, with few self-help strategies. Seldom using punctuation to mark meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Less experienced writer</strong></td>
<td>Increasingly willing to take risks with both composition and transcription. Writing confidently in certain genres (e.g. simple narratives) and trying out different forms of writing, drawing on experience of the models available. May find it difficult to sustain initial efforts over longer pieces of writing. Mainly using language and sentence structures that are close to speech. Spellings of familiar words are generally correct, and attempts at unfamiliar spelling reveal a widening range of strategies. Using sentence punctuation more consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Moderately experienced writer</strong></td>
<td>Shaping writing in familiar genres confidently, drawing on experience of reading. Widening range of writing and taking on different forms more successfully. Aware of audience and beginning to consider appropriateness of language and style. Learning to revise own texts with support and to link and develop ideas coherently. Spellings of words with regular patterns are mainly correct and attempts at unfamiliar words show a growing knowledge of visual patterns and word structures. Using sentence punctuation appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Experienced writer</strong></td>
<td>A self-motivated writer who can write at length and is beginning to use writing to refine own ideas. Developing own style and range as a writer but needing support with the structuring of more complex narrative and non-narrative forms. Likely to be reflecting on writing and revising texts for a reader, choosing language for effect or to clarify meanings. Using standard spelling more consistently and drawing on effective self-help strategies. Increasingly able to use punctuation, including paragraphing to organize texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Exceptionally experienced writer</strong></td>
<td>An enthusiastic writer who has a recognizable voice and uses writing as a tool for thinking. Making conscious decisions about appropriate forms and styles of writing, drawing on wide experience of reading. May show marked preferences for writing in particular genres. Able to craft texts with the reading in mind and reflect critically on own writing. Using mainly standard spelling. Managing extended texts using organizational structures such as paragraphing and headings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: WRITING CRITERIA AND SCALES

3-Level criteria: Text
   Sentence
   Word

1. Text
   a. Meaning
   b. Organisation
   c. Ideas
   d. Awareness of the audience/reader
   e. Register

2. Sentence
   a. Grammar
   b. Syntax
   c. Punctuation

3. Word
   a. Vocabulary
   b. Spelling
### INEXPERIENCED WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Meaning</td>
<td>Writing does not communicate coherent meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Organisation</td>
<td>There is no evidence of clear structure. No use of paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Ideas</td>
<td>Few ideas expressed, but they are incomplete. Lack of originality. There is no sense of ownership in the adopted writing style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Awareness of the audience</td>
<td>No awareness of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Register</td>
<td>No appropriate register</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Grammar</td>
<td>Few sentences are grammatically correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Syntax</td>
<td>Sentence structures that are close to the speech. Simple sentence structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Punctuation</td>
<td>Some punctuation but seldom used for marking meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Vocabulary</td>
<td>Use of common words and phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Spelling</td>
<td>Only spelling of familiar words is correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AVERAGE WRITING**

### Text Level

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Awareness of the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Writing communicates meaning at a simple and stereotyped level.
- b. There is evidence of structure mainly in familiar genres writing. No use or inconsistent use of paragraphs.
- c. Most ideas are expressed and developed coherently. No elaboration on ideas. They still lack the signs of ownership on the writing style.
- d. Some awareness of the audience
- e. Some evidence of considerations regarding linguistic choices related to the appropriate register.

### Sentence Level

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Most of the sentences are grammatically correct.
- b. Attempts at using complex sentence structures.
- c. Sentence level punctuation is used appropriately (full stops, capital letter).

### Word Level

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Growing evidence of taking risks by using both common and less common words and phrases.
- b. Spelling of words with regular patterns is mainly correct.
**GOOD WRITING**

**Text Level**
- a. Meaning
- b. Organisation
- c. Ideas
- d. Awareness of the audience
- e. Register

| a. Writing communicates coherent meaning. |
| b. There is clear structure. Use of paragraphs mostly successfully. |
| c. All ideas are coherently expressed. Sense of ownership on the writing style. |
| d. Good awareness of the audience |
| e. Appropriate register. |

**Sentence Level**
- a. Grammar
- b. Syntax
- c. Punctuation

| a. Sentences are generally grammatically correct. |
| b. Some complex sentence structures. |
| c. Sentence and within the sentence punctuation is used appropriately to mark meaning. |

**Word Level**
- a. Vocabulary
- b. Spelling

| a. Words are used for effect and clarifying meaning. |
| b. Accurate spelling throughout the text, except for unusual words. |
### APPENDIX 7: WRITING ASSESSMENT SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>INEXPERIENCED</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
<td>Not clearly conveyed</td>
<td>Partially conveyed</td>
<td>Clearly conveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Poor organisation &amp; cohesion of ideas</td>
<td>Average organisation &amp; cohesion of ideas</td>
<td>Good organisation &amp; cohesion of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideas</strong></td>
<td>Few &amp; undeveloped</td>
<td>More but not well developed</td>
<td>Plenty &amp; well developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Register</strong></td>
<td>Violation of basic principles for kind of text</td>
<td>Basic principles for kind of text but inconsistent</td>
<td>Basic principles for kind of text. Has reader in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writer's &quot;voice&quot;</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Partial Presence</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td>Few correct sentences</td>
<td>Most sentences correct</td>
<td>Almost all sentences correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td>Simple sentences, too long, wrong syntax</td>
<td>Generally correct, some use of composite sentences</td>
<td>Correct syntax &amp; use of composite sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punctuation</strong></td>
<td>Partial, ineffective</td>
<td>Correct use at sentence level</td>
<td>Correct use also within sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>Simple words and phrases</td>
<td>Less common words and phrases</td>
<td>Effective, clarifies meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling</strong></td>
<td>Ignorance of basic grammar rules</td>
<td>Correct for words that follow rules</td>
<td>Generally correct except for uncommon words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall assessment

Rater's name: ........................................ Assessment date: ......................
### Appendix 8: Raters Consistency Check

#### Comparison of Raters’ Ratings of Written Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ratings

- **G** = Good
- **A** = Average
- **L** = Low

#### Total Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Agreement</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Agreement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consistency Factor** = \[(\text{FA} \times 100\%) + (\text{PA} \times 66.7\%)] \div \text{Total} \times 100\%

Consistency Factor = 90.29\%
APPENDIX 9: ETHICAL APPROVAL & PARENTS’ CONSENT

STUDENT HIGHER-LEVEL RESEARCH

School of Education and Lifelong Learning

Certificate of ethical research approval

STUDENT RESEARCH/FIELDWORK/CASEWORK AND DISSERTATION/THESIS
You will need to complete this certificate when you undertake a piece of higher-level research (e.g. Masters, PhD, EdD level).

To activate this certificate you need to first sign it yourself, then have it signed by your supervisor and by the Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee. Complete it on your computer (the form will expand to contain the text you enter).

For further information on ethical educational research access the guidelines on the BERA web site: http://www.bera.ac.uk/publications/guides.php and view the School's statement in your handbooks.

Your name: Christiana Christou

Degree/Programme of Study: Mphil/ PhD

Project Supervisor(s): Dr Ros Fisher

Your email address: C.Christou@exeter.ac.uk

Tel: 0035799406622

Title of your project: Investigating the relationship between drama and writing

Brief description of your research project:
Research in English-speaking countries provides evidence of the positive impact of drama on the primary school children's writing. In my own home context (Cyprus) drama is not considered to be an integral part of the Greek language lesson. In my case study research, I want to investigate the relationship of educational drama, as an
integral part of a language curriculum, to children’s writing. The focus of my investigation concerns primarily the attitudes of children to writing, the impact of drama on the quality of writing and the impact of drama on the children's engagement in the writing process. The site of the investigation will be my own classroom in Cyprus.

Give details of the participants in this research (giving ages of any children and/or young people involved):

I will be researching my whole class (28 children aged 8-9) with eight case study children.

Give details regarding the ethical issues of informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality (with special reference to any children or those with special needs) a blank consent form can be downloaded from the SELL student access on-line documents:

A little after the school opening, on September 21st, I invited my class parents to a parents’ evening, in the presence of the school Headmistress. During the meeting, I gave the parents all the necessary information that they need to know about the conduct of my research. I emphasized that the research context will neither go significantly beyond normal curriculum practice nor ‘result in any educational disadvantage’ (School of Education Ethics Policy) for children. I also explained to them that the use of drama is based on the belief of its effectiveness on children's writing development. As far as the dissemination of the research findings is concerned, I reassured them that both the anonymity of children and the school will be kept. Also that all personal data arising from the project will be kept strictly confidential. At the end of the meeting, I asked for their written consent. In parallel, I am planning to talk to the children about their role in the research and I will ask for their consent to their participation as well.

Give details of the methods to be used for data collection and analysis and how you would ensure they do not cause any harm, detriment or unreasonable stress:

Data collection & analysis methods
I will use multiple methods (see table below) in order to achieve ‘triangulation’ of methods and obtain a better understanding regarding a fuller picture of the relationship between drama and writing in the specific research context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Research Questions</th>
<th>Methods of Data Collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of drama on the quality of the writing?</td>
<td>1. Writing samples</td>
<td>1. Writing Scales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Provision for the data collection and data analysis methods

The data collection and analysis methods that I will use have been approved by my supervisors.

Third parties involved in the project will be four other colleagues who will act as raters of the writing samples of the children and all names will be removed from the writing samples. The raters will be teachers from other schools who do not know the children of my class. Writing samples will be identified only by a number. The data derived will only be used as part of my PhD study and all children and schools will remain anonymous in any publications arising from the study.

Give details of any other ethical issues which may arise from this project (e.g. secure storage of videos/recorded interviews/photos/completed questionnaires or special arrangements made for participants with special needs etc.):

I will keep my data and all related notes and results in a locked cabinet. At the end of the project all data will be destroyed, including all video and audio tapes.
Give details of any exceptional factors, which may raise ethical issues (e.g. potential political or ideological conflicts which may pose danger or harm to participants):

I cannot think of any such exceptional factors.

This form should now be printed out, signed by you below and sent to your supervisor to sign. Your supervisor will forward this document to the School’s Research Office for the Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee to countersign. A unique approval reference will be added and this certificate will be returned to you to be included at the back of your dissertation/thesis.

I hereby certify that I will abide by the details given above and that I undertake in my dissertation / thesis (delete whichever is inappropriate) to respect the dignity and privacy of those participating in this research. I confirm that if my research should change radically, I will complete a further form.

Signed:…………………………………………………………

Date:………………

N.B. You should not start the fieldwork part of the project until you have the signature of your supervisor

This project has been approved for the period: September 2005 until: July 2009

By (above mentioned supervisor’s signature):

………………………………………………………… Date:…………………………

N.B. To Supervisor: Please ensure that ethical issues are addressed annually in your report and if any changes in the research occurs a further form is completed.

SELL unique approval reference:…………………………………………

Signed:………………………………………………………… Date:………………

Chair of the School’s Ethics Committee
LETTER TO PARENTS

To: The parents of children in Class G3
Prodromos Primary School A’
Larnaca - Cyprus

Dear Parents,

Subject: Consent of parents for their children’s participation in educational research

Within the framework of my postgraduate studies to obtain a Doctoral degree from the University of Exeter (UK), I need to carry out certain research work. For this purpose, I have obtained permission from the Ministry of Education and Culture to conduct a research project at Prodromos Primary School A’.

The research concerns the teaching of the lesson of ‘I Think & Write’ through the use of educational drama. The research will include observation of the class, the completion of questionnaires by the children, interviewing the children and video recording of the lessons. The results and conclusions of the study will be submitted to the Ministry but the names of the children will be held anonymous according to the standard ethical code and practices of educational research.

I would kindly request your written consent for the participation of your child in this research.

Thanking you in advance for your co-operation,

Christiana Christou (Ms)
Teacher of Class G3

Student’s Name:……………………………………….          Date:………..…………

I consent to my child’s participation in the research:  Yes / No

Parent’s name:…………………………………………

Signature:………………………………………………
### APPENDIX 10: QUESTIONNAIRE (PART A) SPSS ANALYSIS

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>V25 - V50</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.861</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error of Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V25 - V50</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Confidence

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg post</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre - avg post</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Difficulties

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td>2.8929</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.04179</td>
<td>.19688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg post</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre - avg post</td>
<td>-.59821</td>
<td>.71796</td>
<td>.13568</td>
<td>-.87661</td>
<td>-.31982</td>
<td>-4.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Disposition

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avgpre</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avgpost</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avgpre - avgpost</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-5.31</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Perceptions

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avg post</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre - avg post</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.664</td>
<td>-1.386</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Strategies

#### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avg post</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre &amp; avg post</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>avg pre - avg post</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair</td>
<td>Paired Differences</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q1 - post.q1</td>
<td>Lower: -0.914, Upper: 0.128, t: -1.548, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q2 - post.q2</td>
<td>Lower: -0.752, Upper: 0.252, t: -1.022, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q3 - post.q3</td>
<td>Lower: -1.203, Upper: -0.512, t: -5.091, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q4 - post.q4</td>
<td>Lower: -1.036, Upper: -0.035, t: -2.197, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q6 - post.q6</td>
<td>Lower: -0.307, Upper: 0.735, t: 0.844, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q7 - post.q7</td>
<td>Lower: -0.363, Upper: 0.006, t: -1.987, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q8 - post.q8</td>
<td>Lower: -0.986, Upper: -0.157, t: -2.826, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q9 - post.q9</td>
<td>Lower: -0.639, Upper: -0.004, t: -2.077, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q10 - post.q10</td>
<td>Lower: -1.431, Upper: -0.069, t: -2.26, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q11 - post.q11</td>
<td>Lower: -0.688, Upper: 0.474, t: -0.378, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q12 - post.q12</td>
<td>Lower: -1.058, Upper: -0.014, t: -2.105, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q13 - post.q13</td>
<td>Lower: -1.448, Upper: -0.552, t: -4.583, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q14 - post.q14</td>
<td>Lower: -1.348, Upper: -0.224, t: -2.869, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q15 - post.q15</td>
<td>Lower: -0.945, Upper: 0.159, t: -1.461, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q16 - post.q16</td>
<td>Lower: -0.966, Upper: -0.034, t: -2.201, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q17 - post.q17</td>
<td>Lower: -0.853, Upper: 0.281, t: -1.034, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q18 - post.q18</td>
<td>Lower: -0.805, Upper: 0.305, t: -0.925, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q19 - post.q19</td>
<td>Lower: -1.081, Upper: -0.205, t: -3.012, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q20 - post.q20</td>
<td>Lower: -0.785, Upper: -0.072, t: -2.465, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q21 - post.q21</td>
<td>Lower: -0.894, Upper: 0.037, t: -1.89, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q22 - post.q22</td>
<td>Lower: -0.789, Upper: -0.139, t: -2.931, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q23 - post.q23</td>
<td>Lower: -0.806, Upper: 0.02, t: -1.95, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre.q24 - post.q24</td>
<td>Lower: -0.637, Upper: -0.149, t: -3.306, df: 27, Sig. (2-tailed): 0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 11: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - PART C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What helps me..</th>
<th>2. What troubles me..</th>
<th>3. What I like..</th>
<th>4. What I do not like..</th>
<th>5. I can get better if..</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before</strong></td>
<td><strong>After</strong></td>
<td><strong>Before</strong></td>
<td><strong>After</strong></td>
<td><strong>Before</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 01</td>
<td>Teacher's ideas</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Ideas/Content</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 02</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 03</td>
<td>Reading books</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Ideas/Content</td>
<td>Writing in-role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 04</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>writing in-role+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 05</td>
<td>Reading books</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>Content/paragr.+</td>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 06</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 07</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Drama&amp;teacher's notes</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 08</td>
<td>My ideas</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 09</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
<td>No understand the title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 10</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/Ideas</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>No drama/no ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 11</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Finish my writing</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 12</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 13</td>
<td>Inspiration/ideas</td>
<td>Drama/wr.sample</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 14</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
<td>No ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 15</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>think nice sentences</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 16</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. What helps me.. | 2. What troubles me.. | 3. What I like.. | 4. What I do not like.. | 5. I can get better if..
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 17</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 18</td>
<td>My ideas</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 19</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Write at length</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 20</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Think of ideas</td>
<td>Have ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 21</td>
<td>Have good ideas</td>
<td>My ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 22</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Handwritting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 23</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Have ideas</td>
<td>Lack of ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 24</td>
<td>Teacher's notes</td>
<td>Drama/ideas</td>
<td>Handwritting</td>
<td>Write at length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 25</td>
<td>Silence/thought</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 26</td>
<td>My ideas</td>
<td>Teacher's help</td>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
<td>Handwritting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 27</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>Good ideas</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child 28</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Recognise mistakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 12: SAMPLES OF TRANSLATED INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

Eliz, Interview set 1, 12th Dec 2005

I will ask you some questions and I would like you to answer frankly. I have to tell you that the questions are personal and that there is no right or wrong answer. All answers are correct. If you do not understand a question, don’t worry, ask me to explain it better.

1. Do you like writing Eliz?
Yes, I like it very much because with writing I may have more ideas, I learn new words, I improve my spelling…

2. Where do you like to write?
I like more to write at home because I have as much time as I need and I’m not in a rush and I can write a lot. At school I feel a bit anxious that I will not make it in time.

3. When do you like to write?
When I have some free time. When I finish my homework and have nothing to do, I may sit down and write something… a short story, something…

4. What do you write at home?
I read stories and write what I liked, their summary, who I want to be like, this kind of things.

5. Do you write your own stories as well by any chance?
No, I never did.

6. Where do you write your ideas about the stories that you read?
I write them on a piece of paper and keep them in a file.

7. Would you like to bring and show me what you write by yourself? I like reading what you write.
Yes, I will bring them.

8. What things do you like writing about from the ones we write at school?
About the texts that we have in the book "My Language". I like it when you ask us to write their summary.

9. I have noticed that every time you write T&W, whatever the subject, you write with enthusiasm. From all the subjects we write in the T&W book, what to you like to write about most?
I like it most to write letters when you ask us to write in the classroom. But I also like the other things that you ask us to write.
10. What helps you in your writing?
Before we start writing, we discuss it between us and you are helping us by writing some ideas on the board or we read some texts to help us…

11. What thoughts do you make before you start writing a T&W?
I think of the first things that I’ll write, how to start. If we have to write, let’s say a letter, we will write “Dear…”. The same way, when we have to write a piece of text, I think about the beginning, how I should start and in the end how I should finish…

12. At home, do you talk at all about the T&W that we write at school?
Yes, I show them to my parents and they tell me “Well done Elizabeth, very nice, keep it up”. We talk about them with my mother.

13. Do you read together what you write?
Yes, we read them and my mother, sometimes my father too, tell me where I went wrong and to watch this word…

14. Now I want you to tell me what you feel, your feelings, when I tell you: “Children, today we are going to write a T&W”.
I feel that I will do well and that I will write a lot.

15. What is good writing for you?
To have correct spelling, nice letters and good ideas.

16. Now I want you to tell me what troubles you when you write T&W.
I find it a little difficult how to start and how to finish.

17. Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?
Yes, very much.

18. How do you feel when you read out in the classroom what you have written?
I feel very proud about myself for what I write, because I read them out to the whole of the class.

19. Who in your class is a good writer and how do you know that?
Ria, Rea and Polis. Because they write neatly and in length and get good remarks from you.

20. What can you do to become a better writer?
If I follow my teacher in what she says, if I watch her spelling, pay attention and get more ideas…
1. Do you like writing Eliz?
   Yes, I like it very much.

2. Where do you like to write?
   Both at school and at home.

3. Where would you say you like it more?

   I prefer to write at school because we do drama and we have more ideas to write about afterwards.

4. When do you like to write?

   When I am at school, because we do drama every Friday which helps us get better ideas and write more.

5. What do you like to write about at school?

   I like to write interviews and letters. Also, to think of an end to a story, to make it continue…

6. What do you like writing about at home, apart from doing homework?

   I like writing poems and stories similar to the stories we say in drama.

7. Can you explain a little bit more? Can you give me an example of the writing you did so far at home?

   After we wrote “My magic box” at school I wanted to write more poems, so I asked my dad to buy me a children’s poetry book. I read a poem and then I write mine’.

8. What helps you in your writing?

   When I do not know what to write drama gives me ideas.

9. At home, do you talk at all about the T&W that we write at school?

   Yes. If I make a spelling mistake we sit down and discuss it so that I don't do it again.

10. Do you read together what you write?

    Yes, we read them almost every time with mum.

11. Now I want you to tell me what you feel, your feelings, when I tell you: “Children, today we are going to write a T&W”.

    I feel joy and enthusiasm.

    For what reason?

    Because I like writing, that’s why.
12. What is good writing for you?

To contain good ideas. To be written correctly and not have spelling mistakes.

13. What should one do or keep in mind to write a good T&W?

To keep quiet, concentrate and pay no attention to other noises… To think of plenty of ideas, to think that he will manage to write a lot and he will make it.

13. Now I want you to tell me what troubles you when you write T&W.

Nothing. Only the noise my classmates make, that is why I only write a page and a half. When there isn’t so much noise I write two and a half.

14. Do you like reading out your writing to the rest of the class?

Yes I do. I’m looking forward to reading out my writing and get the comments of my peers.

15. Which kids in your class do you think write good T&Ws?

Myself, Vivian, Andry P., Andry G. and Polydoros.

Why?

They participate and say their ideas when we do drama and they always write a lot.

16. What can you do to become a better writer?

I can become a better writer if I am more attentive in drama and listen to others’ ideas and if I read more books and write at home.

Ria, Interview set 3, 9th Jun 2006

-Which is your favourite piece of writing this year?
-The adventure of Tom Thump in the chocolate mouse.

-Why you chose this piece of writing?
-Because it had action, such a little boy to climb the stairs and climb on the table to get into the mouse. I liked the story you told us in drama and that then we took the role of Tom Thump and we write his story.

-What were you thinking while you were writing Tom’s adventure in his role?
-To write a narrative that has clever things because Tom was clever himself.

-What helped you to write this piece?
-The story, our role as Tom and when we showed with mime how he climbed down the stairs. I found also useful the dialogue that Paul (a peer) in the role of Tom had with another child who was Tom’s mum.

-In what way the story helped you? Can you explain it?
-I used words from the story in my writing.
-What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?
-Drama, because it is our first time we work with it and we have more ideas and it is like a game and I like fiction stories.

Bros, Interview set 3, 8th Jun 2006

-Which is your favourite piece of writing this year?
-The end of the story of the Blodin the Beast, when we finished ourselves the story of the Blodin the Beast from the point that stopped

-Why you chose this piece of writing?
-Because we gave our own ending to the story and because it had action and imagination and it had magical things such as Sanga’s carpet…

-What helped you to write the end of the story?
-The end of the story that we presented with our groups in drama gave me ideas.

-Can you explain how what you presented in drama gave you ideas?
-When I was writing I was thinking of what I saw in drama and what we presented with my group.

-How what you saw in drama helped you in writing?
-It helped me to write how Hosea crossed over the river and run away from Blodin. All the groups had Hosea to sit on the carpet …

-What do you prefer more, discussion or drama before writing?
-I prefer doing drama first and then writing.

-Why you prefer this way?
-Because it gives me more ideas to write. When we do drama I think at the same time.
### APPENDIX 13: TRANSCRIPT OF DRAMA VIDEO ANALYSIS (SAMPLE)

**SUBJECT:** Children in resistance  
**DATE:** 30/3/2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>FOCAL CHILDREN: Ria &amp; Chris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children sit in a circle, very quiet and attentive they listen to the teacher</td>
<td>Describes the subject, location, time framework. Assigns roles: The children become the children of 1942. Stops. She asks the children to show to their groups their reaction under the circumstances of the story. “What did you feel at that moment? I want you to work out, to think of the right expression on your face and mouth”</td>
<td>Ria and Chris are in the same team. They are listening to the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They work within their groups. They try out their frozen frames.</td>
<td>Goes round the groups, sees and discusses children’s ideas. “Time for the presentations”. She tells the children what they should note now that their classmates will be doing the presentation of their ideas. “What did the children feel?”</td>
<td>They try out their frozen frames in their groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some children finish and walk around the classroom. They eventually sit back in the circle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nik is asked but does not reply. Bros says: “They were startled”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mirka has more active participation in the group (but not in the whole class).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ria puts up her hand. Chris doesn't
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>FOCAL CHILDREN: Ria &amp; Chris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| They watch the frozen frames of their classmates and they call out the feelings of each. | “1-2-3… Freeze”  
What feelings is the child showing us? | They watch. |
| Feelings are heard – Vocabulary of feelings | “What did possibly happen? Did you understand?”  
Narration continues  
“Start making assumptions and guesses. Discuss with your team. Make 4 assumptions for the 4 given elements that were presented. I want a dialogue”  
Goes round the groups  
“We use ‘maybe’ to make assumptions” | They work in their group. Ria has the role of co-ordinator. Chris follows and co-operates for the group result. |
| They sit in small group circles and discuss All children seem to discuss about the case and activity that was assigned to them. They take the activity seriously. | “Now we pay attention to the children’s thoughts” | Their group presents their dialogue – improvisation |
| The groups make their presentations and the rest of the class watches. | | Ria starts first. She is serious: “Why is there this picture of our teacher on the wall?”  
She pauses, then continues… |
## APPENDIX 14: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE (SAMPLE)

### Name: Eliz  
**Date:** 19th Jan 2006  
**Drama Session:** Tom Thumb in chocolate cream

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Schedule No.</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Eliz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 19th Jan 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Session: Tom Thumb in chocolate cream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time taken to begin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Time being on the task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time not being on the task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Conversation with peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Asks Teacher for help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Toilet/Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Doing something else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few pauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot / All the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense / Peer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>When</td>
<td>How many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers / Peers</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>What</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Reminders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Helps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Erases / Rewrites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Review of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completion of task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion of task</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Unhurried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>S pelling/Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Going along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Take a 5-min extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood of the writer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Unhurried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood of the writer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Grudging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Committed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Writing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Length of Writing</td>
<td>2 pages (longest in class)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Further Comments
- Listens very carefully. Concentrating on explanations and guidelines given by teacher before writing starts.
- Appears to enjoy writing.
- Writes with self confidence.
- Works independently.
- Rarely asks for teacher’s help, only to make sure she is on right track.
- Works fluently for long time intervals.
- Appears proud of her writing.

### Analysis in Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Independence</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very focused on the task</td>
<td>Works independently</td>
<td>Looks to enjoy writing</td>
<td>Showing her work to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the task almost all the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few pauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts writing immediately, no time wasted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks anxious to get on with task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews work throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FLUENCY IN WRITING
- Enthusiastic
- Bored
- Indifferent
- Happy
- Resigned
- Anxious
- Committed
- Grudging
- Indifferent

### LENGTH OF WRITING
- 2 pages (longest in class)
APPENDIX 15: SAMPLE LESSON PLANS

LESSON 1

Subject: The Selfish Giant (Oscar Wilde)
Duration: 3x40 minutes
Materials: A card with the outline of a big garden drawn on it, a sign displaying “Children keep Out! Trespassers will be Prosecuted” an old overcoat for when playing the role of the Giant, music, a tambourine, a hot seat, a large sack.

AIM
Children to investigate the meaning of “selfishness” and “repentance”
Through the story of “The Selfish Giant”

OBJECTIVES OF GREEK LANGUAGE LESSON

The children to:
1. listen carefully
2. ask appropriate questions
3. follow instructions
4. react to what is happening
5. co-operate
6. describe / assess the Giant based on his behaviour and his answers during the interview.
7. write a letter in-role – about the giant’s profile based on the information available to them.

OBJECTIVES OF DRAMA LESSON

The children to investigate the giant’s character and the meaning of “selfishness” and “repentance”, through role play and drama techniques, including the hot seating and mime.

Description of Activities

1. Introduction
I show children the outline of a large garden that I have drawn on a card and ask them what they would like this garden to contain so that it is ideal for their games within it. I
write their suggestions on the card. I tell them that the garden belongs to a giant who has been away for a long time.

2. Mime / Improvisation (individually and in groups)
   I ask the children to choose their favourite game/activity without telling anybody what it is. When I give the signal, they get up and each child pretends to perform the game or activity they have chosen. After 1-2 minutes, I stop the children and negotiate with them as to where each game is taking place. This allows me to group the children according to where they wish to play. I restart the activity, encouraging the children to talk and play between them. I interact with the children to encourage their creative participation.

3. The problem is presented – the Giant!
   The children sit in a circle. I invite them to talk about the games they were playing and the things they were keen on doing inside the garden. Then, I explain that one day the Giant returned and put up a sign outside the garden. I reveal the sign that says “Children keep Out! Trespassers will be Prosecuted”. I ask the children to explain to me what it means and why in their opinion the Giant put it up. Here I stress that I did notice that the children were very careful while playing in the garden so the Giant’s reaction is not justified.

Other questions
   a. Why do you think he wrote the sign with so big letters?
   b. Can we say something to the Giant to persuade him change his mind and let us play?
   c. Can we perhaps bring him something to show him that we are friendly?
      I let the children discuss what they could possibly bring to the Giant.

4. Dramatic play – Group improvisation
   I ask the children to work in their groups and make or buy or write something for the Giant (2’). I ask a child to bring a large bag from the corner of the garden. The child gets the bag and passes in front of the other children who place their gift in the bag, while they call out what it is. Then, 2 children place the bag with the gifts in front of the Giant’s door. I ask 2-3 children to show me with their faces how happy the Giant would be when he sees their presents.
5. **The teacher in the role of the Giant**

I tell children how the Giant came to the door and saw the bag with no sign of the children who were hidden. Then, taking on the role of the Giant (I put on the overcoat) I speak with a coarse voice taking out a few of the things the children put in the bag. Without showing any pleasure, I put them back and shout to the children that I am not interested in their gifts and that I am not going to change my mind. I also tell them that the garden is mine and they are not welcomed. I finish by saying: ...*And with these words the Giant banged the door closed.*

6. **The Giant on the “hot seat”**

I tell the children that they will have the opportunity to interview the Giant to find out his real character. I help the children to think of questions for the interview. I take on the role of the Giant and sit on the hot seat. I am abrupt and try to act the Giant’s character.

7. **The Giant's profile – group writing activity**

I tell the children: “Now that you have seen and interviewed the Giant, I want you to think, within your groups, what you know about him and write it in the form of notes. Think of what adjectives or other words we can use to describe him from his behaviour. You have 4-5 minutes available. The secretary of each group will write and all children will contribute their ideas.”

I write the word “Giant” on a small card that I stick on the board and I give an example of how the children should work [after first asking for ideas] (eg hostile to children, he doesn’t like children [why], they are noisy, they are naughty, they will spoil his garden).

8. **Group announcement and completion of Giant’s profile on the board**

Each team announces one element they have written about the Giant’s character that has not been mentioned by a previous team. Completion of the profile on the board.

9. **Individual written work – Writing in role**

I tell the children that a new child is about to move in to the neighbourhood with his/her family, next to the Giant’s house. They, in the role of a child who knows the Giant, decide to write to the new child a note to say what they know about the Giant and warn about the Giant's behaviour. I mention that the notes on the board will be helpful.
LESSON 2

Subject: Students in resistance – Athens 1942

Duration: 2x80 minutes

Materials: The story, a Greek flag, a piece of cloth dyed with red paint, large picture-WANTED, music (Song: Accordion), cardboard for writing slogans, whiteboard.

OBJECTIVES
The children to become sensitive to historical events through the story and drama, to actively take part in activities, to use their imagination, to put ideas forward, to co-operate and present their own improvisations to the rest of the class, to write/tell their own story and actions in first person.

Activities

1. Starting point
Song: Accordion

2. Time and space framework and the problem
I tell children that today we will travel back in time and with the help of the story we will find ourselves in 1942.

Two weeks have already gone by from the time you found the proclamation of the secret organisation “The Struggle” that called on all Greeks to fight for the freedom of Greece from the Germans.

Your teachers never stopped for a minute talking to you about the right of the Greeks. Your fathers and elder brothers to take up their arms and get out on the mountains to fight against the Germans who were depriving you of your freedom.

The other day, a German officer came to your school with his soldiers and ordered the Headmistress to immediately lower the Greek flag that was waving high up on the flagpole, in the school yard. The Headmistress and your teachers refused and the Germans left in anger.
Today though, things have become more serious. When you got to your school in the morning, you found a thick strong padlock on the school gates, a huge picture of your teacher on the wall with “WANTED” written under it and the Greek flag missing from the flagpole. The Headmistress and your teachers were nowhere. After a while, a child started screaming and you all gathered near him. He had found a piece of cloth with blood all over it…

3. Freeze-Frame
“How did you react children when you saw the locked gates of your school, your teacher’s picture on the wall, the Greek flag missing and the blood soaked piece of cloth?”
“Can you make up a freeze-frame that expresses your feelings?”

4. Group improvisation
“What did possibly happen? Did you understand what happened? With your group you started discussing and speculating on what might have happened.”

Children in their groups improvise their dialogue. Two groups present their dialogues to the rest of the class.

3. Class Meeting in-role
“We must do something, we cannot stay with our hands crossed” (said the school president). We must all think, we will not allow the Germans to shut our schools down and us to stay illiterate and forget our history, that our land is Greek and belongs to the Greeks and not the Germans. And do not forget the blood soaked piece of a shirt we found. Whom does it possibly belong to? We must do something. Do you have any ideas?”

The children sit in a circle and describe their ideas to the class.
[“Let us write slogans on the walls of the school and our neighbourhood, take Greek flags and do a demonstration outside our school, shout slogans, throw stones at the Germans, secretly put up another Greek flag on the flagpole, show the Germans that we are not afraid of them, go secretly to the school without the Germans knowing…”

4. Group improvisation
“Actions” are decided by the children who are split into groups by their president (teacher in-role) and each group undertakes to discuss and present its actions to the rest.
5. Think & Write/Writing task
Return to the present time. Today more than sixty years have passed since that day of April 1942. The children of those days have now grown and today they are over seventy years old. What do they possibly tell their young grandchildren about their own fight for the freedom of our Greece? Tell your story, starting from the time you found your school locked up.

LESSON 3

Subject: Blodin The Beast (by Michael Morpurgo)
Duration: 3x40 minutes
Materials: The story-book, music

Activities

1. Introduction to the story
I tell children that today we will travel to the story-land. Using the book, I show the kids the double page with the picture on it before the start of the story. The picture shows Hosea and Sanga looking at each other. I ask the children about the 2 characters including their gender (Hosea looks like a woman, I wonder why?), without telling them anything else other than Hosea’s name.

Then I read the first 2 pages of the story. The first page talks about Shanga and his remarkable will not to submit to his enemy Blodin and the second refers to the villagers and their panic. It ends with their requests to Sanga to surrender to Blodin and his enigmatic refusal: “I will stay here. I have my carpet to finish”

Page 1
Blodin the Beast, destroyed the whole world. He was drinking only oil and was blowing only fire from his mouth. When he roared, the whole earth was shaking and all the people were trembling with fear. Town after town, village after village, he demolished everything. Blodin the Beast spread panic and destruction everywhere.

“I will stay” Sanga told them again. “I have my carpet to finish”.
2. Creating the chant of the Slaves
   I read again with suitable style the first paragraph, phrase by phrase. The children
   repeat after me. Then I ask them to tell me what Blodin did, starting with the phrase
   “Blodin the Beast…”. For example: “Blodin the Beast was drinking only oil”.

3. Team movement
   I ask children to study the picture to find out how Blodin can move. I note the words
   they say. I assign the kids to their groups (4-5) and ask them to create their own Blodin
   who moves according to their assumptions. I challenge them: “Can you somehow join
   your bodies together to achieve this?”

   Group presentation accompanied by music.

4. Why doesn’t Sanga come with us? Team improvisation.
   Children take on the role of the villagers and discuss Sanga’s decision between them.

5. How can Sanga be persuaded?
   I say that the villagers decided to go and find Sanga to try and persuade him to change
   his mind and leave with them at this difficult time. The kids discuss about their
   arguments to Sanga and the way they should say goodbye in the case he does not
   change his mind.

6. Teacher in-role. Dialogue between villagers and Sanga
   The children, in the role of the villagers, try to persuade me (in the role of Sanga) to
   leave. I continuously refuse, with the excuse that my carpet is so important, that I know
   many truths and that evil will not win, that I am not scared of Blodin and that I will stay
   to finish my carpet and they should better leave so that the beast does not get angry.

7. Think & Write/Writing task
   The villagers try to persuade Sanga to leave with them to save himself from Blodin.
   Think and write a script of a dialogue between the villagers and Sanga.
LESSON 1: THE SELFISH GIANT - Part A

Extracts from researcher's log:

This is the first one of a series of three drama sessions based on Oscar Wilde’s story of 'The Selfish Giant'. I chose this story as a foundation for drama work for two reasons: first because there were extracts of the story in the children’s Greek textbooks and therefore it was aligned with Greek Curriculum language and moral objectives and second because ideas for constructing drama activities based on this story were available in Joe Winston’s book: ‘Drama and English at the Heart of the Curriculum’ (2004, p.56-67). Given that I was a fairly new teacher to working with drama pedagogy I was deliberately trying to base, as much as possible, the design of my drama lessons on the work of educational drama specialists. So, for this particular lesson (after ensuring that the kind of drama activities were appropriate for this year group) I almost followed exactly the outline and activities suggested in Unit 1, with only a few differences (Winston, 2004, p.58-60).

My aims for this particular drama lesson were that the children should a. explore character and issues through a range of dramatic conventions including role-play, mime, hot-sitting, tableau and b. create and sustain an appropriate atmosphere through the use of sound and movement.

My aims for the follow-up writing were that the children should a. write the Giant’s character profile and b. (as an extension of a) to write a letter in-role of a child in the Giant’s garden based on the profile of the Giant.

What follows is the description of a part of the drama session as recorded in the video. This part concerned the activities (e, f, g and h in the lesson plan) that mostly related to the writing task that followed the completion of the drama.
e. Teacher in role as the giant
The teacher in the role of the Giant comes to the door and sees the sack with the children’s presents. Then, as the giant, talks in a grumpy voice, takes out three of the actual presents the children put into it (in the previous exercise) and throws them back into the sack calling out to the children ‘Ha! You’re trying to cheat me with your presents! So you think! I am not interested in your presents. It is MY GARDEN, NOT YOURS! I will not give up! Never! Go away!’

Out of role the teacher calls the children to stop hiding and come back to the circle. She asks them to tell her (being in the role of children in the Giant’s garden) how the giant reacted? Children’s responses were:

- He was really furious!
- He thought that we were trying to cheat him.
- He talked to us in a very bad manner.
- He was teasing us.
- He got really upset.

f. Hot seating the giant
The teacher tells the children that they have the chance to interview the giant to find out what sort of character he really is. The children in the circle think of possible questions and contribute/share their ideas with the class. Then, the teacher takes on the giant’s role and the children hot-seat her:

**Teacher in role:** What do you want to ask me? I do not have time for you! I am very busy! Come on! Ask me your questions now! As soon fast as you can…

**Child:** You traveled back home with the plane?

**Teacher in role:** YES! YES! YES! Silly question! Why did you ask?

**Child:** You are big! How do you put yourself inside?

**Teacher in role:** As you probably don’t know there are special planes for giants only! HA! HA! HA!

**Child:** Why don’t you let us play in your garden Mr Giant? We’ve been very careful and we never caused any damage.

**Teacher in role:** The garden in MINE! Only MINE! Got that?

**Child:** But you can play with us as well. Do you know that?

**Teacher in role:** Ha! What games can I play with you? I AM A GIANT!
**Child:** Why don’t you let us play in your garden? Why are you so mean with us?  
**Teacher in role:** I am not mean at all! It is MY GARDEN and I can do whatever I like!  
**Child:** But we are neighbours of yours Mr Giant! The rest of the neighbours let us play in their gardens! Why don’t you?  
**Teacher in -role:** I do not want ANY KID in my garden! ANY!  
**Child:** How would you feel if you were in our position? If we had a garden and we wouldn’t let you play in it. Would you like it?  
**Teacher in -role:** I haven’t thought of this and I don’t want to! Next question, the final one!  
**Child:** Why did you throw away our presents?  
**Teacher in -role:** As I said yesterday, I am not interested in your presents. I’m not changing my mind! You are not welcome in my garden! Never!  

g. Writing activity-character profile  
The teacher asks the children to think (within their group) of what they know about the giant, what they have learned from the hot-seating and make a feather map. The teacher creates a feather map on the board and gives children an example of how it can be used to create a character profile (based on the word ‘horrible’). ‘The giant has been horrible with us. He spoke to us very badly.’  
The children work in their groups and then share their feather maps with the rest of the class while the teacher notes on the board what children say. At the end of this activity the following character profile of the giant was created on the board.
THE GIANT’S PROFILE

GIANT

Wild Horrible

Rude and abrupt

Irritable Gets angry easily

Selfish Wants everything to himself

He does not allow us to play in his garden

He was away for 7 years

Huge in size

Bad mannered

Hostile with children
h. Writing in-role
The children in the role of a child in the Giant’s garden write a letter to a newcomer child to the neighbourhood, to let him/her know and warn him/her about the giant’s behaviour.

Extracts from researcher’s log

This drama session went quite well and I feel quite happy after its completion. The children were concentrated; they participated with enthusiasm and were co-operative, worked well in their groups and with the teacher either in or out of role. The elements of story and fiction seemed to be attractive for the children who had the role of the children in the Giant’s garden. The fact that they had a familiar role to them I think made easier the development of this drama session…

Comments on the activities

Hot-seating the giant
When they hot-seated the giant the children (as a whole class) adopting appropriate register and language came out with questions very relevant to the situation. Maybe I can build on this activity in the next session and ask from the children to write a script…

Writing activity-character profile
I should have allowed more time for the development of this activity in children’s groups, given its direct relation to the following writing task. Had I given them more time to reflect on what happened in the story and then negotiate and come up with the giant’s profile would have been more helpful for their subsequent letter-writing.

LESSON 2: CHILDREN IN RESISTANCE

Extracts from researcher’s log:

This drama session/lesson was designed by myself as part of a larger cross-curricular project based on Greece’s second world war history and more precisely about Greece’s invasion by Italy in 1940 and the German occupation that followed. In particular this unit
was designed to be used as an introduction to the Greek language texts that concerned
the contribution of children and young people to the fight for freedom in the years of
German occupation. Its planning was based on historical evidence.

My aims for this particular drama unit were that the children should a. learn through their
drama lived experience historical events about children’s involvement and contribution in
the years of occupation, by co-operating, making hypotheses and suggesting ideas,
through a range of dramatic conventions including storytelling, tableau, group
improvisation, teacher in-role and class meeting in-role.

My aim for the follow-up writing was that the children should write in-role and narrate the
story as they would live it in the drama.

What follows is the description of a part of this drama unit as recorded in the video. This
part concerned the activities 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the lesson plan (Appendix 15) that mostly
related to the writing task that followed the completion of the drama.

Description of Drama Activities

3. Tableau
The teacher asks the children to take the role of the children in the story and think of their
reactions to what they saw and, in their groups, make a tableau to show their reaction(s)
(see activity 2, storytelling). The children work in their groups and try out their tableaus.
They are reminded by the teacher that they have to work on their facial expression and
body posture. Teacher goes around the groups and watches and discusses children’s
ideas. She gives the signal and everybody goes back in the circle. The teacher explains:
‘Now every team will present its tableau. The rest of you please watch carefully your peers’
tableaus because after each tableau we will discuss the feelings that each tableau
represents. With the signal ‘1, 2, 3 …freeze’ the first group stands up and presents its
tableau twice. The class then discusses the feelings that are presented: ‘Children are
surprised’, ‘Children are frightened’. Before the next presentation teacher tells children that
they have to be as serious as they can because of their role’s demands. In the next
presentation the teacher challenges class to watch every child in the tableau and tell their
feelings: ‘What is Dia’s feelings? Children’s response: ‘Surprised’ ‘Where is she looking do
you think?’ Children’s response: Looking at the place where the flag was’. Feelings are
discussed in relation to children’s facial expression and body posture. Suggestions are made by children about how the tableau would be even better.

4. Group improvisation-Making hypotheses

Second Group's improvisation:
_ Why is the gate locked?
_ Maybe the teacher locked it.
_ And this photo of our teacher on the wall?
_ Maybe the Germans put it there.
_ Whose might be this piece of cloth with blood on it?
_ Our teacher’s maybe?
_ Where is the flag? Who took it away?
_ Maybe the Germans who came yesterday to our school and asked the teacher to get it down.

At this point Teacher gets in-role of a child and asks more question to prompt children to make hypotheses….

5. Teacher in-role & Class meeting in-role
Teacher in-role as children’s president initiates discussion about possible actions and prompts children to make suggestions:

Teacher in-role: What can we do?
Child in-role: Write slogans on the walls?
Teacher in-role: Right! Good idea Kate. I’m writing it down…What else?
Child in-role: Make a protest and call out slogans.
Teacher in-role: Very good idea Andreas! Yes, we absolutely would do that! Written down!
Child in-role: Put back a new flag?
Teacher in-role: Excellent idea Demis! But how would we do that?
Child in-role: Break the lock or jump over the gate and place the flag back.
Teacher in-role: Written down!

…

Teacher in-role: Let’s now organize ourselves in groups and every group to be assigned a different task.
6. Group improvisation
The children in their groups work out their assignments and then every task is carried out in front of the rest of the class. The first group are writing their slogans on the ‘walls’ using the board in the class. They write:
‘FREEDOM OR DEATH’, ‘GERMANS OUT OF GREECE’, ‘LONG LIVE GREECE’

The second group using mime breaks the lock of the school’s gate. The third group using mime installs the Greek flag. The third group makes a protest calling out slogans. The teacher in-role congratulates children’s actions and says that they carried out successfully their missions. She then stresses that without their team work and collaboration they would not have made it.

Extracts from researcher’s log:

3. Tableau
Children worked really well, co-operated and got in the shoes of the children in the story. They considered my suggestions and using facial expression and body posture successfully represented the characters’ feelings.

4. Group improvisation-Making hypotheses
In this activity children had difficulty in making hypotheses because they tried to remember exactly what they said (their words) in their rehearsed improvisation. After a couple of group presentations I decided to take the role of a child and take part in their dialogues. By asking them questions I helped them make hypotheses.

6. Group improvisation-Actions
It went really well, better that I was expecting.

General comments
It’s worth noting that in today’s session the activities allowed all the children to enter the story and be in the shoes of the heroes. Even the ‘low achievers’ got really well engaged in the drama work and contributed their ideas both in their group work as well as in the class work. Especially in the class meeting in-role, Mirka, Dia and Loopen were actively engaged and came up with good ideas for possible actions.
LESSON 3: BLODIN THE BEAST UNIT 1

Extracts from researcher’s log

This is the first of a series of six drama units/sessions based on Michael Marpurgo’s tale of ‘Blodin the Beast’. I chose this story as a foundation for drama work for four reasons: first because of its symbolic meanings and mainly its ecological extensions since I thought its inclusion would be ideal in a larger cross-curricular project of environmental education and awareness in which my class participated; second because it provides opportunities for cross-curricular planning and teaching; third because ideas for constructing drama activities based on this story were available in Joe Winston’s book: ‘Drama and English at the Heart of the Curriculum’ (2004, p.98-109) and fourth because I was fascinated by the tale myself. I almost followed (not strictly) the unit’s 1 suggested outline and activities (Winston, 2004, p.100-102) with a few changes.

My aims for the particular drama lesson/unit were that the children should a. explore the Giant’s character and issues through a range of dramatic conventions including role-play, mime, hot-sitting, tableau and b. create and sustain a proper atmosphere through the use of sound and movement.

My aims for the follow-up writing were that the children should write a script based upon the villagers’ dialogue with Shanga.

Description of Drama Activities

What follows is the description of a part of this drama unit as recorded on video. This part concerned the activities d and e of the lesson plan (Appendix 15) that mostly related to the writing task that followed after the completion of the drama.

d, Group and whole class improvisation

The teacher puts the class in role as villagers and asks: Why Sanga is not coming with you? ‘Do you know what he is weaving?’

First, the children in their groups, in the role of villagers, discuss ‘what is Shanga weaving?’ and the teacher goes around and helps them make hypotheses.
Then back in the whole class circle the teacher takes the role of a villager and encourages children in role to speak out their hypotheses.

**Teacher in-role:** Why Sanga is not coming with us? What is he weaving?

**Child in-role:** I am not sure what he is weaving. But Shanga is too wise an old man, and with this weaving maybe he will stop Blodin destroy our village. (Bros)

**Child in-role:** I agree with you, but I don’t know how he will manage to stop him. (Nik)

**Teacher in-role:** This is what I was thinking! How can a weaving save us? Do you think this is possible?

**Child in-role:** Maybe this is a magical weaving to help him go away from Blodin (Chris)

**Teacher in-role:** Who knows!

**Child in-role:** I do not know!

**Teacher in-role:** Does anyone know what is on the weaving? Maybe it is something on it that is so important for Shanga…

**Child in-role:** Maybe, but (with a very concerned expression) we can’t leave Shanga alone. The beast will scorch him to ashes with his fire! (Eliz)

**Child in-role:** Why Shanga wants to stay in his cave? He can make his weaving when Blodin sleeps. (Ria)

**Teacher in-role:** I have an idea! Why don’t we go and find Shanga in his cave and ask him what he is weaving and try to convince him to come with us? Can we do that?

**Class in-role:** Yes, we can!

**Teacher in-role:** Harry up then! We do not have time. Let’s go and talk to Shanga!

e. At Shanga’s cave (Strategies: Teacher in-role as Shanga & Whole class improvisation in-role as villagers)

Teacher asks children to prepare their questions for Shanga and his weaving. Then takes on the role of Shanga and she is sitting cross-legged, pretending that she is weaving Shanga’s carpet.

**Teacher in-role:** Why you came over? It is very dangerous up here and Blodin is on his way to the village!

**Child in-role:** We are here Shanga because we want to talk you.

**Teacher in-role:** What do you want to tell me?

**Child in-role:** We want to ask you to change your mind and come with us, Shanga!

**Teacher in-role:** I cannot come with you! I have to finish my weaving!

**Child in-role:** But Blodin will scorch you to ashes with his fire!

**Teacher in-role:** My life is not that important as my weaving is!
Child in-role: But your life is very important for us Shanga! Because if you die who is going to cure our children’s illnesses and who is going to support us when we have personal problems?
Teacher in-role: You can manage without me. I have to finish my carpet! My carpet is all my life!
Child in-role: You can weave your carpet when the beast is sleeping.
Teacher in-role: Blodin will not let me finish it even if he sleeps…
Child in-role: Shanga you can hide behind the stones and finish it.
Teacher in-role: Blodin will find me whatever I do to deceive the monster!
Child in-role: Can’t we help you finish your carpet, Shanga?
Teacher in-role: I have to finish it MYSELF! I started it on my own, I have to finish it on my own!
Child in-role: What about if we put a sleeping pill in his oil?
Teacher in-role: It cannot do anything to him! Oil is flowing in his veins. Sleeping pills will not work.
Child in-role: You cannot find something in your magic books?
Teacher in-role: My magical spells can do nothing to him! Only my weaving! Please go now! I have to finish my weaving!

f. Writing task
Teacher asks the children to write a script of Shanga’s and villagers’ dialogue. She illustrates with the children’s help how to write a script of the first two or three lines concentrating on appropriate stage directions.

Extracts from researcher's log

General reflections on the drama session

The story appeared to have attracted children’s interest and attention since they were concentrating and responsive during the storytelling and also willing to participate in the activities.

Comments on the activities:

Activity 1: The story book picture attracted children’s interest. They listened carefully to the storytelling.
**Activity 2:** The children seemed to enjoy this activity. They co-operated well in their groups and with my support they came up with creative and imaginative ideas about how Blodin is moving.

**Activity 3:** Rios (LAAB) was very negative in participating in this group activity. He stood up from the working circle of his group and went back to his desk seat. When I asked him why he left he told me: ‘Because I don’t like it.’ Nik (LAB,) on the other hand actively participated in the group improvisation as a child in-role and contributed: ‘I agree with you, but I don’t know how he will manage to stop him. He (Nik) has been progressively participating more and using the right register.'
APPENDIX 17: FOCAL CHILDREN’S WRITING SAMPLES

You know my friend, because I heard you are moving in nearby, I’m writing to you this letter to warn you about something serious.

In our neighbourhood lives a selfish giant (writing activity). He was staying away at a friend’s for seven years (storytelling) and me and my friends we were going into the giant’s garden playing several games (mime).

But when the giant returned, he sent us all away from his garden and did not let us play in it any more (teacher in-role). This giant wants everything for himself. He is very bad-mannered with us (writing activity).

One night we sent him a sack full of little presents (class improvisation). But the giant, when he saw our presents, told us: ‘I know that you are hiding somewhere hereby and do not think that with your presents you will make me change my mind’, told us (teacher in-role) and slammed the door (storytelling)…

…If you pass by his house you will see a sign on the gate saying: ‘Children Keep Out! Trespassers will be prosecuted’ (visual prompt).

[Eliz, G1]

Villager 1: Shanga come with us! Don’t stay here! (said with a firm tone) (hot-seating)

Shanga: (very seriously) NO, I won’t leave my cave! (teacher in-role)

Villager 2: But Shanga…The monster is very dangerous. If he finds you he will turn you into ashes with the fires that come out of his nostrils! (storytelling)

Shanga: I don’t care! I only care about finishing my carpet! (teacher in-role)

Villager 3: The carpet is more important than your life? (hot-seating)

Shanga: Villagers, I gave you my answer. I’m not coming with you! (teacher in-role)

Villager 4: If you die Sanga, what will happen to us? Who is going to give us advice on our problems? Who is going to cure our children and us when we are sick? (hot-seating)

Shanga: You can take care of yourselves. (teacher in-role)

[Eliz, G1]
My dear grandchild,

One day, when I was a child in 1941, we went to our school and we found the gate locked. We got surprised!

We broke the gate. We got inside. We found a cloth with blood on it, our teacher’s photo with a sign that said ‘WANTED’ and the Greek flag was missing from its place. We got very scared.

We spitted in groups and that night we wrote slogans on the walls and we put a new flag back to its place. The next day we did a protest and we called out slogans such as: ‘FREEDOM OR DEATH’, ‘LONG LIFE CREECE’ and ‘GERMANS OUT OF ATHENS’. Every day we were doing these things. We did not stop till our country got her freedom from Germans

[Chris, G3]

Villager 1: (begging voice [.did the kid write ‘begging voice’ or you..?]?) Shanga, please come with us.
Shanga: I have to finish my carpet.
Villager 2: If you stay here Blodin will scorch you to ashes!
Shanga: I made my decision! I will stay here.
Villager 3: What are you weaving?
Shanga: It is a carpet that I have to weave myself.
Villager 4: This carpet is magical?
Shanga: It could be I don’t know, but I think that with this carpet something will happen when I finish it.
Villager 5: Come with us and you will weave your carpet there.
Shanga: There? I wont be able to do it because we’ll be Blodin’s slaves.
Villager 6: At night you can come to your cave and weave your carpet.
Shanga: But Blodin will find out that I came over and will scorch me with his fires.

[Chris, G3]
Dear friend,
I heard you are moving to our neighbourhood. There is a giant there. He is very mean. He was abroad for 7 years.
When the giant was away we were playing many games. We were playing hide and seek, tennis, volley, basketball and football and when the giant came back he sent us away from his garden and put up a sign he wrote: ‘Children Keep Out! Trespassers will be prosecuted’.
The next day the children put in a sack some stuff and gave them to the giant and the giant saw them and didn’t take a thing. A child went and told him ‘would you like it if we were in your place and didn’t let you come to the garden?’ ‘No,’ he said. ‘Will you let us play in the garden?’ ‘No’.

See you,
With love, Nik

[Nik, B1]

My dear grandchildren,
One day, I went to my school. I saw the gate locked. Then we broke it. We saw a photo of our teacher which written underneath WANTED. We saw a cloth with blood on it. We did not find the Greek flag in its flagpole. We were thinking that the Germans put it down.
We wrote slogans on the wall: ‘LONG LIVE GREECE’, ‘LONG LIVE FREEDOM’, ‘GERMANS OUT OF GREECE’ and we did a protest calling out slogans.
At the end, although Germans were very strong we defeated them.

[Nik, B1]
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