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**ABSTRACT**

This dissertation reports on a qualitative longitudinal study that explores the original conceptualization of drama-based instruction (DBI) in the L2 classroom among ten K-12 teacher-candidates in a language teacher preparation program. It gives particular attention to two case study participants as they continued to (re)conceptualize drama-based instruction in L2 teaching/learning during diverse field experiences within the United States and Sweden. The following research questions were investigated: 1) In what ways might drama-based instruction offer a basis to L2 teacher-candidates as they work to engage in playful/learning ZPD activity with learners during field experiences in US K-12 schools and abroad?; 2) What are the challenges and affordances experienced by teacher-candidates as they attempt to orient to L2 education from a perspective informed by dramatic play?; and 3) Does L2 teacher-candidates’ use of dramatic play activities impact their perceptions of their students’ L2 knowledge and development? If so, how?

Analysis of participants’ written lesson plans and teaching reflections, along with researcher field notes of classroom observations and semi-structured interviews with the teachers revealed three major findings: 1) participants struggled to successfully commit to perspective of DBI, informed by Vygotskian principles, resulting in formal learning ZPD activity taking precedence over playful/learning ZPD activity during drama-based activities; 2) drama-based instruction ruptured traditional classroom dynamics which challenged participants’ emerging, and existing, pedagogical content knowledge; and 3) participant assumptions of students’ L2 skills, and the process of second language acquisition, affected methodological considerations when designing DBI for L2 instruction. The analysis highlights the need for specific teacher-education
in DBI for successful mediated learning to occur in L2 classrooms, and the specific challenges of orientating to methods that support a communicative-based pedagogy for L2 teaching/learning.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background and Purpose

Drama, used as an instructional strategy, takes advantage of imaginative processes that humans have participated in for thousands of years to explain, explore, and imitate cultural interactions observed in society. Drama is able to illustrate multiple beliefs, perspectives, and possibilities related to human activity (Edmiston, 2007; Enciso, 2015; Holzman, 2010; O’Neill, 1995). In addition, it has been noted that drama possesses the ability to make substantial positive contributions in the learning process by a number of scholars in the field of drama/theatre in education (Anderson, 2012; Baldwin & Fleming, 2003; Booth, 2005; Bowell & Heap, 2013; Eriksson, 2009; Fels & Belliveau, 2008; Grady, 2000; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Miller & Saxton, 2004; Neelands, 2000; Nicholson, 2011; O’Connor, 2010; O’Neill 1995; O’Toole, 1992; Verity, 1992; Wagner, 1998).

Indeed, research conducted on drama-based instruction (DBI) shows that it is able to facilitate diverse learning opportunities for a wide range of learners – including those in the process of learning an additional language (Bundy, Piazzoli, & Dunn, 2015; Lauer, 2008; Matthias, 2007; Rothwell, 2011; Ryan-Scheutz & Colangelo, 2004; Wilburn, 1992). While discussions on the role of drama in second language (L2) instruction is not new to the field of language education, (and will be extensively discussed in the forthcoming chapters of this dissertation), how teachers are educated to successfully use drama to assist the production of thought and meaning-making in the L2 teaching/learning process has yet to be fully explored.
In general, methods of L2 instruction have come and gone out of favor based on the popularity (or abandonment) of relevant theories in both the fields of second language acquisition and education (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Loewen, 2015; Lightbown & Spada, 2006). The contemporary goals of language learning, as Huhn (2012) points out, includes a “focus on various forms of communication across cultures and communities and the uses of language as a tool to acquire new knowledge” which demands “far more than just the development of grammatical knowledge” that existed in the grammar-translation paradigm of a previous language teaching/learning generation (p.163). Huhn (2012) continues:

“Consequently, preparing the language learner within this new paradigm means that the classroom teacher must be much more than an individual who imparts grammatical knowledge and orchestrates mechanical linguistic practice. Today’s language teacher must be able to assume the role of facilitator in guiding student learning, designing opportunities for interaction within the classroom and with communities beyond the classroom, and providing feedback and assistance so that learners know what they must do to progress (Shrum & Glisan, 2010)” (p. 164).

Both the ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012) and the TESOL PreK-12 English Language Proficiency Standards (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 2006) position successful communication in a variety of diverse settings as the cornerstone for L2 curriculum design. However, as McApline and Dhonau (2007) remark, “While much national attention has been given to what students should know and are able to do in a foreign language classroom, very little attention has been placed on what their teachers should know and be able to do as foreign language educators” (p. 248, emphasis added).

Challenges surrounding the implementation of a function-oriented communicative-based pedagogy for language teacher-candidates notwithstanding, DBI poses its own unique challenges for educators seeking to incorporate it into L2 instruction. There are several teacher-practitioner oriented manuals that provide a rationale for drama as a teaching methodology alongside
examples of drama-based learning strategies (e.g., Boal, 1992/2002; Edmiston, 2014; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Maley and Duff, 1982; O’Neill, 1995; Saldaña, 1995; Siksa, 1958; Spolin, 1986; Van de Water, McAvoy, & Hunt, 2015; Wagner, 1976; Ward, 1947; Way, 1967). While these texts have been valuable for introducing drama into educational settings, they largely fail to address what Wagner (1998) has called the crisis in drama education research; that is to say, “There has not been a huge tolerance in educational drama research of the evolving understanding that teachers develop when a new pedagogical structure, drama, is pressed into their practice” (p. 223). To explain, drama in education necessitates a radical paradigamic shift in how the student-teacher relationship is conceptualized if used in the language learning process. As Maley and Duff (1982) caution:

“The [drama] activities cannot work unless there is a relaxed atmosphere. Rearranging the layout of the room will help, but you will also need to alter the students’ idea, and possibly your own, of what the teacher is there for. You will no longer be the source of all knowledge nor the sole arbiter of what is ‘right’ and ‘wrong,’ ‘good’ and ‘bad.’ Your main function now is to set things in motion; you are, to use the French word, the ‘animateur.’ You should ensure the students understand what you want them to do, then step back as far as possible from what is happening, controlling but not directing” (p. 22).

Unlike other approaches of L2 instruction that were born with an emphasis on habit formation rooted in a behaviorist philosophy, DBI serves to rupture preconceived notions of just how and in what ways the teaching and learning of new, academic concepts take place for those involved in the educational process. Van de Water et al. (2015) warn: “Doing drama can feel like organized chaos” (p.4). This feeling may derive from current curriculum and instructional practices in U.S. K-12 contexts that tend to place value on the creation of predetermined end products within physical environments that reflect top-down approaches to order and discipline. In contrast, the fine arts (including the disciplines of drama/theatre, music, movement/dance, and the visual arts), in their roles as symbolic instructional tools, may hold the potential to offer
individuation that allow for dynamic, dialogic, and transformative relationships between teachers and students to emerge in otherwise teacher- and administrator-driven learning environments.

These relationships forged through DBI may serve as a foundation for the formation of unique playful/learning Zones of Proximal Development (ZPDs) that support language learning in the classroom. The ZPD is a dialectical concept of instruction first discussed in the work of the Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky during the early part of the twentieth century and before his untimely death at the age of 37 from tuberculosis in 1934. As Edmiston (2007) briefly explains:

“In every social situation, Vygotsky (1978) theorized that all people (including those with impairments) create ZPDs, which lie between their actual level of development and a potential level of development that shifts or becomes possible with the guidance or cooperation, of an adult or more capable peer” (pp. 338-339).

As will be discussed in further detail in chapter two, the ZPD and Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory, breaks from a causal and linear approach to learning, instruction, and development. As Verity (1992) explains, “At all times as the learner and knower move through the learner’s ZPD, restructuring goes on... at any given moment, the learner and knower are to be found in a semiotically-constructed, temporarily-shared relationship that is entirely open to change. Thus, learning is seen to be crucially social and crucially indeterminate, since it relies on the construction of numerous, yet temporary, versions of ‘reality,’ which can be simply defined as the task at hand” (p. 68). Edmiston (2007) makes the claim that the “playful situations of drama open up possibilities for adults to collaborate with children” and that “fictional situations create what Vygotsky (1967) conceptualized as ‘zones of proximal development,’ where ‘a child is a head taller’ and where the often-hidden potentials of children can be revealed” (p. 338).

For Holzman (2009, 2010), actualizing the ‘head taller’ experience for individuals outside the realm of early childhood and into other stages of life opens the door for limitless potential especially through drama or performance-based activity. Holzman (2009) sees performing “in the theatrical sense of the word” as having:
“similarities to the pretend play of early childhood in which children are doing what is familiar to them and, at the same time, doing things that are brand new, things that are beyond them…we let very young children perform ahead of themselves – speaking, drawing pictures, reading books (and much more) before they know how. This performing kind of play and these spaces for performance are essential to development and learning – not only in early childhood but for all of us at all ages. Development, in this understanding, is the activity of creating who you are by performing who you are not…and Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development is not a zone at all, or a societal scaffold, but an activity – simultaneously the performance space and the performance” (pp. 18-19).

These important assertions take into consideration the dynamic relationship that exists between learning, drama, and cognitive development – a relationship that warrants further investigation in the field of language teacher preparation. L2 teacher-candidates, and language learners alike, are engaged in an ongoing process of becoming in the language learning classroom as they participate in activities that are brand new to them. Holzman (2009) explains that “Vygotsky’s attempt to create a dialectical conception of human development (the activity of becoming) and a dialectical methodology for studying it (tool-and-result) reframes the question of human development in such a way as to embrace its paradoxical nature: How can something be both what it is and what it is not?” (p. 17). L2 teacher-candidates find themselves engaged in such a paradoxical dilemma while in enrolled in teacher-preparation programs. They are positioned as being in the process of becoming professional language educators (subject to institutional and socio-political expectations and demands) as well as highly knowledgeable multilingual language users. At various occasions, L2 teacher-candidates must embody and perform both of these roles while participating in student-teaching field experiences. They are simultaneously being and becoming professional language teachers with in-depth knowledge and skill in the target language being taught.

This process becomes further complicated when looking at U.S. national language teacher preparation programs that place particular emphasis on translating the previously described ACTFL and TESOL standards into relevant pedagogical practice wherein
contextualized communication is advocated as being central to L2 curriculum design. For many L2 teacher-candidates, the approach to language teaching/learning taken by the ACTFL and TESOL standards, and how it has impacted L2 pedagogical decision making, is a radical departure from their personal experiences as a language learner in the world language classroom. Teacher-candidates that were predominately exposed to instruction in the world language classroom – as language learners – that emphasized grammatical form over communicative function through rote memorization and didactic teaching methods might experience difficulty (re)orienting to a set of educational standards that now ask them to privilege meaning over form through interactive, student-centered activities; activities they may never have participated in as language learners but are now asked to endorse in student-teaching field experiences by their teacher-preparation program. To this end, DBI – with its unique potential to be used to create meaningful playful/learning ZPD activity where educators and learners alike are invited to perform beyond their current abilities – might offer a fundamental reorganization of how teacher-candidates orient to their practice as emerging L2 educators attempting to promote communicative-based standards of language teaching/learning.

1.2 Research Questions

In order to exploit the potential benefits DBI might provide L2 teacher-candidates, it is important to first investigate the complicated, multi-faceted process of encouraging teacher-candidates to first (re)conceptualize and then implement Vygotskian-informed DBI in the language learning classroom to create playful/learning ZPD activity. Thus, this study explores the original conceptualization of DBI in the L2 classroom among ten K-12 teacher-candidates in a language teacher preparation program. It then focused on two case study participants as they continued to (re)conceptualize DBI in L2 instruction during diverse field experiences within the
United States and Sweden. (The exact process of participant selection for further case study analysis will be explained in more detail in chapter three.) To this end, the specific research questions pursued in this dissertation included the following:

1) In what ways might drama-based instruction offer a basis to L2 teacher-candidates as they work to engage in playful/learning ZPD activity with learners during field experiences in US K-12 schools and abroad?

2) What are the challenges and affordances experienced by teacher-candidates as they attempt to orient to L2 education from a perspective informed by dramatic play?

3) Does L2 teacher-candidates’ use of dramatic play activities impact their perceptions of their students’ L2 knowledge and development? If so, how?

Using a longitudinal, qualitative case study approach (to be discussed in further detail in chapter three), these questions were designed to capture a comprehensive description of the teacher-preparation process undertaken by L2 teacher-candidates as they attempted to incorporate DBI in their instructional practice.

1.3 Research Position Statement

The basis of this proposed research study emerges from my previous experiences with drama and education. I was initially trained as a professional actor and hired by the Walnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia as one of four Dorothy Haas Acting Fellows. Along with many other responsibilities in this position, I was trained (using an apprenticeship model) to work as a teaching artist in local schools and other various institutions, within an hour of Philadelphia, in order to implement DBI at sites of learning. During my experiences as a teaching artist, I began to count myself amongst a growing number of educators who have found the use of drama activities in the classroom opening up unforeseen possibilities of learning for a diverse range of students.
In particular, during my time as a professional teaching artist, I found that many children whose learning experiences involved the process of acquiring English as an additional language and becoming socialized into an English-medium environment seemed particularly affected by the opportunities drama afforded them. On more than one occasion, I witnessed children who were English Language Learners (ELLs) appear to be afraid to discuss the language-, culture-, community- and family-related social practices available to them outside of school. I felt their embarrassment and their struggle with being seen as culturally different from what they assumed many of their teachers expected of them. Cultural misunderstanding and miscommunication between children who were ELLs and educators seemed to be prevalent in many of the classrooms I visited and could result in scenes of tension and frustration.

Yet, when creative drama was infused into lessons many children who were ELLs and their monolingual peers became attentive, excited, and enthusiastic about learning. I became particularly aware of how several ELL students were often able to transform from silent to active participants in the learning process and become valued members of the classroom community through the use of creative drama practices. Many learners began to see their diverse worldview perspectives not as deficiencies but as resources to share with their fellow peers and educators.

Later, while pursuing my secondary teaching certification and immersed in my student teaching experience, I engaged in an inquiry-based qualitative research project to see how learners would take up drama-based activities during a unit on Romeo and Juliet. I implemented drama techniques I had refined at the Walnut Street Theatre into both an intermediate ESL (English as a Second Language) class and a ninth-grade advanced English course.

To be frank, I found the position of a student teacher constraining. As a teaching artist, and an independent contractor, I had followed the rules and procedures of the school where I was placed, but I had none of the institutional pressures that current classroom teachers experience (such as a need to cover a large range of curricular objectives in a limited period of time, provide
measurable/quantifiable evidence of student learning and achievement, defend particular pedagogical choices, etc.) As a student-teacher, I was removed from my ideal teaching position I held as a teaching-artist and placed into the realistic accountable shoes of the public-school teacher.

Additionally, I quickly realized that a student-teacher must strike a balance between their personal philosophy of how teaching/learning takes place in the classroom against the beliefs of their co-operating in-service teacher. During my time implementing DBI in both the ESL and ninth-grade English classrooms, I became acutely aware of the important methodological negotiations that must occur between pre-service and in-service teachers when designing learning strategies for lesson plans. I was a guest in my co-operating teachers’ classrooms, yet I struggled at times between what research told me were ‘best practices’ and what I saw being employed in the classroom.

That is not to say that what I witnessed were not ‘best practices.’ The methods employed by my co-operating teachers, from their point of view, were indeed ‘best practices’ as they saw and understood the social configuration and needs of their learners. However, I felt an inherent power imbalance between the role of the pre-service teacher and that of the in-service teacher whereby the in-service teacher, by virtue of experience, was deemed “the expert” and the pre-service teacher “the novice.” It was a uni-directional learning process despite my recent exposure with current research on teaching methods and the prior pedagogical experience that I brought with me to the classroom.

In addition, I experienced the complex emotions that can occur when engaging in DBI activities with students for the first time in a student-teaching setting. As a well-trained educator in the fields of both drama and second language learning, I had moments of hesitation and anxiety when developing and engaging in drama-based lesson plans with my students. I feared that I might ‘fail’ in the eyes of my supervisors, that I may not be taken seriously as a competent
teacher, or that the students would not take to the drama-based lesson and I would be left scrambling for alternative instructional activities to meet pre-established learning objectives.

Despite these troubling circumstances, the results of the inquiry-project were overwhelmingly positive in both classes with students remarking that they enjoyed the opportunity to engage in DBI, get away from their desks, and experience the text in physical form. While the positive results of using DBI were encouraging, this experience also helped me to see first-hand the institutional, situational, and emotional constraints placed upon teacher-candidates that may serve to influence their experimentation with particular teaching techniques or their perspective on what learning strategies are valued as practical classroom endeavors.

Certainly, as will become apparent within the pages of this dissertation, the teacher-candidates in this language teacher preparation program experienced similar instructional and self-imposed constraints as I did when they attempted to gain an understanding of DBI that would allow them to integrate it in a meaningful way throughout their pedagogical practice. These constraints ranged from navigating their personal philosophies of education and second language acquisition with supervisor expectations when preparing lesson plans, to anxiety over losing control of the classroom while teaching, to experiencing moments of imposter-syndrome in viewing themselves as competent teachers and users of the languages being taught. These similarities in experience force me to acknowledge that the personal narrative and perspectives I recount here affect the interpretation of the data collected during this study and serve to provide me with a more dynamic perspective regarding the participants’ methodological considerations and pedagogical decisions made during diverse field experiences in language learning classrooms.
1.4 The Significance of the Study

With an increasingly linguistically diverse society in the United States (Garcia & Kleifgen, 2010; Greenfader & Brouillette, 2013), L2 educators, whether working with language-majority or language-minority learners, must be prepared to engage their students in innovative ways to facilitate their grammatical, communicative, and symbolic competency skills. For that reason, teachers, teacher-educators, education administrators, policy makers, academic curriculum publishers, and caregivers of multilingual children are only a few of the many people who may benefit from becoming aware of the affordances and challenges faced in implementing DBI in today’s language learning classrooms.

On a broader level, this dissertation aims to strengthen our understanding of the complex factors involved in L2 teacher preparation by focusing specifically on the unique journeys of two L2 teacher-candidates, from an original cohort of ten participants, as they attempted to (re)orient their conceptual approach to how DBI can be used in classroom settings that departs from traditional notions of L2 teaching/learning. The insights from this study, and the specific study recommendations, should be of value to the field of world languages education, TESOL, PK-12 education, applied linguistics, and other related fields.

1.5 Dissertation Overview

Chapter two begins by orienting the reader with the field of drama in education through an in-depth discussion of recent research trends in drama as a classroom teaching/learning strategy that impact contemporary pedagogical practices. Following this, a theoretical argument is put forth – grounded in Vygotskian socio-cultural theory – that provides a framework for drama’s
potential to create unique playful/learning zones of proximal development in general education settings, and in the field of L2 teaching/learning.

Chapter three proceeds to foreground the methodological considerations of the study’s overall design, the contexts in which the research took place, the selection of participants, and the exact procedures undertaken for data collection and analysis. The study’s validity and reliability as well as its overall potential for generalization is also addressed. In addition, an overview of the coursework completed in the participants’ L2 teacher preparation program is presented.

Chapter four provides contextualizing information by illustrating how the ten participants in the world languages cohort, from which the two case studies described in this dissertation were selected, became introduced to DBI strategies during their first methods course and how they were asked to (re)orient their approach by incorporating Vygotskian principles of socio-cultural theory. Chapters five and six then proceed to present the experiences of each case study participant during their elementary field experiences. Chapter seven follows the case study participants as they continued their teacher-preparation, and use of DBI, abroad in north-central Sweden. These data analysis chapters provide detailed accounts of each participants’ socio-cultural and language learning background as well as thick descriptive reports of their attempts in using DBI in the L2 classroom over the final two years of their teacher preparation program in each field experience setting.

Chapter eight synthesizes the results of both case studies and addresses the relevant findings in light of the proposed research questions. Implications for language teacher preparation, L2 pedagogy, and language teacher education, are subsequently addressed. The chapter concludes the dissertation with an acknowledgement of the study’s limitations and proposes suggestions for future research directions.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter serves to familiarize the reader to the central concepts that guide this dissertation study. It opens with a definition of drama that will be used in this research by contrasting it with its more formal counterpart: theatre\(^1\). It then provides a brief overview of the three main approaches that have historically been used by educators when incorporating drama into classroom instruction (i.e., linear, process, and hybrid design). Next, drama’s antecedents in the play behavior of early childhood is explored with particular attention given to play’s role in leading cognitive development as discussed in Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory. This is done in an effort to theorize DBI’s potential to create unique playful/learning zones of proximal development activity.

Following this discussion, an argument is then formed, rooted in Vygotskian socio-cultural theory, that advocates for a particular approach in using drama as an important instructional tool by those in the field of education, and more specifically, for those working within the field of L2 teaching/learning. Accordingly, specific Vygotskian-informed criteria for DBI to support playful/learning ZPD activity is put forth that theorizes a unique drama-based teaching methodology rooted in socio-cultural theory. Finally, broad research trends in drama as

\(^1\) In this dissertation, theatre is consciously written using the traditional British spelling, which ends in -re, as opposed to the -er ending found in Standard American English spelling. This is done in following the lead of Lou Bellamy, the founder and artistic director emeritus of Penumbra Theatre in St. Paul, Minnesota who professed, “It’s my feeling that R-E connotes ‘craft’ and that E-R connotes the building within which the craft takes place” (n.p., Combs, 2010).
a classroom teaching/learning strategy that impact contemporary pedagogical practices and the use of drama as a tool for instruction in contemporary L2 education will be discussed.

2.2 Definitions and Approaches to Drama-Based Instruction

Over the last fifteen years, numerous publications have discussed the concept of drama and its relevance within the contemporary classroom (Davis, Ferholt, Clemson, Jansson & Marjanovic-Shane, 2015; Holzman, 2009; Lobman, 2010; Lobman & Lundquist, 2007; Marjanovic-Shane, Connery, & John-Steiner, 2010; Rabkin & Redmond, 2004; Wakeford, 2004). However, when discussing drama for teaching/learning, it is important to first contrast it with the more formal discipline of theatre, an art form that focuses on the creation of a product to be performed for an audience (Davis, Clemson, Ferholt, & Jansson, 2015; Davis & Behm, 1978/1987; Siks, 1983; Rosenberg, 1983; Wagner, 1998; Way, 1967). While it is possible that those engaged in drama activities may produce a performative product for each other or an outside audience – akin to the goal of more formal theatrical endeavors – drama’s primary focus is on the ongoing development of participants’ socio-emotional and cognitive knowledge. In facilitation with a leader, this knowledge manifests itself through personal experience(s) and becomes actively embodied during DBI activities. DBI provides unique opportunities for diverse personal interactions in specific imaginary contexts that afford students the chance to learn, reflect upon, and define their subjectivity and selfhood in relation to others in the world.

Wagner (1998) brings attention to the extensive range of definitions and the “wide variety of activities that come under the broad terms informal classroom drama or educational drama” (p. 3). She argues that “any research review of doctoral dissertations and other research on drama is limited by the wide variety of definitions of informal classroom drama” (p. 3). Wagner (1998) includes among these terms creative drama, creative dramatics, process drama,
role drama, educational drama, or drama in education; noting that the terms creative drama and drama in education are the most frequently used research terms when referring to “improvised drama usually conducted in a classroom” (p. 5).

Likewise, Mages (2008) notes that this “multiplicity of terms” related to research on drama pedagogy is “problematic because it is often difficult for scholars to determine whether studies that use identical terms are, in fact, investigating identical constructs. Similarly, it is often difficult to discern whether studies that use different terms are, in fact, investigating different constructs” (p. 130). In an effort to dilute the already overcrowded field of labels used across academic disciplines researching drama-based instruction, this study will simply use drama or the acronym DBI (Drama-Based Instruction) to broadly refer to the use of elements of drama in curriculum and instruction.

In general, the plethora of research terms discussing instructional practices using drama can be categorized under one of two learning methodologies: linear or process-oriented drama. Linear drama involves the creation of a carefully planned sequence of lessons with specific learning objectives in mind. Typically, linear drama methods include a series of imaginative-based activities that results in a steady increase of complexity and rigor over the course of a unit or lesson; resulting in the formation of a clear beginning-middle-end cumulating pedagogical framework (van de Water et al., 2015). For instance, if a teacher’s learning objective involves having their students correctly understand and apply the Pythagorean Theorem \((a^2 + b^2 = c^2)\), the teacher might challenge the students to imagine themselves as city planners tasked with locating the most convenient venues to host a large international convention (e.g., the Olympic Games). In a culminating dramatic scenario, the students must then present and defend their findings (including how they used the Pythagorean Theorem to assist in their conclusions) to a pretend city council played by the whole class (see Vetere & Uzuner-Smith, 2018, for a more detailed version of this example).
Conversely, process-drama methods operate with the facilitator teaching from within the drama ‘in-role,’ meaning that the facilitator takes on an imaginary leadership role and plays alongside the participants in an unfolding drama. Rather than being specifically objective-oriented (with learning goals being selected by the educator in advance), process-drama methods of instruction are decidedly participant-oriented with the needs, desires, goals, and suggestions of the group taken into consideration. The connecting pedagogy then emerges from the collective interest of the group.

For example, a process-drama lesson might involve the teacher telling a class of elementary students that he/she is a king/queen and they need the students’ help to fight a dragon that has been burning trees on the edge of town because the teacher heard the students are the bravest knights that live in the area. Together, the teacher and the students (in their roles as the king/queen and knights of the kingdom) go on an imaginary quest with obstacles that must be periodically overcome. These obstacles might first be introduced by the teacher-in-role. For instance, the group might need to cross a muddy swamp to reach the dragon. To overcome this obstacle, the teacher would ask the students (the knights) for suggestions on how to solve their dilemma and then follow their solution(s). Later, the students might propose additional challenges faced by the class. Through a dynamic interactive process between the students and the teacher in assumed roles on the imaginative plane, the class is able to engage in an ongoing drama that might last one lesson or several days and explore numerous topics based on the students’ reactions and contributions to the drama. At the conclusion of the lesson, the students reflect on the process of participating in the activity and discuss topics that emerged in the drama with guidance from the teacher.

While linear and process-oriented drama methodologies have distinct features, characteristics, and accompanying teaching strategies, a hybrid methodology has emerged in many classrooms. This hybrid methodology allows educators a degree of flexibility and an
increased sense of structure when planning lessons using drama-based instruction. Educators can take into consideration their classroom dynamics and their own level of comfort as well as their overall classroom goals when deciding on which drama-based technique to employ (van de Water et al., 2015). In this way, lesson activities may be more open-ended and emergent, or driven towards the learning of a particular concept depending on the circumstances of the teaching context (i.e., space, time, institution requirements and expectations, etc.)

The ten participants originally enrolled in this research study were encouraged to use a hybrid methodology when designing Vygotskian-informed DBI lesson plans for the language learning classroom. The participants were encouraged to pre-select particular language objectives but remain open to emergent contributions provided by students during the drama activities that might provide a space for expanded, contextualized language learning to take place beyond their pre-determined standards. This topic will resurface in chapter four when the hybrid approach to incorporate DBI activities into language learning lesson plans was introduced to the participants.

While little work (and only relatively recently) has attempted to theorize DBI (e.g., Haught, 2007; Holzman, 2009, 2010), there is a much more extensive body of research concerned with imagination, creativity, and role performance during dramatic play. Currently, there does not seem to be much work that bridges these two domains (i.e. theoretical research on the developmental importance of dramatic play and uses of DBI in formal learning environments). Therefore, the next section of this chapter reviews the developmental relationship that has been explored between drama and play activity before putting forth a theoretical rationale, grounded in Vygotskian socio-cultural theory, for the use of DBI to lead cognitive development in the classroom.
2.3 The Relationship Between Play and Drama: A Vygotskian View

As might be apparent, drama methodologies (whether linear, process-oriented, or a hybrid of both approaches) focuses on humans’ capacity and propensity towards playful activity. Play as a human activity has been studied, critiqued, discussed, and theorized by a number of scholars from a variety of paradigms for centuries (Bruner, 1983; Csikszentmihalyi, 1981; Dewey, 1910, 1916; Erikson, 1963; Freud, 1963; Froebel, 1887; Groos, 1901; Holzman, 2009, 2010; Montessori, 1964; Paley, 1992, 2004; Piaget, 1962; Sutton-Smith, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978). During much of the latter part of the twentieth century research on play shifted away from its potential biological (or innate) role in human evolution and towards exploring its function in the cognitive development of young children. Indeed, Bodrova & Leong (2007) point out that several psychologists during the twentieth century put forth “some well-known views of play that include the psychoanalytic perspective (Erikson, 1963, 1977; Freud, 1966), play as social interaction (Howes, 1980; Howes & Matheson, 1992; Parten, 1932; Rubin, 1980), and the constructivist perspective (Piaget, 1951)” in an effort to highlight play’s importance in child development (p. 129). However, as Karpov (2005) points out:

“Although the most influential approaches to sociodramatic play give different explanations of the appearance of such play and its role in children’s development (Erikson, 1963; A. Freud, 1927; S. Freud, 1920/1955; Piaget, 1945/1962), all of them share one major idea. Sociodramatic play is considered to be children’s free and spontaneous activity in which they do whatever they want, liberating themselves from any rules and social pressure; therefore, adults are not supposed to interfere with children’s play” (p. 139).

Here, Karpov (2005) references ‘sociodramatic’ play in his critique of previous psychological theories of play. He puts forth an important explanation regarding Vygotsky’s conceptual understanding of ‘play’ in relation to other Western psychologists by clarifying that followers of Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory “prefer to use the term play to define children’s activity in which they take play roles and act in accordance with these roles. This activity
emerges during the third year of life, when children start naming themselves as action
performers...Children begin to use the name of the adult (for example, a mother) whose actions
they are imitating, which indicates their transition to role-play” (Karpov, 2005, pp. 113-114).

Vygotskians view the sociodramatic play activity of three to six-year-olds as the
important outcome of adult-mediated object-centered joint activities that take place during the
first and second years of life (e.g., a mother feeding a toy doll with a baby bottle, which a child
then imitates). In other words, sociodramatic play has its antecedents in the dialectic social
interactions the child has with their environment and the occupants that inhabit it; a radical
departure from previous theoretical approaches to children’s play activity that saw its emergence
in child behavior as spontaneous action. Further, Vygotsky limits his conceptualization of ‘play’
by only considering those activities that possess two necessary characteristics – an imaginary
situation and the following of rules – as play activities (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Bodrova &
Leong, 2007).

The contention that there are always rules governing play-based activities appears to have
been a unique consideration with Vygotsky (1978) arguing that:

“Whenver there is an imaginary situation in play, there are rules – not rules that
are formulated in advance and change during the course of the game but ones that
stem from an imaginary situation. Therefore, the notion that a child can behave
in an imaginary situation without rules is simply inaccurate. If the child is
playing the role of a mother, then she has rules of maternal behavior. The role of
the child fulfills, and her relations to the object (if the object has changed its
meaning), will always stem from the rules” (p. 95).

These rules, however, and how they are perceived in children’s play continues to develop
over the span of early childhood. Initially, rules take a ‘back seat’ to the imaginary situation and
the roles being enacted in play. They are implicitly understood through the behavior of the
participants in the capacity of their engagement in various assigned roles. Later on, the rules
become much more explicit in child’s play while the imaginary situation takes an implicit
position. Additionally, the roles shift from being predominately socially oriented and explicit in
nature (playing mommy, daddy, bus driver, police man, the cook, etc.) to a more implicit position (i.e., that of a player in the agreed upon imaginative context) (Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978).

Vygotsky (1978) argued that play, rather than being a reflection of a child’s current cognitive ability, is understood to be an activity that leads, rather than follows, cognitive development in early childhood (ages 3-6). The concept of a leading activity was not an idea extensively developed by Vygotsky during his lifetime, but rather a topic of inquiry that was expounded upon by members of his intellectual circle after his premature death (see Davydov, 1988, 1999; Elkonin, 1972; Karpov, 2005; Leont’ev, 1978, 1981). As Duncan and Tarulli (2003) explain a “leading activity refers to that particular activity through which the most important psychological and social changes occur during a given developmental period. These most important changes are the specific changes that prepare the child for the further challenges of the next developmental stage” (p. 272).

In its capacity as the leading activity of early childhood, play uniquely leads the child in the development of particularly crucial “neo-formations” (a term that Vygotsky uses to refer to newly emerging psychological functions), which, once mastered, changes the young child’s relationship with his/her present social situation and establishes a need for a new leading activity to continue progressing forward in their line of cognitive development. Vygotsky’s writings on play as a leading activity lends themselves to be more concerned with the fundamental cognitive development that comes about for a preschool child due to their engagement in play-based activities rather than seeing play as a pedagogical tool in their next stage of development when

---

2It is important to note here that in the field of early childhood education, early childhood has come to be commonly associated with the period of human development comprised between birth to age eight (NAEYC, 2009). In the neo-Vygotskian approach to child development (based upon but slightly varied from Vygotsky’s articulations of how a child cognitively develops) this age span is further broken down into infancy (1-12 months), toddlerhood (1-2 years of age), early childhood (3-6 years of age), and middle childhood (7-12) (Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Karpov, 2005).
play is perceived to retreat from its position as a leading activity to that of a periphery one in formal classroom learning contexts. Importantly, however, Bodrova and Leong (2007) point out that “…Vygotskians do not believe that socially oriented play disappears when children reach the age of 7 or 8. Children at 10 and 11 still play socially, but the importance of social play as the leading activity fades. As children get older, they develop more explicit rules for their socially oriented play…The older the child, the more time is spent in negotiating roles and actions (rules) and the less time is spent on acting out the script (imaginary situation)” (p. 136).

Vygotsky (1978) claimed that it was imperative to include the study of human culture and history when attempting to understand the development of higher mental functions in the human mind. If we see drama activities (and its formal counterpart theatre) as growing historically from the play activities seen in early childhood, and as defined by Vygotsky, it is possible to see it as a more structured and systematic action that allows the possibility for intentional learning to take place beyond the early childhood years (see Figure 2-1); as long as it leads the cognitive development of the next developmental stage. For Vygotsky, this next stage would consist of formal schooling during middle childhood (ages 7-12) where the ability to acquire scientific (academic) concepts takes place.

Holzman (2010) comes to a similar conclusion by arguing, “…to my way of thinking Vygotsky makes too sharp a break between playing and learning-instruction. Can’t play be the highest level of preschool development and still be developmentally important across the life span? I think so.” (p. 35). However, in order to capitalize on the benefits afforded by sociodramatic play activity outside of early childhood – in its matured form as drama activity – it is necessary to explore its potential to lead cognitive development in formal learning environments through the formation of unique zones of proximal development where purposeful mediation can take place.
Vygotsky (1978) believed all conceptual learning, including observable actions displayed during play, take place on two levels: first, amongst people (inter-psychological) and then within the individual (intra-psychological). All of the higher cognitive functions humans use originate as actual relationships between individuals. Vygotsky (1978) argued that physical (tools of labor) and semiotic tools (psychological) assist individuals in changing their physical and social environments which in turn re-positions individual relationships within the wider social milieu. Similar to “tools of labor (hammers, spades, etc.) that enormously increase human physical abilities” and serve as mediators between humans and the mastering of their natural environment, psychological tools are artificially constructed and social in nature (Karpov, 2014, pp. 16-17). Psychological tools take the form of symbolic artifacts in their external state (i.e., signs, symbols, languages, formulae, graphic devices). These socially constructed psychological tools are what cause the transition of the elementary, and Vygotsky would argue natural, processes of human cognitive functions into higher and more complex processes.

If one strips down higher mental functions in an individual, one would find the natural process lying underneath; Vygotsky maintains that our instinctual, natural processes do not disappear, however, but rather become modified and advanced to a higher degree by the cultural

Figure 2-1: Developmental relationship between sociodramatic play, drama, and theatre.

2.4 Mediation and Internalization: Creating Playful/Learning ZPDs
environment that introduces the psychological tools. Thus, psychological tools are first introduced and imbued with cultural meaning through interpersonal relations via interactions between individuals. In essence, according to Vygotsky (1978), the human mind is in a constant state of mediation whereby individuals use psychological tools, (such as language), to regulate our relationships with others and within ourselves (Karpov, 2014; Kozulin, 1998; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014).

These interpersonal interactions mediated by the psychological tool, creates a model for the process of intrapersonal behavior. Psychological tools eventually move from an external state to an internal one, a process known as internalization, that fundamentally changes the cognitive makeup of the individual. Internalization of psychological tools cannot be seen as a straightforward continually progressive action, however. It is characterized by upheavals, moments of backtracking, rapid forward progressions, and ongoing structural changes influenced by the socio-cultural environment of the individual (Karpov, 2014; Kozulin, 1998; Vygotsky, 1978). The social environment is not the framework for mental development. It is its very basis.

These two psychological components, the mediated mind and the internalization of intrapersonal behavior via interpersonal interactions, serve as essential tenets for what Vygotsky termed the aforementioned zone of proximal development. Vygotsky (1978) formally defined the ZPD as being “the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p 86). Interestingly, Vygotsky made a characteristic distinction between ZPDs that are created during play activities (as seen during the early childhood years) and those that arise out of formal (classroom) learning-instruction (dominate after age seven and pervasive throughout middle childhood and adolescence):
Though the play-development relationship can be compared to the instruction-development relationship, play provides a much wider background for changes in needs and consciousness. Action in the imaginative sphere, in an imaginary situation, the creation of voluntary intentions, and the formation of real-life plans and volitional motives— all appear in play and make it the highest level of preschool development (Vygotsky, 1978, pp. 102-103).

In reference to the formation of the ZPD in play activity, Duncan and Tarulli (2003) explain that:

“When the child is engaged in play, the social-contextual and situational supports integral to the activity enable the child to act in ways that are beyond the actual developmental level, the lower boundary of the child’s zone of proximal development, carrying out actions which are in advance of his or her everyday real-life actions. These are actions corresponding to the child’s potential developmental level, the upper boundary of the zone of proximal development. The context of play activity, then, draws the child into the zone of proximal development” (p. 277).

When Vygotsky chose to differentiate between learning experiences that occur within the context of play versus formal learning situations one might find in the classroom, Holzman (2010) argues that he “overlooked some continuity between the two ZPDs, in part because he was so concerned with learning in formalized school contexts (pp. 35-36). Holzman (2009) also asserts that “play might indeed be the highest level of preschool development, but it would be a mistake to infer from this that play’s developmental potential is limited to the preschool years” (pp. 52-53) and “that in order for learning past early childhood to be developmental, it needs to be done playfully” (p. 53). Lantolf and Poehner (2014) note that Holzman (2010) stresses play, as a leading activity of development “holds enormous potential for promoting development throughout the lifespan” (p. 157). This position stems from her

“observation that socio-dramatic play requires a collective orientation in which all participants come together and function as a social unit. It is this collective functioning that allows for the creation of new potential among members of the group in which individuals take on new roles, contribute to the group’s endeavor as they are able, and perform in ways they previously had not” (pp. 157-158).

Following Holzman’s insights, I posit that it is possible to construct play-based ZPDs outside of early childhood and into formal learning instruction environments through the use of
DBI. To do so, however, the Vygotskian criteria for a play activity and a learning activity must coalesce to guide the cognitive development of the learner. These unique playful/learning ZPDs may provide an opportunity to internalize a variety of scientific (academic) concepts – including those that guide the learning of an additional language – by performing beyond oneself through the integrated use of imagination, creativity, and meaning-making.

Citing the work of Davydov and Markova (1983) and Elkonin (2001), Bodrova and Leong (2007) outline the Vygotskian criteria for a learning activity whereby one needs:

“1) A learning task as the generalized way of acting that is to be acquired by the student; 2) learning actions that will result in the formation of a preliminary image of the action that is being learned; 3) control actions or feedback where the action is compared with a standard; 4) assessment or self-reflection action showing the learner’s awareness of what he or she has learned; and 5) motivation or the desire to learn and participate in the learning task; intellectual curiosity built into the activity so the child sees the tasks as something worthy of learning, interesting, and useful” (p. 173).

Accordingly, I assert that the criteria to form a playful/learning ZPD must involve the following four elements: 1) An explicit imaginative context; 2) Explicit roles to be assumed by participants that follow particular social rules of behavior related to the agreed upon imaginative context; 3) Creative imitation of the assumed social roles; and 4) The existence of a conflict or a need to be satisfied in the drama to provide motivation, or a desire to learn and participate in the drama, that must be solved using targeted academic concepts with feedback and self-reflection provided by the mediator of the activity. The first three requirements are derived from Vygotsky’s definition of a sociodramatic play activity while the fourth requirement comes from his outline of a learning activity. It is theorized that if a DBI strategy incorporates these requirements, learning that leads cognitive development can take place during playful/learning ZPD activity.

The criteria outlined here will be re-visited in chapter four when they were introduced to the current study’s participants in an attempt to (re)frame their approach to using DBI in the
language learning classroom. This particular approach towards implementing DBI in the
language learning classroom departs from previous ways DBI has typically been used in L2
instruction. Attention is now given to the historical and current state of drama as an instructional
strategy in the language learning classroom to advocate for the potential Vygotskian-informed
DBI might hold for L2 teaching/learning.

2.5 DBI and Language Learning

Using drama as an instructional tool in the second language classroom is not a new
phenomenon, but until recently it has remained largely under-theorized. The communicative turn
in L2 teaching ushered in scholarship that began to discuss the use of DBI as a means for
facilitating both communicative and grammatical competency in L2 situations (Dickson, 1989; Di
Pietro, 1987; Hall, Guy, Störtenbecker, & Whitaker, 1982; Jappinen, 1986; Leisher, 1984; Maley
& Duff, 1978/1982; McNeece, 1983; Pross, 1986; Smith, 1984; Stern, 1980; Stevens, 1989;
Wessels, 1987; White, 1984). Historically, drama in the L2 classroom has been viewed as a
useful way to contextualize communication, giving learners an opportunity to see why and how
language can be used to express meaning and attain needs as well as an opportunity to focus on
grammatical elements emerging from language function (see Darvin, 2015; Di Pietro, 1987; Early
& Yeung, 2009; Galante & Thomson, 2016; Nolan & Patterson, 2000; Rieg & Paquette, 2009;
Ryan-Scheutz & Colangelo, 2004).

Alan Maley and Alan Duff (1978/1982), two pioneers of drama in ESL/EFL education,
make a point to say that language teaching had divorced the cognitive features of language
(vocabulary and structures) from its affective domains (the body and emotions):

“Much has changed in language teaching, but it is still true that the conviction
that Vocabulary + Essential Structures = Language lies at the base of nearly
every foreign language syllabus. Teaching on these lines takes account of only
one aspect of the language – the intellectual aspect. But language is not purely an intellectual matter. Our minds are attached to our bodies, and our bodies to our minds. The intellect rarely functions without an element of emotion, yet it is so often just this element that is lacking in teaching material” (Maley & Duff, 1982, p. 7).

Drama, they argue, is a means of synthesizing these two features; to put the body back with the mind and recognize the situational conditions that impact language use (Maley & Duff, 1982). Indeed, at the beginning of the communicative turn in L2 teaching and learning, L2 researchers appear to have seen drama in the language learning classroom as holding initial promise in several areas including intercultural communicative competence, oral fluency, and grammar instruction (through both implicit and explicit means). However, the implementation of DBI strategies into L2 curricula did not proliferate as expected during the ensuing decades (Kao & O’Neill, 1998; Liu, 2002; Di Napoli, 2009). This may have been due to the continuing prevalence of grammatical skill-based language-as-object transmission models of L2 teaching (Kramsch, 1996; Wagner, 1998; Cummings, 2009, 2011). Belliveau and Kim (2013) note that if used in the L2 classroom today, drama techniques tend to consist of scripted dialogues which are memorized and reiterated, role-plays often devoid of meaningful context, and warm-up games (Di Napoli & Algarra, 2001; Matthias, 2007). DBI tends to be positioned as an eclectic set of instructional tools that are used to support teacher-driven L2 meaning-making (a Drama-as-Tool orientation) rather than a distinct methodological approach to govern the L2 teaching/learning process (Drama-as-Methodology).

Recently, Dunn and Stinson (2011) compared two research studies of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in Singapore who participated in a series of lessons utilizing the techniques of process drama. One study used educators well-trained and versed in process drama while the second study employed five professional development workshops for English educators on how to implement process drama. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to gauge learners’ oral-proficiency outcomes as well as teacher dispositions, Dunn and
Stinson (2011) come to the conclusion “that when drama learning experiences are planned and implemented by teachers who are concerned with, and aware of, dramatic form and are able effectively to manage the four roles of actor, director, playwright and teacher, across both the macro and micro levels of planning and implementation, that the language learning outcomes for students are enhanced” (p. 630). While admitting that their research “is by no means definitive” they raise additional, important questions regarding the training of L2 educators to use drama in the classroom: “What is the impact of the culture of teaching drama; or of teaching language? What preparation and readiness impacts on the pedagogical artistry in both domains of language and drama? And how can research be designed, implemented, and reported so that it speaks effectively to both fields?” (p. 630).

Liu (2002) echoes these questions by highlighting several challenges facing both teachers and students in L2 classrooms when implementing “these active, collaborative, essentially dialogic approaches” in a “previously traditional language classroom” (p. 15). Liu (2002) cites such challenges as learner resistance, management of the physical setting, the pace and mood of the class, and effective facilitation of the activity that enhances learning. Additionally, Liu (2002) mentions limited amount of instructional time, perceptions of drama activity as being non-rigorous, and lack of training and experience in the techniques of drama. Liu (2002) suggests that “a thorough understanding of the theory and a reasonable amount of practice is always a welcome preparation to ensure when, where, and how to maximize the potentials of Process Drama in language classrooms” (p. 17).

To address the current state of DBI use in L2 education, Belliveau and Kim (2013) conducted a literature review spanning the past two decades. Based on their findings, they come to the conclusion that the act of providing teachers with descriptions of drama techniques is not enough for their implementation to occur in the L2 classroom. Rather, they endorse increased consideration for “the challenge a number of educators face when implementing drama-based
pedagogies with learners mainly familiar with traditional, teacher-centered approaches” and suggest that “an investigation into how students and teachers perceive and react to their learning/teaching experiences with drama-based pedagogy from their own perspectives could deepen our understanding of the pedagogical challenges” (p. 18).

Yet, even if pre-service L2 educators are exposed to various approaches to DBI with ‘a thorough understanding of the theory’ and ‘a reasonable amount of practice’ in coursework completed during teacher-preparation programs, Wilbur (2007) concludes that “once in the classroom, pre-service teachers rely more on their apprenticeship of observation and beliefs than on new theoretical approaches presented in formative courses” (p. 80). However, Huhn (2012) points out that “…empirical studies are limited in the area of documenting how a pre-service foreign language teacher develops from a student to an experienced teacher” (p. 171).

Watzke (2007) and Wilbur (2007) each argue for longitudinal studies looking into the process of L2 teacher development. Huhn (2012) expounds upon this call by arguing for an inclusion of “studies that show the effects of strong teacher education programs on teachers and their students as they gain experience in the classroom” (p. 177). Recent L2 Vygotskian research has conceptualized teacher preparation as praxis, wherein abstract theoretical knowledge of learning is brought into contact with concrete experiences in classrooms and pre-service teachers dialogically reflect upon their efforts, evaluate successes, and reorient for the future (Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). Following this line of inquiry, insights into the internalization process of specific pedagogical content knowledge (the use of Vygotskian-informed DBI) for L2 educators may result in valuable developments in teacher preparation.
2.6 Conclusion

This chapter provided a historical overview of drama-based pedagogy, including the dominate methodologies (linear, process, and hybrid-oriented) that exist in the field of drama in education. Additionally, using a Vygotskian sociocultural theoretical framework, a theory of learning underlying the use of drama as a viable approach to instruction was presented. Specifically, the use of drama as a tool for instruction in L2 education was discussed with particular attention given to current issues surrounding pre-service L2 teacher preparation in general.

These topics will resurface in later chapters, particularly in Chapters 3 – 4, where detailed rationales are provided to support the systematic approach taken to introduce drama as an instructional strategy in an L2 methods course as well as a basis for the analyses of two L2 teacher-candidates’ pedagogical decision-making when implementing, and subsequently interpreting, drama as a practical instructional strategy in diverse L2 classroom settings. The following chapter will discuss the research context as well as the methodology for collection and analysis of data.
Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The present chapter will discuss the research context and the methods used to explore the research questions that were presented in chapter one. Again, this study examined ten L2 teacher-candidates’ initial conceptualization of DBI in L2 instruction. The participants were then introduced to Vygotskian principles of socio-cultural theory in an effort to (re)conceptualize teacher-candidates’ existing perceptions of DBI as both a powerful form of pedagogy in support of L2 learning as well as a vehicle for promoting teacher-candidates’ planning, decision-making, and reflective practice (see chapters one and two). Focusing on two particular participants as case study participants, the study looked at their attempts to (re)frame their conceptual understanding of DBI as they worked in different instructional settings with diverse populations of learners. The current chapter seeks to outline various methodological considerations including the present study’s overall design, the contexts in which the research took place, and the exact procedures undertaken for data collection and analysis. This chapter concludes with a discussion on the study’s validity and reliability as well as its overall potential for generalization.

3.2 Study Design: Case Study Research

Case study research has a long history in the social sciences across a variety of academic disciplines ranging from psychology to law. Creswell and Poth (2018) define case study research as a “qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data...
collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual materials, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes. The unit of analysis in the case study might be multiple cases (a multisite study) or a single case (a within-site) study” (pp. 96-97).

Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) make the assertion that “a case study provides a unique example of real people in real situations, enabling readers to understand ideas more clearly than simply by presenting them with abstract theories or principles” (p. 289). Taking into consideration the dynamic and variable nature that exists in socio-cultural contexts, the case-study approach was selected to provide an in-depth examination of the complex institutional and environmental factors teacher-candidates experience while training to become L2 educators. Specifically, a collective case-study design was used in order to demonstrate multiple perspectives related to the topic of inquiry and to engage in cross-case analysis.

The study took place at a large university, Mountainside University\(^3\), located in the mid-Atlantic region of the eastern United States. This particular university was intentionally chosen as it hosts a number of long-standing programs in teacher education, including world languages education. In addition, a pre-existing relationship existed between myself, as the researcher, and the program in question. I taught two courses in the program: a methods course that explored the complexity of teaching world languages and a practicum class that afforded teacher-candidates the opportunity to demonstrate knowledge of second language teaching/learning and educational theories by participating in a companion field experience housed at a local elementary school. This relationship afforded me access to both research participants and relevant sites of study.

The aforementioned courses, and my role as a teacher-researcher, will be described in greater detail later in this chapter (see section 3.5), however it is important to explicitly state that my status throughout this study was that of a participant-observer. During data collection, I was

\(^3\) The university has been provided with a pseudonym.
immersed in the classroom culture of the participants as both their teacher and as a classroom researcher. This allowed for a high level of context familiarity yet by the nature of my authorial position as the participants’ course supervisor, their behaviors and responses during the study may have been directly impacted. This limitation, and its effect on how the data was collected and analyzed, is discussed in greater detail in chapter eight. In addition, the particular steps taken for participant recruitment and site access is detailed later in this chapter (see section 3.4). The next section will detail the world languages teacher preparation program where the study took place.

3.3 Research Context: The World Languages Teacher Preparation Program

The world languages teacher preparation program at Mountainside University leads to a four-year undergraduate degree that aims to prepare candidates to teach in all grades from the pre-kindergarten level through twelfth grade in the United States. The students have the opportunity to select among the following language concentrations: French, German, Latin, Russian, and Spanish. During the first two years of the program, students in the world languages teacher-preparation program complete both general education and foreign language-specific coursework. As students move into their fourth semester, they typically take a course that explores the foundations of second language teaching. This class introduces predominate theoretical perspectives and principles related to second language acquisition that serves as a basis for the remainder of their coursework. This required foundational course has the effect of bringing students from each language specialization together to form a cohesive cohort.

In their fifth semester, students engage in a supervised field experience that exclusively centers on L2 language instruction in the early grades. The field experience involves creating a thematic 8-week FLEX (Foreign Language Exploration) unit, designing supportive instructional
materials, and planning and teaching their own lessons in an after-school program for students in grades 1-5. The students’ work in the field experience is informed and supported by a three-credit course that is taken simultaneously during that semester and is dedicated to exploring a variety of pedagogical methods and approaches for teaching world languages in the elementary grades.

In the sixth semester, candidates typically complete their mandatory study-abroad program in order to develop proficiency in their language specialization area. When they return, in the seventh semester, the students take another methods course focusing on the middle and secondary level learner. Additionally, they are placed in a middle or high school setting for a limited six-week supervised, pre-student teaching field experience. In their eighth and final semester in the program, the students engage in a fifteen-week student teaching experience at the secondary level. It is possible for an individual, who has previously earned a bachelor’s degree, to enroll in the world languages teacher-preparation program as a post-baccalaureate candidate. In such instances, post-baccalaureate students complete the last two years of the world languages teacher-preparation coursework, beginning in the fifth semester.

If a world languages education student wishes to pursue an ESL (English as a Second Language) endorsement, they may enroll in the ESL endorsement program. This additional credential, from the state department of education, allows the world languages education student to work as a specialist with ELLs in addition to teaching in their primary content-area. The ESL endorsement program consists of a 15-credit sequence of courses that includes practical teaching experience with English learners. The ESL endorsement requirements are satisfied primarily through two existing programs at Mountainside University: 1) Coursework completed on campus; or 2) Coursework completed through a one-year hybrid program (involving both online and face-to-face instruction) that culminates in a five-week EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teaching experience in South America.
Table 3-1 summarizes the typical sequence of required coursework for successful completion of the world languages teacher-preparation program, excluding university-required general education credits and language-specific coursework, at the undergraduate/post-baccalaureate level.

Table 3-1: Typical sequence of required coursework in the world language teacher preparation program (undergraduate/post-baccalaureate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>First Year Seminar in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Second   | Learning and Instruction (Educational Psychology)  
Infant and Child Development |
| Third    | Education in American Society  
Adolescent Development |
| Fourth   | Introductory Field Experience for Teacher Preparation  
 Foundations of Second Language Teaching  
 Introduction to Teaching English Language Learners |
| Fifth*†  | Methods I (Elementary-Focus)  
Elementary School Field Experience  
Teaching Exceptional Students |
| Sixth    | Study Abroad |
| Seventh  | Methods II (Secondary-Focus)  
Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience; Secondary Education |
| Eighth   | Practicum in Student Teaching; Secondary Education |

*Post-baccalaureate coursework begins during the fifth semester.  
†Entrance to major requirements must be completed prior to the fifth semester (undergraduate).

Table 3-2 provides an overview of required coursework necessary to obtain the ESL program specialist endorsement. The required courses for the ESL endorsement is the same regardless of the ESL program option that is chosen by the student at this university.

Table 3-2: Overview of required coursework for the ESL endorsement option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL Endorsement: Required Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-Functional Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Second Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, Culture, and the Classroom: Issues for Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Schools Performances and Programs with English Language Learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section describes the participants involved in this study as well as the steps taken for their recruitment. In addition, a rationale for highlighting the two case studies described in this dissertation is detailed.

3.4 Participants

As previously discussed, this study first looked at how ten teacher-candidates (enrolled in a world languages teacher preparation program) originally conceptualized DBI and how they attempted to incorporate it into their emerging teaching practice. Initially, prospective participants were recruited due to their simultaneous enrollment in the methods course and the elementary field experience during the fall of 2015. Convenience sampling was selected due to the relative ease of access afforded in collecting relevant data associated with the posed research questions based on the relationship forged from my role as the instructor of both of these courses.

The study began in the fall of 2015 and concluded in May of 2017 upon the participants’ successful completion of the teacher preparation program. At the time, 11 teacher-candidates were registered for these courses and each teacher-candidate was given the option to voluntarily participate in the study. The full list of inclusion criteria was as follows: 1) Undergraduate students; 2) 18 years of age or older; and 3) Enrolled in the fall 2015 semester of the world languages methods course and elementary field experience. For the purposes of this study, post-baccalaureate candidates were considered equivalent to undergraduate students as their assigned coursework and program of study to be completed was consistent – and identical to – the undergraduate level.
The study was conducted in three phases, each requiring (and receiving) approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Each phase qualified for an exempt status. Informed consent was solicited and provided by the participants at the start of each research phase. The participants were made aware, at each time of informed consent, that they could opt out of the study at any point without accruing adverse consequences. Out of the 11 teacher-candidates that were solicited for inclusion in this study, ten agreed to participate in the first phase of the study, which took place during the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year. Table 3-3 provides basic biographical data of the ten participants originally enrolled in the study:

Table 3-3: Biographical data of the study participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Language Specialization</th>
<th>Age When Study Began</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uta</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukas</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the participants shared English as their first language and had been raised in the United States. Madeline, Mary, and Patrick grew up with at least one multilingual parent (Kannada/Tamil in the case of Madeline and Spanish for Mary and Patrick). The frequency of multilingual use in each of these participants’ homes, however, varied with Madeline and Mary indicating they received no formal instruction from family members on how to communicate in the additional language spoken at home while Patrick did. The participants’ ages ranged from 20-23 with Spanish as a participant’s language specialization outnumbering French 7:3.

---

4 All participant names are pseudonyms throughout the study.
At the start of the study, Savannah was the only participant who had completed all of the required coursework for her ESL endorsement. She had chosen to participate in the ESL endorsement option that mandated participation in the five-week EFL field experience in South America. While in South America, she taught English to young Spanish-speaking learners. While Savannah was the only student who had already completed the requirements for an ESL endorsement, Madeline, Mary, Max, Michael, and Sandra each expressed interest in pursuing the ESL endorsement by completing the necessary coursework on campus over the next two years. At the beginning of the study, these five participants were actively involved in the decision-making process regarding whether or not to pursue this additional credential.

During the first phase of the study, Max, a traditional undergraduate student, and Madeline, a post-baccalaureate candidate were chosen for in-depth investigation as case studies due to the diverse variations that existed in their socio-cultural, educational and drama-based backgrounds and experiences. Additionally, their initial shared interest in pursuing the ESL program specialist endorsement, and their common language specialization in French, made them ideal candidates for cross-case analysis. Additional background information regarding each case study participant is provided in detail in chapters five and six.

The second phase of the study took place during May and June of 2016 when the case study participants chose to enlist in a pilot EFL program in central Sweden to satisfy one of their ESL endorsement course requirements. The third phase took place periodically during the case study participants’ secondary field experiences throughout the 2016-2017 academic year. Each of these phases, their associated research contexts, and the procedures undergone for data collection is described in detail within the following three sections.
3.5 Phase I: The Elementary World Language Classroom

In the fall of 2015, the methods course met two days per week (Tuesdays and Thursdays) from 9:45 – 11:00 a.m. for fifteen weeks. Similarly, the practicum course that included the elementary field experience initially met later in the afternoon (Tuesdays and Thursdays; 2:30 – 5:00 p.m.). This practicum course only met during the first five weeks of the semester. Beginning in the sixth week of the semester, students met at a local elementary school (Tuesdays and Thursdays) from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. to engage in the elementary field experience. The field experience lasted for a total of eight weeks (from September 29, 2015 – November 17, 2015). The syllabi for both of these courses, including the course description, objectives, and specific assignment guidelines, is included in Appendix A. However, a brief overview of these courses, including their limitations, will be provided here.

3.5.1 Methods Course Overview

The methods course that the ten participants took in the fall of 2015 was the first of two methods courses that all world languages teacher-candidates at Mountainside University complete and it focused on L2 instruction for the elementary learner (grades 1-5). As the instructor of this methods course and the supervisor of the elementary field experience, I found myself in a unique position to influence the pedagogical strategies these particular teacher-candidates might employ in future classrooms at the very beginning of their educational journeys.

Crandall (2000) asserts that “the core of traditional language teacher education has long been the methods course, a course which presents the theoretical rationale and practical implications of language teaching approaches, methods, procedures, and techniques” (p. 38). For many teacher-candidates, it is the first time they come into contact with the core ideas that will
come to make up their pedagogical content knowledge. In other words, the new knowledge that will help guide their decisions in curriculum and instruction for the world languages classroom is explicitly introduced and discussed. Crandall (2000) goes on to note that L2 “methods courses often discuss the rationale for, and instructional practices reflected in ‘innovative’ methods (e.g., Silent Way, Community Language Learning, Natural Approach, Content-based Language Instruction) as well as ‘traditional’ ones (Grammar-Translation, Audio-Lingual, Communicative), and they often combine this discussion with specific attention to techniques for teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing)” (p. 37).

I inherited the syllabus of the methods course from its previous instructor and given that it was my first year teaching the class, I chose to keep much of its original design. The organization of the syllabus took a similar approach to Crandall’s (2000) description of the typical L2 methods course, which included a critical introduction and evaluation of the innovative and traditional methods in language teaching that she references. The syllabus endeavored to provide an overview of historical and contemporary approaches, methods, and strategies, (as well as their underlying theoretical basis), that have been used – and continue to be used – within the field of world languages instruction. This was achieved by modeling a range of teaching strategies from a variety of learning theories (behaviorism, cognitivism, sociocultural, and humanism) that have been used in the world languages classroom over the past fifty years. Students were encouraged to engage in critical, reflective, discussion on the perceived rationale for the strategies’ uses, and the challenges and affordances for L2 learning provided by each example and theoretical perspective.

However, Crandall (2000) also made note of the growing trend in language teacher education that occurred towards the beginning of the 21st century: a “shift from methods to methodology…a shift away from a top-down approach to methods as “products” for teachers to learn and “match” [to appropriate learning situations] and toward a bottom-up approach to
methodology as reflections on experiences” (p. 38). Crandall (2000), citing Richards (1990), goes on to explain that this change consists of “…exploring the nature of effective teaching and learning, and discovering the strategies used by successful teachers and learners in the classroom” (p. 38).

The methods course attempted to honor this shift from methods to methodology by providing insight into the pedagogical decision-making process undergone by educators in the field when they select appropriate learning strategies to meet course objectives. However, with a lack of elementary world languages programs in the area, these particular L2 teacher-candidates did not have the opportunity to see many of the approaches, methods and learning strategies discussed in class implemented under learning conditions that exist in elementary world language classrooms. In addition, they were unable to inquire into the instructional decision-making process of practicing world languages elementary teachers when they chose to use particular methods of instruction to achieve designated learning goals. While modeling learning strategies in methods classes may be beneficial to an extent, it is impossible to replicate and provide realistic simulations of the teaching conditions in which these practices would take place while confined to a university classroom; especially when teaching simulations involve learners, (i.e., their fellow classmates), who possess dissimilar characteristics and reactionary behavior than the students they would ultimately be teaching in the elementary field experience.

An additional challenge involved the introduction of a communicative-based approach to L2 teaching/learning. The textbook chosen for the course was Helena Curtain and Carol Ann Dahlberg’s (2010) Languages and Children: Making the Match: New Languages for Young Learners, Grades K-8. Curtain and Dahlberg (2010) base their teaching approach heavily on translating the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages’ Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century (National Standards in Foreign Language Education
Briefly, the ACTFL Standards (2006) are based on four interlocking goals. Curtain and Dahlberg (2010), in the second chapter of their text, explain that “The first goal…is communication…the other four goals – cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities – all flow from and are dependent on the ability to communicate” (p. 31). Additionally, Curtain and Dahlberg (2010) emphasize that “the language teacher who thinks only in terms of memorizing lists of basic vocabulary, drilling and mastering a body of grammatical forms, and practicing a series of pronunciation tasks, is not giving students the opportunity to exchange authentic messages nor providing inherently motivating tasks” (p. 34).

For many teacher-candidates, the approach taken by the ACTFL Standards (2006), and how it has impacted L2 pedagogical decision making, may be a radical departure from their personal experiences as a student in the world languages classroom. As mentioned briefly in chapters one and two, over the past several decades L2 language pedagogy has undergone significant changes: from methods that were born with an emphasis on habit formation rooted in a behaviorist philosophy to those focused on establishing communicative competency through interactive activities (Huhn, 2012; Wilbur, 2007). Thus, there is little uniformity that exists when it comes to the L2 learning experiences undergone by the teacher-candidates enrolled in this teacher-preparation program.

Consequently, those teacher-candidates that were predominately exposed to the world languages classroom that emphasized grammatical form over communicative function through behaviorist and cognitive approaches of rote memorization and didactic teaching methods may experience difficulty (re)orientating to a set of educational standards that now privileges meaning over form through interactive, student-centered activities. In addition, envisioning a communicative-based language teaching classroom becomes especially difficult without concrete,
communicative-based, world language elementary classrooms available for the teacher-candidates to readily observe and reflect on the pedagogical practices taking place. Many of the world languages teacher-candidates that were enrolled in the methods course found themselves being asked to suddenly (re)conceptualize their understanding of the L2 teaching/learning process and what it means to be an L2 educator that promotes being not only a language-learner, but a language-user.

3.5.2 The Elementary Field Experience Course Overview

The elementary field experience served, in part, to help aid the teacher-candidates in their (re)orientation to communicative-based L2 teaching/learning and to circumvent some of the limitations imposed on the methods course. This was done by providing practical application to the pedagogical concepts discussed in both courses. During the first-five weeks of the semester, in both classes, students explored salient topics related to classroom instruction such as classroom management, unit mapping and sequencing, employing diverse learning assessments, and the writing of cohesive lesson plans that meet planned L2 language objectives.

In the elementary field experience, teacher-candidates were asked to develop a thematic, eight-week unit that served to introduce learners in grades 1 – 5 to their language specialization. The unit was required to consist of fourteen, ninety-minute lessons (weeks 1-7). The eighth week of the program involved one teaching day consisting of a community presentation in which each classroom shared their L2 learning experiences with family and community members. In addition, teacher-candidates were asked to design L2 learning strategies to use in their lesson plans that could be justified through sound educational and/or previously discussed second language acquisition theory. This original curriculum would be implemented in an after-school world languages program offered in partnership with a local school district.
Since the elementary field experience would be the first time these teacher-candidates were to be held accountable for a classroom of their own, they were placed in teaching groups of three to four in order to cooperatively design their curriculum and share teaching responsibilities. In the fall of 2015, seven teacher-candidates specialized in Spanish while four focused on French. Due to the small number of teacher-candidates concentrating on French that year, all four French teacher-candidates were placed in one teaching group. Ultimately, nine elementary students enrolled in the French class. Two students were in second grade, six students were in third grade, and one student was in fourth grade. Thus, the learners ranged from seven to nine years of age.

As a result of low enrollment numbers for elementary students interested in studying Spanish that particular year, all seven Spanish teachers were placed in one teaching group as well. Due to the significant number of teacher-candidates, the Spanish teaching group rotated their teaching responsibilities throughout the week to provide ample opportunities to lead learning activities and to not outnumber the students in the class. Eight elementary learners enrolled in Spanish. Two students were in first grade, one student was in second grade, four students were in third grade, and one student was in fourth grade. As such, similar to the French class, the learners ranged in age from seven to nine years of age.

The teacher-candidates were given complete autonomy over the design of their units and the teaching methods they chose to employ during individual lessons. They were encouraged to try a variety of techniques being discussed co-currently in the methods course to fit their learning objectives. This was done to promote critical considerations of L2 teaching methodology, foster an atmosphere of pedagogical experimentation, further develop their pedagogical decision-making skills, and to encourage critical reflection of the learning activities they selected to meet their goals.

Students were also required to relate their lessons to a thematic unit (fairytales and folktales of Spanish or French origin) and were asked to keep in mind the central goal of the
ACTFL Standards (2006) that were promoted in the Curtain and Dalhberg (2010) text; that is to say prioritizing contextualized, communicative learning activities over other forms of L2 teaching/learning. Teacher-candidates were repeatedly encouraged through class lectures, assignments, conferences, and written feedback to think of situations where their language objectives would be used by their learners and create imaginative, interactive situations so that their students might apply their newly learned language concepts in meaningful ways.

During the first five weeks of the semester, the teacher-candidates drafted lesson plans for the first four weeks of the field experience. These lesson plan drafts were submitted to me for general feedback and suggestions for improvement. Revisions were required only under the following circumstances: 1) the lesson lacked logical progression and/or cohesion; 2) the learning activities did not match the stated objectives; or 3) there was a lack of appropriate assessments to ensure learning objectives were met.

All lessons that were taught at the elementary school were supervised by myself, two district-employed elementary teachers (who were not familiar with world languages pedagogy but were familiar with elementary-aged learners), and one university employed Spanish/English bilingual supervisor with prior elementary world languages teaching experience in Spanish. There were no in-service co-operating elementary teachers who specialized exclusively in world languages elementary education supervising the teacher-candidates during the field experience. The teacher-candidates were never in a position where a supervisor was not observing a lesson.

Additionally, during each week of the field experience teacher-candidates were required to write teaching reflections that were posted on a secure online blog by Sunday at 6:00 p.m. I would respond to these reflections to provide mediational comments on their developing pedagogical content knowledge. Each reflection was intended to cover a one-week period of the field experience and thus pertained to two days of teaching. Exact guidelines for the written reflections is included in the syllabus for the elementary field experience (found in Appendix A).
Likewise, teacher-candidates were responsible for submitting one brief self-recorded video to VoiceThread with at least three different coded examples that demonstrate how they (individually) addressed a weekly theme (see Appendix A for specific themes listed in the elementary field experience syllabus) as well as any other reactions to their teaching practices. VoiceThread is a collaborative secure video-sharing software that allows individuals to tag moments in the video and comment on what is occurring in a particular situation. Viewers of the video can subsequently respond to those comments. In this case, a virtual dialogue promoting improved teaching practices through reflexive thinking took place between myself and the participants on a weekly basis through VoiceThread. The teacher-candidates were only required to self-record their teaching once per week.

3.6 Phase I Sources of Data

At the conclusion of the fall 2015 semester, several forms of data were collected from the ten participants. These included their weekly written teaching reflections and all of the final lesson plans written for the elementary field experience. The written teaching reflections and the final lesson plans included my written comments offering mediation (in the form of feedback) on the participants’ attempts to think about and plan for DBI in the language learning classroom. In addition, semi-structured exit interviews were conducted privately, and individually, with the case study participants (Madeline and Max). During these exit interviews, each case study participant was asked, among other things, to reflect on their use of DBI and their attitudes towards its perceived effectiveness. The full list of the exit-interview questions is included in Appendix B.

Towards the end of the exit-interview, the case study participants were also asked to review their elementary field experience lessons and complete a questionnaire indicating if, from their conceptual understanding of DBI, they felt they had used a drama-based technique during
each of their lesson plans. If they had, they were asked to specify which technique they thought they had used from a provided list of DBI techniques and why they chose to use it for that particular lesson. If they said they had not used a drama-based technique during a particular lesson, they were asked to explain why they had chosen a different learning strategy. The questionnaire and drama-based technique definitions that were used are included in Appendix C. Finally, all written observational notes and audio/visual self-recordings focused on the case study participants’ self-identified DBI teaching practices (made as part of their educational record in the elementary field experience; see syllabus in Appendix A) were collected via participants’ informed consent then transcribed and analyzed by myself before being subsequently destroyed to protect the participants’ visible identities.

3.7 Phase II: The EFL Secondary Classroom

During the spring 2016 semester, a new study abroad program was launched to aid world languages education majors who were interested in pursuing their ESL program specialist endorsement credential. In partnership with a university located in north-central Sweden, interested teacher-candidates could gain practical experience teaching English as a Foreign Language in Swedish secondary (grades 7-12) schools that would satisfy some of the course requirements for the ESL endorsement program. The Sweden program was launched on May 9, 2016 and ran for four weeks; ending on June 4, 2016.

Both Madeline and Max elected to participate in this program and I, as the researcher, accompanied them to document their field experiences abroad. The Swedish partner university placed Max and Madeline in two schooling locations for their EFL field experience:
Gymnasieskola and Grundskola. Since the Swedish education system differs profoundly from the one found in the United States, a brief overview is provided here in order to fully understand the teaching contexts where the participants were placed.

3.7.1 English Education in Sweden

The students at both Gymnasieskola and Grundskola, where the participants were placed, had been introduced to English as a subject of study once a week in second grade (ages 7/8) and as a required subject from third grade (ages 9/10) through ninth grade (ages 15/16). Beginning in eighth grade (ages 14/15) students are introduced to a third language (most often German, French, or Spanish). If students cannot handle learning a third language, they may take an additional class in English.

“After compulsory school [ages 7-16], almost all students proceed to upper secondary school, which is optional. Municipalities are obliged to provide residents aged between 16 and 20 with good quality upper secondary education, either under their own auspices, or in conjunction with other providers. The courses offered and the number of places should as far as possible be tailored to the preferences of the young people. There is a national curriculum setting out the upper secondary school’s core values, tasks and overall goals” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2016, p. 16).

In addition, “upper secondary school offers six diploma programs preparatory for higher education and 12 vocational programs leading to a vocational diploma…Students must, as a minimum, have passing grades in Swedish, English, mathematics and nine other subjects to be eligible for a program preparatory for higher education. The vocational programs require passing grades in Swedish, English, mathematics and five other subjects” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2016, p. 16).

All K-12 educational institutions where research was conducted were assigned pseudonyms. Here, Gymnasieskola is, in reality, the Swedish word for upper secondary school (ages 16-19) while Grundskola is Swedish for primary (compulsory) schooling (which occurs for ages 7-16).
Research, 2016, p. 16). Thus, developing a high proficiency in English is imperative for many Swedish students who desire access to higher education or wish to develop a vocational trade.

Gymnasieskola was an upper secondary school serving students between the ages of 16 and 19 years of age. Attached to Gymnasieskola was a lower secondary school with learners between the ages of 13 and 15. Both of these upper and lower secondary schools had a sports profile which uniquely enabled students to combine their athletic interests with their studies. The study participants were on site at Gymnasieskola Mondays through Wednesdays and placed in both EFL and FFL (French as a Foreign Language) classrooms.

Grundskola, on the other hand, was a combined compulsory primary and lower secondary school. It consisted of two buildings: one with classrooms for students aged 7 to 12 (grades 1-6) and the other hosting students between the ages of 13 and 15 (grades 7-9). The participants were on site at Grundskola on Thursdays and placed in EFL classrooms only. While Max and Madeline taught in both the upper and lower secondary school locations during their time at Gymnasieskola, during their time at Grundskola they were confined exclusively to the lower secondary building. In addition, they elected to team-teach throughout the field experience at both schooling locations. Table 3-4 provides an overview of the participants’ schedule and field experience placements throughout the four-week program in Sweden.

Table 3-4: Participants’ schedule and field placement locations in Sweden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May 9 – 13</th>
<th>May 16 – 20</th>
<th>May 23 – 27</th>
<th>May 30 – June 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Orientation Day</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
<td>Gymnasieskola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Observe an elementary EFL classroom</td>
<td>Grundskola</td>
<td>Grundskola</td>
<td>Grundskola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Time for reflection and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants worked in a variety of classrooms across these two educational institutions in tandem with a number of co-operating mentor teachers. Similar to their experiences in the methods course and the elementary field experience during the fall semester, Max and Madeline were given free autonomy over the subject matter and the selection of methodology/learning strategies they could employ in both of these locations. The only request that was made by the EFL Swedish teachers, at both locations, was that they devise lessons that would motivate their students to speak more in English. The participants’ teaching responsibilities, learner demographics, the role[s] of their co-operating mentor teachers, and their chosen topics of instruction will be detailed in chapter seven.

3.8 Phase II: Sources of Data

Throughout the course of the EFL study abroad program, several forms of data were collected from Madeline and Max. These included their weekly written teaching reflections, self-recorded videos focused on their self-identified DBI teaching practices, and all final lesson plans written for the field experience. Similar to the first phase of the study, I collected all written observational notes and audio/visual self-recordings (made as part of their educational record during the EFL study abroad program) via participants’ informed consent. Then, I transcribed and analyzed them before they were subsequently destroyed to protect the participants’ visible identities. Each time a new lesson was taught, it was filmed and kept on a password-protected laptop that remained in my possession. If the same lesson was taught across several class sections only one video recording (to document the lesson structure) was required.

Two semi-structured interviews were also conducted during the program. Each interview was completed individually with each participant in a private location. The first interview was done during the first week of the program and the second interview was completed during the
final week of the program (see Appendix B for the interview questions). As in the previous research phase, during the second interview participants were asked to review their EFL field experience lesson plans and complete a questionnaire indicating if they felt they had used a drama-based technique during each of their lessons (see Appendix C) based on their developing conceptualization of DBI in L2 teaching/learning. If they had, they were asked to specify which technique they thought they had used from a provided list of drama-based techniques and why they chose to use it for that particular lesson. If they said they had not used a drama-based technique during a particular lesson, they were asked to explain why they had chosen a different method of instruction.

3.9 Phase III: The Secondary World Language Classroom

The final phase of the study occurred during the 2016-2017 academic year. Particular consideration was placed on the instruction they received during their first methods course, their cumulating field experiences to date, and their involvement with drama-based L2 instruction during the first two phases of the study. Unlike the previous two phases, the focus of this portion of the study was to document how the participants viewed the continued development of their pedagogical content knowledge as they engaged in their secondary field experiences rather than an ongoing review of the decision-making process behind their individual L2 pedagogical choices.

Since the context of the secondary field experience most closely approximated the professional environment in which both case study participants intended to work, it was anticipated that the reflective comments made in this phase of the study would reveal how they have come to conceptualize DBI and its potential use in secondary settings. In addition, possible insights into how the case study participants might envision the use of DBI in their teaching
practice upon completion of the teacher preparation program was expected. The details of their secondary field placements, including their learner demographics and mentor-teacher collaborations, is included in chapter seven.

Two semi-structured interviews were individually conducted with each participant during this phase of the study. The first interview took place in the first week of December 2016. This was shortly after the participants had completed their pre-student teaching experiences. The final interview occurred during the first week of May 2017 upon the completion of their 15-week student teaching experience.

A comprehensive list of all data sources and an overall timeline of the study is listed in Table 3-5:

Table 3-5: Comprehensive list of data sources and overall timeline of research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase I: August 2015 – December 2015 | • Methods Course I  
• Elementary Field Experience       | • Teacher-candidates’ weekly written teaching reflections with researcher’s feedback;*  
• Teacher-candidates’ weekly lesson plans with researcher’s feedback;*  
• Teacher-candidates’ semi-structured interview responses (1 each);**  
• Teacher-candidates’ lesson plan self-evaluation (questionnaire)**  
• Teacher-candidates’ digitally recorded DBI teaching practices**  
• Field Observation Notes*  |
| Phase II: May 2016 – June 2016        | • EFL Study Abroad Experience in central Sweden | • Teacher-candidates’ weekly written teaching reflections with researcher feedback;**  
• Teacher-candidates’ weekly lesson plans;**  
• Teacher-candidates’ semi-structured interview responses (2 each);**  
• Teacher-candidates’ lesson plan self-evaluation (questionnaire)**  
• Teacher-candidates’ digitally recorded DBI teaching practices**  
• Field Observation Notes**  |
3.10 Procedures for Data Analysis

Using the data collected throughout the study, and considering the points made from the review of literature, the study’s findings were reviewed in relation to the research questions discussed in chapter one. To that end, data analysis focused primarily on 1) the ways drama-based instruction might have offered a basis to L2 teacher-candidates as they worked to engage in play-based ZPD activity with learners during field experiences in US K-12 schools and abroad; 2) the challenges and affordances experienced by teacher-candidates as they attempted to orient to L2 education from a perspective informed by dramatic play; and 3) whether teacher-candidates’ use of dramatic play activities impacted their perceptions of their students’ L2 knowledge and development.

After each phase of the study, data was collected and organized in the following way: 1) All interviews were digitally transcribed from the audio recording to a spreadsheet database. The resulting transcription was then coded; 2) All written reflections were digitally copied and entered into a separate spreadsheet database, coded, and organized into a table by the field experience week in which the reflection was written; 3) All lesson plans and the corresponding questionnaire answers were compiled in a three-ring binder, labeled, and divided by week and field experience; and 4) All digital video recordings were organized by time and date for ease of accessibility. Only participant-identified drama-based interactions, (via the results of the participant
questionnaires), that had been captured on video as part of the participants’ educational record were used for analysis purposes. These actions were taken to verify the authenticity of the classroom interaction. These recordings were subsequently digitally transcribed using Jefferson (2004) transcription conventions (see Appendix D for specific notation interpretation) and destroyed after transcription was completed to protect participants’ visible identities.

I developed 12 codes for all semi-structured interview transcriptions and the written weekly teaching reflections. The first eight codes, described in Table 3-6, were designed based on expected data results from the semi-structured interview questions posed to each participant and the assignment guidelines that governed the participants’ weekly teaching reflections. The remaining four codes emerged through recurrent themes that appeared throughout the semi-structured interviews and the written teaching reflections that were not anticipated prior to engaging in the research study. These emergent codes are listed, and defined, in Table 3-7.

Table 3-6: List of predetermined codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2B</td>
<td>L2 learning background: Any utterance that involved contextual information regarding the personal narrative history of the participant’s second language learning experience[s].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBI-V</td>
<td>Drama Based Instruction-Views: Any utterance that provided insight into a participant’s perspective of drama-based instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Personal/Professional Goals: Any utterance that included information related to a participant’s personal or professional aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fears: Any utterance pertaining to expressed fear related to the teacher-preparation experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Objectives: Any utterance describing the learning objectives or professional goals set out to be accomplished during a particular lesson or field experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Reflection: Any utterance that demonstrated a critical, historical review of teaching practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Unplanned Circumstances: Any utterance that details unexpected challenges that arose during a field experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Future Adaptations: Any utterance that suggests adjustment to future teaching practice[s].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon completion of the initial coding phase, the ensuing data was re-analyzed. Particular attention was focused on identifying surfacing themes and/or patterns related to the participants’ mediated experiences conceptualizing DBI across diverse field experiences. Patterns and themes were examined both individually and across case studies. The next section discusses the validity and reliability of the analysis conducted and the subsequent representation of the results gathered from the data.

### 3.11 Validity and Reliability

Mason (2002) makes it clear that qualitative researchers must “provide some sort of account of exactly how [the researcher] achieved the degree of accuracy [they] claim to be providing” (p. 188). Taking into consideration the competing views regarding validation and reliability in qualitative research, Creswell and Poth (2018) consider validation “to be an attempt to assess the ‘accuracy’ of the findings as best described by the researcher, the participants, and the readers (or reviewers)” (p. 259). They go on to argue that “this view also suggests that any report of research is a representation by the author,” and that validation, “is a distinct strength of qualitative research in that the account made through extensive time spent in the field, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV</td>
<td>Education Values: Any utterance that provides insight into a participant’s teaching philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Challenges: Any utterance that reveals a perceived issue to be overcome during a field experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: Any utterance that pertains to a participant’s understanding of the teaching/learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCK</td>
<td>Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Any utterance that pertains to a participant’s understanding of the L2 teaching/learning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
detailed thick description, and the closeness of the researcher to the participants in the study all add value or accuracy of a study” (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 259).

Indeed, this study employed several validation strategies to document the accuracy of the study. Creswell and Poth (2018) suggest that “qualitative researchers engage in at least two of the validation strategies in any given study” (p. 259) and go on to cite several examples. The validation strategies, suggested by Creswell and Poth (2018) that were followed throughout this study included: 1) Corroborating evidence through triangulation of multiple data sources (see Table 3-5 for a comprehensive list of data sources); 2) Discovering, and including, negative case analysis or disconfirming evidence (see chapters four through seven for a detailed account of the study’s results); 3) Clarifying researcher bias or engaging in reflexivity (see chapter one for the researcher’s position statement); 4) Prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field (see Table 3-5 for a timeline of this longitudinal study); 5) Generating a rich, thick description of the participants and the environment in which the study took place (see chapters four through seven); and 6) Having a peer review or debriefing of the data and research process (as a dissertation study this research was subject to extensive peer and institutional review).

3.12 Generalizability/Transferability

Case study research presents an inherent challenge when discussing the degree to which its findings can be generalized or transferred to other populations, contexts, and situations especially since the researcher desires to understand a particular phenomenon in depth instead of aiming to find out what is true for many. Perry (2011) describes external validity (or transferability) as “the degree to which findings of a study can be generalized to a larger population or transferred to similar situations” (p. 60, italics original). Cohen et al. (2011), on the other hand, stress the usage of the term generalizability over more familiar research terms
such as *external validity* and/or *transferability*: “Generalization takes many forms; it is not a unitary or singular concept, and it connotes far more…” (p. 242).

Cohen et al. (2011) go on to point out that “whilst much qualitative research strives to embrace the uniqueness, the individual idiographic features, of the phenomenon and/or participants, rendering generalization irrelevant…this need not preclude attention to generalization where it might be applicable in qualitative research” (p. 242). Indeed, while the goal of this study was not to claim generalizability of the study’s findings, there is a desire that the underlying assumptions of the inquiry, and/or the insights produced through the investigation of the presented case studies, may be found useful to others including L2 teacher educators, pre- and in-service L2 teachers, developers of L2 curricula, applied linguists, and others interested in second language acquisition through the teaching/learning process. The hope is that enough thick description and base information related to the methods of data collection and ensuing analysis has been provided to aid other interested parties in reframing the study’s findings to gauge its relevance to their own unique situations and circumstances.

In addition, a central goal of this inquiry was to illuminate some of the challenges that L2 teacher-candidates experience while attempting to (re)orient their approach to the L2 teaching/learning process that reflects the communicative classroom advocated by both the ACTFL Standards (2006) and the TESOL (Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages) PK-12 English Language Proficiency Standards (TESOL, 2006). Thus, this study was designed to contribute much more than a description of L2 teacher-candidates’ personal experiences in the final two years of their teacher preparation program. Rather, it endeavors to provide others an opportunity to witness an alternative approach to L2 teacher preparation and potentially (re)imagine the status quo.
3.13 Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the research study’s qualitative design, the proposed sample population, the multiple contexts where the research took place, and the sources of data gathered to answer the proposed research questions. In addition, the procedures taken for data collection, and the process undertaken for ensuing analysis, was detailed. Finally, issues related to the study’s validity and generalizability were discussed. The next chapter will provide an outline of the instructional choices that were made by teacher-candidates enrolled in the methods course and the elementary field experience. In addition, a detailed description of the ten teacher-candidates’ initial conceptualization of DBI and my attempt to (re)frame their perception of how and in what ways it might be used in the L2 classroom is provided before focusing particular attention on Madeline and Max, the two teacher-candidates that were selected as case study participants.
Chapter 4

Setting the Stage

4.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the ten participants’ initial conceptualization of DBI in L2 instruction and how it was originally used by the participants across the elementary field experience. After the participants had gained experience developing and implementing lesson plans in the field experience, I provided additional in-depth modeling of DBI strategies with explicit connections to Vygotskian socio-cultural theory in an attempt to (re)orient the teacher candidates’ approach towards using drama in L2 instruction. This chapter describes this attempt in detail with participants’ subsequent reactions and concludes by turning attention to Madeline and Max’s unique experiences conceptualizing and incorporating DBI during their diverse field experiences.

4.2 Conceptualizing Meaningful Instruction for Language Learning

A select number of DBI strategies were introduced to the ten teacher-candidates prior to the start of the elementary field experience. These strategies included role-play (assuming a character or persona in an imaginary context), puppetry (giving lifelike characteristics to inanimate objects), and storytelling (i.e., dramatizing or extending the actions described in a story rather than story-reading). These particular DBI strategies were selected to be discussed in the methods class due to their initial appearance in the teacher-candidates’ assigned course readings. In this early introduction to DBI, these strategies were positioned as a way to link language and action to produce contextualized communicative-based learning situations.
I shared with the participants some personal anecdotes that involved using these DBI strategies to promote language learning with ELLs (drawn from my personal experiences as a teaching artist in Philadelphia; see chapter one.). Through class discussions, I was able to highlight essential characteristics of these lessons that I felt were necessary to create playful/learning ZPD activity – e.g., lessons that used one or more DBI strategies where explicit roles for the teacher and the learners are assumed, an explicit imaginary context is formed, creative imitation is permitted, and a conflict or need to engage in the activity is present. In this approach, DBI strategies were presented as a complementary system of tools to govern L2 instruction (i.e., a Drama-as-Methodology orientation to DBI).

These personal examples of DBI in L2 instruction were contrasted with the suggestions for using role-play, puppetry, and story-telling that were presented in the participants’ assigned course reading. The examples provided in the text presented these particular DBI strategies as three of several eclectic tools that could be used to “bring language to life” or to “create an environment for communication” alongside an array of other non-DBI strategies (e.g., games, songs, Gouin Series, TPR, etc.) (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010, pp. 31-45 and 407-421). In other words, the course textbook presented a Drama-as-Tool orientation to DBI. As previously mentioned in chapter two (see section 2.5), a Drama-as-Tool orientation positions DBI as a set of instructional tools that are used to support teacher-dominated short-term learning exercises rather than as a distinct methodological approach to govern the L2 teaching/learning process (a Drama-as-Methodology framework).

When the elementary field experience began, the teacher-candidates tended to follow the textbook’s conceptualization of DBI in the L2 classroom. Thus, DBI strategies, when attempted, were positioned as ancillary tools used to support a teacher-driven approach to L2 meaning-making through didactic methods rather than as an essential methodology rooted in a coherent theoretical view of teaching and learning.
Table 4-1 and Table 4-2 present representative examples of the DBI strategies used in the French and Spanish teaching groups during the first five weeks of the elementary field experience:

Table 4-1: Representative DBI strategies used during elementary field experience (French Teaching Group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DBI Strategy</th>
<th>Representative Examples</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role-Play</td>
<td>Teachers perform scenarios to make meaning of set phrases to teach to students. Scripted Dialogues</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher announces in French that students must search for the teachers’ pets that were let loose around the classroom. On the whiteboard, an ‘animal pen’ is drawn where all the animals must be placed; inside the pen is the list of vocabulary words of the lost animals. Each student is asked to walk around the room to look for one hidden pet. Students must match their found animal with the corresponding word on the board in the animal pen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dramatically interpreting the meaning of specific L2 words for classmates (Classmates guess and say the word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students perform an emotion; other students guess which emotion is being performed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher tells students that they will be going on an exciting boat trip down the longest river in France, the Loire. Students are split into two groups with teachers as ‘captains.’ They ‘sail’ to the all-purpose room, which is a great spot for ‘fishing.’ There is a blue tarp for the water with animal vocabulary on index cards with metal paper clips on top of the tarp in the middle of the room. Two fishing pools made of a wooden stick with a string and a magnet tied to the end is used by each team. Each team lines up. The first person in each line takes the fishing pole. When they fish out a card, they must say the name of the animal word correctly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Representative DBI strategies used during elementary field experience (Spanish Teaching Group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DBI Strategy</th>
<th>Representative Examples</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role-Play</td>
<td>Teachers dramatically interpret rules in Spanish. They depict them being broken and followed to model expected classroom behavior.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are told that they will be going on a safari scavenger hunt. Animals are hidden around the classroom. In pairs, students will look for all of the animals and put stickers on a checklist when an animal is found. Students will finish their checklist and come back to the teacher and name all of the animals for a prize.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The representative examples in Tables 4-1 and 4-2 make it clear that without being provided explicit expectations or instructions on how to conceptualize DBI as a methodology rooted in a coherent theoretical view of learning, DBI strategies, (e.g., role-play in an imagined setting), were used primarily as a backdrop to help students complete other product-oriented learning activities that drove instruction through formal learning ZPD activity (e.g., a matching game, a game of charades, a scavenger hunt, a presentation, etc.).

I made several attempts to mediate the teacher-candidates’ perceptions of how DBI strategies were being positioned in their L2 instruction. These attempts included shared observational notes, several mini-conferences after lessons at the elementary field site, and feedback on participants’ blogs and teaching videos during the first five weeks of the elementary field experience (examples of these attempts can be found in chapters five and six in relation to Max and Madeline’s individual cases.) Despite these ongoing attempts at mediation, the pattern of conceptualizing DBI-as-Tool rather than DBI-as-Methodology for L2 teaching/learning persisted. This may have been due to the abstract methods I used when initially introducing DBI in the methods course prior to the start of the elementary field experience (e.g., anecdotes and class discussion vs. in-depth modeling and critical reflection). Consequently, as the teacher-candidates began Week 6 of the elementary field experience, I decided to provide a more in-depth workshop to (re)introduce a DBI-as-Methodology orientation – an approach to using DBI
informed by Vygotskian-principles that has the potential to create playful/learning ZPD activity that would drive L2 learning and instruction in formal learning environments.

4.3 (Re)Framing Drama-Based Instruction

Through a systematic lesson that conceptualized DBI-as-Methodology (rooted in Vygotskian socio-cultural theory) rather than DBI-as-Tool, it was anticipated that the teacher-candidates might develop a stronger framework that could serve as a basis for creating lessons that might foster purposeful playful/learning ZPD activity; that is to say learning activities that possessed the Vygotskian-informed criteria discussed in chapter two: 1) An explicit imaginative context; 2) Explicit roles to be assumed by participants that follow particular social rules of behavior related to the agreed upon imaginative context; 3) Creative imitation of the assumed social roles; and 4) The existence of a conflict to provide motivation, or a need to participate in the drama, that must be satisfied using targeted academic concepts with feedback and self-reflection provided by the mediator of the activity. By committing to these criteria, I hoped that the teacher-candidates might begin to see DBI strategies less as ancillary instructional support tools to contextualize other learning strategies (i.e., DBI-as-Tool), and more of an approach to instruction that could drive communicative-based L2 curriculum design. In order to accomplish this, however, students would need additional explicit mediation to (re)frame their orientation to DBI strategies in the language learning classroom.

The workshop to begin the process of (re)framing the teacher-candidates’ conceptualization of DBI strategies in the L2 classroom was video-recorded for transcription and analysis purposes and to document the exact steps taken for teacher-candidate mediation. I began the workshop by prompting the teacher-candidates to reflect on why imaginative situations might be useful when designing L2 learning activities. The teacher-candidates identified that imaginary
situations might allow their elementary students to apply newly taught L2 concepts in meaningful, contextualized ways.

Next, the teacher-candidates were asked to brainstorm a list of characteristics they felt created a ‘good’ learning activity. Creating a meaningful context for communication, interactive qualities, and ensuring relevance to students were suggested as essential features of a ‘good’ learning activity. These were recorded on the chalkboard. They were then asked to brainstorm how they felt they had created meaningful contexts for communication during the elementary field experience to date. Finding a theme, connecting learning activities with something the students were already comfortable with – i.e., a movie or a story – combining culture and real-world relationships through simulations, images, music, and/or realia were all provided as examples by the teacher-candidates as ways they endeavored to create meaningful contexts for communication. These were also recorded on the chalkboard.

I pointed out that several of the elements they stated they had employed to create meaningful contexts are also used when implementing a drama-based methodology. Next, I gave the teacher-candidates two practitioner-oriented background articles discussing the history and purpose of using DBI strategies in the classroom by Richard Fairchild (2007a/2007b) to read in class. These articles describe a process-oriented approach to DBI in a general education setting (see chapter two for a longer discussion on process-oriented DBI). After they had finished reviewing the handouts, I prompted the teacher-candidates to articulate the differences between drama and theatre as explained in the reading. A table highlighting these differences was co-constructed on the chalkboard to ensure comprehension of the definition from the reading (Table 4-3).
Looking at the co-constructed table, I asked the teacher-candidates if they knew an activity in early childhood that is similar to drama. One of the participants, Mary, identified play as a similar activity. Next, I told them that play is viewed as an important component in child development by many cognitive psychologists, a fact that many of them knew from their prior coursework in child development. I pointed out that there are several definitions of what constitutes play, but for this workshop we would be focusing on the definition defined by Vygotsky (an imaginary context, assumed roles, and creative imitation.)

The teacher-candidates were then presented with the four pieces of criteria I theorized as being necessary for playful/learning ZPD activity to take place: 1) An explicit imaginative context; 2) Explicit roles to be assumed by participants that follow particular social rules of behavior related to the agreed upon imaginative context; 3) Creative imitation of the assumed social roles; and 4) The existence of a conflict to provide motivation, or a need to participate in the drama, that must be satisfied using targeted academic concepts with feedback and self-reflection provided by the mediator of the activity. I explained further that I believed these criteria were necessary in order to position DBI strategies as being capable of driving the L2 teaching/learning process.

Table 4-3: Participants’ conceptual framework for understanding drama.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Drama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Classroom, Playing Area, Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery</td>
<td>Environment, Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors</td>
<td>Students, Participants, Players, Teacher-in-Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Teacher, Leader, Facilitator, Artist-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Script</td>
<td>Scenario, Story, Material, Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearse</td>
<td>Practice, Work on, Experiment with, Explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>Share, Show, Play out, Dramatize, Improvise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Observers, Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique</td>
<td>Assess, Discuss, Reflect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRODUCT**

**PROCESS**

*Table reproduced from the given course reading (Fairchild, R., 2007b, Retrieved from http://www.angelfire.com/ego/edp303/basics.htm)*
Finally, the teacher-candidates were given a table of terms and definitions of commonly used drama strategies (Table 4-4). This list was comprised of the thirteen commonly used DBI strategies, compiled from the literature across the field of drama in education, and it greatly expanded on the previous three DBI strategies that had been discussed earlier in the course (role-play, puppetry, and storytelling).

Table 4-4: List of terms and definitions of commonly used drama tools and techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantomime</td>
<td>Conveying action, thoughts, and feelings without words; communicating with your body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Pantomime</td>
<td>Teacher narrates, coaches, guides a scene while the group pantomimes the action/story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>To create and execute anything extemporaneously, without preparation - “making it up as you go along.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>Telling stories – not story reading. Delivering a story in a unique creative way i.e. puppetry, felt board, dress-up, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel/Interview</td>
<td>Students imagine they are an expert on a topic. They are questioned by their peers on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundscape</td>
<td>Atmosphere or mood created by the use of sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley/Gauntlet</td>
<td>Two lines of people facing each other with space between as an alleyway for participants to ‘walk down.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableaux Vivants</td>
<td>Frozen pictures of people to portray a concept that the students can then discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Play</td>
<td>Becoming a character or persona. May include teacher-in-role, student-in-role, and/or writing-in-role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-Coach</td>
<td>Offering guidance, supplying words/phrases, and questioning individuals or the group while they are involved in dramatic play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Imagery</td>
<td>Teacher narrates, coaches, guides a scene using descriptive words to assist students in forming mental or physically drawn images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Props</td>
<td>Objects used by the role-player.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppetry</td>
<td>Giving life-like characteristics to inanimate objects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the teacher-candidates expressed surprise at the length of strategies listed in Table 4-4. Two participants, however, (Savannah and Max), mentioned they had experienced some of these strategies due to their participation in drama classes in high school and were excited about the possibilities these strategies presented for the language learning classroom. However, they were unsure how these strategies could be used for the novice language learner.
They seemed to conceptualize these strategies as requiring a high level of receptive and productive L2 skills based on their own experiences participating in DBI.

Consequently, a lengthy conversation ensued regarding the feasibility of implementing drama-based activities in the L2 classroom. This included an exploration of classroom management techniques that might be needed to facilitate such interactive activities, the importance of creating a classroom community that feels safe for all students to participate in drama lessons, (i.e., realistic language expectations, the lowering of anxiety, de-emphasizing performance while valuing diverse forms of participation, etc.), the value of teacher commitment to the drama-activity being chosen, and reservations educators might have about facilitating a performance-based methodology.

Following the theoretical discussion of Vygotskian-informed DBI, I modeled a succession of three hands-on drama-based activities for the teacher-candidates. These activities were selected to showcase a range of linguistic demands and variations in participation and proficiency levels from both teachers and learners that can exist among drama activities. By doing this, the flexibility that exists amongst DBI strategies to accommodate a wide-range of learner needs, teacher skill, and instructional situations was showcased. It was hoped that in providing teacher-candidates with a wide range of DBI strategies in action from a DBI-as-Methodology orientation, I might rupture their current conceptual understanding of DBI’s role in the language classroom.

4.3.1 The Locked Safe: A Modified Gauntlet Activity

First, a modified gauntlet activity was demonstrated (refer to Table 4-4 for definitions of DBI terms). Instructing in French, I asked the teacher-candidates to form two parallel lines. Two people, (one person at the front of each line) faced me, while the other students turned and faced
the opposite direction. The two people at the front of the line that were still facing me were given 3 x 5 index cards with an image on it depicting a physical action (e.g., bowling, swimming, playing soccer). All of the students were told that the cards contained an image of a secret action. The name of the secret action was supposedly a password to an important family safe that contained a lot of money. The password needed to be communicated quickly, correctly, and secretly to only a few other people to access the money in the safe.

When the activity began, the students with the cards were instructed to turn around, tap the person behind them on the shoulder and act out the secret password-action depicted on the card. The person who had been tapped had to then guess what the image was via the pantomiming of the other student and re-create the action. The pantomime was passed down the line. The last person in the line would need to speak the password aloud in the target language (i.e., the French word for the physical action that was pantomimed) to “open” the safe and access the money.

These directions were communicated using simple commands, key-word repetition, clear physical gestures, realia (play-money), pantomiming the physical actions to successful complete the activity, and cartoon images (a safe and bag of money). After the instructions were given in French, I asked if someone could tell me, in English, what they were going to do during the activity particularly since not all of the teacher-candidates had been exposed to French in formal learning situations. One student was able to repeat the directions correctly, in English, so that all participants knew the circumstances and participant expectations of the activity.

At the end of the activity, I asked the teacher-candidates what the conflict was and why this activity should be considered a drama activity. The teacher-candidates identified anticipation as the dramatic conflict (one person knew the secret password action, the others did not), the use of imagination to facilitate communication (pretending to be in a situation where the voice cannot be used, pantomiming an action with objects that are non-existent), acting out an action by assuming the explicit role of a person doing a particular action who needs to get into their family
safe, and its non-competitive nature (i.e., the activity was focused on the process of meaning-making rather than on the product-oriented goal of ‘winning.’). In addition, language proficiency skills needed to complete the activity were also assessed by the teacher-candidates and they discussed how the activity might be modified to accommodate higher proficiency levels.

4.3.2 Vanishing Artwork: A Tableaux Vivant

The next drama-based activity that I modeled for the teacher-candidates were tableaux vivants (i.e., inanimate human pictures). The teacher-candidates were shown Renoir’s 1896 impressionist painting La Famille de L’Artiste (The Artist’s Family) from the Barnes Foundation’s searchable art collection. They were told that the painting was going to leave the museum soon and that another artist needed to draw a replica so that others might enjoy the image. To help the artist draw the replica, it was important to recreate the image in the form of a silent inanimate picture by assuming the characters of the painting with their bodies. The teacher-candidates then proceeded to replicate the painting with their bodies at the front of the classroom. Once the tableaux vivant was created and the teacher-candidates remained motionless in place, I told the students that the artist drawing the replica needed additional information from the “models.” Random students were then tapped and asked, “Qui es-tu?” (Who are you?) or “Qu’est-ce que tu fais?” (What are you doing?). The selected student had to become animated, step forward out of the inanimate picture, and answer the question with the correct vocabulary word or phrase.

After this activity, the class de-briefed once again in order to discuss the ways in which this activity might be useful, what language concepts it could be used to teach, perceived challenges, ways to support the emergent language needs of the learners, and why it would be considered a drama-activity. In this case, the students were engaged in an imaginative scenario
by creatively imitating characters that were following the social rules of behavior as exhibited in the painting. In addition, the motivation or need to participate in the drama was due to the imaginary dilemma of the painting being removed from public view and the questions of the replica-making artist. Similar to the discussion after the previous activity, students also explored the proficiency skills needed to engage in the activity and how the target language could be advanced to match the students’ linguistic needs as necessary.

4.3.3 Stolen Colors: Student and Teacher-in-Role

Finally, the teacher-candidates were asked to return to their seats. I proceeded to put on a black ski mask to give the impression that I was a thief (an example of teacher-in-role). I then showed images of famous landmarks around the world and in the surrounding community on the projection screen at the front of the classroom. The pictures were first shown in color and then in black and white. Each time the image color changed to black and white I would provide an evil laugh. Pretending to steal an imaginary object and repeating key words in French, I made clear to the students that I had stolen all of the colors from the world.

Next, showing the teacher-candidates an image of a book with the words *livre de magie*, I indicated that there was a magic book in the classroom. If they could find the magic book as detectives, it could restore the missing colors from the world. Gesturing for the teacher-candidates to stand, they were able to follow along with the drama, and look for the magic book (a prop I had previously hid in the room.) At this point, I took the ski mask off to indicate that I was no longer the thief and began to pretend to look for the magic book alongside the teacher-candidates as a concerned citizen.

Once a teacher-candidate found the book, I expressed extreme gratitude. Then, I had the teacher-candidates look through the pages to find pieces of colored construction paper hidden
within its pages. When a teacher-candidate found a piece of paper, I pulled it out with excitement. I said the name of the construction paper’s corresponding color in French several times. The teacher-candidates then had to find something in the room that was of the same color and say its name loudly to ‘restore’ the color back to the room. Following this activity, the class discussed and identified the elements of drama (character, theme, plot, setting, spectacle, etc.) that was used in this exercise and the linguistic demands that were placed on them as learners of new L2 vocabulary.

4.3.4 Writing the Script: Planning Lessons with a DBI-as-Methodology Orientation

After these explicit examples of DBI strategies in action, I asked the teacher-candidates to form small groups of three or four to discuss the process of planning a lesson that could incorporate DBI in the L2 classroom in a way that might support playful/learning ZPD activity. I gave each group a large piece of drawing paper. In order to start the planning process, I asked each group to think of a theme to explore. The teacher-candidates chose diverse topics such as animals, body parts, and family members. Next, I challenged the teacher-candidates to pick specific items to teach related to that theme. I demonstrated an example on the chalkboard. ‘Colors’ was my chosen theme. Secondary colors, primary colors, and colors of the rainbow were all specific topics I showed as examples of what I might teach under that theme.

Once the teacher-candidates had decided on these two features of their lesson (theme and topics), I directed them to pick a setting where they could teach one of those specific topics. Once that was chosen, students were directed to pick characters they, and their students, could portray in that particular setting. Finally, the teacher-candidates were asked to decide on a conflict that could occur in that setting; a conflict that would need to be resolved. The teacher-candidates then had to think about how they would solve this conflict as a class. What would
need to be done? What would the students need to know (linguistically and culturally) to be able to resolve such a conflict? The teacher-candidates were encouraged to begin anticipating their students’ needs (what L2 concepts would they need to explore to participate fully in the drama?) and how they might bring this drama to life in the classroom. Thus, in this lesson planning process, the L2 objectives were selected last rather than being the driving force in instructional design.

To conclude the drama workshop, I reminded the teacher-candidates that DBI, informed by Vygotskian principles, is intended to provide a vehicle to create an imaginative situation with a motivating conflict that may only be solved using particular language objectives. Finally, I encouraged the participants to look at the lesson plans they had already written for the following week in the elementary field experience (Week 7) and voluntarily see if they could incorporate at least one Vygotskian-informed DBI lesson as an optional endeavor.

4.4 The Struggle for Self-Regulation: Challenges in (Re)Framing a Mindset

During the ensuing, and final, teaching week of the elementary field experience (Week 7), the teacher-candidates in the Spanish classroom designed two review lessons that involved several DBI strategies. These lesson activities came on the heels of participating in the DBI workshop during the preceding week. However, upon closer examination, the activities for the most part did not commit to the Vygotskian-informed criteria that would allow playful/learning ZPD activity to emerge as discussed in the DBI workshop. Rather, the DBI-as-Tool orientation adopted earlier in the field experience persisted. (Re)framing one’s orientation to a learning strategy is a difficult process that takes time to develop. One workshop, towards the end of the elementary field experience, presenting the principles of Vygotskian-informed DBI, may have proved too late for the students’ to successfully internalize into their teaching practice during the
elementary field experience. Most of the teacher-candidates continued to struggle to meet the conditions necessary to support successful playful/learning ZPD activity. This signaled to me that the teacher-candidates had not yet been fully self-regulated to be able to design Vygotskian-informed DBI lessons (DBI-as-Methodology) without additional explicit mediational support.

For example, on the first teaching day of Week 7 in the elementary field experience, two of the Spanish teacher-candidates, Sandra and Emily, had students choose a slip of paper from a hat that contained the name of two animals the students would portray in a skit for the rest of the class. Each pair of animals that the students would portray would be from a popular Disney film. While the students would have to invoke an explicit imaginary context in order to perform in each skit, assume explicit roles that would follow perceived social rules of behavior, and be provided with an opportunity for creative imitation of the characters from the films, there was no dramatic conflict or inherent need for the students to engage in the drama beyond fulfilling the teacher-directed assignment; that is to say there was no dramatic need or conflict within the play activity to motivate students’ participation. In addition, after each pair of students performed their scene, their classmates were prompted to guess what movie the scene was from (in English) and name the animals that were portrayed (in Spanish). Thus, without a personal need to participate on the imaginary plane during the dramatic scenes, the role-play became focused on meeting extrinsic learning goals outside of the dramatic play. The DBI strategy (role-play) was conceptualized as a tool to create a backdrop for another product-oriented teaching strategy: a game of charades. Charades was then used to test the students’ declarative memory of L2 animal vocabulary via a formal learning ZPD activity.

Likewise, on the second teaching day of Week 7, another Spanish teacher-candidate, Mary, attempted to review emotion vocabulary using the same modified gauntlet activity that had been demonstrated to the teacher-candidates during the DBI workshop in the methods class. Recalling from the previous section, this activity involved students forming two parallel lines and
pantomiming the meaning of a word by tapping the person behind them and passing the action secretly down the line. However, unlike the DBI workshop where this DBI strategy (pantomime) was situated in an imaginary context (students were positioned as family members who needed to learn a secret password to access a safe full of money), the students in the elementary Spanish classroom participated in the modified gauntlet activity without an explicit imaginary context, explicit roles, or an inherent conflict/need to participate in the drama. Again, the DBI strategy (pantomime) was conceptualized, in this case, as a means to facilitate a competitive game to see which line of students correctly named the emotion in Spanish first.

Finally, a third Spanish teacher-candidate, Patrick, had students form a circle in the front of the classroom. In the middle of the circle were index cards with images and names of a body part. The students were asked to “act out that part of the body hurting” (Spanish Elementary School Lesson Plan, 11/12/2015). The remainder of the class were to guess the part of the body, and after the students provided the answer, the student-actor would say the prescribed sentence, “Me duele [insert body part].” Similar to the issues in Sandra, Emily, and Mary’s use of DBI, Patrick’s activity did not provide an explicit imaginary context nor explicit roles for the students to portray. In addition, the need to participate in the role-play remained extrinsic to the drama activity creating another game of charades where learning was assessed through a formal learning ZPD activity.

In a different case, another Spanish teacher, Uta – of her own volition – asked me for advice before she attempted to design a Vygotskian-informed DBI activity. On the second day of Week 7 of the field experience, and with my verbal input, Uta paired her students up and announced that one student would be an artist while the other person would be the artist’s clay. Uta then told the students that the artists would sculpt their clay into a statue that represented an emotion word for their gallery display. The emotion words would be provided by Uta. In order
to magically return to human form, the students who were pretending to be clay would need to say the emotion word in Spanish that they were portraying. The students would then switch roles.

Unlike the previously described cases, (i.e., Sandra, Emily, Mary, and Patrick), in this example the students were provided with an explicit imaginary context (artists in an art studio), explicit roles to play (artist/clay), opportunities for creative imitation, and a conflict/need inside the drama activity (sculptures needed to be created for a gallery, and words needed to be spoken to resume human form.), which offered an opportunity for playful/learning ZPD activity to take place. Uta could assess the students’ listening comprehension of the L2 vocabulary by how the students sculpted their “clay” and determine L2 recall by listening to students’ oral production of the correct vocabulary words when returning to being a human. In this instance, the DBI strategies that were used (role-play and pantomime) drove the L2 teaching/learning process. However, without my explicit mediation, it is doubtful that Uta would have been any more successful in developing Vygotskian-informed DBI activities than her peers.

Reflecting on this particular lesson, Uta commented:

“The students were incredibly engaged because they had a meaningful context in which to use the language. The lesson was designed so the students had their own space and time to process what the phrase meant and how they could creatively display that. Our students typically freeze up if we ask them questions too quickly or single them out. This activity removed the affective filter (Krashen) because they were able to help each other and express ideas before they were asked to display their ideas to the rest of the class” (Written Teaching Reflection, 11/15/2015).

Uta’s reflection describes a positive reaction to the Vygotskian-informed DBI activity she facilitated in the elementary Spanish classroom. She seems particular surprised at the level of engagement shown by the students during the lesson and how the activity itself seemed to reduce their ‘performance’ anxiety, which she identifies as having been a persistent barrier to their use of the language up to this point. In addition, Uta reflected on what she felt she had done differently
as a teacher to be able to successfully facilitate the Vygotskian-informed DBI activity for her students:

“I think my biggest strength was adding humor to reduce the affective filter. Even the shyest students were enthusiastically participating. I think I was able to encourage their dramatic interpretations through my own excitement. I have learned that students (even the youngest) are keen on the authenticity of your energy and attitude so it is essential to genuinely convey these traits” (Written Teaching Reflection, 11/15/2015).

Uta makes an important observation here. She points to her own excitement and use of humor to persuade students to engage in a learning activity that encourages playful learning behaviors that may seem unfamiliar to many students. She remarks that it is ‘essential’ to convey authenticity when introducing and facilitating Vygotskian-informed DBI strategies. Uta seems to infer that if the teacher does not ‘buy’ into the playful/learning context of the activity, the students will not either.

Finally, Uta expressed some challenges and affordances this DBI activity produced:

“Once the activity began, although the students had good intentions, certain students became a little too aggressive with each other so I addressed each one individually. I simply gave a quiet, verbal reminder that we are real people and not clay so we can be hurt more easily. After this, the students channeled their excitement much better. I believe that students working together and co-constructing knowledge is incredibly beneficial because we are naturally social beings. Young learners, especially, are inclined to enjoy interpersonal activities both inside and outside the classroom. My entire lesson this week relied on this belief because each the students had to prepare their sculpture through social interaction and also had to depend on each other to “unfreeze” the sculptures” (Written Teaching Reflection, 11/15/2015)

Here, Uta describes a potential challenge for teachers implementing Vygotskian-informed DBI strategies into their classroom for the first time. DBI strategies, in general, rupture the traditional script of schooling by providing students the opportunity to engage in playful activities that allow for an element of personal freedom that is not always permitted during other formal learning activities. Consequently, faced with a sudden sense of autonomy and afforded a space to express personal creativity, students’ behaviors may be interpreted as ‘over-excitable’ or
‘aggressive.’ and, in fact, this may be true due to the possible repression of these emotions by other institutional and instructional practices.

While the French teaching group did not incorporate as many DBI activities as the Spanish teaching group following the DBI workshop, one of the case participants, Max, did choose to engage in DBI on the first teaching day during Week 7 of the elementary field experience. The other case participant, Madeline, sought out my advice on designing a DBI lesson during Week 6 (prior to the whole class DBI workshop). Those lessons are analyzed in detail in chapters five and six. Since it was optional to engage in Vygotskian-informed DBI during Week 7 of the elementary field experience, the remaining French teacher-candidates did not choose to re-write their lesson plans to experiment with a DBI-as-Methodology approach to L2 teaching/learning.

Regardless of the level of success in using DBI strategies as a way to create playful/learning ZPD activity, several of the Spanish teacher-candidates expressed value in DBI and an interest in further developing their skills in facilitating its use in L2 instruction as they looked forward to their secondary field experiences that would occur the following year:

“Some lesson activities I will definitely incorporate next fall are the drama-based ones. I really liked how this puts a fun twist on learning and students really get into acting out situations and pretending. This is a great fun way for students to learn and also lowers the affective filter” (Sandra, Written Teaching Reflection, 11/17/2015).

“I think everyone would enjoy drama-based activities…drama activities that are adapted to older students can also be fun, too. I remember in Spanish 3 freshman year of high school we had to put on a fashion show for one of the units, and everyone really enjoyed doing that” (Lukas, Written Teaching Reflection, 11/17/2015).

“I will definitely try to use more drama-based instruction because I think it is something that the students really like and can understand rather well” (Savannah, Written Teaching Reflection, 11/17/2015).

“Dramatic based instruction and interactive learning techniques that steer clear of the audio-lingual method for the most part and create interest and a need for communication are the most effective [procedures and practices for L2
learning]...I think the drama-based instruction activities as well as using a book or source of culture to teach would be good lesson activities to pull from this elementary field experience for the secondary class next fall” (Mary, Written Teaching Reflection, 11/17/2015).

Madeline and Max, from the French teaching group, also expressed interest in using DBI strategies in the L2 classroom. Madeline commented:

“In the future, I would like to incorporate more drama-based activities. I still would have to figure out how to use drama based activities in a classroom with older students, but I really think it is beneficial for learning to put yourself in a situation where you have to use the language instead of just reading about it or filling out a worksheet like some classes are still run today” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/2015).

While Max stated:

“I want to do a lot more drama-based instruction because I think it’s fun and I think the kids can have fun doing it as well” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/2015).

Recognizing that the teacher-candidates had not been able to fully self-regulate themselves to incorporate Vygotskian-informed DBI in L2 curriculum design, and taking into account the ongoing interest in DBI expressed by several of the teacher-candidates across both teaching groups, I selected Madeline and Max as case study participants (as discussed in the previous chapter) for further investigation due, in part, to the fact that they had elected to participate in an upcoming EFL field experience in Sweden. This would provide the next immediate opportunity for them to apply their emerging conceptual understanding of DBI as a unique way to promote L2 teaching/learning in a new teaching context prior to their secondary field experience in the United States. Owing to their expressed interest in using DBI in future field experience contexts. and in wanting to further understand their process towards (re)conceptualizing the use of DBI strategies in the language learning classroom (from a Drama-as-Tool to a Drama-as-Methodology orientation), I continued to follow their progress. Their cases are presented over the next three chapters.
4.5 Conclusion

This chapter broadly discussed the early experiences of conceptualizing DBI in the language learning classroom among ten L2 teacher-candidates enrolled in a language teacher preparation program. Originally, these teacher-candidates were introduced to three DBI strategies (role-play, puppetry, and storytelling) through coursework completed in their methods course. This led to DBI being conceptualized as a supportive tool to contextualize language learning from a variety of methodological perspectives rather than as an approach to L2 teaching/learning that might drive instruction. Consequently, the teacher-candidates were introduced to additional DBI strategies and were shown how to incorporate them into lesson plans using Vygotskian-informed criteria to support playful/learning ZPD activity.

While this chapter provided broad insights into the patterns that arose amongst the ten teacher-candidates as they began to (re)conceptualize DBI as playful/learning ZPD activity in the language learning classroom, what follows are three data chapters that aim to take a closer look at this complex process. In chapters five and six, Madeline and Max’s early attempts in using DBI during the elementary field experience (both prior to and after the workshop on Vygotskian-informed DBI) are analyzed and discussed in detail using methods of classroom discourse analysis. Chapter seven provides further data on the participants’ next attempts incorporating DBI into their L2 instruction during the four-week EFL field experience in north-central Sweden. Madeline and Max’s final impressions of DBI in L2 instruction concludes the data chapters.
Chapter 5

Act One: Becoming a ‘Good’ Teacher – The Unfolding Case of Madeline

5.1 Introduction

As outlined in chapter three, this study took place in three phases over the course of two years when two world language teacher-candidates participated in the final 24 months of their teacher-preparation program. This chapter, and the next, describes data drawn from the first phase of the study. The results from phase one of Madeline’s case, and the ensuing analysis which details her initial attempts and conceptual understanding of DBI strategies in the L2 classroom, is presented in this chapter. This is done in an effort to trace the genesis of her professional development throughout the rest of this study. Similarly, the results and analysis of phase one from Max’s case will be discussed in the next chapter. The results from phase two and three of the study, are discussed in chapter seven.

As discussed elsewhere in this dissertation (most notably in chapters two and three), Madeline and Max were selected for further investigation as case study participants to gain a closer examination of the process an individual undergoes when attempting to (re)conceptualize DBI in the language learning classroom (i.e., orienting to a Drama-as-Methodology vs. Drama-as-Tool conceptual framework.) Madeline and Max were chosen, in part, due to their similarities in language specialization and interest in pursuing their ESL endorsement credential. In addition, they elected to participate in an EFL study abroad experience which would afford them with the next immediate opportunity to apply their developing conceptual knowledge of DBI in language learning classrooms prior to participating in their secondary field experience, which was a unique consideration of these two participants.
What follows in this chapter is a brief biographical sketch of Madeline’s socio-cultural and language learning background followed by her initial attempts to incorporate DBI in the elementary field experience. This includes my attempts at mediating her conceptual understanding of how DBI might be used in the language learning classroom, (i.e., as an instructional tool to support teacher-dominated approaches to L2 teaching/learning), to one informed by Vygotskian principles (i.e., as an instructional tool to support playful/learning ZPD activity in cooperative classroom settings).

5.2. Socio-cultural and Language Learning Background

At the beginning of the study, Madeline was a twenty-three-year-old post-baccalaureate teacher-candidate specializing in French education. Her exposure to world languages began from a young age. Madeline identified herself as biracial – her father was a multilingual immigrant from southern India while her mother was a white, monolingual English speaker from Ohio. Growing up, Madeline and her family would travel to Bangalore in southern India every few years where she heard people speaking Kannada and Tamil in addition to English. She recalled:

“I just remember when I was six, we’d gone there [to India], and seeing all the different scripts and hearing the different language. I think it just went past me, though. I wasn’t thinking about foreign language then” (Interview, 12/10/15).

While it may be impossible to know the level or type of influence these early interactional moments with linguistic diversity had on Madeline’s future engagement with world languages, her ability to recall witnessing particular linguistic features of the Indian community that she periodically visited, and her ability to distinguish them from her own language practices, signals a possible emergence of multilingual awareness from a very young age.

While her father spoke Kannada, Tamil, and English, Madeline and her two sisters were not brought up speaking any additional languages other than English. She explained:
“He didn’t see us learning those languages as useful at all so he just didn’t bother teaching us a different language. I remember giving my dad a hard time a couple of years ago; being like, “Why didn’t you teach us this language?” He was like, ‘You’re not going to use this language. Why would you need to?’ And I haven’t tried to pick it up. I could practice it with him, but then that’d just be a lot of work” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Madeline’s own journey as an L2 learner of French began nearly ten years prior to the start of this study and involved substantial personal investment. Beginning in the sixth grade, she was presented with the opportunity for formal instruction in world languages through an exploratory program offered via her middle school curriculum. She chronicled her perceived early L2 learning challenges in one of her weekly reflections written for the elementary field experience:

“I started studying French when I was in sixth grade and really didn’t like it at first. Learning another language didn’t come as naturally to me as it does now. Eventually everything clicked…” (Weekly Reflection, 8/26/15).

Her assumption that L2 learning might come to someone ‘naturally’ points to her belief that some people may have an innate propensity towards studying world languages; one that she felt she did not initially possess as determined by criteria set forth by her school’s gatekeepers. Nonetheless, Madeline proceeded to take French for the next four years – completing Advanced Placement (AP) French in her senior year. Her continued involvement with French meant that she was able to participate in a school-sponsored field trip to France while she was in 11th grade. Her visit to France during her high school studies would heavily influence her future decision to major in French as an undergraduate student:

“We stayed with a host family. It was the first time that I was actually stuck in a situation where I could use everything I had learned. What I learned was so much different from anything that I was using. Like everything [I knew] was so formal and I just remembered the last night I was with that host family. I was sitting there at the dinner table and my host sister was talking about [the television character] Hannah Montana; trying to explain to her parents what it was, and I could understand every single word she was saying, and their whole conversation, and I was too shy to be a part of it, which still makes me mad that I didn’t talk to them, but I just remember being so surprised at how quickly I learned – how much more I learned – and how much I loved using the language
and being around it. So, I remember that summer telling my parents that I
wanted to be a French major and it was a huge deal” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Madeline’s L2 interactional experiences abroad made her conscious of a disconnect that
was occurring in her L2 learning; that is to say, she became aware that the French she was
exposed to in her classroom context was substantially different from the language that was being
used by her host family in France. Her experience abroad helped her realize that the elements of
French that are often privileged in the classroom (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) are insufficient
tools to support successful social interaction.

Upon completing her initial undergraduate degree in French and comparative literature,
Madeline found herself with a personal dilemma regarding her career path:

“I always knew that I wanted to teach. Well, I didn’t always know, but after
freshman year I knew that I wanted to teach” (Interview, 12/10/15).

She was interested in becoming a French teacher, but she lacked the necessary credentials
to pursue such an option. Yet, despite Madeline’s ongoing interest in teacher-preparation, she
explained her reasons for not enrolling in the world languages teaching certification program
earlier in her undergraduate program:

“I knew it was a completely different track that I’d have to go on to. I’d have to
go to the college of education. So, I went and talked to an adviser and after five
minutes of discussing it he was just, “Go to grad school for it.” I was like, “Oh,
okay. I’ll just go to grad school for it.” And the rest of the twenty-five minutes
he just talked about how his son went to the same high school as I had. So, I was
like, “Okay! Let’s go to grad school for it!” (Interview, 12/10/15).

When asked why she had decided to participate in the ESL endorsement program in
addition to pursuing her world languages certification she explained that it was, “Just to help me
find a job. I guess that’s the main thing that made me look into it” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Interestingly, Madeline did not verbalize any other reason for acquiring the ESL endorsement
including an expressed interest in working with ELL students as a unique student population.
Rather, she places emphasis on viewing the ESL endorsement credential as a marketing tool to
gain entry into the job market. It appears as if her primary interest in the teacher preparation program is in developing her role as a French teacher with her specialization in ESL as a secondary pursuit to ensure job security.

Madeline’s personal socio-cultural and language learning background uniquely orient her to language teaching. Her experiences growing up in a multilingual household, as well as her travels abroad to India and France, allowed her to see language as a tool for communication which she discovered involves far more than a study of grammatical structure and the memorization of isolated vocabulary items. In addition, it is possible that her long-held desire to teach French – and her decision to return to Mountainside University as a post-baccalaureate candidate – provided intrinsic personal motivation to successfully acquire and apply the pedagogical content knowledge discussed in the world languages teacher preparation program. These assertions will be further explored in the upcoming sections of this chapter.

5.3 Phase I: The Elementary Field Experience

In the fall of 2015, as Madeline prepared for the elementary field experience, I asked her to write a reflection detailing what she hoped to learn from her first guided teaching opportunity. She wrote:

“Since [this course] lets me become certified in K-12, I hope this experience will help me decide what grade levels I would like to teach. I always thought I would want to teach secondary education, but this experience could show me that I like working with children. Also, this class will be my first formal form of teaching, so I hope to learn a lot from it. I know that not every day will be perfect, so I am really interested in learning ways to resolve conflicts among the children and how to handle children when they are misbehaving” (Weekly Reflection, 8/26/15).

Madeline pointed to her initial predilection for teaching at the secondary level (grades 7-12), but at this point in her teacher-preparation program she possessed limited classroom
experience from the stance of an educator (“…this class will be my first formal form of teaching” [Weekly Reflection, 8/26/15]). She appeared to be the most concerned with the quality of her classroom management skills and her ability to “handle” young learners. She seemed to be curious about student behaviors and how their actions in the classroom might affect her teaching strategies rather than the reverse: how her chosen teaching strategies might affect student behavior and learning outcomes. In addition, she expressed some of her personal fears:

“What I am most afraid of in this class is that I will end up being a terrible teacher. I’m afraid I’ll get up in front of the class and have absolutely no idea what I am doing. Or that none of the children will even bother to listen to me. What if all my training is for nothing and I’m not cut out for teaching? I think it takes a special skill to be a good teacher, and I am afraid that I’ll find out that I don’t have it. I know that in the weeks before the actual field experience we will be learning a lot and we will write a bunch of lesson plans, but still, all of it will be tested when I’m in front of a class” (Weekly Reflection, 8/26/15).

At this early stage in Madeline’s development as a teacher-candidate, she expressed her fear of failure. Similar to her belief in an innate tendency towards excelling at foreign language study, she appeared to view “good” teaching as attainable only if one possessed a “special” skill; a skill that she was afraid she did not naturally possess, which would render the hard work that she had completed in the teacher preparation program to date useless. She acknowledged, on the onset of the program, that she would be “learning a lot” and “writing a bunch of lesson plans” in the weeks prior to the elementary field experience, but she seemed to have set up a rigid binary for herself (successful/unsuccessful) that ran parallel to the grading requirements of her field experience (pass/fail). Madeline appeared to have perceived only two options for her at this particular juncture: do well in the elementary field experience or re-think her career options once more.

Madeline’s perception of what constitutes ‘good’ teaching may have arisen from the value she placed on the teaching expertise presented in the teacher-preparation program. In particular, in the methods course and the elementary field experience practicum class, I often
presented the teacher-candidates with lists of “do’s” and “don’ts” related to research on ‘best’ teaching practices. This was done in an effort to guide the development of teacher-candidates’ professional dispositions. However, these lists may have been interpreted by Madeline as prescriptive teaching expectations, (i.e., a ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ way of facilitating classroom learning), rather than as guides to develop teacher-candidates’ sense of classroom methodology (i.e., being critically aware of the outcomes related to pedagogical decision-making that may arise inside and outside of the classroom.)

This sense of being labeled ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ while experimenting with new teaching practices may have had the effect of producing a sense of anxiety as she entered her first field experience. In addition, it may have influenced the pedagogical choices she made when designing her original lesson plans with her peers. The next section provides an outline of Madeline’s overall teaching practices during the elementary field experience before focusing on her initial approach to the use of DBI in the language learning classroom.

5.3.1 Examining Madeline’s Teaching Practices in the Elementary Field Experience

Across the eight-week field experience, Madeline was identified (via her group’s submitted lesson plans) as leading a learning activity 11 times. In addition, she was listed as co-leading a learning activity on eight other occasions. Tables 5.1 and 5.2 provide the results of the strategy questionnaire (see Appendix C), which was given to Madeline at the end of her exit-interview once the elementary field experience had been completed (see chapter three for a more in-depth overview of data sources, methods of data collection, and definitions of methods).

This questionnaire asked her to review and reflect on the 11 lessons she was listed as a lead teacher. Then, using her emerging understanding of L2 teaching/learning, she was asked to select which strategies she felt she had used during each learning activity. The list of the DBI
terms and definitions from Table 4-1 in chapter four was included with the questionnaire for her reference when completing the form.

Table 5-1: Elementary field experience questionnaire results for Madeline: Non-DBI strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Strategy</th>
<th>Number of times used (Self-identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiolingual</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Game</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Physical Response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar-Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 [Film, Visual Art, Song]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2: Elementary field experience questionnaire results for Madeline: DBI strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Strategy</th>
<th>Number of times used (Self-identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantomime</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Props</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppetry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Play</td>
<td>1 [Teacher-in-Role &amp; Student-in-Role]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableau</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Imagery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Pantomime</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel/Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundscape</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley/Gauntlet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the strategy questionnaire was designed to capture Madeline’s emerging conceptual knowledge of language teaching methods, her personal analysis of the instructional methods she employed during the elementary field experience may not have reflected reality. As apparent from the questionnaire results, Madeline reported a seeming reliance on non-DBI strategies to a higher degree than DBI strategies during the design and implementation of her learning activities throughout the elementary field experience. According to Madeline’s self-assessment, she felt she had used the audio-lingual method followed by competitive learning games the most throughout the elementary field experience. As I argue in what follows, and as I theorized in chapter two, Madeline’s expressed favoritism for these traditional methods of L2
teaching/learning may have been caused by her personal perception of how language learning should occur and/or the way she may have experienced L2 learning in her everyday classroom environments both at the K-12 and higher education settings. In addition, in an effort to maintain a sense of control over the classroom, traditional power dynamics offered through the non-DBI methods may have provided a sense of safety while leading learning activities as a novice teacher.

Indeed, in reviewing the results of Madeline’s questionnaire, there were only three lessons where she assessed herself as having used DBI strategies. When DBI was used, pantomiming (conveying meaning through the body without words) appeared to have been heavily favored. These self-assessed DBI lessons occurred during weeks three, four, and six. Due to the fact that the teacher-candidates were required to self-videotape their teaching of only one lesson per week, (per the requirements of the elementary field experience), video data for the self-identified DBI lessons were collected for weeks three and six only (see chapter eight for a discussion of study limitations). Madeline chose to not videotape her week four lesson, thus analysis of classroom interactions using DBI strategies will focus on only those lessons with existing video data (in weeks three and six). This was done for accurate transcription and analysis purposes and to examine Madeline’s perception of what constitutes drama-based instruction.

5.4 Week Three DBI Lesson: A Game of Charades

Madeline’s teaching group in the elementary field experience consisted of four teacher-candidates who co-constructed lesson plans for students in grades 1-4 (see chapter three for a longer description of the research context). Over the first two weeks of the elementary field experience, I observed Madeline’s teaching group twice to provide feedback on their emerging
pedagogical practice. At the end of the second week, I made the following written observation that I shared with the French teacher-candidates:

“I encourage more direction giving in French all around – I hear a lot of English being used because I have a feeling it has become ‘easy’ to get directions and points across to the students [in English], but the students will benefit more from repeated French exposure as long as it’s targeted at their [proficiency] level. The more English you use the harder it will be to try to get them to use French” (Written Observation Feedback, 10/6/2015).

This comment was made in order to encourage the teacher-candidates to meet the challenge set forth by ACTFL stating that world language instruction should aim to be conducted around 90% of the time in the target language (Crouse, 2012). In the methods class, students were encouraged to use a variety of para-linguistic supports to help them stay in the target language. These included the use of pantomime (which was explained as conveying meaning with the body without words), gestures (understood to be physical actions to emphasize speech), visual models (e.g., images, graphs, maps, etc.) and/or realia (objects from everyday life) while reminding them to create communicative-based tasks that would create a compelling and authentic need to use the target language. These suggestions were repeated often during class lectures and through written and oral feedback on teacher-candidates’ lesson plans and written teaching reflections.

Madeline, in an effort to follow this advice and to meet the challenge of using more of the target language in her instruction designed a review activity for the students that would involve the use of two para-linguistic strategies that had been suggested: pantomime and visual models. Indeed, when reflecting on why she had selected pantomime as the DBI strategy used in her Week 3 lesson on the strategy questionnaire, she commented:

I chose that [pantomime] because I wanted to use more French with them and I can't remember my feedback, but I think I used a good amount of French (Strategy Questionnaire Response, 12/10/15).
Going into Week 3 of the program, Madeline’s lesson was to assess the students’ memory and comprehension of the folktale *La lune qui disparaît* (*The Moon Disappears*), written by Dori H. Butler, which was read to the students during Week 2. This story was a folktale, and it would serve as the thematic basis for subsequent lessons through the fourth week of the field experience. Madeline’s specific learning objectives were for students to be able to identify the French names of at least four different animals that made an appearance in the folktale and to review the story’s plotline “because it helps solidify all of the new information, like French vocabulary, that students learned from having the story read to them the week before” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Week 3/Day 1, 10/13/2015).

Madeline began writing the following words on the whiteboard prior to the start of the lesson under the heading *Les Animaux*: écureuil, hibou, moufette, raton laveur, and chèvre (The Animals: squirrel, owl, skunk, raccoon, and goat.) Directly underneath this list, she wrote another heading, *Les Émotions* (The Emotions), and included the following list of L2 vocabulary: heureux, peur, triste, and enthousiaste (happy, scared, sad, and enthusiastic.) On the opposite side of the whiteboard, she taped thirteen pictures of all of the characters that made an appearance in *La lune qui disparaît*.

After the class finished their opening routine, the students were asked to remain seated on the carpet in a semi-circle facing the whiteboard. Madeline proceeded to ask the students a series of questions regarding the characters in each of the pictures on the whiteboard. Excerpt 5.1 demonstrates Madeline’s attempt to review pre-taught individual L2 lexical items from the previous week through her use of pantomime:

**Excerpt 5.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Madeline:</td>
<td>I’m going to go over some important vocab words that we covered (3.0) comme les <em>animaux</em>. ((Points to the</td>
<td>I’m going to go over some important vocab words that we covered (3.0) like animals. ((Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Les animaux. Qui peut se souvenir (taps her temple with left index finger) écureuil? (Points to the word écureuil on whiteboard) (1.0) >Repetez-moi<. É-cu-reuil.


Madeline: É-cu-reuil. Et anglais. Can anyone se souvenir (taps her temple with left index finger)?

Jack: Remember!

Madeline: Raises both arms, bending at the elbow, so that her hands are placed just below her chin shoulder-width apart. Her wrists bend forward and her fingers curl towards her palms and uses lips to squeak twice.

Thomas: Sq[uirrel]. Sq[uirrel].

Bonnie: [Eat!] [Eat!]

Madeline: (Points to Thomas) Oui! Squirrel. Très bien. (Points to the word on the board and taps each syllable) É-cu-reuil. (Points to the next word on the whiteboard under écureuil) Qui peut se souvenir hibou? (2.0) ((Two students raise their hands. Points to Serena)) Serena?

Serena: Owl? (Points to Thomas) Yes! Squirrel. Very good. (Points to the word on the board and taps each syllable)

É-cu-reuil. (Points to the next word on the whiteboard under écureuil) Who remember hibou? (2.0) ((Two students raise their hands. Points to Serena)) Serena?

Eric: Um (1.0) maybe um (2.0) deer? Um (1.0) maybe um (2.0) deer?

Madeline: ↑N:o. (Shakes head right to left. Points to Serena) Serena?

((Madeline pinches her nose with her right hand and waves her left hand in front of her face. Two students raise their hands. She points to Thomas)).

Thomas: Skunk!
In lines 15–20 and 41–45, the self-selected DBI strategy (pantomime) appears to have been used by Madeline as a complementary teaching aide to reduce her use of direct translation. As anticipated, this early use of DBI seems to have been an isolated teacher-oriented action that was selected as one of the para-linguistic supports offered in the methods course to maintain teacher production of the target language. Without explicit instruction on how to incorporate DBI strategies oriented towards the formation of playful/learning ZPD activity, Madeline’s initial interpretation of how to use DBI in L2 instruction was similar to the actions taken by her peers across both teaching groups when they first conceptualized the use of DBI in their respective lesson plans (i.e., using a Drama-as-Tool orientation to DBI; see chapter four). Pantomime, in this instance, became a tool to promote a guessing game activity that did not move beyond direct translation between the students’ L1 (English) and the target language (French). The students remained spectators and interpreters of a series of charades demonstrated by Madeline.

In addition, Madeline displays a strong tendency to rely on a classic I.R.E./F. (teacher-initiated utterance, student-response, teacher-evaluation/feedback) pattern of classroom discourse, which limits the communicative contributions of the students to include only responses needed to answer questions posed by the teacher. This conversational pattern may be due to her stated fear of not being able to manage students’ behavior in the classroom. By restricting the students’
communicative contributions, Madeline is able to maintain a sense of control over her teaching environment.

### 5.4.2 The Disappearing Pantomime

After Madeline finished reviewing the key vocabulary in *La lune qui disparaît*, she began to ask the students a series of comprehension questions while (re)telling the story. Storytelling, the second DBI strategy that Madeline reported as being used in this lesson, is discussed in light of the interactions that occur during this story (re)telling process. The interactions transcribed in Excerpt 5.2 occurred during the middle of Madeline’s story (re)telling activity:

Excerpt 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Gesture[s]</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>It’s going down.</td>
<td>It’s going down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Oui, ↑mais (.) &gt;la lui est près&lt; (.) la lune ((Points to the illustration of the moon)) était ↑pl:::us petite. La ↑lune (Points to the illustration of the moon) (. ) était ↑pl:::us petite.</td>
<td>Yes, ↑but (.) &gt;it was near&lt; (.) the moon ((Points to the moon) was sma:::ller. The ↑moon (Points to the illustration of the moon) (. ) was ↑sma:::ller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((Points to the illustration of the moon)) (. ) était ↑pl:::us petite.</td>
<td>(Points to the illustration of the moon) (. ) was ↑sma:::ller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Oui. Levez la ↑main. oLevez la main. Oui. The moon was getting smaller. (2.0) Maintenat↑, (.) est-ce que chèvre↓ (. ) et raton ↑laveur &gt; a ↑cro&lt; øécureuil♂? (0.2) &gt;Do you think that they believed him now?&gt;&lt;</td>
<td>Yes. Raide your ↑hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((Points to the illustration of the moon)) (. ) était ↑pl:::us petite.</td>
<td>(Points to the illustration of the moon) (. ) was ↑sma:::ller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Oui. Levez la ↑main. oLevez la main. Oui.</td>
<td>(Points to the illustration of the moon) (. ) was ↑sma:::ller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Oui. The moon was getting smaller. (2.0) Maintenat↑, (.) est-ce que chèvre↓ (. ) et raton ↑laveur &gt; a ↑cro&lt; øécureuil♂? (0.2) &gt;Do you think that they believed him now?&gt;&lt;</td>
<td>Yes. Raide your ↑hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Oui. Levez la ↑main. oLevez la main. Oui. The moon was getting smaller. (2.0) Maintenat↑, (.) est-ce que chèvre↓ (. ) et raton ↑laveur &gt; a ↑cro&lt; øécureuil♂? (0.2) &gt;Do you think that they believed him now?&gt;&lt;</td>
<td>Yes. Raide your ↑hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Oui. Levez la ↑main. oLevez la main. Oui. The moon was getting smaller. (2.0) Maintenat↑, (.) est-ce que chèvre↓ (. ) et raton ↑laveur &gt; a ↑cro&lt; øécureuil♂? (0.2) &gt;Do you think that they believed him now?&gt;&lt;</td>
<td>Yes. Raide your ↑hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Oui. Levez la ↑main. oLevez la main. Oui. The moon was getting smaller. (2.0) Maintenat↑, (.) est-ce que chèvre↓ (. ) et raton ↑laveur &gt; a ↑cro&lt; øécureuil♂? (0.2) &gt;Do you think that they believed him now?&gt;&lt;</td>
<td>Yes. Raide your ↑hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
<td>Getting smaller?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Uh-huh↑.</td>
<td>Uh-huh↑.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>oYes♂.</td>
<td>oYes♂.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Ou:::i</td>
<td>Ou:::i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>[Ou:::]</td>
<td>[Ou:::]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((Thomas raises hand))</td>
<td>((Thomas raises hand))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Mmhmm. Très bien. (0.2) Okay. (.) Maintenant, (. ) qui ont peur ((Jack and Seth raise their hands)) now?</td>
<td>Mmhmm. Very good. (0.2) Okay. (.) Now, (.) who is afraid ((Jack and Seth raise their hands)) now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 Jack?  Jack?
26 The squirrel.  The squirrel.
27 >No, no, no↑. Qui (.) a (.) peur?  >No, no, no↑. Who (.) is afraid? (2.0) [Now].
28 (2.0) [Maintenant].  (2.0) [Now].
29 Scared.  Scared.
30 Yea. Wh::o do you think is scared now?  ((Mitch, Seth, Jack, and Serena raise their hands)).  Jack?
31 The squirrel.  The squirrel.
32 No, no, no↑. Qui (.) a (.) peur?  (2.0) [Maintenant].  Who (.) is afraid? (2.0) [Now].
33 Scared.  Scared.
34 The animals.  The animals.
35 Yea. Who do you think is scared now?  ((Mitch, Seth, Jack, and Serena raise their hands)).  Jack?
36 To::us les animaux ((Uses her left hand to make an imaginary circle in the air)).  Oui. (.) Trés bien. (1.0) What do you think they do now?  (2.0) What do you think they do now?  (2.0) What do you think they do now?  ((Mitch and Seth raise their hands)).  Mitch?
37 Scared.  Scared.
38 To::us les animaux ((Uses her left hand to make an imaginary circle in the air)).
39 Yes. What do you think they do now?  (2.0) What do you think they do now?  (2.0) What do you think they do now?  ((Mitch and Seth raise their hands)).  Mitch?
40 Hi::bou?  Yes. Very good. (1.0) And do you (. ) remember (.) what the owl (. ) said? (1.0)
41 Close. (2.0) ( (Bonnie raises hand) ) Bonnie?  Close. (2.0) ( (Bonnie raises her hand) ) Bonnie?
42 About (. ) the solar system.  About (. ) the solar system.
43 They ask (. ) the owl?  They ask (. ) the owl?  They ask (. ) the owl?  They ask (. ) the owl?
45 Hi::bou?  Hi::bou?  Hi::bou?  Hi::bou?
46 Oui. Trés bien. (1.0) Et est-ce que vous vous ( . ) souven ( . ) w-wait (2.0) est-ce que ( . ) vous pouvez >se souvenir< (2.0) qu’est que hibou ( . ) a dit? (1.0)
47 Te[aches...]?  Te[aches...]?  Te[aches...]?
48 A dit?  [said?]  [said?]
49 Teaches them?  Teaches them?
50 Mmhmm. Do you remember what he teaches them?  Mmhmm. Do you remember what he teaches them?
51 About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.  About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.
52 Mmhmm. ↑Ou::i.  Mmhmm. ↑Ye::s.
53 ↑Mmhmm. ↑Ou::i.  ↑Mmhmm. ↑Ye::s.
54 When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…
55 About (. ) the solar system.  About (. ) the solar system.  About (. ) the solar system.  About (. ) the solar system.
56 About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑. About the ↑solar system. About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.  About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.
57 Mmhmm.  (Hhhh) No.  The sun doesn’t hands) now?  Jack?
58 Thomas  Thomas  Thomas  Thomas
59 About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.  About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.  About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.  About how the ↑sun ( . ) makes the ↑moon ( . ) disapp::ear↑.
60 Thomas  Thomas  Thomas  Thomas
62 Levez la main.  ((Raises hand))  When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…  When the earth turns…
63 (Hhhh) No. The sun doesn’t  (Hhhh) No. The sun doesn’t  (Hhhh) No. The sun doesn’t  (Hhhh) No. The sun doesn’t
In this excerpt, pantomime has disappeared from Madeline’s lesson. Storytelling as a DBI strategy defined in Table 4-1, is a strategy that affords “delivering a story in a unique creative way (i.e., puppetry, felt board, dress-up, etc.).” It is intended as a means of sharing a story that goes beyond reading a story. Storytelling as a DBI strategy asks participants to physically embody characters to convey the actions of a story without scripted dialogue.

However, the way Madeline facilitated this learning activity meant that it continued to be a test of students’ declarative memory and direct translation through story comprehension questions rather than as a means to develop students’ communicative capabilities through the L2 by (re)telling the story in a unique way.

As with the use of pantomime in Excerpt 5.1, Madeline, without explicit guidance to do otherwise, does not permit the students to participate in creative imitation (and by extension topic exploration) by partnering with her in the bilingual story (re)telling process. Instead, the roles the students played were only that of passive contributors to teacher-established comprehension questions that were recalled by select students due to their prior exposure to the story (and the names and emotional states of the characters) in a previous lesson.
5.5 Week Three DBI Activity: Reflections and Initial Mediation

To summarize the discussion up to this point, prior to explicit instruction on how to incorporate DBI in ways that might promote playful/learning ZPD activity, the self-identified DBI strategies in this lesson appeared only as a formulaic vehicle to meet Madeline’s pre-determined objectives (vocabulary review through story-recall). In order to use pantomime and storytelling as a means to create playful/learning ZPD activity in the context of this particular lesson (i.e., using a DBI-as-Methodology orientation), Madeline would have needed to provide an imaginary context in which the students would have assumed explicit roles that needed to (re)tell the folktale through creative imitation or make meaning of her pantomimed actions (e.g., the students are the last known people to have heard the story and they must retell what they remember before it is forgotten, etc.)

At the end of Week 3, written feedback was provided to Madeline in an attempt to (re)focus and (re)situate her use of DBI to create more meaningful communicative-based playful/learning experiences that might drive the learning experience rather than as auxiliary tools to support L2 language production during formal learning ZPD activities:

“The last thing to consider is to make sure that every time you design an activity, that activity needs to possess some point of conflict (or drama) that creates a communicative need for students to use the language concept you are teaching that day” (Written Supervisor Feedback, 10/15/2015).

This feedback echoed comments that had been made in the methods course prior to the start of the elementary field experience. On the next teaching day directly following the lesson in which she had indicated her use of pantomime and storytelling as DBI strategies in her learning activity, Madeline led another lesson to introduce students to L2 clothing vocabulary. This activity involved inviting students to pull random individual articles of clothing from a box, asking them to say the name of the clothing item in French, and then putting the piece of clothing on a teacher. To emphasize my point regarding contextualizing her learning activities to create
authentic communicative situations through DBI strategies, I went on to illustrate a (re)interpretation of this same activity in feedback provided to Madeline:

“For example, the clothing in the box [activity] may have been enhanced by providing students with an imaginative scenario that reflects a real situation where the students would need to look for clothes to help dress someone (E.x.: “Nous allons sur un voyage en Alaska. Quels vêtements…?”) [We are going on a trip to Alaska. Which clothes…?] That way students begin connecting French as a real, living language that is used to complete tasks in the same way that English does” (Written Supervisor Feedback, 10/15/2015).

Over the next two weeks of the elementary field experience, Madeline led two more learning activities. The first involved introducing days of the week, months of the year, and seasons via the direct method and reinforcing the new vocabulary by teaching two songs (one about days of the week; the other about months of the year). The students then played a game where they had to listen to L2 questions that contained a season vocabulary item. Then, after recognizing the meaning of the season vocabulary, they would need to write down articles of clothing they would wear during that time of the year on whiteboards. Madeline’s choice to contextualize the game to reflect a situation where students would need to comprehend seasonal vocabulary may have been influenced by the feedback she received from me the previous week. The second lesson that she taught involved pre-teaching vocabulary (using the direct method) of the next story that would be read to the class (Les Fées by Charles Perrault).

In her written teaching reflections during Weeks 3 and 4, her attention focused mostly on pedagogical issues related to time management and ways of addressing challenging student behaviors. By the end of Week 5 of the elementary field experience, her reflections shifted towards matters related to methodology signaling, perhaps, a new development in her pedagogical conceptual knowledge. In particular, Madeline showed signs that she was becoming aware of the limitations imposed on the learners by the current learning strategies she, and her teaching group, were using in their lesson activities:
“I realized a lot of times our foreign language class feels like a guessing game. I wanted to try to teach them the vocabulary without constantly asking them, ‘What do you think this means?’ So, I pointed at pictures I put on the overhead and just said what they would be in French. Immediately students repeated the words and raised their hands to guess what the images were” (Written Teaching Reflection, 11/1/2015).

I applauded Madeline’s recognition that L2 meaning-making was occurring through decontextualized circumstances in their lessons, and I encouraged her attempt to address this issue by changing her teaching strategy. However, I wanted her to be aware that the shift in the approach she took to introducing vocabulary continued to be rooted in teacher-dominated methods of direct translation (i.e., point to object, say the object name in L2, students repeat the word before guessing what it means in L1). In response, I offered the following feedback:

“How did it feel to move away from asking them ‘What does this mean?’ to allowing students to use the context to make meaning? I wonder if you could also now take this a step further - on Thursday we’ll be talking more about drama-based instruction activities where teachers take advantage of imagination and dramatic tension to make meaning. I want you to think of activities that students could engage in where they are exposed to new words using this type of instruction - I have a feeling you're going to get some good ideas” (Written Supervisor Feedback, 11/2/2015).

Madeline and I spoke together in class the day after this feedback was provided. During this conversation, Madeline shared with me the topic she was going to teach for Week 6 of the elementary field experience (the imperative mood). She wanted to incorporate my feedback into the design of her instruction, but she was unsure where to begin. I encouraged her to start writing her lesson plan by thinking about a context where students might experience the imperative mood. The students in Madeline’s class had just listened to the fairytale, Les Fées, during Week 5. Madeline felt that the context of the story, about a step-mother who favored one daughter over another, might serve as an appropriate basis for the imperative mood. I agreed and suggested that she assume the role of the step-mother and command the students, as if they were her children, to complete particular household chores.
Madeline’s lesson during Week 6 would take place two days before the workshop that would attempt to (re)frame the teacher-candidates’ orientation towards DBI in the L2 classroom (see chapter four). However, the feedback I provided her emphasized a Drama-as-Methodology orientation to DBI. Although the Vygotskian principles Madeline attempted to implement in this lesson were not made explicit at the time she designed the learning activity, her methodological considerations and subsequent actions provide a glimpse into another early attempt at conceptualizing DBI in the L2 classroom.

5.6 Week Six DBI Lesson: Inner Drama

Madeline listed the following specific learning objective for her Week 6 DBI lesson:

“Students will be able to identify three to four action verbs (cuisiner, balayer, dormir, manger, se doucher, se laver)” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Week 6/Day 1, 11/3/2015). In addition, the following rationale was provided behind the design of her learning activity:

“This activity is important because Madeline will be teaching basic verbs that can be used in an everyday setting. These verbs can help students by building their vocabulary and expanding their knowledge for added language use. Students will be acting out commands and hearing the commands in French so this activity involves visual and kinesthetic learning, which applies to Gardner’s Multiple Intelligence Theory” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Week 6/Day 1, 11/3/2015).

Madeline identified (via the strategy questionnaire) pantomime and role-play (specifically teacher-in-role and student-in-role) as the DBI strategies used to facilitate her learning objectives during the first of the two teaching days scheduled for Week 6 of the elementary field experience. Furthermore, she indicated that she felt she had incorporated Total Physical Response (TPR), and a learning game, as additional instructional strategies.
Following my written and verbal feedback, Madeline appeared to be interested in experimenting with new approaches to L2 teaching/learning for this lesson. When asked, via the questionnaire, why she had chosen to use these particular DBI strategies she wrote:

“Most of my lessons have been repetition lessons and I knew it was something that they would have fun with and I was hoping that since they were having fun they’d take more away from the lesson” (Strategy Questionnaire Response, 12/10/15).

It is important to note Madeline’s analysis of her prior teaching methods. In an effort to deviate from her current pattern of instruction she turned to DBI to incorporate “fun” into her lessons and to increase her learners’ L2 skill retention, two aspects she felt were missing from her instruction in other cases. Her conscious decision to rupture her current pattern of L2 teaching/learning is noteworthy. Through the use of DBI, it appears that Madeline hoped to break free of the repetitive discourse occurring in her current lesson design and implementation and reveals the value she places on the role of fun in the L2 learning process.

5.6.1 Beginning the Lesson: Getting into Character

Madeline’s learning activity began with the students assembled near her and standing on the carpet at the front of the classroom. Excerpt 5.3 reveals the way in which Madeline introduced her learning activity to her students through a teacher-led discussion to activate prior knowledge of the fairytale, Les Fées, followed by her attempt to become one of the characters in the story (i.e., teacher-in-role):

Excerpt 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Asseyez-vous. Asseyez-vous.</td>
<td>Sit down. Sit down. ((Students sit on carpet in a semi-circle. Madeline stands in front of them)). Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>((Students sit on carpet in a semi-circle. Madeline stands in front of them)). Okay. Qui… Qui</td>
<td>Who… Who ((Points to each of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to each of the students) Qui peut se souvenir ([taps her temple with her left index finger]) le livre ([unfolds her hands as if a book is opening]) les crapauds et les diamants? ([Two students raise their hands. Points to Eric]). Eric?

Eric? Um (.) who can remember (.) what happened in Toads and Diamonds? Um (.) who can remember (.) what happened in Toads and Diamonds? Thomas Souvenir… Eric Um (0.5) step (.). mom? Um (0.5) step (.). mom? Madeline Oui! Belle-mère is step-mom. Oui! Belle-mère is step-mom. Okay, > so \\text{mèchante}< ([places both hands on hips, pitch lowers, serious expression]) \\text{Mèchante}. ([Two students raise their hands]) \\text{Mèchante}. ([Two students raise their hands]) 

Madeline (Points at Thomas) Cl: ose. (Points at Thomas) Cl: ose.

Thomas Bossy? Bossy?

Madeline °Cl: ose° °Cl: ose°

Thomas [Child abuse]. [Child abuse].

Seth Mean. Mean.

Madeline Ou: i. Je suis ([points to herself]) la \text{mèchante} ([serious expression, lower pitch]) belle-mère des crapauds et diamants. Ye::. I am ([points to herself]) the wicked ([serious expression, lower pitch]) stepmother from Toads and Diamonds.


Madeline No. I’m the mean step-mom- No. I’m the mean step-mom-

Thomas Oh Oh

Madeline - from toads and diamonds. Okay? - from toads and diamonds. Okay?

Teacher 2 Et (0.2) je suis ([points to himself]) la be: lle so: ur ([places two hands under his chin, palms face down in a
Madeline begins her learning activity (lines 00-08) with the support of pantomime. Pantomime, in this sense, continued to be used as a para-linguistic tool to aid her learners’ comprehension of the L2. She previews the context of her lesson by asking her students to recall the new fairytale, *Les Fées*, that was read during the previous class. In lines 15 – 18, we see

Madeline first adopt her teacher-in-role persona: *la méchant belle-mère* (the wicked step-mother).

She places her hands on her hips, lowers the pitch of her voice, and adopts a serious expressive demeanor. By repeating a key vocabulary word that was taught in the previous lesson, *belle-
mère, and relying on the students’ ability to recall the behavioral features of the characters in *Les Fées*, Madeline creates a context that potentially allows her learners to connect their prior experience[s] hearing the story with her adopted representation of this particular character. Eric appears to be the first student to make this connection (line 25) and labels Madeline correctly as portraying *la méchant belle-mère*.

Madeline’s co-teacher introduces himself as another character (Rène) in *Les Fées*. Throughout lines 67-83, Madeline and her co-teacher engage in a brief drama wherein she commands him to carry out several actions. Throughout the drama, Madeline and Teacher 2 adopt the rules of behavior that govern their individual roles within the imaginative sphere created by Charles Perrault’s *Les Fées*. The power dynamics that exist between the two characters is understood as being parallel to the nature of their relationship found by the students through their previous exposure to the fairytale. These conditions provide the students with a willingness to suspend their disbelief⁶.

In Excerpt 5.4, which directly follows Excerpt 5.3, Madeline asks the students (first in the L2 and then recast into the students’ L1) to name all three actions pantomimed by Teacher 2 during the drama:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 5.4</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Qu’est-ce qu’il fait?</td>
<td>What is he doing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>I know exactly what he did.</td>
<td>I know exactly what he did.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>What’s he doing? ((Serena raises her hand))</td>
<td>What’s he doing? ((Serena raises her hand))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Levez la main ((Four additional students raise their hands))</td>
<td>Raise your hand ((Four additional students raise their hands))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶ Suspension of disbelief is an idea that was originally postulated by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his *Biographia Literaria* (1817/1985) and refers to a situation where the consumer of a story becomes so engrossed in the unfolding drama that they suspend rational thought to believe in the improbable. It is a term often used by those involved in storytelling, including in the realm of drama/theatre. In this case, the students permitted themselves to disregard what they knew to be real and enter the fictive realm of fantasy as both spectators and consumers of the L2 interaction between their teachers.
It is important to examine Madeline’s responses to the students throughout Excerpt 5.4. She does not appear to enforce a connection between the pantomimed actions and the targeted lexical items she has selected to introduce to the students through the prior drama. The focus of the lesson appears to shift from familiarizing students to new L2 academic concepts (vocabulary in the imperative form) to interpreting pantomime action in the students’ L1. The result is an interactional situation akin to a game of charades similar to what had occurred during Madeline’s lesson in Week 3.

Since Madeline lacks the conceptual framework to use DBI in a way that supports L2 learning through playful/learning ZPD activity, her use of pantomime and role-play appear to revert to games of charades. Without supplying additional para-linguistic supports (either visually
or auditory) that allow learners to refer back to the L2 vocabulary that was used by la méchant belle-mère within the drama, the students appear to have difficulty recognizing how the specific language used by her dictated the resulting action Rène was commanded to complete. In essence, the language of the drama becomes divorced from the characters’ action. At this point in the learning activity, the DBI strategies that were conceptualized by Madeline continued to serve as auxiliary support for an otherwise direct translation learning activity similar to the way in which DBI had been used during her Week 3 lesson (Drama-as-Tool).

5.6.2 Extending the Dramatic Sphere

Madeline concluded the mini-drama between herself and Teacher 2 and invited the students to stand in anticipation that they would join her in the imaginary world where la méchante belle mère exists. Excerpt 5.5 occurs a few moments after Excerpt 5.4 when all of the students are now standing on the carpet at the front of the room. Excerpt 5.5 presents Madeline’s attempt to bring students into the imaginative context developed through the earlier dramatic interactions with Teacher 2:

Excerpt 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Madeline:</td>
<td>↓très bien. (.) Hmm. ↑Maintenant,</td>
<td>↓très bien. (.) Hmm. ↑Maintenant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Monsieur Teacher 3 ((Points to Teacher 3 with serious look)).</td>
<td>Monsieur Teacher 3 ((Points to Teacher 3 with serious look)).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>Oui?</td>
<td>Oui?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Dormir. ((Teacher 3 closes his eyes and drops his head to his left side while folding his hands under his left ear as if to feign sleeping. He continues to “sleep” through the next several lines of dialogue))</td>
<td>Dormir. ((Teacher 3 closes his eyes and drops his head to his left side while folding his hands under his left ear as if to feign sleeping. He continues to “sleep” through the next several lines of dialogue))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>S[leep]</td>
<td>S[leep]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>[Sleep]</td>
<td>[Sleep]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>((Raises hand))</td>
<td>((Raises hand))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Madeline may have thought she was beginning a new “dramatic scene” that included the students by asking them to stand and choosing Teacher 3, instead of Teacher 2, to perform her command. However, Excerpt 5.5 makes it clear that the students are still spectators, existing outside the same imaginative sphere of the teacher-driven drama, and their purpose remains to

13 Madeline: "Jack.
14 Jack: Sleep.
15 Madeline: "Oui.
16 Jack: "[NO!] ((Points at Madeline)) Go to sleep!
17 ((Students and Teachers Laugh))
18 Madeline: "Oui. Mais, JACK! Balayez!
19 ((Madeline pantomimes sweeping the same way that Teacher 2 modeled earlier))
20 Jack: Huh? ((Seth and Gavin begin to sweep the same way Madeline modeled and continue through the next several lines of dialogue))
21 Madeline: "Balayez.
22 Jack: U::m
23 Madeline: "Balayez. ((Serena raises her hand))
24 Serena: "Cle::an?
25 Madeline: Sweep. ((Jack begins to immediately pantomime sweeping by swinging his arms rapidly in long strokes and moving side to side. He continues to 'sweep'))
26 Serena: Oh.
27 Teacher 2: Ba::[la::yəz].
28 Madeline: [Oui].
29 Madeline: So ((Grant stops sweeping)), when I call on you, act out the verb I’m saying.
30 Thomas: "Okay".
guess the meaning behind “Rène’s” charade. Madeline chooses to use Teacher 3 to model the behavior she hopes her students will soon enact, but in doing so she implicitly positions Teacher 3 into the role of a ‘sample student.’ However, without explicit instruction to think otherwise, the students continue to see Teacher 3 as one of their instructors and not as ‘one of them.’ Therefore, they appear to not recognize his behavior as something they should anticipate imitating in the near future. The students, it seems, have cast Teacher 3 in the same role that Teacher 2 had previously held before him (i.e., into the role of Rène.) This situation becomes further complicated by the fact that Teacher 3 is following the same rules of behavior as Teacher 2’s interpretation of Rène, while Madeline continues to adopt the mannerisms of la méchant belle-mère. Thus, for the students, this interaction could be seen as a continuation of the earlier drama only this time they have been asked to stand instead of to sit and the role of Rène has been recast by another adult.

Several students successfully identify la méchant belle-mère’s command (go to sleep). It appears as if Madeline uses this as a signal of activity comprehension and assumes the students will be able to make the leap from being ‘outside’ of the drama to becoming an inside character in the drama without further explicit instruction. Since Madeline has now modeled the activity twice, she seems to anticipate that students will be able to take on the role of Rène without additional instruction.

However, for the students, Madeline appears to have abruptly changed the rules of the drama activity without informing them. The students appear unsure as to whether they are part of – or separate from – the imaginative world where la méchant belle-mère and Rène exist. In line 23, Jack cannot decide whether it is the teacher who speaks to him as a student, or if he is now a participant in the drama as well (and if he is, who his character might be.) He falters when confronted both by Madeline’s demeanor as la méchant belle-mère and her incomprehensible command to him: balayez. Without explicit knowledge of their social roles, or if they are inside
or outside the imaginative realm of *Les Fées*, the students are unable to discern the correct behavioral expectations Madeline has outlined for them. In addition, since the students never made the connection between the L2 imperatives and their corresponding action, they cannot comprehend – nor satisfy – her desire.

Madeline, sensing Jack’s confusion, breaks character in line 20 and models the pantomimed behavior she intends him to portray. Jack, unable to make clear meaning of the interaction, continues to express his puzzlement. However, two of his classmates, Seth and Gavin, have begun to make the connection between Madeline’s L2 command and her desired outcome. They begin to imitate her pantomime, which is seen by Thomas who joins in the imaginative activity with additional vocalization. Serena, witnessing her peers’ pantomimed actions, and following the pattern of action identification solidified in the previous teacher-led drama interactions, raises her hand to supply a tentative L1 translation.

At this point in the learning activity, it appears as if it is unclear to the students whether Madeline is looking for 1) a direct translation of her L2 commands; 2) the ability for Jack to understand and imaginatively follow the command; or 3) if the whole class should be interpreting the meaning behind the L2 command and imaginatively following its directive. These issues might have stemmed from Madeline’s novice attempt to conceptualize this lesson from a Drama-as-Methodology framework for L2 instruction. Her lack of experience facilitating DBI strategies as they were positioned in this lesson meant that she was unable to foresee the students’ reactions to the activity and anticipate a response to meet their needs. At the same time, DBI activities, like all instructional activities, must include clearly defined instructions and expectations to be successful, particularly if being used from a Drama-as-Methodology orientation. It is not until lines 48-50 that Madeline provides the students with explicit instruction on how she intends them to proceed with the activity.
5.6.3 Discarded Role Play

Excerpt 5.6 directly follows Excerpt 5.5 and it provides an example of how Madeline and her co-teachers attempted to facilitate students’ learning through their use of role-play and pantomime. However, throughout the following excerpt role-play becomes discarded by Madeline in favor of a formal learning activity based in the Total Physical Response (TPR) method (wherein students perform particular physical actions upon hearing specific words uttered in the classroom).

Excerpt 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Thomas, <em>dormir</em>.</td>
<td>Thomas, <em>sleeping</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>U::hh</td>
<td>U::hh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Dormir.</td>
<td>To sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td><em>Snore</em> (attempting to give a hint to Thomas)</td>
<td><em>Snore</em> (attempting to give a hint to Thomas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>((Loud student laughter))</td>
<td>((Loud student laughter))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>What?</td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>(To Seth, pointing to Teacher 2) He snored! <em>Snore</em> (mimicking Teacher 3)</td>
<td>(To Seth, pointing to Teacher 2) He snored! <em>Snore</em> (mimicking Teacher 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>(1.0) Oh, him?</td>
<td>(1.0) Oh, him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>↑<em>Qu’est qu’il fait?</em> (Points to Teacher 2) Il…</td>
<td>↑What is he doing? (Points to Teacher 2) He…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Yes! ↑<em>To slei:.ep</em>. (Places hands folded under her head like Teacher 3). Yes.</td>
<td>Yes! ↑<em>To slei:.ep</em>. (Places hands folded under her head like Teacher 3). Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td><em>Très bien</em>.</td>
<td><em>Very good</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Snore again!</em></td>
<td><em>Snore again!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td><em>Snore</em></td>
<td><em>Snore</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Jane? &lt;Cui-si-nez._ ((Seth stops sweeping)) (3.0)</td>
<td>Jane? &lt;Cook._ ((Seth stops sweeping)) (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>((Pretending to sleep and spoken on a descending breath)) Na, na, na.</td>
<td>((Pretending to sleep and spoken on a descending breath)) Na, na, na.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td><em>Snore</em></td>
<td><em>Snore</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Jane? &lt;Cook._ ((Seth stops sweeping)) (3.0)</td>
<td>Jane? &lt;Cook._ ((Seth stops sweeping)) (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>((Pretending to sleep and spoken on a descending breath)) Na, na, na.</td>
<td>((Pretending to sleep and spoken on a descending breath)) Na, na, na.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((To Jane)) <em>Cooking</em>. (2.0)</td>
<td>((To Jane)) <em>Cooking</em>. (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Teacher 4 looks at Jane and starts to pretend to whisk)</td>
<td>(Teacher 4 looks at Jane and starts to pretend to whisk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the oven, and shut the oven door)

(Spoken while still feigning sleep with eyes closed) [Cupcake].

(Spoken while still feigning sleep with eyes closed) [Cupcake].

((Serena laughs and looks at Thomas))

((Serena laughs and looks at Thomas))

Cupcake!

Cupcake!

Can you help her?

Can you help her?

((To Bonnie)) Can you help her?

((To Bonnie)) Can you help her?

((To Bonnie)) Can you help her?

((To Bonnie)) Can you help her?

Can you help her?

What’s cuisinez?

What’s cuisinez?

Oui. Très bien.

Oui. Très bien.

Oh. ((Pretends to tie up a garbage bag and slings it over his shoulder))

Oh. ((Pretends to tie up a garbage bag and slings it over his shoulder))

Washing your hands?

Washing your hands?

Snore ((Student laughter))

Snore ((Student laughter))

Hands to mouth and f eigns eating something. So, this is

Hands to mouth and f eigns eating something. So, this is
Madeline’s responses to the students’ contributions throughout Excerpt 5.8 consisted mainly of affirmations, negations, or pantomimes used as a mediational technique to help students decipher the meaning behind the L2 imperatives (see, in particular Madeline’s interactions with Seth in lines 101-112 and Serena in lines 112-145). They did not appear to reflect stable personality traits one might have expected of la méchante belle-mère from Les Fées nor did they involve the behavioral characteristics (right hand under the chin, left arm folded across her chest, lower pitch in voice) she had adopted consistently during the first dramatic interactions with Teacher 2.

Madeline no longer remains “in role” as la méchante belle-mère. In fact, Madeline never resumed her role as la méchante belle-mère after she broke character in line 20 of the previous excerpt (when Jack expressed uncertainty regarding how he should behave during the activity; see excerpt 5.5). Consequently, the imaginary context in which this activity was originally placed has disappeared. In lines 52-67, when Madeline tells Thomas to sleep, she does so as his teacher and he responds as her student⁷. Thomas knows he is expected to do a physical action in response to Madeline’s request. As such, Madeline’s DBI activity has now become a TPR activity that

---

⁷ Note that the imperative form used in formal address for dormir should typically be dormez, but Madeline continues to use the infinitive form of this particular verb throughout the entire lesson.
suppor
[138x688]ts formal learning ZPD activity. Her attempt at using DBI strategies from a Drama-as-
Methodology perspective gives way to a more familiar – and perhaps “safer” - Drama -as-Tool
orientation. A traditional teacher-dominated approach to L2 teaching/learning is maintained and
pantomime becomes used as a tool to facilitate TPR.

While Madeline has provided students with explicit instruction as to the physical action
she expects them to do when she calls on them, she has not resolved the conflict surrounding their
ability to successfully interpret the L2 on their own. By exposing the students to each lexical
item only one time and providing no additional para-linguistic supports (such as visuals or a
vocabulary list), Madeline is essentially relying on her students’ declarative memory skills and
their ability for rapid recollection.

As Madeline initiates a conversation with Jane (line 71) she finds that she is not yet able
to make meaning of Madeline’s L2 command on her own, particularly now that the activity has
become decontextualized. In this instance, rather than providing Jane with additional contextual
clues to aid her L2 comprehension as she had done previously with Thomas (see lines 62-67),
Madeline chooses to whisper a direct L1 translation (cooking) to Jane. However, even with this
form of explicit instruction, Jane does not begin to engage in a pantomime representing cooking.
Teacher 4 attempts to provide Jane with additional mediational support by modeling the
pantomime for her (as seen in lines 77-83), but, again, this does not result in Jane taking up the
pantomime action on her own.

Meanwhile, Thomas, still pretending to sleep, has allowed his imagination to take over
his behavioral activity by ‘talking in his sleep.’ He decides to mutter the word, “cupcake” (line
85). Whether or not this choice was influenced by him overhearing Madeline whispering
“cooking” to Bonnie earlier in line 76 or his understanding of the word cuisinez has caused him to
associate it with a cupcake is unknown, but his utterance attracts the attention of both Serena and
Bonnie. Bonnie repeats Thomas’ feigned sleep-talk in line 89 (“cupcake”) prompting Madeline
to turn her attention away from Jane and on to her. She asks Bonnie if she can help Jane interpret her L2 command, perhaps perceiving Bonnie’s utterance (cupcake) as an indication of her being able to understand the L2 command. Indeed, in line 92 Bonnie is able to supply an L1 translation for *cuisinez* that is acceptable to Madeline but uses another form of the L2 word when responding in English (the present progressive rather than the imperative; cooking vs. cook). Regardless, this translation satisfies Madeline’s linguistic expectation, but Jane still does not engage in the word’s associated pantomime.

In line 93-94 we hear a potential reason for Jane’s physical hesitation, which may not have been due to her not being able to comprehend the verb, *cuisinez*. After all, Madeline did reveal the word’s meaning early in their interaction. Instead, in lines 93-94 Jane quietly asks Madeline, “How do I do that?” Jane appears to have been under the impression that she was expected to supply a singular ‘correct’ or ‘right’ answer to gain the approval of her teacher; that there was only one correct way to portray the cooking process and it was this singular physical action that Madeline was looking for her to enact.

It is possible that since the pantomime of sleeping that Thomas performed was the same as the teachers’ pantomimes, Jane may feel as if she must match the pantomime of cooking in the same way it was previously modeled by Teacher 2. In line 95, it seems as if Bonnie also understands this activity as one that is searching for singular answers that can only be qualified as ‘correct’ through the power invested in Madeline’s role as “teacher.” Thus, Jane appears as if she is being asked to immediately, and simultaneously, recall a new L2 word, its associated L1 meaning, and perform a particular corresponding action in front of her peers for Madeline’s approval.

The interaction between Jane and Madeline is eventually resolved when Madeline, in line 94, demonstrates stirring. She confirms for Bonnie that pantomiming stirring would be an acceptable answer for her L2 imperative in line 98. This becomes interpreted as the ‘correct’
answer that Madeline has been looking for from Jane. It is an answer that Jane (the student) can easily supply and a traditional teacher-dominated approach to L2 teaching/learning is maintained. However, there are several actions a person can use to pantomime cooking – all of which should have been acceptable to convey an obedience to Madeline’s fictive command – but by abandoning the role of la méchante belle-mère and the imaginary context that had been previously built in the drama presented to the students, Jane’s imagination (and her ability to perform beyond herself) may have become constrained. She was no longer engaged in a play activity where she had the freedom to enact a role and imitate social behaviors as she imagined them.

That isn’t to say that elements of play did not exist in this TPR activity. It is clear from Excerpt 5.6 that when some of the students pantomime the requested physical action they voluntarily assume unspecified roles of people who might enact that particular activity in everyday situations (see for, instance, Thomas’ interpretation of sleeping in lines 73-85 and 84-85 and Jack’s reaction to Seth taking out the garbage in lines 113-124). However, pantomimes used in TPR do not offer sustained playful-activity with an inherent conflict to complete the physical actions (outside of arbitrarily responding to the commanding person’s requests.)

If Madeline had continued to use role-play, (i.e., continued her guise as la méchante belle-mère), provided an explicit conflict/need for the students to listen and follow her commands, expressly dictated their role(s) in the drama, and given clear expectations/parameters for learner behavior, students might have been offered a chance to engage in playful/learning ZPD activity and potentially perform beyond their current capabilities. Nonetheless, the students’ tendency to assume unspecified roles in response to Madeline’s physical commands (perhaps influenced by the dramatic scenarios enacted by her and her co-teachers to model the TPR activity at the start of the lesson) would begin to pose a challenge to Madeline’s conceptualization of order and control in the language learning classroom.
5.6.4 Imagination and Issues of Power

Excerpt 5.7, which directly follows Excerpt 5.6, provides an example of the challenges experienced by Madeline and her co-teachers in negotiating student/teacher power dynamics that emerged when attempting to maintain a teacher-dominated paradigmatic approach to L2 learning while implementing teaching strategies that permitted a wider diffusion of power between students and educators:

Excerpt 5.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>ERIC. <em>Balaye</em>z. ((Thomas, who has continued to pretend to be sleeping, falls to the ground snoring))</td>
<td>ERIC. <em>Sweep</em>. ((Thomas, who has continued to pretend to be sleeping, falls to the ground snoring))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Mmmm</td>
<td>Mmmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>(1.0) Thomas, get up ((<em>Gestures to Thomas to stand up. He continues to pretend to sleep</em>). <em>(Thomas, ... make him stand))</em></td>
<td>(1.0) Thomas, get up ((<em>Gestures to Thomas to stand up. He continues to pretend to sleep</em>). <em>(Thomas, ... make him stand))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>((Standing up)) Ah, but I really want to go to sleep.</td>
<td>((Standing up)) Ah, but I really want to go to sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td><em>(Levez-vous)</em></td>
<td><em>(Stand up.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>↓Oh, sweeping. ((Begin to pantomime sweeping))</td>
<td>↓Oh, sweeping. ((Begin to pantomime sweeping))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((to <em>Gavin</em>)) <em>(Can you help him?)</em></td>
<td>((to <em>Gavin</em>)) <em>(Can you help him?)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>((Gavin walks to Éric and whispers to him the answer.))</td>
<td>((Gavin walks to Éric and whispers to him the answer.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Washing the dishes.</td>
<td>Washing the dishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td><em>&lt;Ba-la-yez&gt;</em>.</td>
<td><em>&lt;Sweep&gt;.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Mmmm (1.0) ((<em>Serena begins to pantomime stirring again but this time incorporating her entire torso in a circular pattern</em>))</td>
<td>Mmmm (1.0) ((<em>Serena begins to pantomime stirring again but this time incorporating her entire torso in a circular pattern</em>))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>((to Madeline)) <em>(I know)</em></td>
<td>((to Madeline)) <em>(I know)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>((to <em>Gavin</em>)) <em>(Can you help him?)</em></td>
<td>((to <em>Gavin</em>)) <em>(Can you help him?)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td><em>(Pretty to sweep, he walks over to Éric)</em> Yay, now someone can help me! ((Éric begins to sweep more vigorously with Jack))</td>
<td><em>(Pretty to sweep, he walks over to Éric)</em> Yay, now someone can help me! ((Éric begins to sweep more vigorously with Jack))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oh là là, rapidement! (Serena looks at Eric’s stirring and begins to stir using a wider, circular gesture with her hands and stops incorporating her torso)

Gavin, <cuisinier>.

Madeline Oui. «How do you do that?»

Teacher 4 «That’s some violent sweeping!» (Eric stops stirring)

Okay. (1.0) Bonnie, maçon. (2.0) Qu’est que fait <maçon>?

Madeline Mmhmm. Oui, maçon. (2.0) <maçon>. (3.0) Mitch <s’habiller>.

Teacher 4 «That’s some violent sweeping!» (Eric stops stirring)

Thomas Snore ((Begins to take a few steps forward while still keeping his hands folded under his left ear and pretending to sleep))

Madeline How do you do that? (Mitch pretends to put on clothes. He stops and reverses the direction of his pantomime to
Thomas had been commanded to sleep at the beginning of the previous excerpt (Excerpt 5.6, lines 52-73). While Madeline turned her attention to the other students, Thomas was left on his own. He was told neither to stop nor continue his pretend action. Consequently, he chose to continue to obey his imaginary orders and in lines 146-149 we see him decide to make another, dramatic choice. He falls to the ground, pretending to sleep, and snores loudly. Madeline, appears to view this action, and the accompanying noise, as being disruptive to her current conversation with Eric. She uses her authoritarian position as the classroom teacher (and not that of *la méchant belle-mère*) to request that Thomas returns to his feet in order to gain a sense of
control over him. Similarly, two of her co-teachers also attempt to divert Thomas away from his version of the sleeping pantomime towards their acceptable version.

The teachers’ attempts to curtail their students’ use of imagination and play activity to adhere closer to their notions of conventional learner – and by extension classroom – behavior is thwarted by the ambiguity of the rules/roles and imaginative scenario that now exists between the teachers and learners while they are in engaged in the TPR actions based on unclear directions from Madeline. When Eric cannot interpret *balayez* on his own, Madeline directs another student (Gavin) to help mediate his L2 comprehension. When he finally comprehends the command and begins to sweep, Jack, (who has also been commanded to sweep), is able to create an imaginary relationship with Eric that is built upon their same fictive directives (see lines 173-177). For Jack, it appears to make sense to communicate with Eric rather than remain isolated sweeping on his carpet square. When the two come into contact with one another they begin to sweep using large, vigorous, and quick movements, presumably as a means to quickly clean the house and finish the chore together. Unlike with Thomas, these actions are permitted to continue while Madeline works with Gavin and Bonnie, although they do garner the attention of Teacher 3 and Teacher 4 who make evaluative comments on the action.

Perhaps as a mean of curtailing the raucous nature of the collaborative sweeping activity, Madeline chooses to put Jack to sleep by commanding him with *dormir* in line 197. After an indication of slight hesitation while he processes the meaning of the L2 command, Madeline repeats the word. Jack successfully identifies the meaning behind this L2 command and imitates the sleeping pantomime modeled earlier by Teacher 3, complete with snoring. While Madeline turns her attention to Mitch, Thomas decides to make another acting choice. In line 210, Thomas begins to sleep-walk, which eventually moves him away from his original position on the carpet (lines 210-254). Jack notices Thomas’ movement and begins to imitate his behavior, which results in the two boys bumping into one another repeatedly and laughing at their imaginary
situation. While the boys appear to be having fun and do not seem to perceive their actions to be physically threatening, Teacher 4, who is positioned nearest to the two students, interprets this behavior differently. She identifies it as have the potential to be physically harmful and moves to interrupt their play activity.

Speaking in the students’ L1, Teacher 4 tells Thomas he should be sleeping; an action he believes he is still engaged in as evidenced by his hands remaining folded under his right ear. This instruction appears to mean that she believes he should follow her interpretation of the sleep pantomime (which would be to remain immobile) and confuses Jack’s prior command (balayez/sweep) with his current command (dormir/to sleep).

Jack and Thomas’ solution to Teacher 4 putting an end to their physical contact is to move away from each other and seek out their own physical and social space away from other students. Jack decides to remain on the carpet to accomplish this task whereas Thomas uses this opportunity to explore other areas in the classroom. His choice to allow the imaginative sphere to extend beyond the boundaries of the carpet seem to be incongruous with Madeline’s unvoiced parameters of where the play-space should, and should not, occur.

In line 246, Madeline, calls for Thomas to come back to the carpet while Teacher 3, in line 247, capitalizes on his imaginative situation. Teacher 3 simultaneously plays alongside him and attempts to (re)direct his play-behavior by telling him not to sleep-walk. Before Thomas has a chance to respond to either Madeline or Teacher 3, Teacher 2 makes the decision to physically walk to where Thomas has moved in the classroom and give him no other choice but to return to the carpet. Justifying his return and still choosing to be immersed in his own dramatic play, Thomas exclaims, “I was awoken!” but at this point the lesson has been disrupted from its original formulaic pattern, which still consists of the I.R.E/F dominated discourse pattern that existed in Madeline’s Week 3 DBI lesson. Up to this point, Madeline has moved from student to student, initiating a request, waiting for the student to respond, and then provided teacher
feedback or evaluation. With the pattern disrupted by the play behavior of her students, Madeline
may have begun to feel a loss of control over her drama-based lesson, choosing to stop all actions
and re-start the activity.

5.7 Reflections and Next Steps

Madeline, in consultation with me, had originally conceptualized the use of DBI during
her Week 6 lesson as a means to teach the imperative mood by assuming the character of *la
méchante belle-mère* (teacher-in-role) who could command the students (positioned as students-
in-role as her daughter, Réne) in the imaginary context of the story’s setting. This premise would
position DBI as the main teaching strategies that would create the formation of a playful/learning
ZPD wherein the learners conceptual understanding of the imperative mood could be mediated
and made explicit through play-based activity (Drama-as-Methodology). However, the moment
Madeline abandoned her imaginary role and began to only accept one pantomimed action for
each command as “correct,” the DBI strategies (role play and pantomime) became
(re)conceptualized to their former position seen in Week 3. That is to say, they were used as
supportive tools to facilitate a more traditional TPR activity that led to the creation of a formal
learning ZPD (Drama-as-Tool).

When interviewed at the end of the elementary field experience she reflected on her
experiences teaching this lesson:

“If I did that activity again – the one where they’re acting things out – there was
just too much going on and no one was listening to me. I would really like to
[use DBI in the future], but with secondary education I would have to figure out
more how to use that. I think it would also depend on my students, too. I mean
if my students are – I guess I would try it once maybe? But if I have more closed
off students like if I know that this activity they’re just not going to participate or
take anything away from it then I won’t do it” (Interview, 12/10/2015).
It is possible to see how Madeline, who previously described her fear of being able to handle classroom management, could feel as if her authority was undermined during a learning activity that permitted increased learner agency. While she may have experienced personal challenges utilizing DBI during her elementary field experience, it appears to not have deterred her from a desire to use them in the future. In fact, she seems interested in DBI’s potential to create realistic communicative situations whereby language is able to be used in authentic interactions between learners rather than arbitrarily contrived through other pre-fabricated means.

As Madeline concluded her elementary field experience, she was also asked to reflect on what she felt she had improved upon pedagogically as a developing language teacher. She stated:

“I think I have improved on classroom management and target language use. In the beginning, I think I was afraid to discipline the students or I was unsure what exactly to do to keep the class in order. Now, I feel more confident since I feel like I’ve found my place in the classroom as the teacher. I also feel more confident when it comes to the target language use” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/2015).

Once more, Madeline points to classroom management and her use of the target language in an educational setting as the main points of pedagogical knowledge she gained from participating in the elementary field experience. She noted the increase in confidence she felt from being able to teach within the supported environment of the field experience and acknowledged her emergent identity as an L2 teacher. When asked to reflect upon some of the challenges in/outside of the class she taught, Madeline provided the following comment:

“In class, I had trouble with my nerves, especially in the beginning. I would get super nervous in front of the class before I taught so I would sometimes forget what I was saying…Now, I still get a little excited, but overall, I haven’t had much of a problem with that lately. Outside the classroom, I had trouble thinking of fun activities for the children and I had trouble thinking of activities that wouldn’t be a guessing game for the students. A lot of my lessons have had me asking the students what something was…sometimes it’s easy to fall back into a guessing game pattern” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/2015).

Madeline’s sense of anxiety may have played a part in her (un)willingness to attempt alternative approaches to L2 teaching/learning, such as DBI from a Drama-as-Methodology
orientation, during the elementary field experience. It is important to recognize that teacher-candidates in this program are in the process of developing their pedagogical capabilities and content knowledge (L2) skills while being asked to simultaneously apply such knowledge during high-stakes field experiences with a variety of stakeholders (e.g., students, caregivers, supervisors, school/university administration, other teacher-candidates) containing very real academic consequences (e.g., being asked to leave the teacher preparation program). As mentioned in chapter one, Madeline found herself in the complicated process of both being and becoming a language educator with an emerging set of pedagogical skills.

Madeline acknowledged that she tended to rely on a “guessing game” pattern when designing her lesson plans for the elementary field experience. However, she also pointed out that despite completing coursework in both the methods course and the elementary field experience (with its heavy emphasis on implementing the ACTFL Standards (2006) and moving teacher-candidates towards a communicative approach to L2 teaching/learning [as explained at length in chapter three]) she remained unsure of how to design or where to find lessons that fall outside of the “guessing game” pattern she tended to employ.

She added that throughout the course of the elementary field experience her perceptions of the L2 teaching/learning process were confirmed while her attitudes toward her own L2 learning experiences had changed:

“I just always thought that the L2 was better for interpersonal relationships and it should be more than just reading from a book, which we really didn’t do any of. Not having them just sit there and write vocabulary. I don’t know if my views have changed that much. I learned a lot more. Classroom management, so that could’ve changed. It’s just that my attitudes towards how I was taught French have changed. Obviously, I had an idea that being more involved and having more real-life experience – I already came in with that idea of ‘that’s how language should be taught,’ but looking back at the way I was taught it kind of makes me mad that – like, I learned stuff, but it could’ve been better maybe? I guess I’ll never know” (Interview, 12/10/15).
Hence, Madeline sees value in interactive learning when it comes to second language acquisition. When asked if this retrospective analysis served her as a type of philosophical guide while she continued to define her own teaching expertise in the teacher preparation program, she answered affirmatively.

5.8 Conclusion

Through the examination of Madeline’s interview and questionnaire responses, weekly written teaching reflections, and transcriptions of classroom interactions, it became clear that without explicit guidance on how to use DBI strategies to create playful/learning ZPD activity, her conceptualization of DBI in L2 instruction was primarily seen as supportive instructional tools for other methods of L2 instruction that fostered formal learning ZPD activity in teacher-dominated circumstances. I will return to Madeline in chapter seven when I report on how both she and Max worked to (re)contextualize their emerging views on DBI in the language learning classroom when they traveled to Sweden for Phase II of the study. The next chapter will provide insights into Max’s unique experiences incorporating DBI in the elementary field experience.
Chapter 6

Act Two: Teaching as Performance – The Contradictory Case of Max

6.1 Introduction

Similar to the previous section, this chapter presents the first phase of the study as experienced by Max, a teacher-candidate in the final 24 months of his language teacher-preparation program. The results of phase one are presented here in an effort to establish Max’s original orientation towards DBI in the language learning classroom. The results from phases two and three will be presented in the next chapter. In the sections that follow, the socio-cultural and language learning background of Max, as well as his initial attempts at using DBI strategies in the world languages classroom during the elementary field experience, will be detailed.

6.2 Socio-cultural and Language Learning Background

When this study began, Max was a 21-year-old undergraduate teacher-candidate specializing in French education. Max grew up in a home where neither of his parents nor his younger sibling spoke a language other than English although they had studied languages at various points growing up (as part of their individual K-12 schooling experiences). Max’s keen interest in learning another language began in seventh grade:

“I took two years of Spanish in seventh and eighth grade and then I switched to public school and decided that I wanted to take French because I was tired of – I didn’t have a good Spanish teacher in seventh and eighth grade. I just wanted something different” (Interview, 12/10/15).
Similar to many students in the United States, Max’s introduction to a world language was a required component of his school’s curriculum. His initial interest towards studying French was caused by negative classroom experiences he felt he had faced in his beginning Spanish lessons. He did not perceive his Spanish teacher as being a “good” instructor and he wished to study something “different.” This desire led to the start of his formal French studies.

Reflecting on his early learning experiences in French, he identified a mixture of approaches to L2 teaching/learning that were used at his junior/senior high school:

“I had a mix of two older [French teachers] and one younger [French teacher]. The two older ones were more drill and kill – I don’t remember doing much acting out of things in my French I [class] …and my French II, it was sort of the same thing like it was a lot of just in-class kind of activity” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Thus, his early French classes appeared to have been focused primarily on the rote memorization of grammar rules through didactic teaching methods (i.e., “drill and kill”). Continuing his own L2 learning process at the university, Max indicated that he felt his French courses at college supported higher rates of oral communication than his secondary experiences. At the same time, however, he was provided with a range of coursework that continued to support all four linguistic skills (speaking, reading, writing, and listening):

“There’s a lot more talking because I think – it’s college. You can have that kind of structure. Where like after you’ve achieved a certain level, you focus more on just speaking…at the same time, I’ve taken really grammar intensive courses. I’ve taken courses that are more focused towards the writing aspect, too. So, there’s a mix of everything” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Max seemed to hold the impression that an L2 learner must first have a sound basis in understanding the rules of L2 grammar before proceeding to higher rates of L2 oral communication, which reflected his own personal trajectory learning an additional language. Yet at the same time, Max identified grammar, as well as age, as being the two factors that have the possibility to impede successful L2 learning the most:

“Aside from age, I think it’s – I want to say, instinctively, I want to say grammar. Doing that grammar stuff over and over again, but at the same time that was
helpful to me because I’m good at grammar and I’m into that, but I know that’s not everyone’s forte. I think that actually turns a lot of people off from language and you’re just like – how many times do you want to go over the subjunctive? Not that many.” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Max demonstrated an ability to see the L2 learning process from a variety of perspectives. He seemed to recognize that his experience as both a recipient and producer of L2 knowledge, may not be another person’s experience. He believed the strategies he employed to achieve proficiency in French, which included the explicit study and application of grammar rules, may not be what motivates, supports, and interests another student pursuing higher rates of L2 proficiency. When asked what instructional methods he felt to be most conducive to L2 learning, Max responded by stating:

“I think just being exposed and whatever that means to expose students to the language. I always did a lot of – in addition to the grammar drill-and-kill kind of stuff I did in school, I always went the extra step and listened to music or watched movies or, you know, did other things that were French outside of the classroom…and being able to hear it because as you hear it – you can be learning about the grammar rules and all that stuff, but as you’re getting language it helps you develop a better accent” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Thus, it appeared that for Max optimal L2 learning was a combination of explicit grammar instruction and contextualized language-usage through interactions with authentic L2 materials (e.g., films, music, literature, etc.). He seemed to place value on the learning experiences that can occur both outside as well as inside the L2 classroom but emphasized that seeking out additional L2 materials outside of his French classroom was a non-compulsory ‘extra’ step in his learning process, a step he had undertaken to further his own intrinsic goals of advanced L2 proficiency. He seemed to correlate a positive relationship between learners’ continued exposure – however that may be defined - to the L2 and their ability to connect the grammar instruction learned in formal/learning environments, which he believed leads to higher levels of comprehension and the development of native-like phonology.
When asked why he felt French, as opposed to other languages, was important to teach, he responded by stating:

“I think French is not spoken about as much as it should be when you talk about global, powerful languages, but it’s one of the official languages of the EU, one of the official languages of the UN – it’s the official language of the Olympic Games, so it’s a very widespread used language and I think that it has a lot more communicative power than people think it does” (Interview, 12/10/15).

For Max, French was seen as a dynamic communicative tool that has the possibility to be used in a wide range of contexts that he believed should be, and could be, valuable to others. Seeing French as an underrated language of study, Max appeared anxious to help others see its importance in the 21st century. Conversely, when asked what prompted him to complete coursework for the ESL endorsement credential, his response was similar to Madeline’s rationale: “Being more marketable” (Interview, 12/10/15). Like Madeline, he did not explicitly express a direct interest in working with ELL students as an ESL teacher. Instead, he viewed the ESL endorsement as a useful credential to diversify his skill-set and increase his chances in securing a teaching position.

Max’s personal socio-cultural and language learning background informs his approach to L2 teaching/learning. Max seemed to hold the impression that an L2 learner must first have a sound basis in understanding the rules of L2 grammar and vocabulary before increasing the frequency of L2 oral communication in the language learning classroom. His position is influenced by his own personal trajectory learning an additional language effecting his conceptual understanding of the second language acquisition process – build a sound foundation of the target language through knowledge of grammar rules and basic vocabulary and then progress to communication in ‘higher’ level courses. This position will be further explored in the upcoming sections of this chapter.
Max expressed enthusiasm and optimism at the onset of the elementary field experience in the fall of 2015: “I’m super excited to be getting this experience with younger kids even though I think I prefer secondary [education]” (Weekly Written Reflection, 8/26/15). Despite his stated preference to teach an older demographic (learners in grades 7-12 as opposed to K-5), Max appeared open to developing his L2 teacher expertise through the elementary field experience. He did not state that he had set any specific, personal goals to achieve during his tenure teaching at the elementary level, but affirmed that he, “try[es] to make every moment a teaching or learning experience for [himself] and others around [him],” and he was “look[ing] forward to this semester” (Weekly Written Reflection, 8/26/15).

During the eight-week field experience, Max was identified (via his group’s submitted lesson plans) as leading a learning activity 12 times. In addition, he was listed as co-leading a learning activity on five other occasions. Following the same procedures that were used for Madeline (see chapter five), Tables 6-1 and 6-2 provide the results of the strategy questionnaire (see Appendix C), which was given to Max at the end of his exit-interview once the elementary field experience had been completed. This questionnaire asked him to review and reflect on the 12 lessons he was listed as a lead teacher. Then, using his emerging understanding of L2 methods, he was asked to select which strategies he felt he had used during each learning activity (as outlined in chapter three). The list of DBI terms and definitions from Table 4-1 in chapter four were included with the questionnaire for his reference when completing the form.
Similar to Madeline’s results that were detailed in the previous chapter, Max reported the use of non-DBI strategies at a slightly higher rate than DBI strategies during the design and implementation of his lessons throughout the elementary field experience. Max appeared to favor the use of competitive learning games followed by an array of other non-DBI strategies of L2 instruction (including an activity using repetition, an information-gap activity, the use of a Prezi presentation, and two instances of a visual art-based activity) throughout the elementary field experience.

When DBI strategies were selected as being used in learning activities, pantomiming (conveying meaning through the body without words) was favored the most followed closely by storytelling, role-play (both teacher and student-in-role), and improvisation. The results of Max’s

---

**Table 6-1: Elementary field experience questionnaire results for Max: Non-DBI strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Strategy</th>
<th>Number of times used (Self-identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audiolingual</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Game</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Physical Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar-Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 [Repetition, Information-Gap, Visual Art (x2), Audio/Visual (Prezi Presentation)]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6-2: Elementary field experience questionnaire results for Max: DBI strategies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Strategy</th>
<th>Number of times used (Self-identified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantomime</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-Coach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Props</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppetry</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-Play</td>
<td>2 [Student-in-Role &amp; Teacher-in-Role]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided Imagery</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Pantomime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel/Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundscape</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley/Gauntlet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
questionnaire reveal that he felt he had used DBI strategies during five lessons he designed and implemented during the elementary field experience. These DBI learning activities occurred during weeks two, three, four, and seven. Due to the fact that the teacher-candidates were required to self-videotape only one lesson per week, (per the requirements of the elementary field experience course), video data for the self-identified DBI lessons were available for analysis in weeks two and seven only (see chapter eight for a discussion of study limitations). Max chose not to videotape the lessons that used self-identified DBI methods during weeks three and four. Consequently, analysis of classroom interactions while engaged in self-reported drama-based methods of L2 instruction will focus on only those lessons with existing video data (in weeks two and seven) for accurate transcription and analysis purposes.

6.4 Week Two DBI Lesson: Drama as Best Supporting Actor

During Week 1 of the elementary field experience, Max, like Madeline, reflected on his use of instructional French in the classroom as recorded in his first written teaching reflection:

“My weakest area coming in, I think, was actually having the confidence to use 90%+ French in the classroom setting. I was definitely worried that if I got going in French that it would become a snowball and I would be using more complex sentences than I should… On Thursday, I really tried to use a lot more French with the students to sort of transition them into 90%+ mode” (Written Teaching Reflection, 10/4/2015).

In an effort to continue meeting this goal, Max endeavored to read the folktale, La lune qui disparaît by Dori H. Butler, aloud completely in the target language during Week 2 of the elementary field experience. This particular story was selected, as outlined in the previous chapter (and according to the rationale that was provided in the group’s lesson plan), because it “provide[d] opportunities for each student to expand on the vocabulary they have learned up to this point. It [was] also the central theme for the rest of [the unit].” In addition, the group stated
they were “presenting the story to them by acting it out to help stimulate their connections with English to the new information in French” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Day 2/Week 2, 10/8/2015).

In their initial lesson plans, the teaching group had positioned the reading of the folktale to come at the end of the ninety-minute lesson. Their first two learning activities consisted of a geography lesson to help students situate the folktale in Québec and discuss francophone culture in Canada. The second learning activity, designed by another teacher, was to involve learning L2 vocabulary related to characters in a fairytale. However, this story was considered a folktale and did not involve typical characters from a fairytale (e.g., king, queen, princess, witch, etc.), but involved animals with human qualities.

As it stood, the procedures to read the story were listed as follows in their initial lesson plan:

“1) Max will introduce *La lune qui disparaît* by doing a picture walk of the text and asking students, ‘*Qu’est-ce que c’est?* [What is it?]’ while pointing to various pictures in the book. They will respond in English and Max will give the word in French then ask the students to repeat the word. Max will also ask the students what they think will happen in the story; 2) After doing a picture walk, Max will ask the students what they think the story is about and then proceed into reading the story. As Max reads the story, he will act out what’s happening and repeat key phrases/vocabulary. He will ask the students to make silly faces that convey the emotions of animals throughout the story; 3) Max will ask the students, ‘*Qu’est-ce qui s’est passé?* [What happened?]’ The students will respond by telling one thing that happened in the story. Again, Max will repeat what the students say in French (Weekly Lesson Plan, Day 2/Week 2, 10/8/2015).

I expressed concern about the sequence of learning activities leading up to the reading of the folktale and asked the teacher-candidates to critically reflect on what additional strategies they would need to include to make the story comprehensible if it was to be read in French and to consider the learning goals involved with reading the story:

“The students have not explored any animal vocabulary yet - your previous activities led me to believe you would be doing the other fairytale *[Les Fées]*. If this is not the case, you need to change your previous activity so that you are teaching animal vocabulary as they are the characters in your book. Your picture walk, as it stands, will be less beneficial due to the lack of pre-teaching vocab. Constantly stopping and repeating unfamiliar vocab will just lead to instant
forgetting and input-overload. Is the picture walk designed to teach vocab for the story or to facilitate comprehension of the narrative? Decide and rewrite this activity to reflect the objective you’re after (Written Supervisor Feedback, 10/4/2015).

When the teacher-candidates returned their rewritten lesson plan two days later (10/6/15), very few changes had been made. The reading of the story remained at the end of the lesson and the two previous learning activities stayed the same. The only change that was made was an expanded explanation of how the learning activity would conclude after the story was read (included in bold):

“Max will ask the students, ‘Qu’est-ce qui se passé?’ [‘What happened?’]. For support, Max will add gestures to convey the meaning of this question. If need be, Max will add only the phrase, ‘Qu’est-ce qui s’est passé? S’est passé? Happened. Qu’est-ce qui s’est passé?’” The students will respond by telling one thing that happened in the story. Again, Max will repeat what the student says in French” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Week 2/Day 2, 10/8/2015).

Given the time constraints, I allowed them to proceed with their plan as written in the hope that they would be afforded an opportunity to reflect on their methodological choices and pedagogical decision-making skills. Max self-identified pantomime, storytelling, and narrative pantomiming as the specific DBI strategies he felt he had used in this particular learning activity. Specifically, his learning activity was designed to meet the third objective of his teaching group’s written lesson plan: “Students will be able to identify and recall the basic plotline of the story La lune qui disparaît,” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Day 2/Week 2, 10/8/15) and, as he stated on the strategy questionnaire, “The whole thing [story] was in French so I chose to pantomime the story to assist comprehension” (Strategy Questionnaire, 12/10/15).

6.4.1 Story-Reading: Pantomime to Support L2 Meaning-Making

Excerpt 6.1 demonstrates Max’s attempt to negotiate meaning amongst his students throughout his endeavor to read the folktale entirely in French by using pantomime:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>(Reading) &lt;L’écureuil effrayé&gt;.</td>
<td>(Reading) &lt;The scared squirrel&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>&quot;The squirrel was&quot; -</td>
<td>&quot;The squirrel was&quot; -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>(Continuing to read) - &lt;Écureuil avait peur&gt;.</td>
<td>(Continuing to read) - &lt;Squirrel was scared&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>J’ai peur.</td>
<td>J’ai peur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>J’ai peur.</td>
<td>J’ai peur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>[Il a peur].</td>
<td>[Il a peur].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>II ne pouvait pas.</td>
<td>II ne pouvait pas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>[The squirrel was scared].</td>
<td>[The squirrel was scared].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
<td>Il ne pouvait pas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
<td>Eating acorns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
<td>He couldn’t eat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout lines 4-6, 15-16, and 22-23, Max demonstrates his initial use of pantomime.

Following an I.R.E/F teacher-dominated pattern of classroom discourse, he changes the tone and pitch of his voice while providing complementary non-verbal gestures to simulate the meaning of his L2 utterances. Max attempts to elicit L1 responses from his students as his only form of assessing their L2 comprehension. He remains in the target language until the students provide...
an acceptable translation. This causes them to continue to postulate L1 interpretations until a satisfactory response is supplied. When the students do provide a “correct” translation, he uses that moment to discontinue the use of the L2 and provide an evaluative comment in the students’ L1. Thus, confirmation, and validation, of L2 meaning-making is only completed through the act of direct translation. As such, the L2 story reading endeavor is a learning exercise targeting the students’ L1 deductive reasoning skills through the use of pantomime as a comprehension aide (i.e., Drama-as-Tool orientation).

Similar to how Madeline, and their peers in the teacher preparation program, first used DBI strategies in the L2 classroom, it becomes apparent that Max had reserved the use of pantomime as a way to assist target language comprehension throughout his learning activity. Again, without explicit instruction or voiced expectations from me to use DBI strategies otherwise, Max used these drama-based strategies (pantomime and teacher-in-role) to promote meaning-making through direct translation via teacher-directed comprehension questions rather than as a way to drive L2 instruction through playful/learning ZPD activity.

6.4.2 Reading-in-Role: Misidentification of DBI Strategies

While Max was animated during his reading of the story, he did not tell the story in a way that went beyond the reading of a story (e.g., using masks, costumes, props, puppetry, etc.; see Table 4-1 in chapter four). Thus, he misidentified the use of storytelling when self-assessing his use of DBI strategies in this lesson at the end of the elementary field experience. In addition, he misidentified narrative pantomiming as another DBI strategy used throughout the learning activity. Narrative pantomiming would have involved Max narrating, coaching, and/or guiding a scene while the group pantomimed the action/story rather than the teacher pantomiming a story.
However, as Max progresses through the story, he does incorporate another DBI strategy that he did not self-identify in the strategy questionnaire. He begins to demonstrate a noticeable change in his use of pantomime as he continues to read the story. In lines 46-51 and 58-70 in Excerpt 6.1, rather than employing pantomime after the L2 utterance, and then initiating a request from the students for an expression of their comprehension in their L1, he uses physical actions simultaneously with his speech practices. Max continues to validate students’ responses in their L1, but he begins to use physical actions as a way to communicate through the story by simultaneously embodying the language. Recalling that pantomime was defined as “conveying action, thoughts, and feelings without words; communicating with your body,” by adding verbal communication alongside the physical actions Max unknowingly changes the DBI strategy he was using from “pantomime” to “teacher-in-role” who uses gestures in character.

As Max proceeded through the reading, a character named Hibou was introduced into the story. Hibou was described as being both wise and old and it was the animal who comforted the other characters’ fears by teaching them about the phases of the moon. With Hibou’s entrance into the folktale, Max noticeably changed his reading practice. He continued to simultaneously gesture alongside his L2 utterances, but he also adopted speech patterns that significantly altered his persona. Raising his pitch, fluctuating the prosodic features of the L2, and making his tone drastically more nasal, he attempted to invoke his perception of a wise and old character.

Excerpt 6.2 provides evidence of this shift in reading practice and the students’ continued attempts to negotiate meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excerpt 6.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(takes left hand and with a sweeping hand and with a sweeping gesture
gesture shakes his index finger at all
of the students) AU tour (jabs left
index finger at students) et
(proceeds to jab left finger at
students on each syllable for the
remaining L2 sentence) je vais vous
<sujet de la lu::ne. >=What do you
think he says<<?

Thomas Maybe it's because it's normal? Maybe it's because it's normal?
(Speaking as Hibou) (Speaking as Hibou)
↑Ra::semblez-vous ((takes both
hands and gestures rapidly in a semi-
circle towards his chest as if
gathering something close to him))
→Tell you.

Max (Because of the-) Come together ((repeats semi-
circular hand gesture. Looks back at
book. Reads as Hibou)) Je vais vous
t↑Prend::dre ((gestures handing
something out to the students) I will-
Tell you.

Max Tell or teach ↑yo::u. (.) Quelque
cho::se? So::me ↑things de la -
Llll-

Max -Come together ((repeats semi-
circular hand gesture. Looks back at
book. Reads as Hibou)) I am going
t↑Tea::ch you ((gestures handing
something out to the students) I will-
Tell you.

Max -Lune

Seth About the moon.

Max (Points at Seth on the syllable of each word to affirm his utterance)
About the moon. (Returns to
reading as Hibou) ↑Il y a DEUX
((Raises his thumb and index fingers
and shows them around to the
students)) ↑deux

Max -Deux. (↑Puts his thumb down and
raises his index and middle fingers)

Thomas "[Two]." "[Two]."

Seth "[Two]."

Max (Reading as Hibou) Deux choses
que ↑VOUS devez ↑Savo::ir ((points
with index finger and taps the air on
each syllable) >au sujet de la
lu::ne< a dit Hibo::u. (.) TOUT
D'ABORD ((raises left hand with
index finger and shakes it on each
syllable) (.) First.
By incorporating diverse vocalizations and gestures designed to invoke the personality of Hibou (most notably, jabbing his finger on the individual syllables of words spoken by Hibou), Max assumes elements of role-play (specifically, teacher-in-role) into his learning activity. It is unclear why he reserves this shift in vocal performance only during Hibou’s speech practices and
not with other characters in the story. He does, however, continue to validate students’ L1 translations by affirming their responses in their L1 and adopting his normal voice, which maintains the Drama-as-Tool framework.

In using pantomime and teacher-in-role, Max introduces elements of a play activity into his lesson. It is possible to see Max using his imagination and creative imitation (based on his personal experiences) to create identifiable gestures that represent the meaning behind his L2 utterances. Likewise, the students needed to use their imaginations to recognize, interpret, and identify the actions conducted within the pantomime activity. In addition, the storybook’s illustrations and the premise of the folktale itself (a forest of talking animals fearing the conditions of the waning moon), necessitated an additional degree of imagination for students to create comprehensible meaning.

However, the students remained outside of the imaginary context of the story for the duration of the lesson, consciously aware through the I.R.E/F discourse pattern of their continued role as novice L2 learners within the real-world setting of the elementary world language classroom. The imaginative world where the story takes place (including the conflicts, conditions, and consequences experienced by the characters) and the world of the classroom remained separate. The students did not have an opportunity to interact with the L2, or imitate Max’s modeled behavior(s), in a way that moved beyond direct translation. Thus, while Max used imagination, followed rules/constraints of behavior and creative imitation while engaged on the imaginative plane during the reading of the story, the students did not.

In order for Max to have used pantomime and role-play as a means to create playful/learning ZPD activity, he would have needed to invert his approach to the lesson. Rather than pantomime and role-play being used as tools to comprehend L2 story-reading, L2 story-reading is necessitated because of pantomime and role-play. For example, the students would need to assume explicit roles within a particular imaginative context wherein they would have
been faced with a need to listen and respond to the reading of the folktale (e.g., the Library of Congress has heard that the students have been studying French, which is good news because they need someone to listen and record a rare folktale called, *La lune qui disparaît*, and they know these students would be great folklorists, etc.). However, in lacking a conceptual framework to (re)orient to a DBI-as-Methodology orientation, Max sees the DBI strategies in this lesson, (role-play and pantomime), simply as useful tools to facilitate L2 comprehension and to support his main learning activity: story-reading.

### 6.5 Week Two DBI Activity: Reflections and Initial Mediation

To review, without prior explicit instruction on how to use DBI strategies in particular ways to potentially promote playful/learning ZPD activity, the self-identified (and un-identified) DBI strategies used in this specific lesson served as supportive strategies. They served to meet the teacher’s (Max’s) pre-determined objectives for both himself and his students (i.e., read and comprehend a story in French through teacher-directed comprehension questions that made use of direct translation).

Reflecting on this particular lesson, Max justified his pedagogical choices by stating:

“I used English only when I thought students were lost, when there was complex phrasing, or when I wanted to judge students’ comprehension…I helped the students by prompting them in English after reading and mimicking out the text. I wonder what more I could have done to convey meaning while using less English. Perhaps doing a more dramatic presentation, but then I don’t know that students would have the same opportunity to make vocabulary connections” (10/11/2015).

It is not clear how Max decided when students were “lost” or what he considers to be “complex phrasing” in the students’ L2. His current L2 teaching practices seems to reflect his own experiences and personal philosophy regarding the process of L2 teaching/learning. That is to say, that he perceives the existence of a hierarchical developmental pattern in second language
acquisition wherein certain syntactical features of the L2 must be learned first before proceeding
to introduce additional components of the language to students (see section 6.2). Thus, for Max,
certain L2 phrases would be less complicated and, consequently, understood better than others.
How he defines “complexity,” and “phrasing” remains unclear (e.g., does such a hierarchical
development pattern extend to other features of the language such as at the lexical, semantic, and
pragmatic levels, etc.), but he appears to see more “complex phrasing” as requiring the use of the
students’ L1 in order to facilitate comprehension, which may account for his use of the students’
L1 throughout his lesson.

Interestingly, Max questioned whether or not pursuing a more dramatic interpretation of
the story might have helped facilitate his learners’ L2 comprehension while using less English.
Recall that on the strategy questionnaire he stated that he had selected pantomime as the
particular DBI learning strategy for this lesson since the “whole thing [story] was in French” and
it would “assist comprehension” (Strategy Questionnaire, 12/10/15). However, he immediately
expresses discomfort with the notion of revoking the bilingual one-to-one lexicosemantic
mapping he seems to encourage in his learners and sees as necessary for comprehension to take
place.

Three weeks later, Max wrote a reflective comment during the sixth week of the field
experience on the topic of assessment, which would provide additional insight into his seeming
reliance on direct translation:

“I like students to translate directions/instructions or whatever it may be that I'm
saying just to show (very explicitly) that they understand. The advantages of this
method are that students are able to show their comprehension on the spot and it
helps other students who maybe weren't sure about what was said. On the other
hand, it really can get too much back into English. I would like to get away from
this, too, on occasions and just give directions in French and have the students do
the activity or game or whatever it may be. Giving them the opportunity to first
try an activity without English translation and adding that linguistic support if
they seem lost or do not do the activity as intended” (Written Teaching
Reflection, 11/09/15).
In response to this reflection, I provided the following commentary in order to try to provoke Max into thinking critically about the underlying ideology behind using direct translation in his instruction and to encourage him to explore other L2 teaching/learning approaches that might be more compatible with his expressed wish to move away from relying on English to solidify L2 meaning-making:

“While direct translation does show you that they [the students] are comprehending what you are saying, are there other ways that the students could show comprehension without relying on this method? I've also noticed that when students don't produce the exact direct translation, they are told they are wrong - for example, indicies - one student said evidence. Well, yes - a clue is evidence - valuing these comments and then producing a close synonym helps learners feel as if they are competent in their [L2] decoding skills.

In order to not rely on direct-translation, it requires a shift in your thinking of how second languages are learned. By thinking that students need to directly translate the language into their first language to get 'comprehension' means that you see the second language as always being filtered through the first language. Why can’t a learner come to comprehend the second language in the way he/she understands it in context?” (Supervisor Written Feedback, 11/09/15).

Although Max would not have a chance to directly answer these questions, the workshop on how to use DBI strategies in a way to potentially foster playful/learning ZPD activity occurred three days later and promoted an approach to L2 teaching/learning that departed from an emphasis on direct translation. Indeed, as Max moved into Week 7 of his elementary field experience, he self-identified using the most DBI strategies in his learning activity than at any other point during the elementary field experience. He self-identified pantomime, soundscape, improvisation, and role-play (specifically teacher-in-role and student-in-role) as the DBI strategies that were used to facilitate his learning objectives during the first of the two teaching days scheduled for that week (Strategy Questionnaire, 12/10/15). In fact, Max explicitly expressed an interest in further experimenting with a variety of DBI strategies for L2 teaching/learning. When asked, via the strategy questionnaire, why he had chosen to use these
particular DBI strategies for this lesson he wrote, “I wanted to do an activity that was DBI. I wanted to test the waters” (Strategy Questionnaire, 12/10/15).

6.6 Testing the Waters: Week Seven DBI Lesson

According to the lesson plan submitted by Max’s teaching group, Max’s learning activity for the first teaching day in Week 7 of the elementary field experience was designed to meet the following objective: “Students will be able to produce three elements of weather vocabulary (il pleut, il fait du soleil, il fait du vent, il neige, il fait chaud, il fait froid)” (Weekly Lesson Plan, Day 1/Week 7, 11/10/2015). In order to accomplish this stated learning target, Max designed a lesson involving an imaginary airplane trip that would entail students “flying” to different parts of the world, an imaginative context that he anticipated would provide them with an opportunity to discuss diverse weather conditions. The exact procedures for his learning activity included the following steps:

“1) Introduction: Max will ask the students to line up in order of height and fasten their seatbelts. Max will pair the students off in the line. Nous voyageons! Students will board an imaginary airplane and we will fly to different parts of the world (to talk about different weather conditions);

2) Activity Engagement: The first stop on our voyage spectaculaire will be in Côte d’Ivoire. As students disembark, Max will welcome them (part of the voyage will include a map animation that shows where we are traveling in the world.). He will also project an image on the document camera to help with the setting.

Max will ask the students to describe the weather by using pre-made weather cards that have pictures of weather and the phrase associated (i.e., a picture of the sun captioned il fait du soleil [it is sunny]). Max will ask the students to (do their best to) read the card they choose. The class will either agree (thumbs up) or disagree (thumbs down). Max will reiterate the phrase and have the class repeat with him.

Second, we will fly to l’Antarctique. Once we arrive, Max will tell the students to portez les manteaux [wear the coats]. Max will act out shivering and chattering teeth and ask the students again to find appropriate weather vocab
cards (*il pleut, il fait froid* [it is raining, it is cold]), repeating the same steps as at Côte d’Ivoire. The third stop will be in a *forêt tropicale* in Martinique. Again, through pantomime, Max will act out weather (*il pleut, il fait chaud* [it is raining, it is hot]). Students choose the cards; Max reiterates the vocabulary. The last stop will be back in our hometown. Students will describe the actual weather for the day. Max will provide other vocabulary if needed.

3) **Closure:** Max will ask the students to recap the weather from each different stop along the way” (Day 1/Week 7, Written Lesson Plan, 11/10/2015).

I was encouraged to see Max making use of explicit imaginary contexts to discuss new L2 vocabulary and that, in doing so, he was beginning to incorporate other francophone countries outside of France and Canada in his instruction, which he was praised for in my feedback on the teaching group’s initial lesson plan that was submitted for review. I suggested that he also think of including additional soundscapes and realia to help students establish each imaginary “elsewhere.” However, as can be seen in the procedures listed above, the lesson did not seem to be designed in a way that would support playful/learning ZPD activity (e.g., no explicit identified roles for the students to assume, limited opportunities for students to participate in creative imitation, and a missing element dramatic conflict or need to participate in the trip and use the targeted L2 weather-related vocabulary).

At this point in the elementary field experience, I was aware that the French teaching group was primarily focused on reviewing the L2 concepts that had been introduced to the students over the previous six weeks of their unit and that they were worried about adequately preparing their learners for a parent presentation to showcase that knowledge that would occur in less than a week. In fact, Max’s weather-related lesson would be the last lesson to introduce new L2 concepts to the students. Thus, knowing that their anxieties lay elsewhere, I did not ask Max to direct his energy towards redesigning his learning activity to include the Vygotskian-informed criteria for playful/learning ZPD activity in this learning activity via the use of DBI strategies. Instead, I gave Max the freedom to implement the activity as it had been written to see how he
navigated the use of DBI in the L2 classroom and to see if the DBI workshop would influence his choices facilitating the learning activity without my direct mediation.

6.6.1 The Voyage Spectaculaire Takes Flight

Max introduced the imaginative trip to the students by modeling their expected behavior with the aid of his fellow co-teachers. This was done while the students sat on the carpet at the front of the classroom. Excerpt 6.3 demonstrates the introduction of the learning activity:

Excerpt 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>We’re traveling around the world et nous parlons de la météo</td>
<td>We’re traveling around the world and we talk about the weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>To see the weathers?</td>
<td>To see the weathers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>To talk about weather.</td>
<td>To talk about weather. Okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&lt;We will give an example first world&gt; okay?</td>
<td>&lt;We will give an example first world&gt; okay? [(Max begins handing out cards with weather-related symbols on them to his co-teachers.)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&lt;Nous allons donner un example première monde&gt; okay?</td>
<td>&lt;Nous allons donner un example première monde&gt; okay? [(Max begins handing out cards with weather-related symbols on them to his co-teachers.)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>To talk about weather.</td>
<td>To talk about weather. Okay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&lt;We will give an example first world&gt; okay?</td>
<td>&lt;We will give an example first world&gt; okay? [(Max begins handing out cards with weather-related symbols on them to his co-teachers.)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>What’s the weather like in winter?</td>
<td>What’s the weather like in winter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>What weather?</td>
<td>What weather?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Oh! Uh ()-We’re going to go to the different seasons and-</td>
<td>Oh! Uh ()-We’re going to go to the different seasons and-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Well, &gt;that’s what we’re doing&lt;, yes, but the question quel temps – &gt;what do you think that means&lt;? Quel temps</td>
<td>Well, &gt;that’s what we’re doing&lt;, yes, but the question quel temps – &gt;what do you think that means&lt;? Quel temps (writes quel temps on the board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Can I be island?</td>
<td>Can I be island?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>No. Okay. I am going ()&lt;to ask a question&gt;. Okay. ()&lt;I am going to ask a question&gt;.</td>
<td>No. Okay. I am going ()&lt;to ask a question&gt;. Okay. ()&lt;I am going to ask a question&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Quel temps fait-il en hiver. (.)&gt;What did I ask&lt;? ()En hiver. (1.0)</td>
<td>Quel temps fait-il en hiver. (.)&gt;What did I ask&lt;? ()En hiver. (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Oh! Uh ()-We’re going to go to the different seasons and-</td>
<td>Oh! Uh ()-We’re going to go to the different seasons and-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Well, &gt;that’s what we’re doing&lt;, yes, but the question quel temps – &gt;what do you think that means&lt;? Quel temps</td>
<td>Well, &gt;that’s what we’re doing&lt;, yes, but the question quel temps – &gt;what do you think that means&lt;? Quel temps (writes quel temps on the board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Oh. What temperature.</td>
<td>Oh. What temperature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mnhm ((writes fait-il en hiver}</td>
<td>Mnhm ((writes fait-il en hiver}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hiver after quel temps))

after quel temps)

How temperature’s -

How temperature’s -

En hiver?

En hiver?

What temperatures are in

What temperatures are in winter?

Right. What’s the weather in

winter? (.) Quel temps fait-il en

hiver?:?) (.) Mademoiselle Co-

Teacher?

Il fait froid.

Il fait froid.

Il fait ↑froid. Monsieur Co-

Teacher 2?

Il neige.

Il neige.

Il ↑neige. ((Points to another
coteacher))

Il ↑neige. ((Points to another co-
teacher))

>Il fait nuageux<.

>Il fait nuageux<.

<Il fait nuageux>. Ok.

<Il fait nuageux>. Ok. <Could you

enact a snow scene?>. >So, what do

you think they’re going to

do<?

A[ct it.]

A[ct it.]

<Act a ↑scene> -

<Act a ↑scene> -

[In winter.]

[In winter.]

Oui. Exactement.

Yes. Exactly.

((Co-teachers pantomime

throwing and being hit by

snowballs))

((Co-teachers pantomime throwing

and being hit by snowballs))

Qu’est-ce qu’ils font?

What are they doing?

Snowball fight! ((Laughter))

Snowball fight! ((Laughter))

Snowball fight. Exactement. ↑Okay,

thank you.

That was funny.

That was funny.

Okay. <Je vous donne un
carte.> (.)

Okay. <Je vous donne un carte.> (.)

All right, I’ll give you a ↑card.

((Passes out cards to students. Pulls down

projection screen and projects an image of a global map.))

Okay. We start. ((Clicks on the
global map, which gives way to an
image of an airplane.))

Okay. Nous commençons

((Clicks on the global map,

which gives way to an image of
an airplane.))
As Excerpt 6.3 demonstrates, in lines 00-04 Max explains to the students that they will be traveling around the world to talk about the weather. This is accomplished by providing students with cards that reflect weather symbols (e.g., clouds, a sun, a snowflake, a thermostat, etc.) and the targeted language phrases (e.g., il pleut/it’s raining, il fait du soleil/it’s sunny, il fait froid/it’s cold, etc.). From the instructions he provides in the introduction of the activity, it is apparent that he had chosen, at some point, to change the original procedures he had outlined in the initial lesson plan to a new version that would afford more participatory opportunities for the students. First, they needed to identify if their card described the environment they were “visiting.” If it did, they were to say the scripted phrase and join the other students whose phrases also matched the weather conditions of the place they were “visiting.” These students were then supposed to perform a pantomimed action, in front of the other students, that depicted an action or activity that might occur in that place.

Throughout the introduction, Max tells the students what to anticipate in the lesson, but he does not appear to tell them why they are engaging in this particular imaginative scenario. He does not provide the students with a rationale to partake in the imaginary journey nor does he provide them with an authentic reason to use the features of the L2 that correspond to his targeted language objective. The performative pantomime aspect of the learning activity requires a degree of imagination the students may not be able to achieve without a purposeful and rational motivation, particularly if they have never visited or experienced the weather conditions of each location. Furthermore, the pantomime does not incorporate, or make use, of the L2 (either previous learned concepts or the targeted weather-related vocabulary of the lesson.)

Max does not provide the students with corresponding roles that would reflect people who might engage in the imaginary situation he has devised (e.g., tourists, businesspeople, travel writers, etc.), but such an option for explicit character creation is not a direction given by Max.
and is, therefore, left as an ambiguous personal choice. The roles the students inhabit in the imaginary context remain implicit.

In addition, Max decides to also remain in his role as the classroom teacher, which he performs for the students on a daily basis. Interestingly, though, he casts a co-teacher into the explicit role of the airplane pilot. He instructs the students, in French, to stand and form a line behind this co-teacher. He tells the students to follow her as she walks around the room once. His co-teacher pretends to steer a plane as the students follow her in a single line. While the students are walking around the room, Max displays an image of a world map on the projection screen. He points to the African continent and tells the students, in French, that they are currently above Africa. The students return to the carpet area of the classroom and Max asks them to sit down. At this point, one student remarks, “It looks like we just gone nowhere,” (Video Transcription, 11/10/2015) indicating the student may not have been able to fully involve himself in the imaginative context based on the design and execution of the imaginary plane trip alone.

6.6.2 Pantomime in New Lands

Once the plane trip ends and the students are all seated on the carpet at the front of the classroom, Max presents a second image onto the projection screen. This image is of a pristine beach in Côte d’Ivoire with clear blue skies, white sand, and bright blue ocean water. He plays Ivorian music and welcomes the students to the Côte d’Ivoire, yet his existence on the beach at Côte d’Ivoire presents a potential paradox for some students. Since Max did not board the plane himself and is presumably still playing his traditional role of the classroom teacher, it may be unclear how, or why, he has arrived at the same imaginative destination as the students. Max’s presence as a teacher in the imaginary context becomes a violation of the imaginary rules that
govern the fictive journey. Since Max chose not to take on another role alongside his students on the imaginative plane, he causes the students to shift between the pretense of their imaginative journey (a context that may permit students to abide by a separate set of operational rules of behavior that may have otherwise caused them to interact differently with Max) and the reality of the classroom space (where their actions are governed by the expected classroom policies and procedures of school-behavior). This may have been remedied if Max had briefly established his identity/rationale for his presence in Côte d’Ivoire, (e.g., “Bonjour! Je suis le président de la Côte d’Ivoire!”/ “Hello! I am the president of Côte d’Ivoire!”). However, as it stands, Max’s violation forces the students to undertake a shift in cognition each time he engages the students in an I.R.E./F. pattern of discourse. By causing the students to move from the imaginary realm to a space grounded in realism, opportunities for alternative behavioral contributions may have become limited.

Pointing to the image of the beach in Côte d’Ivoire on the projection screen, Max proceeds to ask the students a series of weather-related questions in French. Once the students respond correctly to the questions in French, (through the mediation of the appropriate weather cards), Max instructs them to pantomime an activity that one might do in this particular context. Once the pantomime has concluded, the students are asked to board the plane again, walk/fly around the room, and another context is displayed on the projection screen.

This pattern continues for the duration of the learning activity with students “visiting” Antarctica and a tropical rainforest in French Guiana before returning to the elementary school’s hometown. Each setting is accompanied by an image and an audio soundscape that reflect the sounds that might exist in the pictured environment (e.g., blowing wind in Antarctica, a thunderstorm in the tropical rainforest, and a jet engine during the plane ride[s]). The lesson concludes with Max reading a phrase that was written on a card and asking the students to repeat
after him several times. He then asks the students what the phrase means in English before going on to the next card/phrase.

Excerpt 6.4 demonstrates a typical interaction between Max and the students once they arrived at an imaginary location. In this case, the students have just arrived at their first destination: the beach in Côte d’Ivoire:

Excerpt 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Bienvenue!</td>
<td>Welcome!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Where the heck are we?</td>
<td>Where the heck are we?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Ooooo.</td>
<td>Ooooo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Bienvenue à la RÉPublique (.) la République de &lt;Côte d’Ivoire:re&gt;.</td>
<td>Welcome to the REPUblique (.) of the Ivory Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>°[Afri::ca].</td>
<td>°[Afri::ca].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>[It’s a country. La Côte d’Ivoire:re. la République de Côte d’Ivoire. It’s the Ivory Coast. It’s a country. Okay. ((Points to the image of the beach on the projection screen. His finger happens to touch the ocean)) Quel temps fait-il?</td>
<td>[It’s a country. La Côte d’Ivoire. La république de Côte d’Ivoire. It’s the Ivory Coast. It’s a country. Okay. ((Points to the image of the beach on the projection screen. His finger happens to touch the ocean)) What is the weather like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>[It’s a country. La Côte d’Ivoire:re. La république de Côte d’Ivoire. It’s the Ivory Coast. It’s a country. Okay. ((Points to the image of the beach on the projection screen. His finger happens to touch the ocean)) Quel temps fait-il?</td>
<td>What’s -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>°&lt;Ocean&gt;s?</td>
<td>°&lt;Ocean&gt;s?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Quel temps ((Pulls hand away from the image and moves it in a circular pattern to indicate the whole image)) What’s -</td>
<td>What weather ((Pulls hand away from the image and moves it in a circular pattern to indicate the whole image)) What’s -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Oui. En français?</td>
<td>Yes. In French?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Summer!</td>
<td>Summer!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>((Reading from her card)) Il fait du soleil.</td>
<td>((Reading from her card)) It’s sunny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&lt;It’s sunny&gt;s?</td>
<td>Oh! I’ve go:t -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;Il fait du soleil. Levez-vous.&lt; (.) &gt;It’s sunny. Stand up.&lt; (.) What else? &gt;It is sun::ny&lt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Quoi d’autre? &gt;Il fait du soleil&lt;s&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Something else?</td>
<td>Something else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>Oh! I’ve go:t -</td>
<td>Oh! I’ve go:t -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Is it the temperature thing? ((Points to Mitch’s card with a thermostat indicating a high temperature)) Is it the temperature thing? ((Points to Mitch’s card with a thermostat indicating a high temperature))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;Qu’est-ce que c’est dit&lt;? What’s it say? &gt;What does that say&lt;? What’s it say?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mitch</td>
<td>&lt;Il fait (. ) CHode&gt;?</td>
<td>&lt;Il fait (. ) CHode&gt;?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Max introduces the students to Côtre d’Ivoire, and the other settings, through a bare minimum of signs to create the imaginary context (i.e., one photo and a representative soundscape). As he proceeds to ask the students weather-related questions about the environment shown in the picture, he follows an I.R.E./F. pattern of teacher-dominated classroom discourse.

In doing so, the students must abandon the pretense that they have flown halfway around the
world and are sitting on a beach in Côte d'Ivoire, and, instead, respond to Max as if they were
students sitting on a carpet in a world language elementary classroom answering teacher-posed
questions. In order to have avoided this pattern, Max would have needed to have provided roles
not only for himself, but also for his students; roles that would have come up against a conflict or
a need that would have required them to have used the weather-related L2 targeted concepts. In
doing so, the students might have been provided with more agency within the lesson that may
have broken the I.R.E./F. discourse pattern. Without an explicit intervention by me that would
have directed Max’s learning activity otherwise, mediation of the learners’ L2 capabilities
through playful/learning ZPD activity cannot be produced, even with Max’s deviations from the
prescribed submitted lesson plan, since the necessary conditions still have not been met nor
sustained (i.e., an explicit imaginary context).

In lines 50-53, Max invites the three students to “act out their favorite scene to play on
the beach when it’s hot.” This is a request that requires the students to make an immediate
adjustment in their perception of reality (what exists for them in the here and now) versus the
imaginary (the possibilities of existence in another time and place). The students appear to
hesitate when making this abrupt change in their thinking. Essentially, the students are being
asked to (re)conceptualize their learning environment so they are no longer standing in front of
the classroom, but on a hot beach (whether or not that beach is in west Africa remains unclear).

Once more, the students are not given explicit characters to play other than themselves,
thus ambiguity of their roles and their rules of behavior permeate throughout the pantomime
exercise. Without overt circumstances of the pantomime activity (i.e., why the students are
enacting their favorite activity to do on the beach, who can be interacted with on the beach, what
relationship conditions exist between the other people that are available/unavailable for
interaction, etc.), the students appear paralyzed to follow Max’s instructions. They seem to have
difficulty seeing themselves other than students standing in front of a classroom filled with their
peers staring at them waiting for a performance to occur. In line 55, Thomas asks, “What are we supposed to do?” Max repeats a version of his original instructions in line 56: “Act like you’re on the beach,” but does not provide additional circumstantial information to help the learners enter the imaginary context of the beach.

In lines 56-71, Max begins to attempt a sequence of actions to mediate the learners’ behaviors to help them complete the pantomime activity. When Thomas begins to dance to the Ivorian music, Max seizes upon this choice and supports his contribution to the pantomime by dancing alongside him. This type of positive reinforcement allows Bonnie to imitate Max’s earlier, and more subdued, action of sunbathing on the beach. Jack, a student in the ‘audience’ appears to have become drawn into the unfolding performance and provides a suggestion for an appropriate action that would fit the ongoing scene. This interpersonal verbal act is valued by Max who begins to pantomime the freestyle swimming stroke – an action that Mitch is able to visualize and imitate in his own individual way. While this mediation helped to facilitate completion of the pantomime activity, it was not targeted towards introducing, reinforcing, or an application of the targeted language objectives. Thus, pantomime, in this instance, was used as an ancillary strategy to support the otherwise didactic teaching methods of the overall learning activity (i.e., Drama-as-Tool).

While the students “traveled” to the other destinations on their itinerary, varying levels of learner participation in the pantomime activity at each location occurred. To encourage learners to perform in the pantomimes, suggestions were provided (and accepted if appropriate) from the “audience” (i.e., the other students) and the co-teachers. Again, the mediation was centered on the performance and not on the L2 learning objectives. However, the use of imagery and the soundscape at each location did appear to help create dramatic anticipation amongst the students (i.e., an interest in finding out where they would be “flying” to next). In addition, by not knowing if the next image would contain a matching weather condition to the card they held, they did not
know when they would be selected to read the pre-scripted L2 phrases and be called upon to perform. This dramatic anticipation may have helped increase learners’ focus during the lesson. In addition, the activity seems to have possessed an underlying authoritarian approach to L2 learning (i.e., learners successfully match the weather phrase to the condition, read the sentence correctly, and are awarded a spot in the pantomime. If a learner does not read the phrase correctly, they cannot enter the pantomime. Instead, they must repeat the phrase after the teacher until they are deemed successful.)

When the students were informed that they would be traveling back to their classroom in their hometown, the students seemed disappointed that the activity was ending with several negative comments ranging from groans to shouts of “No!” One student, Thomas, proceeded to ask Max if they could describe the weather in their hometown to prolong the established routine. Thus, it appears as if the students became more comfortable participating in the drama-based learning activity once they were supported by suggestions from their peers and co-teachers and the routine became familiarized.

6.7 Reflections and Next Steps

In his weekly teaching reflection, Max explained his rationale for not focusing on using the L2 during the pantomime portion of his learning activity:

“The objective of the lesson was for students to attempt to read the French phrase on a card that depicted an element of weather, which described the image projected on the board. The vocabulary would be brand new to the students, but I was more focused on them attempting to read and pronounce the words. Looking back at the activity, I didn’t have much trouble at all with having students read their words or phrases and the activity as a whole, I thought, went fairly well up until the end when they were a little rambunctious” (Weekly Teaching Reflection, 11/15/15).
Thus, for Max, he interpreted his written lesson plan objective (students will be able to produce three elements of weather vocabulary) as being limited to a read aloud scenario. The context of an imagined journey, the images, and the soundscapes may have aided this endeavor, but once the read aloud had been successfully accomplished, it became unnecessary for further L2 production to occur during the other elements of the drama-based activity (the pantomime). It should be pointed out that while Max did not meet the Vygotskian-informed criteria for play-based ZPD activity to form during his learning activity, he did voluntarily adjust his procedures, which resulted in an increase in opportunities for students to engage in creative imitation in imaginary contexts through the use of pantomime.

Ultimately, Max recounted a positive classroom teaching/learning experience as a result of this experimentation with DBI. When asked to describe the challenges he felt he faced implementing this particular DBI activity, he said:

“Just having the confidence and knowing that something will work or won’t work because you don’t want to, or at least I didn’t, want to go full fledge into this and have the students be like, ‘I don’t know what’s going on.’ That the students wouldn’t be able to figure out the point of the activity…It was just stuff like that: will they know exactly what’s going on? Will they be able to use it?” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Creating a positive, and logical, experience for the students participating in the learning activity was important to him. Max appeared to have perceived a level of risk involved in choosing to implement DBI in the L2 classroom. He feared students’ ability to form meaning out during DBI activities yet he saw this particular lesson as an opportunity for initial exposure to weather-related vocabulary for his students. The memorization of the L2 language targets and the ability for spontaneous and appropriate recall/reproduction of them was not the primary goal of the learning activity:

“I had those cards that had the weather phrases on them so that obviously helped because there were pictures and stuff, but I didn’t go over that either before we did the activity. I just handed the cards out and we started doing the activity and so when we got to it, I said, ‘You just need to try and say it. I don’t care if it’s
wrong. I just want you to practice saying it.’ And that was one of the comments I got from whoever was observing me that day. They didn’t feel as if they [the students] knew the words. I was feeling super frustrated because she [the district supervisor] didn’t understand [that] the point of the activity wasn’t for them to know the words. It was for them to practice reading the language and using it” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Reading the language and implicitly examining its use in situ appears to have been Max’s ultimate learning objective and it is what appears to have guided his pedagogical decision-making. He seemed to have been experimenting with the belief that through participation in the drama-based activity, students might have been able to negotiate meaning of the new L2 concepts by virtue of the imaginary context. However, without clearly defined roles and a rationale conflict/need guiding the use of the scripted L2 phrases in the drama, students’ implicit conceptual understanding of their meaning may have been very different from the actual socio-cultural imbued meaning of the phrases during the voyage spectaculaire. Consequently, it is not until the imaginary trip had been dissolved that Max elicited explicit understanding of the L2 phrases through direct translation and choral repetition.

As Max concluded his elementary field experience, he was asked to reflect on what he felt he had improved upon pedagogically and what he felt he still needed to improve upon:

“I think I’m strong in [classroom] management and L2 usage (even though I’ve been hypercritical of myself on that over the past few weeks.) Students also always seem to be engaged in the lessons, so that is certainly good! Instructional design is still – not a weakness, but an area that I would like to continue to grow and expand in. I would maybe say that inductive grammar instruction would be a weaker point at this time, but only because we didn’t get much practice using it. Personally, one of the challenges for me in and out of class was the mental aspect of things – reassuring myself that I do actually know what I’m doing and allowing myself to be open and talk about issues, or problems that I have or find, with people I know and look up to (like my mom, my former teachers from high school, other professors, etc.)” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/15).

At this point in Max’s development as a teacher, he felt comfortable and confident in his ability to facilitate classroom settings using the target language and addressing student behaviors. He desired to deepen his knowledge of how to develop a sequence of instruction to support L2
learning and was interested in exploring strategies to implement an inductive approach to grammar teaching in his classes.

While these areas of pedagogical content knowledge were in a state of continuing development for Max, (which he appeared to recognize and accept as a condition of his teacher-preparation process), it was not simply his developing use of pedagogical content knowledge that he found challenging. Rather, he identified confidence in his conceptual understanding and application of his newly acquired pedagogical content knowledge as an additional obstacle he struggled to overcome. However, he viewed his negative self-perception as an element that, in the end, would help him further develop his teacher expertise:

“I learned that in the moments where I feel so dejected about a lesson or class for a day, when I think that a lesson went so horrid and the kids didn’t learn a thing or that the lesson design was completely stupid, my self-criticism and feelings will lead and push me to being a better teacher” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/15).

Max was asked to reflect upon his future goals as he moved forward in his teacher preparation program. He articulated the following:

“In a secondary classroom, you can have a more mature or complex scene/scenario or role-play. I suppose it might be difficult in regards to imagining and being creative, but as a drama geek myself, I think it’s important to be a role model in this and show the students that it’s A-OK to get into their acting” (Weekly Reflection, 11/17/15).

Thus, Max expressed a desire to continue developing DBI for L2 instruction as he moved into other teaching contexts. Interestingly, he seemed to make an assumption about the willing use of imagination and creativity amongst students at the elementary school level (grades K – 5; ages 5 – 11) versus the middle and secondary levels (grades 6-12; ages 11 – 18). Additionally, he seemed to position elementary learners as being incapable of engaging in complex drama scenes/scenarios. Complexity was, unfortunately, left undefined, but it may have had to do with Max’s perception of the proficiency level one must attain in order to participate in the DBI activities he envisioned:
“I was just thinking of doing some of the improv[isation] games that I did [in theatre] and doing them in French. It would be a lot harder to do because you’d have to have a certain level of pre-requisite French to partake in it…something like that would be really interesting in French. I think you could do it at French II if it was very basic, um, but from French III I think you should have enough vocabulary by then that you should be able to act out a scene…I wouldn’t want to use this [DBI] for basic introduction of vocabulary. Like ‘Bonjour! Je m’appelle Max.’ That’s the most boring and like – it’s so hard to create a real scene from something like that. I mean, I guess you could if you really tried, but I don’t think they’d be into that in the same way that they could be into like having a scene where there’s a sense of urgency” (Interview, 12/10/15).

Max seemed to have reduced DBI to improvisation and role-play scenarios/situations rather than examining the range of strategies to produce playful/learning ZPD situations that were introduced during the DBI workshop in the methods course. This may have been because of his own extensive background in theatre. Throughout his middle and secondary education, he had been heavily involved in his school’s theatre program and often volunteered with community theatre organizations. Thus, his conceptual understanding of DBI may have been limited by his own everyday experiences engaging in drama-based exercises that had previously served to strengthen his skills as an actor and were heavily rooted in improvisation (recall from chapter two that DBI strategies in education were developed from strategies used by professional actors to prepare to play roles in scripted performance.) Consequently, it is possible that DBI, in Max’s view, would not be as useful in L2 instruction at the novice proficiency level since improvisational situations (his conceptual referent for DBI) would require advanced communicative capabilities.

Certainly, Max seemed reticent to place novice learners in improvisational situations where they might only have been able to produce one or two-word utterances. He also appeared to have particular preferences on when DBI should be used in L2 instruction:

“You wouldn’t do a DBI activity for something that you could teach in a different way that doesn’t have the same importance as a real-life communication scenario. Whereas – like something I would consider a more appropriate lesson would be like if you were doing a role-play of – like you need to buy medicine for someone whose sick at a pharmacy and creating something that can have a
rea life effect or like something that could really happen. I think those types of scenarios are more important or more – I want to say more malleable, but I don’t know if that’s a good word” (Interview, 12/10/15).

At this point in his development as a teacher, Max appeared to view DBI as a pedagogical tool that afforded students the opportunity to be language *users* rather than language *learners* in the L2 classroom. He made a distinction between L2 concepts: those that can be taught outside of a “real-life communication scenario” and those that cannot. He seemed to struggle with the notion that students in an L2 classroom might simultaneously be language users *and* language learners; that is to say that through using the language they can learn about its function as a psychological tool to satisfy particular communicative need(s). As Max would state later in the study, “I think it’s hard to teach grammar with drama. ‘All right kids! Act out your – er verb endings! Go!’” (Interview, 6/14/16), which, again, reflected his own trajectory learning an additional language: form-first, function-second. His stated rationale for the use of DBI in the L2 classroom reflected his belief that certain L2 concepts (e.g., grammar) that are addressed throughout the process of L2 teaching/learning are divorced from real-life communication scenarios. In these situations, he saw the value of DBI as being significantly diminished. Nevertheless, he anticipated using DBI throughout the remainder of his teacher-preparation program because in his words, “I’m a theatrical person to start with” (Interview, 12/10/15).

On a final note, it is important to mention that Max experienced competing views on the L2 teaching/learning process in Week 7 of the elementary field experience after he engaged in his drama-based learning activity and he expressed how those views effected not only the feedback he received on the quality of his teaching practice, but his self-efficacy as a teacher-candidate to effectively apply DBI as a primary method of L2 instruction. As mentioned in chapter three, two district supervisors and a bilingual (Spanish/English) course assistant provided additional feedback to the teacher-candidates during the elementary field experience. As such, one of the
district supervisors observed Max’s drama-based learning activity in Week 7 of the field experience.

This particular supervisor was an experienced elementary teacher (over twenty years) in the district who did not have expertise in world languages education but was familiar with pedagogical conceptual knowledge as it related to the elementary learner. This gap, however (between contemporary approaches to L2 teaching/learning and the perceived needs of the elementary learner) came into conflict after this supervisor observed Max’s drama-based learning activity. She provided Max with feedback that he perceived to have been negative in nature, which caused quite a bit of frustration on his part:

“I felt that some of the comments that I received on this activity were a lot more negative than the lesson went and I think it’s an important element of communication to talk about when we feel this way as teachers...Tuesday, after I came home, I made a post on Facebook about how upset I was over my lesson. The communication that I received from other teachers and people that taught me along the way was so incredibly helpful. I received numerous messages of support and messages saying that ‘everyone has off days’ and that it's totally normal to feel how I've been feeling. That really helped me a lot” (Weekly Reflection, 11/15/15).

Consequently, the feedback that I provided to Max on his DBI learning activity, and his conceptualization of DBI at this point in his teacher-development, was directed more towards encouraging and supporting the work he had completed throughout the previous seven weeks of the elementary field experience (lest he continued to become discouraged at this early stage in his teacher-development) rather than on specific suggestions that might have opened him up to (re)orientating his approach to DBI strategies in the L2 teaching/learning process. This was done out of concern that he might not have been particularly receptive at this sensitive time to additional feedback he might have perceived as being “negative” in nature.
6.8 Conclusion

In analyzing Max’s interview and questionnaire responses, weekly written teaching reflections, and transcriptions of select classroom interactions, it was made evident that in the absence of ongoing explicit guidance as to how one might use DBI strategies in ways to create playful/learning ZPD activity, its use primarily functioned as a supportive tool for other methods of L2 instruction that fostered formal learning ZPD activity in otherwise teacher-dominated circumstances. This was similar to the results found during Phase I of Madeline’s case. In addition, Max appeared to struggle with his personal conceptual understanding of DBI strategies from his own experiences rooted in theatre; that is to say that he appeared to view them primarily as improvisational role-play activities that would first require foundational grammatical and lexical knowledge acquired through other methods of L2 instruction before being useful in L2 curriculum and instruction.

The next chapter documents Phase II of the study, where both Max and Madeline worked to (re)contextualize their emerging views on DBI in the language learning classroom as they traveled to north-central Sweden to work as English language specialists in several middle and secondary classrooms. The chapter will report on their ongoing growth as developing L2 teacher-candidates and concludes with insights into their pedagogical practices during their secondary field experiences once they returned to the United States (Phase III).
Chapter 7

Act Three: (Re)contextualizing L2 Teaching Practices

7.1 Introduction

As discussed in chapter three, both Madeline and Max were presented with an opportunity for a short-term field experience in two Swedish schools (Gymnasieskola and Grundskola) where they functioned as English language specialists. Within the context of this project, their time in Sweden created the possibility for both (re)contextualizing their emerging understandings of language use and language teaching/learning through the prism of DBI as well as a means to further develop those understandings as they again attempted to integrate DBI practices into their teaching/learning process. Throughout the course of the field experience in Sweden, Madeline created three lessons and led a lesson on five separate occasions. In addition, she assisted Max five other times with two lessons of his own design. Comparatively, Max led his lessons 12 times. In addition, he assisted Madeline eight times with the three lessons she had designed. Madeline and Max very rarely visited the same EFL classroom more than once during their time at Gymnasieskola, whereas at Grundskola they had a more consistent presence in the EFL classrooms of two teachers, Alma and Astrid.

According to the results of the strategy questionnaire, Madeline self-identified using DBI strategies in only one of the three lessons she designed, which took place on the final day of the field experience (June 2, 2016). This lesson was taught across three classes at Grundskola (Strategy Questionnaire, 6/2/16). Conversely, Max self-identified incorporating DBI strategies in both of the lessons he designed (Strategy Questionnaire, 6/4/16). These lessons occurred at both Gymnasieskola and Grundskola. As such, this chapter will primarily focus on the drama-based
lessons designed by Max and how they related to Madeline's attempt at using DBI strategies at
the end of the program. The chapter concludes with a brief addendum detailing their conceptual
understanding and/or use of DBI strategies once they returned from their field experience abroad
and began participating in their secondary field experience sites (Phase III of the study).

7.2 Selecting a Topic: Enacting U.S. Civics

Elsa, an English and French teacher, was the main educator assigned to mentor Madeline
and Max at Gymnasieskola. Elsa explained that she taught English 6 and 7, which were the two
highest levels of English offered at the school and two French courses, which were considered to
be at the intermediate level (French 3). Elsa further introduced Madeline and Max to two other
English teachers, Olivia and Greta. Similar to Elsa, Olivia taught English 6 while Greta taught
English 5 (upper intermediate English). Elsa explained that both the students and English
teachers at Gymnasieskola were currently pre-occupied with national assessment procedures.
This had the effect of interrupting normal schooling routine[s] for which they apologized.

Due to the nature of the national oral exams taking place in the English classrooms at
Gymnasieskola, Madeline and Max were not provided with many opportunities to observe Elsa,
Olivia, and Greta’s EFL teaching methods that would have been typically used throughout the
rest of the academic school year. While Madeline and Max were able to observe an occasional
lesson taught by the in-service teachers, the participants were primarily asked to design learning
activities for the students in order to prime them for their oral assessments in English and to keep
them occupied while the in-service teachers administered the oral exams in a separate room.

Consequently, rather than a traditional student-teaching mentorship experience wherein a
teacher-candidate observes the teaching practices of an in-service educator for a period of time
before slowly taking over all classroom responsibilities from the in-service teacher, Madeline and
Max were expected to take up a position of educational authority beginning in the second week of the program without constructive feedback on their teaching practices by the co-operating in-service teachers. The anticipation was for Madeline and Max to teach on a topic of their choice while the in-service teachers continued administering oral exams rather than follow any in-service teachers’ particular curricular goals.

Despite the irregular availability of mediational support at Gymnasieskola from the EFL teachers, Max approached the EFL teachers’ pedagogical expectations for Madeline and himself with a flexible attitude:

“I’m very ‘go with the flow’ and very open-minded...if somebody wanted to learn about something in a situation like this, in Sweden, where people are very curious about the United States, I would do research and find out the answers to their questions and make a presentation on what they wanted to know and I’d present it at the next class. So, whenever they’re like, ‘Do whatever you want!’ That, for me, was like – ‘Just take over my class! I don’t care what you do!’ So, when we asked Olivia’s class, ‘What do you want to learn about?’ and they [the students] sort of gave us some ideas, that was a good stepping stone...because it’s like, ‘Okay, they would want to learn about the [U.S.] election,’ cause a lot of students were like, ‘That’d be cool’” (Interview, 5/25/16).

Thus, armed with the knowledge of students’ interests Max designed a lesson on the U.S. electoral system and the 2016 Presidential election. In his strategy questionnaire response, Max listed role-play (both teacher-in-role and student-in-role) as well as lecture as the DBI strategies employed in this particular lesson (Strategy Questionnaire, 6/4/2016). When asked to review the decision-making process he undertook in creating the lesson in the first place, he specifically pointed to increasing students’ focus on the specific subject-area knowledge being discussed as the main rationale for selecting DBI strategies in his lesson plan:

“In order to talk about the election, I realized going in that this was going to be more or less a lecture. It’s much more lecture than anything else. And it’s a long lecture at that. So, I knew coming in that I wanted to find ways to make it not as boring and a little more interactive, but I wasn’t sure how to do that. So, I just sort of started going – which is how I do everything – I just go and then I figure it out later. So, I started with basic information...When I was doing the Democratic Party, I sort of got the idea of, ‘Well, what if we talk about the difference between a primary and a caucus with them and they have to become –
they have to participate in caucusing by choosing a candidate via caucusing?’
So, that’s where I sort of got the idea to have them choose between a candidate and whoever they picked then would run against Donald Trump. And so, then it’s just a matter of adding the necessary information you need to talk about how our system works and how it’s confusing and then, um, all the while the goal of this presentation - cause a lot of the teachers asked us to get the students talking. That was the big thing they wanted. I don’t care what you do just make them talk. So, at the end of this conversation, at the end of this lesson, the idea was to have a discussion about how our systems were different” (Interview, 5/25/16).

Here, in the design of Max’s lesson, it is possible to see the Drama-as-Tool orientation re-emerge. The drama strategy here, role-play, is used to support a lecture-dominated lesson. Max seemed to have begun designing his lesson after developing objectives that comprised the conceptual subject-specific knowledge, rather than specific L2 knowledge, he wished the students would begin to internalize. First, the students would have needed to familiarize themselves and comprehend the process of electing the President of the United States. Then, they would have needed to compare and contrast the electoral systems of the U.S. and Sweden. Both of these tasks were to be accomplished through the medium of English. Consequently, in order to successfully complete these tasks, despite their seemingly advanced L2 proficiency level[s], students would have needed to have been in possession of domain-specific L2 listening and speaking skills.

Now, it was impossible for Max to have been aware of the exact L2 proficiency levels, linguistic backgrounds, and cultural knowledge of every student he encountered across the diverse EFL classrooms at Gymnasieskola; particularly since his visits to the classrooms were often isolated to single-lesson interactions. It remained unclear as to whether or not Max considered the L2 skills his students would have needed to participate in his lesson when conceptualizing his learning activities, or if he inquired about the domain-specific language the students would have needed to discuss U.S. civics from the EFL teachers, but he appeared to operate from an assumption that the Swedish students would already be in possession of the L2 proficiency needed to fully participate in the drama-based learning activities he designed for the lesson; an assumption he felt was confirmed through various individual students’ participation in
classroom discussions that he observed, which he then generalized as evidence of advanced L2 comprehension for the group.

7.2.1 The 2016 U.S. Presidential Election: DBI at Gymnasieskola

Max prepared a PowerPoint presentation and began his lesson by providing the students with general background knowledge and information on term lengths and requirements for congressional and executive office, the process and rationale behind primary elections, and an overview of the U.S. political party system with in-depth descriptions of the primary election process of both the Republican and Democratic political parties. He then proceeded to introduce the students to the remaining 2016 Republican candidates involved in the primary elections as of March 15, 2016 (Donald Trump, Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio, and John Kasich). Since Donald Trump would be declared the presumptive Republican nominee for President by the Associated Press on May 26, 2016 (Parker and Rappeport, 2016), Max showed another slide that detailed the delegate count and election results of the remaining Republican candidates with a green border indicating Donald Trump’s imminent success. This slide was followed by a map of the United States detailing the number of delegates and the states each candidate won during the primary elections to date.

After discussing the Republican Party’s primary election process, Max turned his attention to the Democratic Party. Following a similar pattern in how he introduced the Republican primary election process, Max described the candidates for the Democratic Party’s nomination for President (Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders). This was followed by a slide detailing the delegate count and elections results for each candidate and a map illustrating the number of delegates and the states each candidate won to date. Throughout the field experience, Max would continue to update these statistics as additional states held their primary elections.
Once Max had familiarized the students with the primary election process and the candidates still seeking their party’s nomination for President of the United States, he introduced the learners to the idea of a caucus as a voting procedure and explained to the students that they would be imagining themselves as voters in the United States selecting a Democratic candidate to run against the presumptive Republican nominee, Donald Trump. As such, Max presented truncated explanations of both Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton’s positions on a number of socio-political issues such as gun control, health care, the death penalty, marijuana decriminalization, and university tuition. Once the students had made a decision, Max would invite the students to imagine they were in the United States and they should move to an area of the room based on their political choice (e.g., the front of the room if they wanted to vote for Hillary Clinton or the back of the room if they wanted to vote for Bernie Sanders). Max then proceeded to ask the students to explain why they had decided to vote for the candidate of their choice.

Once a Democratic nominee was chosen, Max explained when the general election would take place and presented the concept of the electoral college. He then provided a summary of the views on the aforementioned political issues of whichever candidate “won” the caucus in relation to Donald Trump’s stated position, so they could make another informed decision as U.S. voters for the Presidency of the United States. The students were then given pieces of paper to make their selection. The votes were then counted by Madeline. While the votes were being counted, Max would ask the students if they had any questions about the election process in the United States. This was followed by a reveal of who had been elected president by the class and the conclusion of the lesson.
7.2.2 Civics in Action

This lesson’s transcription was taken from the first time Max implemented this lesson at Gymnasieskola on May 17, 2016 in Olivia’s advanced English class (English 6, which consisted of 17-18 year olds – the majority of whom had been studying English as a compulsory subject for about eight years). Max spent approximately fifteen minutes using a traditional teacher-dominated lecture style of teaching that introduced the initial information on the election process in the United States to the students. He informed the class that they would be participating in an imaginary voting scenario by explicitly stating:

“All right. So, we are going to have a mock caucus. Since I said, if you remember, that they’re a little different. So, I’ve given you a list ((points to the PowerPoint slide)) here of some issues and we’re going to practice how a caucus works. So, we’ll start by talking about the issues” (Video Transcription, 5/17/16).

Max proceeded to present to the Swedish students, via PowerPoint, a comparison list of the seven socio-political issues primary presidential candidates were currently debating in the United States. This list was aimed at providing the students with cultural background information on competing views that existed on a variety of socio-political issues in the United States and, in particular, detailed Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders’ stated views (either in support of or against the presented issue) so the students might be ‘informed voters.’ Figure 1 reproduces Max’s PowerPoint slide on these socio-political issues that the students’ viewed during the lesson:
After discussing each of these socio-political issues, Max proceeded to invite the students to engage in a classroom caucus of their own to select the Democratic Party’s nominee for president. Excerpt 7.1 details the moment when Max invited the Swedish students to actively participate in an imaginary Democratic Party caucus:

Excerpt 7.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>So, those are your issues you have to ↑decide [on] ((references with his hand the list of social justice issues with each Democratic Party candidate’s opinion of them on the PowerPoint presentation)) Take a minute to think about who you’d like to ↑vote [for] and then we’re going to have our caucus. ((Students begin talking with other students near where they are sitting. Max moves over to the desk and speaks with Madeline while students talk)) (1m:27s) ALL RIGHT. &gt;ARE YOU READY&lt;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>Y[EA].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>[Yup].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Max provided the students with very little pretense when it came to the imaginary voting scenario presented to the students. Operating from an authorial position, he explicitly told the students that they would be participating in a ‘mock’ caucus, setting up a potential motivation for...
the students to listen to his lecture on the socio-political issues being debated in the primary presidential election occurring in the United States as well as the electoral process in general.

However, as seen in lines 00-07, Max did not provide an illusory imaginary context in which the students could enact their roles as “U.S. voters.” In fact, they were not even referenced as being U.S. voters; these remained implicit roles to be assumed by the Swedish students in the moment. By not providing the students with an explicit imaginary context situated in a particular region of the United States, the students could not embrace and experience the socio-cultural positions of their fictive U.S.-selves nor argue their position from the viewpoint of a U.S. citizen (which might have been contradictory from their Swedish-self). The presumed caucus remained a teacher-dictated classroom-based task with the Swedish students expressing their personal culturally-imbued perspectives on U.S. socio-political issues (as seen in lines 33-49).

While Max did not provide an explicit imaginary context, nor provide the students with the necessary socio-cultural background to portray explicit roles in an authentic Democratic Party caucus, the general imaginative act of participating in the “caucus” as “voters” provided an impetus for an English-based classroom discussion on the socio-political issues that influenced their decision-making. These oral contributions were in line with the Swedish English teachers’ expressed learning objective: increase students’ oral communication skills. However, as Excerpt 7.2 reveals, the cross-cultural conversations that occurred during the lesson were often prompted by Max and Madeline’s curiosity and dominated by their explanations of U.S. party politics rather than providing rhetorical or guiding questions to spur student-oriented responses.

Excerpt 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Um. So, ↑do you guys have a death penalty here&lt;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;What do you – what do you think about it&lt;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Student K</td>
<td>I think it’s good. ((sarcasm))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Student L</td>
<td>N::o.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In lines 12-13 a student expressed an opposing view to Madeline’s previous statement on the death penalty. Rather than redirecting classroom discourse to create a student-centered debate in English amongst the students (and thereby satisfying their targeted language objective), Madeline and Max continued to perpetuate a teacher-dominated pattern of communication.

Excerpt 7.3 demonstrates Max’s attempt to invite students to participate in the imaginary general election between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. In lines 00-02, it is apparent Max had not planned, prior to the start of the lesson, how the students might imitate the U.S. voting
process. As such, he neglected to provide the students with an explicit imaginative context and roles/rules of engagement in this pretend voting scenario:

Excerpt 7.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Okay, &gt;so now it is your ↑turn&lt; &lt;to vote for President of the United States&gt;.  &gt;Do you all have a piece of paper? Or can you get a piece of paper? &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>Raise our hands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>No. Hhhh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 05   | Max       | →I’ll get some.  ((Goes to the desk to get paper from his notebook.  
Students talk loudly to one another while this is happening.  Two students leave the classroom))  (1m:17s) <I’M GOING TO PASS AROUND A SMALL PIECE OF ↑PAPER.  () DON’T DO ANYTHING TO IT ↑YET.  
((Passes out small slips of paper to each student.  Students continue to talk with one another while the paper is being handed out.)) OKAY, SO YOU’LL BE RECEIVING A () PIECE OF ↑PAPER. Shhh.  (3.0),  
((Students begin to quiet down, but a significant amount of side-chatter persists)) You’re receiving a piece of ↑paper. This is supposed to be your ↑ballot. All right, and if you recall from our ↑caucus, we elected Hillary ↑Clinton to be our Democratic ↑nominee so >we’ll have an election between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump<.  ((Shows the next PowerPoint slide))  <Here’s a list of the ↑issues and where each candidate ↑stands>.  >Again, we’ll talk about ↑this so you’re an informed voter and then we’ll have our election<.  (1.0)  
All right, so in terms of gun control, as I said earlier Hillary Clinton supports gun control. Donald Trump is () anti-gun control ((student side-chatter ends)) as are many of the Republican Party.  ((student side-chatter begins again)) Um, healthcare, Hillary Clinton supports healthcare – yes?  

| 05   | Student P | →When you say support gun control – what do you mean?« |
| 25   | Max       | So, when I say - support gun control means Hillary Clinton <is in favor of enforcing stricter ↑laws so that it’s harder to buy guns>.  
| 27   | Student P | I heard you have it in your constitution that () everyone has the right () to bear arms.  
| 30   | Max       | Right.  <So, the second amendment of the United States ((students are quieted by Tim)) says that every citizen has the right to bear arms>   |
| 31   | Max       | >meaning that every citizen <has the right to own ↑guns>. But () in () gun () control () ↑law:s don’t restrict – >I mean they restrict that amendment, but they don’t take away that right<.  So, it just means that <we want to make it harder for people to buy ↑guns:>.  ((Student side-chatter begins again)) We want it to be harder for criminals who aren’t mentally healthy to have ↑guns>.  ((Student side-chatter stops))  
| 37   | Madeline  | Yea. ↑And <right now if you do go to a gun store, they do a background ↑check ((Student side-chatter begins again)), um, but there is this loop hole> >where if you go to a gun show,< um, ((to Max)) →I don’t think they know that<.  ((To students)) Yea, they’re like gun shows where you can go
As Excerpt 7.3 exhibits, the students began to increase their side-conversations amongst themselves while Max discussed the socio-political positions of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. It is unclear whether these conversations, overheard in both Swedish and English, were relevant to the topic at hand or if their attention span had begun to wane after the teacher-dominated lecture. Nonetheless, Max found himself in a position of having to speak over the students to continue to explain the differing views of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump.

In line 24, a student asked for clarification from Max on one of the socio-political issues that was being discussed; namely, gun-control. Interestingly, Max shifted his explanation of gun-control from the perspective of Hillary Clinton’s political position to that of the editorial ‘we’ in lines 34-36. By doing so, he seemed to take on the role of a spokesperson for those in the United States who advocate for increased gun-control measures. Similar to the situation in Excerpt 7.2, the student was provided with an extensive response from Max and Madeline, which resulted in the student shrugging his shoulders when he was asked if he was able to comprehend their explanation. There was no follow up from Max to discern the intended meaning of the student’s shrug.
Excerpt 7.4 details the imaginary general election process that was presented to the students and the ensuing cross-cultural conversation that occurred while Madeline counted the votes:

### Excerpt 7.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>So, &lt;here are your ↑candidates&gt;. On your piece of ↑paper, (.) you’ll need a pen. &lt;You can write either Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Whoever you want to vote ↑for and then once you have written it ↑down, (.) fold it ↑up, and just &gt;hold on to it and we’ll collect it&lt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>((Students vote and Max and Madeline collect the pieces of paper.)) (1m:46s) All right, so do you have any (. ) questions or comments about our (. ) voting system or our candidates? &gt; Anything you’d like to say? How’s it different than the voting system in ↑Sweden&lt;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>Is it true that (.) Donald Trump is going to build, uh, wall? Between Mexico?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>He thinks [he’s going to build a wall].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>[Um, So, H-He – I mean it depends. People say lots of things and whether things actually happen or not - (shrugs shoulders) &gt;I don’t know&lt;. Right now, he says he’s going to build a ↑wall, um, but I don’t think he really understands the – how much it would ↑cost and how much &gt;time it would actually take&lt;. So, yea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>Uh, what is Donald Trump’s actually plans to do with America? Does he have any plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>That’s a good question. Um, he recently released a (1.0) plan, I guess, of like his ideas and like his finance system. I didn’t (. ) ↑look at it, but (.) um it’s definitely been (1.0) criticized by a lot of Americans. &gt;I don’t know if that answers your question or not&lt;, but there’s not really a -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>&lt;He has been a Democrat for the majority of his life.&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;Yea, he switched back and forth between the two parties&lt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Yea, so -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;He’s been a Democrat. He’s been a Republican&lt;. Yea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Student M</td>
<td>Has the minority of the American presidents always been Democratic or Republican?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Um. That - &gt;I can look that up&lt;. Um. I think – it’s probably been  &lt;fair::ly close to even&gt; I would ↑think, um, but at the beginning, (.) the first seven or eight presidents were known as the Whig Party &gt;which doesn’t really exist ↑anymore&lt; um so like the &lt;first two presidents didn’t identify as Democrat&gt; &gt;or Republican&lt;, um, but yea &gt;I’ll have to look in to see how many has actually been since&lt;. Any other questions or comments? What’s the election – what’s it like to (.) vote in Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>In the States, you have to be eighteen before you can vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>Eighteen. Here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Student M</td>
<td>You have to be a Swedish citizen. Beca – for [example, my family]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In lines 00-05, it is possible to see that the lesson culminated in a U.S. general election process divorced from the socio-cultural and socio-political perspective[s] of those living in the United States. Essentially, the Swedish students were asked who they would vote for from their own socio-cultural and socio-political perspective[s] rather than taking on the imaginary role (and viewpoint) of an eighteen-year-old voter living in the United States.

### 7.2.3 Intermission: Midway Adjustments to the Drama-Based Lesson

As Max continued to implement this lesson in a variety of EFL classrooms over the next three weeks, he made a series of methodological changes to his lesson plan based on both learner feedback and spontaneous mediational conversations that would occur at the end of teaching days between myself and Madeline and Max. As a result of one of our conversations, a change that Max made to his lesson was how he introduced the imaginary voting situations:

“Prior to today, I would introduce the idea of going back to the idea of primary versus caucus: ‘Today we’re going to talk about the difference between a caucus. So, I’m going to have you physically do what we do for a caucus.’ Today was different because last night we had a nice little conversation about really being engaged in your lesson and, to me, the concept that we’re talking about – I don’t
know – there’s a real term for it. I don’t know what it is. This being engaged in your lesson plan. There was a word you said last night. I don’t remember what it was. Commitment I think it was. Committing to the lesson. To me, you just have to let go of all your inhibitions to like just do it. And I think it’s like getting over that first hump that’s hard” (Interview, 5/25/16).

While Max didn’t specify the exact cause of his feelings of inhibition that restricted him from fully committing to the imaginary situation he attempted to devise for his students, he did highlight an important challenge when it came to the full implementation of a DBI learning activity as a novice L2 teacher-candidate: embracing risky pedagogical choices that come with uncertain behavioral and learning outcomes. In the spirit of attempting to ‘get over that first hump’ and commit more fully to the drama scenario he wished to invoke amongst his learners, Max began to take steps to provide a more explicit imaginary context:

“So, today I don’t remember exactly what I said – I said something like, ‘All right so now you’re all…’ for the caucus part ‘…you’re all American citizens. Welcome, to the United States!’ And I started off by saying – I went through the issues first, I think. I don’t remember cause I did it differently in both classes, but anyway, I started off by saying, ‘You’re all American citizens now so we’re going to practice our caucus.’ And I would go into, ‘Good morning, America! We’re here today on Caucus Day here in…’ I think in the one class I was like, ‘Jönköping, Kansas’ or something. The second one was Jönköping, Kentucky.’ They laughed. I said, you know, ‘Make sure you have to go out and vote today.’ Um, and I said something like, ‘And in case you forgot where your candidate stands on the issues, we’re going to go over it really quickly just so you get a reminder!’ And then going through it [the issues] wasn’t nearly as exciting or fun cause it’s like, ‘DEATH PENALTY! YAY! [sarcasm]’ You know, it wasn’t as fun, but once I got to the end of that I was like, ‘All right voters, so make sure you get out there and vote for the candidate you support.’ It was much more radio announcer” (Interview, 5/25/16).

As Max explained, his changes to the lesson included providing the students with an explicit imaginary setting (Jönköping, Kansas/Kentucky) and stating particular roles for the students (American citizens), and himself (a radio announcer), to play in the drama scenario. However, he doesn’t appear to have provided the students with additional cultural, historical, or political information facing the specific communities of Kentucky and/or Kansas. Thus, while he seemed to begin recognizing the importance of the teacher committing to setting up an explicit
imaginary scenario for playful/learning activities to occur, the type and amount of knowledge needed for students to create particular roles and the presence of a dramatic need or conflict continued to remain ambiguous. The secondary EFL students were not provided with the necessary instructional tools needed to view the socio-political issues from the perspective of an ‘American voter.’ Consequently, the Swedish students continued to only be able to embody the physical motions of an ‘American voter’ engaged in the act of caucusing/voting in the general election. The mental components of the situation remained separate from the actions of the body and therefore they could not follow the necessary rules of social behavior required of their assigned drama roles nor engage in creative imitation of those social performances. Thus, ZPD activity in a playful/learning situation continued to remain elusive while conditions for ZPD interactions in a formal learning activity prevailed.

While Max continued to maintain a Drama-as-Tool orientation, his observations regarding the students’ positive response to the adjustments he made in his role-play activity is a significant development in his conceptualization of DBI. Max seems to recognize that if he fully commits to playing, and sustaining, a role through creative imitation in imaginary contexts, it leads to higher rates of student engagement. In comparing how the students reacted to this pedagogical change versus how he originally taught the lesson, he observed:

“I think they found it humorous more than they found it – like a five-year-old would find it. But I think it’s good because it also helped keep their attention. I’m doing it like that tomorrow, too” (Interview, 5/25/16).

During Max’s second interview, he mentioned an additional observation based on the instructional changes he had made to the presentation of his drama-based lesson:

“Before I started doing the radio-man, the students weren’t quite sure when to get up [to vote]. After I finished saying what I wanted to say, they would just kind of sit there like, ‘Now do we go?’ but after – once I did radio-man – they knew. It was very interesting. As soon as I finished they were like, ‘All right! Time to go! Time to vote!’” (Interview, 6/4/16).
Max’s reflections take into consideration the students’ behaviors during the learning activity. In addition, he mentioned how the discussions that emerged from his attempt at a drama-based activity provided him with generalized insights into the students’ L2 cognitive and L2 proficiency level[s]:

“They [the students] get such a bad rap I think…of not being invested in what they’re doing, but when you are able to talk at them for forty minutes about the complexities of the American electoral system and they then have the ability to ask you questions and then engage in discussions about said system and the candidates. That sort of makes you realize that they have the ability – they’re understanding what you’re saying. They may not understand exactly the system itself, but they’re understanding what you’re saying and they’re comprehending the ideas behind things because they would say like, ‘I think that’s really confusing and complicated and I think that in Sweden it’s much easier and simpler. So, you realize that it’s not brand new to them’” (Interview, 6/4/16).

In addition to gaining increased awareness of the EFL students’ cognitive and L2 language capabilities, when asked if he felt the imaginary caucusing and voting activities – and the ensuing conversations that occurred because of them – had allowed for an opportunity to assess any L2 affordances or challenges experienced by his learners, he commented:

“I think the biggest thing that they struggle with is the idea behind delegates and the fact that we don’t vote for a candidate, we vote for a person to vote for a candidate” (Interview, 5/25/16).

Accordingly, Max seemed to perceive his students’ struggle[s] during the lesson as being a consequence of the cross-cultural topic itself rather than any limiting features the students might have had in their L2 development; that is to say the EFL students’ issues were with the conceptual knowledge of the U.S. electoral system and not with the English language per se. However, he also admitted that his ability to assess the students’ L2 skills throughout this lesson, in general, was a particular challenge:

“Assessing them was difficult because they had to reply in order to demonstrate comprehension (whether that was with a response or a question.) But in general, too, I would often stop to ask if everything made sense and if there was anything I could clarify. That is by no means a fool-proof system, but for what I was going [for], it seemed to work and the teachers always reassured me later on that the students really did learning something” (Weekly Written Reflection, 6/2/16).
While Max seemed concerned with the L2 listening comprehension skills of the students, teaching targeted features of English doesn’t seem to have been the focus of his DBI lesson at Gymnaseiskola. Rather, L2 comprehension was seen as a prerequisite for accessing the content of his lesson and engaging in his learning activities. Thus, Max was using English in the EFL classrooms as a medium of instruction wherein a topic was taught through the second language rather than the topic being used to develop particular features of the second language. In fact, Max explained in his weekly written reflection that he felt the:

“Students demonstrate that they understand by participating in the Democratic Caucus in the election lesson. With that lesson, we’re not necessarily assessing students’ knowledge, but rather their comprehension, and they seem to be quick to ask questions if they don’t understand or would like more information/clarification” (Weekly Written Reflection, 5/27/16).

Thus, rather than providing students with opportunities to individually demonstrate and apply their L2 skills within the imaginative framework of a U.S. caucus and general presidential election, he appears to have made an assumption that if a student experienced difficulty during the lesson due to their second language skills they would have voiced their confusion aloud. Max explained, “I’m not above asking [for L2 comprehension]. After I get through it [the lesson], I will ask them point blank, ‘Did you understand that?’ and some of them don’t. It’s a very complex issue, but a lot of them usually do. Once you walk through it a little slower, it makes sense…they don’t maybe understand every step, but they get the idea of it” (Interview, 5/25/16).

Max did indicate that the explicit questions provided by certain students influenced the methodological decisions he made in presenting the concepts of his lesson over the course of the Swedish field experience:

“I think, though, that just that [student responses] has had a major impact on the lesson because I’m learning about what I can explain better, how to simplify complex ideas and I’m getting better, too, at reading when students want to ask for clarification, but are too shy. It’s interesting, this topic in particular, because the information has been changing nearly every day as more and more elections happen, so I’m having to constantly update the information, but I’m also taking
what I learned in class and tweaking slides, ideas, or graphics to better suit the students’ learning” (Weekly Written Reflection, 5/27/16).

Max indicated that he began designing this particular lesson by essentially asking himself two questions: 1) what information did he want to convey to the students; and 2) what was the best way to communicate this information in both an interesting and interactive fashion? Accordingly, rather than attempting to implement a DBI activity as a means to facilitate opportunities for authentic L2 communicative acts, this particular lesson was used as a way to rupture the traditional lecture-style of teaching in general – which Max apparently perceived as possibly perpetuating disinterest amongst his language learners at Gymnasieskola – and make abstract concepts in English concrete for the students.

Max’s use of the DBI strategies during the U.S. civics lesson remained conceptualized in a Drama-as-Tool paradigm, but he made notable shifts in his thinking. He made an observation that committing to role-play in imaginative contexts leads to increased learner engagement with the material being discussed in class. However, and perhaps due to the unique constraints of the teaching context, his use of role-play remained a tool to support lecture-style teaching. To (re)frame this lesson from a Drama-as-Methodology orientation, Max needs to add a third question in his lesson planning process: What context would require knowledge of this information? In this way, Max could devise a role-play that would lead to students’ discovering (in-role) the same information that he presented in the lecture at the start of the lesson. However, as may be apparent, without my direct mediation to conceptualize DBI strategies otherwise, Max continues to imagine their use from a familiar DBI-as-Tool orientation to make formal learning activities “not as boring” and “a little more interactive.”
7.3 Finishing the Pantomime: DBI at Grundskola

At the end of the second week of the EFL field experience, the participants visited their second field site, Grundskola, and met with two additional English teachers: Alma and Astrid. On Thursdays, when the participants were at Grundskola, Alma taught one class of seventh grade English (ages 13-14) from 8:30am – 9:30am while Astrid taught two classes of eighth grade English (ages 14-15) from 11:15 – 12:15pm and 12:55 – 1:55pm. The students at Grundskola had been learning English as a required subject of study for five and six years respectively. Unlike the English department at Gymnasieskola, the teachers at Grundskola were not under additional pressure to administer national assessments and were therefore more available to lend support to Madeline and Max’s teaching efforts including discussing their teaching practices after they had taught individual lessons.

Alma and Astrid asked the participants what they had been teaching at Gymnasieskola. The participants informed them that they were tasked with implementing lessons to increase Swedish students’ oral production in English. Both Alma and Astrid felt this would be a beneficial language goal for their students as well and acknowledged that they had similar difficulties in encouraging their students to use English to express their ideas rather than Swedish. They invited the participants to teach a lesson on a topic of their choice and confirmed they would remain in the classroom at all times. Madeline and Max did not want to continue teaching the same lessons they had been teaching at Gymnasieskola. Instead, they decided to devise new lessons. In addition, rather than co-teach or assist one another, they chose to facilitate their lessons individually. Max would teach the three English classes at Grundskola one week, with Madeline supporting him as necessary, while in the following week the roles would be reversed and Madeline would lead the three classes.
At first, Max had difficulty deciding on a topic of instruction to teach at Grundskola, but he eventually settled on the notion of creating story resolutions and conclusions in English. His lesson plan was devised into five main sections: 1) An introductory activity to prime the students’ L2 use wherein the learners stood in a circle stating their names, something they liked, and their favorite color before engaging in several rounds of an activity termed, “Cross the Room If,” – a listening comprehension exercise which forced the students to cross the room from one side to the other if the sentence provided by Max was true to them (e.g., Cross the room if you have a dog/a cat/ been to the USA, etc.); 2) A mini-lecture using Freytag’s pyramid to outline the plot structure of a piece of prose; 3) The presentation of a teacher-performed dramatic pantomime detailing a story that did not include a resolution or conclusion; 4) A small group-work task wherein the students cooperatively wrote a resolution and conclusion to the teacher-performed pantomime in English; and 5) a shared reading activity that showcased the students’ written work in the L2.

Originally, Max had desired to use improvisational role-play as a DBI strategy that would have supported the goals of his lesson. Of his own volition, he contemplated ways in which he might have incorporated improvisation as a way to incite communicative need amongst the EFL learners and help him to meet both his L2 and subject-specific objectives (e.g., elements of plot structure).

“I wanted to do more drama based games and I started off with some improv[isation] games that I did in my high school theatre classes that were good because they just get you – the goal of the lesson then when I decided to change was just to get the students talking. So, that’s why I went with improv[isation] games. I think I chose some sort of hard ones. I could’ve found, I think, a lot easier ones to use, but I started with five-person freeze” (Interview, 6/4/16).

Thus, Max’s only frame of reference to implement this particular DBI strategy, however, came from the improvisational experiences that he had participated in as a student during his high school theatre classes. The details of the improvisational “game” that Max references in his interview, five-person freeze, were included in his written lesson plan:
“After students present their [story] endings, I will talk about how all of the stories had a resolution and that somehow the problem was fixed in some way. I will then introduce our second game, FREEZE. The next activity we’re going to do is a game where you have to resolve conflicts on your own! This game is called, ‘Freeze’ and here’s how it works: We will create a setting for a scenario (i.e., Madeline goes to the mall, but forgets her wallet!). Max will start acting out the scene on his own. Then, someone in the crowd will yell, ‘freeze!’ That person will get up, and join the scene, but they will change what’s happening. We will do this again so that three people are in the scene. Once three people are in the scene, we will work backwards. The third person to come into the scene will have to find a resolution to leave the scene, and so on. Each time someone leaves, you have to go back to what the scene was like before that person entered. If you get stuck, or need help, we will give you ideas or help you with words” (Written Lesson Plan, 5/26/16).

As can be seen from his lesson plan procedures, Max found a way to rationalize the use of this particular improvisational game by connecting the objective of the lesson (writing story resolutions and conclusions through oral communication in the L2) to the objective of the game. He appeared to have intended on making this connection explicit to the learners. This activity appears as if it would have met the Vygotskian-informed criteria for playful/learning ZPD activity. The students would have been provided with an explicit imaginary context, roles to play, a space for creative imitation, and a need/conflict within the drama that would have needed to have been resolved. If this activity had been implemented, it may have created a playful/learning ZPD activity, but because his main learning activity (writing an ending to the performed monologue) took more instructional time than he had anticipated in each of the EFL classes, he never had the opportunity to implement the improvisation activity. Despite this, Max showed a willingness to experiment with the use of improvisation to support his language teaching goals, as outlined in his written lesson plan. However, due to time restraints, the main DBI strategy that Max self-identified as being used by him in this lesson ended up being pantomime (Strategy Questionnaire, 6/4/16).
Max indicated he used pantomime as the DBI strategy for this lesson. However, as Excerpt 7.5 captures, Max performed an improvisational monologue by assuming a role (teacher-in-role). Pantomime would have required Max to have performed this monologue without words. Excerpt 7.5 records how Max introduced, performed, and concluded his dramatic monologue for the Swedish EFL students. At this point in the lesson, the desks had been moved to either side of the classroom during the introductory activity, which created an alley-way in the center of the classroom that Max used as a ‘performance’ space. The students had sat, or leaned, against the desks on either side of the classroom while Max had conducted his min-lecture on Freytag’s pyramid. They remained in these positions for his monologue in role:

Excerpt 7.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>All right, so, I’m going to tell you a story. &lt;And then you’re going to work in ↑groups to come up with and create (.) a resolution and a conclusion.&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 01   |         | >All right< so this story is about ↑David. David lives in ↓Sweden and he’s going on ↓vacation for two weeks ((shows two fingers to the class)) in Italy. He’s just finished school. He’s ready for a break. He wants to go lay on the ≈be::ach, read a book ((opens both of his hands as if a book is opening)), maybe swim with ≈dolphins ((spreads both hands wide and throws head back)) and ≈just enjoy the nice Italian summer sun>. So, () Tim, ≈or not Tim<, sorry his name is David. So, David starts by () getting out his suitcase ((pantomimes placing suitcase on a table)) and he packs all of his clothes ((pantomimes throwing clothes into the suitcase)). He packs his bathing suit ((pantomimes putting bathing suit in suitcase)), his pants ((pantomimes putting pants in suitcase)), some nice shirts ((pantomimes putting shirts in suitcase)), and he zips it all up ((pantomimes zipping the suitcase)) and gets ready to go ((pantomimes holding the packed suitcase)). So, he carries his luggage out to his car ((moves to the left side of the classroom pantomiming carrying the suitcase)), and he puts it in his car ((pantomimes putting the suitcase in the car)), ≈he loads up his car with all of his stuff<. He::’s just about ready to ↑go >and then he has to double check< to make sure he ha::s everything. Do I have my WALlet? ((pats his left front pant pocket)) Yes, Phone? ((pats his right front pocket)) Yes, Where are my keys? ((Pats his back pant pockets)) So, he looks around for his ke::ys ((turns his back to the students and pantomimes looking for the keys)). He finds them (.) ((pantomimes finding the keys on a table)) and then
he realizes he has everything. He’s ready to go. So, David gets in his car ((pantomimes jumping into a car)). He starts it ↑up ((pantomimes putting the key in the ignition)) and he starts driving ((puts his hands on imaginary steering wheel and pantomimes driving)). He’s driving towards Stockholm – the airport in Stockholm because that’s where he’s flying from – he’s jamming out to some Justin Bieber like, you know ((shurgs shoulders)), we do. ((sings to a Justin Bieber song on the imaginary radio)) “What do you mean? Oh, oh!”

Student WHAT? ((various students laugh))

Max >He’s not really paying attention to the radio.< He’s – he’s, you know, just driving and jamming out and all of the sudden he hears ((puts left hand behind his left ear and stops pantomiming driving)) this noise. So, he turns down the radio ((pantomimes turning the radio’s volume down)) and he starts listening ((puts left hand behind his left ear again)). () He can hear something shaking a little ↑bit, but it doesn’t seem too bad. He looks down at the dashboard ((points to the imaginary dashboard)). There’s no warning light so nothing’s happening so he says, ‘All right, it must be fine. I’ll just keep going.’ So, he turns back up his Justin Bieber ((pantomimes turning the radio back on)). He keeps driving ((pantomimes driving again and moves forward)) down the road. >All of a sudden< ((stops moving forward)), his car starts to shake ((begins to pantomime a shaking steering wheel)). The entire thing just starts shaking ((his whole body begins to shake)) and then it’s starting to rattle and he can hear this noise. It’s getting louder and it’s getting more ↑intense. So, he thinks, ‘Oh, maybe my car just doesn’t like Justin ↑Bieber. I’ll change it.’ So, he puts on some Adele ((pantomimes changing the radio station)). All right, good ((shaking stops)). So, now it’s, ((sings an Adele song)) ‘Hello from the other side!’ It’s getting louder and it’s getting more ↑intense. So, he thinks, ‘Oh, maybe my car just doesn’t like Justin ↑Bieber. I’ll change it.’ So, he puts on some Adele ((pantomimes changing the radio station)). All right, good ((shaking stops)). So, now it’s, ((sings an Adele song)) ‘Hello from the other side!’ And he’s still not paying attention to his driving >but it’s all right<. All of a sudden, that shaking gets harder () and faster ((begins shaking again)) and he’s finding it harder and harder to drive. So, he stops the radio ((pantomimes turning off the radio)) cause he’s – he’s worried. So, now () he’s like, ‘I have to stop. This is getting too dangerous. I don’t know what’s going to happen.’ So, he starts to pull over and all of a sudden, his tire falls off. So, now he’s trying to control his car ((pantomimes losing control of the car while driving)) because it only has three wheels and he’s trying to skate over to the side of the road without hitting anyone else. <And he finally stops his car on the side of the road>, but JUST THEN the engine catches on fire so now he runs to the back of his car ((pantomimes running to the back of the car)). He throws the suitcase out on to the ground ((pantomimes removing the suitcase from the car)) on the side of the road. He gets out his phone ((pantomimes taking out a cell phone from his front right pant pocket)) and calls the fire department () and he says, ‘Great. Now, how am I going to get to the airport on time?’ () All right. >Do you understand the story?<

Students Yes. ((Some students nod their heads))

Max So now it’s your job, () we’re going to work in () groups of four to create a resolution and a conclusion ((points back to the whiteboard with Freytag’s Pyramid written on it)). () All right? Does your conclusion have to be ()

Student No.
In Max’s monologue, he clearly established an explicit imaginary setting where the story takes place through a brief exposition (lines 02-04) and proceeded to assume the roles of the story’s narrator and David, the central protagonist. While Max’s behaviors remained limited to the societal rules established by the explicit context of his imaginative story, the students remained positioned as outside spectators to the drama. In lines 68-69, he did not provide the learners with an explicit imaginary role as “authors” tasked with writing an ending in English to the performed story, but their assignment is kept grounded in the realistic setting of the EFL classroom. He did not invite the students to involve themselves as characters in the drama of the monologue once their endings were written nor did he provide them with a motivation to complete the drama beyond the context of a teacher-dictated assignment. Thus, the conditions for playful/learning ZPD activity through his use of teacher-in-role were not met.

Towards the end of the lesson, Max asked the students to return to standing in a circle in the center of the classroom. He proceeded to ask each group to select someone to read the resolutions and conclusions they had created. Max had informally sought out my advice on the design of his lesson plan when it was originally being written. I had suggested that Max find a way to allow the students to finish the drama he had performed for them through role-play (as a way to bring the students into the drama activity). Later, Max explained his reasoning for keeping the students from entering an explicit imaginative context by assuming fictive roles to complete the established drama:

“I think it wouldn’t have been received well if I asked them to act out their story, but just by asking them to write was fine. I had a hard time getting them just to talk. They probably would’ve had to do something. It would’ve been dumb to have said, ‘You’re going to write the story and then act it out.’ They would’ve had to do something acting first or have an acting model. They would’ve froze” (Interview, 6/4/16).
Max seemed to have seen L2 writing as an emotionally low-risk instructional activity for the learners. He seemed to assume that students would be less resistance to a traditional classroom practice (i.e., co-operative writing), than if they had been asked to engage in a DBI activity, which, for Max, seemed to carry the connotation of an emotionally high-risk instructional strategy. He appeared to take the position that students would have required previous experience with such a learning strategy (student-performed pantomime or other performance-based instructional activity) to feel comfortable participating in a performative mode. He seemed to believe his demonstration of a monologue in-role would not have been sufficient encouragement for the learners. In fact, he predicted negative student reactions to occur if they were to have been asked to perform their own pantomimes.

Thus, based on these presuppositions, he seemed to keep the students in the role of spectator to any drama-based activity conducted during this lesson. This situation was similar to Max’s story-reading activity during Week 2 of the elementary field experience when he used as a tool to convey L2 meaning of a story to the students (see chapter six). In that situation, the students remained spectators to the “performance.” Likewise, in this situation, the EFL students were positioned as observers – rather than partakers – of the DBI strategy (role-play). However, Max’s use of the DBI strategy did provide support, and a rationale, for students to complete the shared writing exercise. Indeed, Max would have only needed to trust my feedback and present the students with an imaginary reason to have listened to his monologue and write an ending to be performed in order to move his conceptual orientation of DBI from a Drama-as-Tool orientation to a Drama-as-Methodology framework.
7.4 Reflexive Thoughts: Reactions from Max

While the conditions for playful/learning ZPD activity were not fully met, Max was still able to identify learner-benefits as a result of the teacher-performed pantomime:

“A few people – you were one of them and I think Alma also mentioned that I talk fast – so, having the pantomime helped them understand, but at the same time Alma and Astrid both said that, yes, I talk fast, but they thought that the students were fine in understanding it [the pantomime]. So, the pantomime just added to their ability to comprehend the story” (Interview, 6/4/16).

Relying on the EFL teachers’ perceptions of their students’ listening comprehension skills, Max sees the pantomime (improvisational role-play) of David’s story as aiding the learners’ ability to negotiate meaning in the L2, which was similar to the rationale for his use of (actual) pantomime in the elementary world languages classroom. However, Max did not include a way to assess the learners’ understanding of the story during the role-play activity beyond explicitly asking the students if they understood him (a question that may or may not have been honestly answered by the students).

Max also expressed personal challenges he experienced engaging in the DBI strategy:

“The first class was fine. I just sort of did it and it worked well and I was like, ‘All right. That’s fine.’ But then in the second class, this jerk-boy, that’s so mean to say, but whatever. He, and the other one, were acting up as soon as I came in so it was sort of intimidating and that intimidation just threw me off. Not intimidating in the way that like I was afraid of them, it was just like I knew they weren’t going to participate and that was distracting. Distracting enough to throw me off and not get as involved in the lesson as I wanted to” (Interview, 6/4/16).

At this stage in Max’s development as a teacher, he appeared to have an acute awareness of how he was perceived by his students, and, in turn, how they might react to his chosen learning activities. He was in the process of developing his pedagogical content knowledge and its successful application in diverse learning environments. His inexperience with diverse classroom behaviors exhibited by students, what they may mean, and how to work with them, appeared to have influenced his perception of the imminent success or failure of his DBI learning activities.
and potentially his level of willingness to engage the learners in dramatic playful/learning situations. As he stated, his feelings of intimidation that he experienced adversely affected his teaching practice.

Despite these obstacles, Max saw value in implementing DBI strategies in the L2 classroom with learners beyond the elementary grades:

“Drama’s more fun with older kids I think, actually. I mean it depends on your objectives. So, like with younger kids it’s more like play and pretend and I guess it is that too with older kids, but you can be so much more creative. You can talk about more abstract things with older kids. Especially when you’re talking about culture” (Interview, 6/4/16).

At this point, Max saw drama as an instructional tool that holds the possibility of providing language learners with opportunities to express abstract thought in the second language as well as having the capability to introduce unfamiliar cultural concepts. In addition to the value Max perceived drama has on the second language teaching/learning process, he stated the importance he felt drama had, in general, in regards to teachers’ professional development:

“I think every teacher should have to take acting classes because acting prepares you for life in so many different ways…I can’t think of another activity that prepares you better to be a teacher than acting because having that ability to react on your feet – it’s so teaching. That’s so teaching. Cause you never know what a kid’s going to say. You never know how your lesson is going to change. You never know when the fire alarm is going to go off. There’s so many different factors that could affect your day as a teacher. So, just finding the right way to fix whatever’s happening, I guess, was what I meant that everyone should experience an acting class” (Interview, 6/4/16).

Drawing a comparison between the unpredictable nature of unplanned, spontaneous occurrences that can, and do, take place when performing live theatre and/or facilitating a lesson in a classroom, Max stressed the importance of being able to adapt to the situation one finds themselves in to ensure a successful outcome. Max exclusively referenced his experiences with drama as the activity that has best prepared him to become a reactionary educator in the L2 classroom.
Through his engagement in the Swedish field experience, Max felt he was able to achieve additional experiences in teaching that contributed to his sense of teacher-development (“I suppose for me, it’s just more practice. More experience. More time actually being a teacher,” [Interview, 6/4/16]) and as Max’s EFL field experience in Sweden came to a close, he had a distinct revelation:

“Last night, I said that teaching is the only thing I could see myself doing. Other than being a firefighter or things I wanted to do when I was little, but when I was five I wanted to be the pope so, like, you know, weird things. For me, now that I’ve matured and grown up, teaching seemed like the only thing that I could do. That I would be good at. There are other things, I suppose that I would be good at being – a – god, I don’t even know – a teacher. I’d be good at being a teacher, I think. So, that’s what I’m here for and I feel like that’s not something that you learn” (Interview, 6/4/16).

7.5 Becoming English Authors: Story-writing vs. Story-telling vs. Story-reading

In the week following Max’s drama-based lesson at Grundskola, Madeline chose to follow up on the work he had done with the students regarding Freytag’s pyramid by centering her lesson on the co-construction of an original fairytale utilizing small groups of students.

During the first week of the EFL field experience, Madeline had observed a guest teacher from France, Adeline, who taught in Elsa’s intermediate French class at Gymnasieskola. This observation had a significant influence on the development of Madeline’s DBI lesson at Grundskola.

“I created that [DBI] lesson because of that French woman that came in, Adeline. She did it. And I think that French lesson – that French was pretty low level, but the English at Grundskola was a little bit of a lower level so I think I always wanted to implement that lesson and Grundskola was a perfect place to do it…That’s why I chose the lesson because it turned out so well for Adeline” (Interview, 6/2/16).

Being able to see Adeline successfully implement the fairytale-based lesson at Gymnasieskola appears to have made Madeline anticipate an equally successful experience at
Grundskola even though the learning environment differed significantly from the conditions that existed in the French classroom at Gymnaseiskola (e.g., learners’ age, content area, classroom size, time of day, etc.).

The lesson began with Madeline requesting that all students leave their desks and stand in a circle. The students followed her direction and pushed the desks to either side of the classroom to create a circle in the middle of the room. Accordingly, Max, Alma, and myself dispersed ourselves amongst the students in the circle. Next, Madeline informed the class that she was going to give each student a piece of paper with the beginning of a sentence. The sentences were distributed counter-clockwise around the circle. Examples of the sentence frames that a student might receive included: 1) I always lose… 2) My favorite food is… 3) My favorite season is… 4) I always laugh when… 5) My least favorite season is… 6) Tomatoes make me think of…7) I could not live without…etc. Once all of the students had received their sentences, Madeline immediately began the exercise by volunteering to go first stating, “I always lose my keys” (Video Transcription, 6/2/16). The warm up proceeded counter-clockwise around the circle with each student supplying an appropriate predicate to the subject of their sentence.

Next, with the students still standing in the circle, Madeline proceeded into the next phase of her lesson where she introduced her learning activity by attempting to activate the students’ prior knowledge of story elements, which was the topic of instruction explored during the previous week’s lesson facilitated by Max. Using an I.R.E/F pattern of discourse, Madeline reviewed the elements of a story before specifying the expectations she had for the learning activity she planned for the students. This particular activity would involve having the students write a whole fairytale in small groups. Each group would blindly select three index cards. The index cards would each have an image on it (e.g., a witch, a ghost, a castle, a knight, a dragon, etc.). The fairytale was to be based off of these three images with each image making at least one appearance in the story. Madeline further specified that the fairytale needed to be at least ten
sentences long and that each group would need to write a complete story with a clear beginning, middle, and end.

In the strategy questionnaire, Madeline self-identified “storytelling” as the particular DBI strategy used during this lesson (Strategy Questionnaire, 6/2/16). As discussed earlier (see Table 4-1 in chapter four), the definition that was provided to the participants for storytelling to be considered a DBI strategy (both during the drama workshop provided in the methods course and before each questionnaire was taken) was that it should involve, “Telling stories – not story reading. Delivering a story in a unique creative way i.e. puppetry, felt board, dress-up, etc.” The emphasis, here, is on the delivery of a story and not the creation of a story alone. While Madeline implicitly cast the students in the role of collaborative story writers she did not indicate a source of conflict or motivation for needing to develop an original fairytale nor did she explore the purpose of a fairytale as a literary genre. Consequently, the students simultaneously performed the roles of Swedish student and English author, but in the everyday unimaginined context of the EFL classroom. Their goal was to write a story for their (very real) visiting teacher as a dictated classroom assignment. It had not been established that they would need to go beyond reading their final product.

While the students needed to invoke their imaginations to develop relationships between the images they blindly selected, create a context in which each story took place, and write the actions of their characters, their implicit roles as English fairytale authors disappeared once the reality of their real-world goal became formalized. Madeline informed the students, after they had been working for two minutes, that they “…will present [their] story to the class at the end” (Video Transcript, 6/2/16). Without an imaginary context explicitly stated to ground the purpose of their writing, outside of story-development there was no reason for students to use their imaginations to see themselves, or others, as anything beyond their normal student-selves. Accordingly, expectations for student and teacher behavior (and linguistic capabilities) continued
to adhere to the roles of everyday academic life rather than the roles that might have existed in the realm of drama.

Without an explicit imaginary context, Madeline did not create the full conditions necessary for a playful/learning ZPD to manifest itself in this lesson. Instead, if ZPD activity occurred, and appropriate mediation was supplied by Madeline during small group work, it existed within the realm of formal learning instruction through small group work instruction. The students would revert to their original roles as EFL students completing a writing assignment with the instructor providing necessary aid for the learners to accomplish the given task.

After thirty minutes had passed, Madeline gathered the students’ attention and requested they re-make the circle they had created at the start of the lesson. Max volunteered to share his story first followed by each group as demonstrated in Excerpt 7.6:

Excerpt 7.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Utterance[s] and Action[s]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>Okay, everyone. Finish your last sentence. And then come back and form a circle. ↑Okay, so to start (.) Max (.) has written us a ↑story. A fairytale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>I will start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>What were your pictures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>&gt;I don’t actually remember&lt;. I had a: Princess?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>I had a princess, a king, a mountain, and (.) a minotaur. &gt;You know what that is&lt;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td><em>No</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td><em>[No]</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td><em>It’s like an ox (.) man</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Yea. &gt;It’s sort of like a ↑cow: w, but it’s like&lt; part human. (1.0) Half human, half cow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>&gt;Do you have the picture?&lt;. ((Max gestures towards Madeline indicating that she has the picture of the minotaur.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>(4.0) ((Holds up a small picture of a minotaur.)) *This. You probably can’t see it. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>Oh!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td><em>It’s a minotaur.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Yea. If you’ve seen, uh, the Chronicles of ↑Narnia, there’s lots of those</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Okay, here's my story.

Once upon a time, in a faraway land, a king ruled over his land. One day an evil mountain minotaur came down from the mountain and into the kingdom. He went to the castle to talk to the king but the king wasn't there! The angry mountain minotaur could only find the princess and this made him very angry. So, he kidnapped the beautiful princess and took her to his mountain.

When the king heard the news, he gathered his troops and his armies. They marched to the mountain angrily and they had a great duel on the mountain. The king won - I can't read my handwriting - the king won and he saved the princess! The mountain minotaur was banished from the kingdom for the rest of time.

So, this group - ( conjectures towards Group 4) Would you read yours?

Okay. (Reading from a piece of paper) Uhm, once upon a time it was two unicorns. They lived in a farmhouse. One day they went out to their meadow. A man walked in the forest and he saw the unicorns. He knew that the horns are magic. Uh, so he went to the meadow and took the blue unicorn. When the pink unicorn saw that her soulmate was gone she started neigh.

Neigh. When the knight heard that, um he heard the unicorn neigh the knight jumped on the unicorn and they ride away to search for the blue unicorn. After hours of searching they finally found him. They took him back home. Now the unicorns are forever happy and they live in harmony.

Very good! (All clapping) Okay. Next group.

(Reading from a piece of paper) Once upon a time it was a poor boy watching over his sheep. Then one sheep disappears and the boy starts searching for the sheep. After a while he found the sheep. In a cave, he also found a book. He started to read the book. It was about a sword in a stone in a castle. If you could pull the sword up, you would be the greatest king in England.

What were your pictures?

Uh, a castle, a sword in stone, and a book.

Very good. (All clapping) This group.

Once upon a time there was an evil witch. She live in a big castle with a big black cat. People were angry with the witch because she had stolen from the rich. So, they stole the cat. So, they borrowed every cauldron to kill the dragon. So, they flew out to the public and they brought to their king their request to kill the dragon. So, they started shooting the dragon and the dragon died so the cat walked home and had a good life. (All clapping)

This last group, what were your pictures?
As demonstrated in Excerpt 7.6, Madeline did not set up an explicit imaginary situation in which the students would need to share their fairytales. Instead, she remained within the realistic context of the classroom and asked each group to share their collaborative efforts with the group. While some of the students dramatically emphasized features of their story by adjusting the prosody of their language, their behavioral mannerisms did not indicate the taking up of any particular role within the fairytales themselves other than that of a narrator. Instead, the learners appeared to remain in their implicit roles as students tasked with presenting the results of their group work; largely disconnected from the imaginative realm of the fairytales they created.
in their small groups. Furthermore, since all students were not required to contribute to the writing of the story or needed to present the finished product, not all learners were required to participate in the learning activity.

Madeline had reported that this lesson used DBI. However, in order for storytelling to have been selected as a DBI strategy – and one that would have supported playful/learning ZPD activity – Madeline would have needed to create an imaginary context with a conflict or need that would have compelled the learners to assume explicit roles that required them to write their unique fairytales and subsequently tell them in a way that went beyond story-reading (e.g., perform their stories for each other as if they were pitching them to a movie studio).

Later, Madeline reflected on her experiences facilitating this lesson:

“I thought it would be a lot worse than it was. I get really, really nervous about the simplest things like presentations and I just imagine them going extremely terribly wrong, which sounds really bad, but has its benefits. You know, I expect terrible things to happen and then normal things happen and I’m like, ‘Oh, I can handle this.’ I expected to get there and just hell break loose, but just normal things happened. In the first class, there wasn’t really that many problems. They were a good, quiet class. They went where I told them to…No one disobeyed me” (Interview, 6/2/16).

Madeline expressed, the anxiety she felt regarding the uncontrollable nature that can emerge in teaching/learning environments. She appeared to characterizes a ‘good’ class as one that follows her directions unequivocally. She seemed to value students who do not present a challenge to a top-down approach to teaching/learning; a traditional classroom power dynamic between teacher (who has the authority) and student (who must follow the authority) that she appeared to promote (e.g., “No one disobeyed me,” [Interview, 6/2/16]). Such a view of learning, however, can become antithetical to drama-based approaches to teaching and learning where power becomes widely diffused and shared amongst students and educators as they creatively imitate social rules of behavior.
In fact, she seemed to apply her own cultural understanding of classroom discipline during the Swedish field experience and, in doing so, reified her belief that placed the learning behaviors of students as actions that are under their personal control:

“I’ve really seen that – especially in an environment here where there’s no discipline – students really are in control of what they want to learn. If they want to be in a classroom and actually pay attention and learn they can, or if they just want to get up and walk around they can because it seems as if there’s no discipline for that. So, I say that students are really in charge of their own learning and I really agree with that statement” (Interview, 6/2/16).

From Madeline’s perspective, the students’ decision to seemingly not apply themselves during learning activities is a result of a student’s choice to not take ownership over the learning process rather than examining additional environmental influences, including teaching methodology, that may affect student learning.

At the end of the Swedish field experience, Madeline reflected on why she felt she had chosen to largely stay away from using DBI strategies throughout her EFL lessons:

“I didn’t know what to teach...Making the lesson was like pulling a rabbit out of a hat! It was like pulling something out of nothing. The teachers didn’t give me anything... I found that it was really hard because I thought I could create good lessons, but I thought I would take them from maybe their syllabus – like, if they had a syllabus. I could watch them and then I could use whatever subject they had used before and then build off of that and then create a good lesson, but they would just expect me to come in with some lesson...I had to create something out of nothing and I wouldn’t have taught- I hated the presentations or lessons I made. I wasn’t proud of them” (Interview, 6/2/16).

Thus, Madeline, at this stage in her development as a teacher, expressed her need for additional institutional structure in order to help augment her existing pedagogical content knowledge. She seemed to believe that this would have allowed her to move from language objective to topic to method to learning activities resulting in better lesson design[s]. Indeed, when asked what additional support she felt she would have needed to implement more DBI strategies, in general, into her lessons, she replied, “I think I would need to see more actual
examples. Like you [the researcher] teaching a class. More than just a few lectures. Some implementation” (Interview, 6/2/16).

7.6 Phase III: The Secondary World Language Classroom

The secondary field experiences were unique to each individual in the teacher preparation program. The educational context in which each teacher-candidate was placed varied in learner demographics, size of school district, mentor-teacher experience and philosophy towards L2 teaching/learning, classes observed/taught, access to technology, etc.

Throughout the 2016-2017 academic year, Madeline was placed in an urban school district approximately fifty minutes from the university campus to complete her pre-student teaching/student teaching field experiences. The school district where she was placed served nearly 7,800 students and was comprised of eight elementary schools, one junior high school, one high school, and one alternative education school. Madeline’s mentor-teacher taught French in both the junior high school (serving grades 7-9) and the high school (serving grades 10-12).

Conversely, Max completed his pre-student teaching/student teaching field experiences in a suburban school district within close proximity to the university campus. The school district where he was placed enrolled approximately 6,900 students and was comprised of nine elementary schools (grades K-5), two middle schools (grades 6-8), one high school (grades 9-12), and one alternative education school (grades 5-12). Max’s mentor-teacher taught four introductory, exploratory French courses for seventh and eighth grade in one of the middle school buildings as well as two French I classes at the high school. The classes at the middle school were forty-two minutes in length while the high school courses were ninety-minutes. Both participants were interviewed on December 1, 2016 shortly after they had completed their pre-student-teaching experience at their secondary field placements and most of the coursework
associated with their second methods course in teaching world languages at the secondary level and again during the first week of May 2017 when they had completed their secondary student-teaching field experience.

7.6.1 DBI and The Secondary World Languages Classroom: Madeline

In Madeline’s situation, she immediately saw in her mentor-teacher the L2 teaching practices she wished to avoid while struggling to find support to design the type of learning activities she envisioned as a future professional. In fact, towards the end of her pre-student teaching experience, Madeline had emailed me to ask for guidance in developing DBI learning activities for a unit she was scheduled to teach in February.

When asked if she felt she had seen her mentor teacher use any DBI strategies during her pre-student teaching observations, she remarked, “No. My mentor teacher wouldn’t even pantomime when people were confused” (Interview, 12/1/16). She further defined her understanding of DBI at this point in her teacher preparation:

“When I think about it, to me, it’s more – I view it as more – just like movement. Getting up, moving, showing what you’re doing through movements. It’s not necessarily like actually acting which is how I used to think of it. But acting things out” (Interview, 12/1/16).

When asked why she would want to implement DBI into her secondary field placement she explained:

“…just seeing this [first period] class, they have so much energy but they – I feel like if I was a teacher, full time, and I had this class I would get so tired. And I’d be like, “What the heck do I do to actually get them to pay attention?” If my current method isn’t working, what else can I do? And so, we’ve been introduced to this new type of activity. I would’ve been willing to try anything but this is something I’ve been introduced to and I like it. I think writing and reading, or at least using a book is one learning style. And if that’s all you do, if a student isn’t that type of learner then they’re at a disadvantage all the time. So, getting up and doing things may be a better style for them.” (Interview, 12/1/16).
Thus, Madeline had come to place unique pedagogical considerations on the role of drama in the L2 learning process. In her view, drama held the potential for increasing learner engagement and as an alternative opportunity for some students to explore the L2 academic concepts presented in class that might prove more successful than other methods/approaches that had been used previously.

However, when interviewed a second time on May 3, 2017, after her student-teaching experience had been completed, Madeline revealed she ended up not using any DBI strategies in her lesson plans. When asked what had held her back from implementing drama-based activities to teach French during the secondary field experience, she stated:

“I just got in a routine. It was so easy to just do what my mentor did and look at the book and be like, ‘This activity goes with this one and then this one and then this one.’ So, it kind of fell to the side and then towards the end I realized that I didn’t do any of the act- or not any of them but I didn’t do a bunch of activities that I could have done. So, no, I think that’s what held me back” (Interview, 5/3/17).

In addition, she reflected on the quality of lessons she felt she had designed and implemented during the secondary field experience:

“In the end, I was never impressed with my lessons. Honestly, if I look back, they’re just, you know they’re probably the same as my mentor’s. I just copied. We have the same teaching styles sometimes because I just did what she did because I didn’t know…Book it is! I just think that another student-teacher who works with this mentor teacher needs to have a better identity then I did as a teacher. Like they already need to know what their teaching style is because my mentor isn’t going to help them” (Interview, 5/3/17).

Madeline further elaborated on the notion of her emergent teacher identity and its role in the development of her teacher expertise:

“At the beginning, I needed a lot of work on lesson plans and I didn’t know who I wanted to be as a teacher, and I think my mentor teacher helped me with – well, not with lessons, but, like I don’t have as much trouble writing them anymore, but I didn’t know how I wanted to lead a class, how I wanted students to think of me – like am I the kind of teacher that doesn’t care if they like me or not?” (Interview 5/3/17).
Madeline’s struggle with her emergent teacher identity may have influenced the pedagogical decisions she felt comfortable to make during her secondary field experience. Without the support to pursue more progressive forms of L2 teaching/learning, such as DBI, she adhered to the same traditional approaches of L2 instruction exemplified by her mentor-teacher and adopted a similar teacher identity; an identity that, at times, was incongruous with her philosophy of L2 teaching/learning.

Furthermore, she detailed an additional challenge in attempting to use DBI in the language-learning classroom:

“It’s [DBI] harder to measure. With the elementary school experience, it was harder to measure because you couldn’t see them having it written down. And we didn’t have an exam at the end. Then in Sweden, the hard part was getting students to go along with the lesson. Then, in the high school when I did a couple of activities – well charades they loved – but activities that strayed from the norm – that got them moving around a little bit, they were unsure at first. They would give me that look. Like, ‘What do we do?’ The activity I did – I did this a couple of times with them – the bell ringer where they had to get up and ask the person across from them a question and they had to respond – I remember my six-period class I did it and they were looking at me like ‘What are we supposed to do?’ They were so uncomfortable! It wasn’t like get up and go ask them if they like pizza. It was formed out and it was something we had covered before. It wasn’t new material and I think it was just the activity in itself. It was so strange to them” (Interview, 5/3/17)

Madeline indicated measuring proficiency gains as an important component to the L2 teaching/learning process; an act that she felt was difficult to accomplish when using DBI in L2 instruction. Likewise, when implementing an approach to L2 teaching/learning that departed from the normative schooling practices and rules of behavior the students had come to expect/associate with the L2 classroom, timid behavior could possibly emerge and students might have proceeded with trepidation when faced with the unexpected or unknown. This behavioral attitude expressed by the students could pose an additional challenge to the teacher’s facilitation of a drama-based lesson.
Despite these perceived challenges, Madeline felt as though she would attempt to use DBI methods in her future teaching practice. She explained her reasoning behind this desire:

“...because I’ve seen that it works and it’s just it’s more fun for me as a teacher, too. There’s definitely value in the DBI because in the end the goal is to be able to use the language – speaking as well – and in situations more than just sitting at a desk and writing. I just want more instruction in it [DBI] really... everyone knows when you go to school, you write. It’s not hard for me to figure out a lesson where students write stuff. But I think at this point if I was given [drama] stuff to do I could do it. I feel like maybe not my first year as a teacher. You know I want to get settled in, or maybe as my first year as a teacher. I don’t know. But that’s kind of what I want my classroom to – I want it to be an array of [skill] areas and we do something almost every single day. It’s not just focused on writing or reading” (Interview, 5/3/17).

At this point, Madeline expressed a desire for additional resources to aid her in the planning, development, and execution of drama-based lessons in the L2 classroom. Having seen the value of DBI across her three field experiences, she demonstrated a willingness to implement it within her future teaching context and sees it as a vehicle for supporting and acquiring a variety of L2 language skills. At the same time, she appeared to view DBI as an approach to L2 learning that might interfere with her success as a first-year teacher; as if the alternative nature of the L2 classroom that utilizes DBI may create more challenges for herself and for her learners than if she adhered to more traditional approaches to L2 teaching/learning such as those exhibited in her secondary field placement.

7.6.2 DBI and The Secondary World Languages Classroom: Max

For Max, being allowed to have the freedom to engage in pedagogical experimentation was important to him as he continued in his process of teacher-development. This sentiment seemed to align with his philosophy of teacher-development; that is to say that through classroom teaching experiences (both positive and negative), one comes to develop a rationale for choices in teaching methodology. Max seemed to value being allowed the opportunity to ‘test out’ learning
activities and reflected upon the choices he made during the facilitation of particular lesson plans. In addition, he explained that his mentor-teacher didn’t, “…have a textbook. So, she creates everything” (Interview, 12/1/16), which would allow for additional flexibility in pedagogical decision-making.

Max said what while he didn’t observe his mentor teacher using any specific DBI strategies during his pre-student teaching tenure, he was open to implementing them in his own instruction during the spring semester. At this stage in his development as a teacher, he defined DBI in the following manner:

“I think it’s acting things out, getting up, and moving around, but I also think that it’s creating the use to actually use the language, too. If you have that part not there then it’s not really – it’s not drama. You have to have suspension of disbelief. I feel like you need to put that in. I don’t know if you know what that is. It’s the idea that you take your own reality and it is sort of gone while you’re in this other world type thing. You need to have that in a world language classroom” (Interview, 12/1/16).

He explained further why he was personally interested in incorporating DBI as a pedagogical technique in his L2 lessons:

“When I was little I wanted to be a firefighter like my dad and then a language teacher. At some point in between the transition from firefighter to teacher, I wanted to be a star of some sorts; whether it was a singer, or an actor, or something, so my little theatre has always existed. Now, I think drama gives me the opportunity to combine my love for drama with my love for education and so it [DBI] really presents that. I think it’s a better learning style for students” (Interview, 12/1/16).

While Max seemed to view DBI as a meaningful form of L2 learning for his students, he also saw it as an opportunity to incorporate a personally pleasurable form of L2 teaching/learning into his instruction; one that combined two of his interests – drama and L2 education. In addition, he perceived drama as affording him unique insights into his students’ second language learning experiences from his own attempts to use it with students during the elementary and Swedish field experiences:
“I think you can learn a lot about how well a student – how a student feels about the language. I was going to say how well they know a language, but there’s other methods that can show you that. What I feel like, with drama specifically, those students were able to put themselves in that position of suspended disbelief and suspended reality. It shows that – I think there’s more commitment there for those kids who are able – commitment’s not the right word because other kids can be committed but not be able to put themselves in that reality, but it shows their capacity to learn through play. I think drama instruction is something that everyone can benefit from whereas the workbook activities – that really benefits the students who learn from reading or writing and that repetition of doing those things but like when we were little – when we were three and four – we didn’t have the opportunity to go play or go write an essay. It was always go play. So, I think when you introduce that element of play to learn a language, everyone benefits in some way whereas workbooks maybe not” (Interview, 12/1/16).

Thus, Max appeared to view drama as a unique pedagogical strategy that provided L2 learners with the opportunity to engage in playful/learning situations. In addition, he saw playful/learning as an activity that was beneficial for and accessible to all learners in some capacity whereas other instructional strategies may only privilege learners who have developed particular formal learning skills in advance.

However, despite these considerations, he remained uncertain of how to exactly incorporate DBI into his future lesson plans during his secondary field experience:

“I don’t know what to do other than the cliché drama things like, ‘Let’s do a scene,’ or ‘Write me a monologue,’ or something like that which maybe the students at this level don’t have the skills to write a monologue. But I think acting things out is a good step. Role playing is a good first step. Maybe with my French ones at the high school – maybe I’ll be able to make more of a monologue type thing. But even something as simple as a character development. Create a character. Tell me about your character. Describe your character. Those are all good things that you could do” (Interview, 12/1/16).

Max initially expressed his uncertainty of what DBI learning activities he might be able to use with his students; however, he seemed to have begun the process of brainstorming potential solutions as he spoke aloud during the interview. However, when Max was interviewed a second time on May 5, 2017, after his student-teaching experience had been completed, he revealed he ended up not using DBI strategies in the way he had hoped, but relied on competitive learning games instead:
I just think that I created fun lessons with lots of games where the students were competing against each other or working in teams and they had to use the language to complete the task. My students – especially at the high school – loved things like that. They’re super competitive and it’s just fun, and two, part of the sort of immersion style learning involves playing with the language so to speak. Having that – the thing we talked about before – the imagination – the imaginatory aspect of language learning and having the students take on this role helps them be more confident in using the language” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Using games in the classroom to achieve learning objectives, while useful, does not constitute a DBI strategy since the impetus of the endeavor is product-driven (i.e., the purpose of the action is to win against an opponent or to achieve a specific end-goal rather than focused on the process of achieving a goal). Max seemed to understand this difference and explained his conceptual understanding of DBI at the conclusion of this secondary field experience. He also described an instance where he felt he had used it during one occasion in the French I classroom:

“...I think a drama-based lesson is a lesson or part of a lesson - maybe like an activity - where the students sort of take on this role that is different from who they are and they have to use that role to complete a task. An example that I would give would be like last - two weeks ago in French I – the students had taken a test on a whole bunch of different concepts. One of the concepts was contractions with de and contractions with à definitive articles and le, la, les. And they did horrible on it. Totally bombed that section of the test and I didn’t think that it was their fault. I thought I just didn’t give them enough time to practice with this activity, so after the test I designed this review lesson, but I designed this activity where the students had to – they became doctors. This slide show, it started – like this slide here, it said, ‘Contraction Surgery,’ in French and it had the little medical symbol on it. The next slide – every student had a copy of this on Google classroom – and they could go on and edit it. So, the second slide then says, ‘Congratulations, you’ve recently been certified as a licensed French contraction surgeon and you’ve been hired by the Instution Medicale de Baracquinie, the leading medical center in the country of Maxicarius’ capital city Baracquinie. Patients are lining up at the door waiting for your medical expertise to make them feel better. Your job is to operate on the sick patients by correcting the forms of à and de when paired with the definitive articles le, la, and les. And although I trust your medical skills, doctors, the institute asks that you provide a brief explanation for why you operate or don’t operate on a patient. I’m sure you’ll do great. P.S., Be on the lookout for patients who may not be sick.’ And then there were like nine or ten slides here with people who all had French names and different ages and they had different forms of de or à with the different articles. So, the first example here is de and le which, if you know French, you can’t have that. It has to become du. So, they had to go in, and this was just a text box, so they could erase the de and the le and change it to du and then over on the side here they had to write, ‘I changed de le to du because the de le always...”
contracts to du.” And then they had to write a sentence using that word. So, they had to do that for all of them” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Max’s approach to this lesson fulfilled the conditions for playful/learning ZPD activity to occur, interestingly enough through the medium of technology and appears to adopt a Drama-as-Methology orientation to L2 teaching/learning. The students were provided with an explicit social role with behavioral rules in an imaginary situation (i.e., doctors conducting imaginary conjunction “surgery” and providing “medical” rationales for their choices). From his perspective, he felt the students had, “a much better understanding now of the concept,” through this activity than when it had been initially introduced through a fill-in the blank exercise (Interview, 5/5/17).

Despite the success of this DBI activity, he remarked:

“I didn’t use it [DBI] as much as I would’ve liked and I didn’t use it in the way I would’ve liked either. I think that a lot of what I did focused more on an authentic communication with other students in the class which isn’t necessarily drama based because they’re not taking on a different role and perspective. It’s just the students using the language, where they have to come up with a question or something to ask another student and a response” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Max appeared to correlate “authentic communication” situations as those that involved students conversing with one another outside of an imaginary situation despite the fact that the conversations might have been created disingenuously (i.e., a teacher-dictated task whereby students must ask a pre-written question to another classmate where they may or may not already know the answer.) He explained some of the challenges he felt existed in implementing more DBI activities in the L2 classroom:

“Whenever I think drama, I always go to this – like in my head I always think about improv[isation] kind of things. Like, what can you just come up with spontaneously? And to me that’s not something seventh grade could do. To me, that’s definitely a French II and up kind of thing, and I don’t know why because French I kids know how to talk about dogs and cats and they can have a conversation about stuff like that and I don’t know if I’m trying – maybe I watch too much like Drew Carey improviganza or something where like they’re having really intricate conversations that are just totally made up and like I’m expecting
my French twos to do the same thing. Again, that’s more like a French IV kind of thing where like here’s a scenario: role play it” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Max seemed to associate DBI activities in the L2 classroom as focusing almost exclusively on spontaneous, negotiated interpersonal communication through improvisational role-play situations and had difficulty knowing how to adapt such situations to meet the proficiency levels of his students. In part, this difficulty might have stemmed from his understanding of the second language acquisition process. Still adhering to a hierarchical and linear model of L2 development, Max appeared to struggle with ACTFL’s (2012) current set of proficiency guidelines, which sees L2 learning as a continual process and a description of what, “individuals can do with language in terms of speaking, writing, listening, and reading in real-world situations in a spontaneous and non-rehearsed context” (p. 3). Viewing learners’ proficiency levels in terms of the diverse language functions they are able to use, rather than their grammatical acuity in the target language, is a difficult change in perspective for Max. It appeared to challenge how he approached his selection, design, and implementation of learning activities and his subsequent expectations for their L2 performance.

However, at this point in his development as a teacher, he appears to have begun the process of questioning his prior assumptions on what learners might be able to handle during the early stages of second language acquisition:

“In the lower levels, I didn’t think the students were well enough prepared to do that [DBI] because it’s not a level – it’s not a level one class. It’s a really introductory class and so I mean with enough scaffolding they probably could have done that [DBI] so shame on me for not at least trying it once and then French I we just never like thought – when I was planning lessons it never occurred to me like, ‘Oh, do this!’” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Another challenge, for Max, was the confidence he had in his ability to facilitate a DBI activity using the target language and feeling the need to protect his students from engaging in a learning activity that might result in emotional self-harm:
“I don’t know if it’s maybe my – me not feeling like I couldn’t scaffold them well enough which would be maybe part of it. Also, some of my students are really – freak out over the littlest things and kind of shut down when they don’t know how to do something and so creating something – an activity where they wouldn’t shut down was kind of a challenge… I feel that the students don’t have everything that they need to be successful at this activity [DBI] and I don’t want them to do an activity where they then come out feeling like, ‘Oh, I don’t know anything.’ So, I am hesitant to do activities like that but I think…that there’s more opportunities to do a more structured and a more sort of maybe not more structured a more intensive DBI activity in a French II and a French III and then French IV – I feel like you can do anything you want in French IV.” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Again, Max did not appear to have felt confident in his ability to design or adapt DBI activities and prepare his students to engage in them at beginning proficiency levels. In addition, he did not present a willingness to engage in learning strategies that might have had the potential to damage his learners’ self-esteem when it came to performing in the target language. He appeared to make predictions about his students’ L2 abilities and how they might handle adversity while participating in a learning activity of this form. That being said, he continued to have a positive view of the role DBI might play in the L2 teaching/learning process:

“You would gather which students have a good grasp on the language content. So, the one example that I sort of thought of when you were saying this was to do the game ‘questions’ with interrogatives where the students have to go back and forth asking each other questions. Something like that you would see if the students understand what the question words mean. You would understand if they understand the structure of how to make a question in French. And, again, you can get that same data from other things, but I think it really goes to show you what the students can do right on the spot with the language whereas if they’re doing a worksheet they can look at their packet or they could have more time to think about it whereas with the drama based it’s really just on the spot. What can you do right now with the language?” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Thus, Max saw the potential for playful/learning ZPDs to occur through DBI strategies in the L2 classroom that would provide him with a unique understanding of what students are capable of doing on their own versus what they could do unassisted and, subsequently, create opportunities for purposeful mediation to take place. At the end of his time in the L2 teacher-preparation program, though, Max indicated he would still benefit with some additional
instruction on how to successfully incorporate DBI in the second language classroom and explained:

“I have a few ways I like to learn and one of them is just like hearing people talk about here’s what I did, here’s this strategy that I used, and I can usually do that pretty well but I also do really like seeing things. So, you can just invite me into a classroom and someone’s doing DBI and I can learn a lot from just watching someone doing something” (Interview, 5/5/17).

Thus, Max revealed a willingness to continue his professional development with the use of DBI in the L2 teaching/learning process and would be interested in seeing how it might be implemented by a second language educator in a classroom setting. His interest in strengthening his use of DBI in the L2 classroom was associated with his desire to incorporate fun into classroom learning – an element that he appeared to feel might be missing from other forms of instruction:

“I just think they’re fun [DBI activities] and if I’m having fun then the students are probably having fun…and I think it’s a fun way to learn and it’s a way to learn that you don’t maybe get to do in all your other classes. Maybe in English class and maybe in social studies class, but you can’t really drama base in math and you can’t really drama base in science. One of my students a few weeks ago asked me, ‘Why do we plays so many games?’ And I was like, ‘If you don’t want to play games, we can do book work the entire class. That’s fine, but I think language learning is a lot like how you learn language when you were a kid. You just used it and you played and you did all these fun things, and so that’s why I tried to incorporate games with you.’ And they were like, ‘Oh, yea. That makes sense.’ And I think adding the drama base where they’re like – they take on a different persona, I guess is really cool – everyone when they were a kid played house. Well, maybe not everyone. But when I was a kid we played boat on my bunk bed. So, like just giving the students this chance to really play and have fun like they’re a kid again, really, I think helps engage them in class, too (Interview, 5/5/17).

Max seemed to assume that he might be able to (re)create similar conditions that one experienced when initially learning their first language by purposefully incorporating socially-oriented play (in the form of the drama strategy of role-play) into classroom instruction. Through engagement in playful/learning experiences, he saw the potential for L2 development to occur
amongst his learners and he demonstrated a willingness to provide these opportunities, via DBI activities, in his future L2 teaching/learning context.

7.7 Conclusion

This chapter detailed Max and Madeline’s ongoing (re)conceptualization of DBI strategies in the language learning classroom. For Max, rather than continuing to use DBI strategies as a means to stay in the target language and assist in L2 comprehension in Sweden, he began to see them as a useful pedagogical tool to enhance learner engagement and maintain interest in lessons. He did, however, still appear to use DBI in Sweden as a means to create imaginative scenarios that served to create rationales for students to engage in otherwise teacher-directed learning activities that often fell outside of the imaginary pretext. While he never fully committed to the Vygotskian-informed criteria for playful/learning ZPD activity to take place while engaged in DBI abroad, he did describe an instance where it may have been put into use during his secondary field experience indicating a potential shift in thinking.

Madeline, on the other hand, largely refrained from engaging in DBI strategies both while studying abroad and while engaged in her secondary field experience. While she felt she had used DBI during the last day of the EFL field experience since the students needed to use their imagination to create original fairytales (storytelling), in reality both the conditions for a play activity and a playful/learning ZPD activity – as defined by Vygotsky – remained elusive. Consequently, the lesson did not use a DBI strategy. Yet, importantly, Madeline did not cite disinterest as the culprit for not committing to the use of DBI in her learning activities. Rather, like Max, she pointed to a need for additional explicit training in DBI using Vygotskian-informed criteria that included modeling and ongoing guidance by an expert in drama methodology. In addition, the perceived risky nature of drama-based pedagogy – with its tendency towards
emergent and unplanned situations – made DBI a less attractive option for novice teacher-
candidates in field experiences where they were perceived as visitors and teachers in training.
These particular issues and suggestions for future directions will be addressed in the next, and
final, chapter.
Chapter 8

The Final Act: Conclusion and Discussion

8.1 Introduction

The research detailed in this dissertation explored how ten K-12 teacher-candidates initially conceptualized drama-based instruction in a language teacher preparation program. It then focused on two case study participants as they navigated their experiences conceptualizing drama as a particular method of L2 instruction in diverse field experiences within the United States and Sweden. Their efforts and reflections were documented as they carried these ideas into two diverse field experiences: first in public schools within the United States, and, later, in public schools in Sweden. The study sought to answer three primary questions:

1) In what ways might drama-based instruction offer a basis to L2 teacher-candidates as they work to engage in playful/learning ZPD activity with learners during field experiences in US K-12 schools and abroad?

2) What are the challenges and affordances experienced by teacher-candidates as they attempt to orient to L2 education from a perspective informed by dramatic play?

3) Does L2 teacher-candidates’ use of dramatic play activities impact their perceptions of their students’ L2 knowledge and development? If so, how?

These three questions were initially explored through an in-depth analysis of the participants’ individual case studies in chapters four and five. The present chapter aims to explicitly address each of the research questions by engaging in an inter-case analysis of the participants’ experiences, synthesizing the relevant findings, and discussing their implications. The chapter concludes with an acknowledgement of study limitations and suggestions for future research directions.
8.2 Drama-Based Instruction and Playful/Learning ZPD Activity

Each participant indicated attempts to incorporate their conceptual understanding of drama-based instructional during field experiences in the final twenty-four months of their L2 teacher preparation program. However, upon closer analysis, the participants appeared to struggle in establishing, and/or sustaining, conditions necessary for playful/learning ZPD activity to occur in formal learning environments.

Following a Vygotskian view of cognitive development (see chapter two), in order for play to be used as a viable pedagogical tool to support cognitive development beyond early childhood, it is theorized that it must mature to become a more structured and systematic action that allows the possibility for intentional learning to take place (i.e., in the form of drama-based instruction). Taking into consideration that Vygotsky differentiated mediated learning that occurs within play-based ZPDs versus those that take place within formal learning ZPDs, it was speculated that Vygotsky’s criteria for a ‘play’ activity and a formal ‘learning’ activity must merge to form a singular playful/learning ZPD in order to continue leading the cognitive development of the learner outside of early childhood.

As been previously discussed, the essential features that comprise a play activity in early childhood, from a Vygotskian perspective, includes: 1) an explicit imaginary situation; 2) explicit roles governed by corresponding societal rules of behavior; and 3) creative imitation. The characteristics of a Vygotskian formal-learning activity, as explained by Bodrova and Leong (2007), was discussed to include:

“1) A learning task as the generalized way of acting that is to be acquired by the student; 2) learning actions that will result in the formation of a preliminary image of the action that is being learned; 3) control actions or feedback where the action is compared with a standard; 4) assessment or self-reflection action showing the learner’s awareness of what he or she has learned; and 5) motivation or the desire to learn and participate in the learning task; intellectual curiosity built into the activity so the child sees the tasks as something worthy of learning, interesting, and useful” (p. 173).
As such, it was anticipated that by combining the characteristics that form both types of ZPD activity, a unique playful/learning ZPD could manifest in formal-learning environments through drama-based instruction. In doing so, purposeful mediation would be able to take place and internalization of scientific (academic) concepts could occur amongst the students. By engaging in drama-based pedagogical activities, intentionally planned by the participants in their roles as emerging language teachers, L2 learners would be able to navigate imaginary, communicative situations through explicit illusory roles. To assume their fictive counterparts, and engage in creative imitation of their roles, they would need to utilize both their understanding of specific, targeted concepts of the new language, culture, and their everyday experiences. Through the implementation of DBI activities, L2 learners would be encouraged to explore several organizing features of their new language to accomplish particular social goals (i.e., performing beyond themselves.)

This theoretically-informed approach to DBI was initially introduced to the ten teacher-candidates in their fall 2015 methods course (Drama-as-Methodology). A select number of DBI strategies (role-play, puppetry, and storytelling) were introduced through the use of instructional videos and reviewing suggested learning activities described in the participants’ methods course textbook (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010). Through course discussions co-constructed between myself and the teacher-candidates, the participants conceptualized ways DBI might be used in the language learning classroom. However, the verbal explanations and the examples of the DBI strategies that were initially provided (discussion and anecdotal examples) prior to the start of the elementary field experience proved insufficient for the participants to make drama a driving force behind their practice in relation to other teaching strategies (a prevalent Drama-as-Tool perspective.) This may have been caused by the original methods that I used in an attempt to orient the teacher-candidates to a theoretically-informed approach to DBI in the L2 classroom.
The participants needed some additional concrete experiences developing and using this form of DBI to be anchored to this new abstract concept. Previously, the participants had no experience using DBI in this way. Consequently, the introduction of this approach remained inert knowledge rather than something that could be tied to practical activity. To remedy this, a workshop focusing on a deeper theoretical explanation of drama in education with explicit in-depth modeling of Vygotskian-informed DBI was provided to the participants.

However, upon closer analysis of the self-recorded, self-identified, instances of DBI attempts, playful/learning ZPDs were problematic to create for the ten teacher-candidates including the case study participants. In general, Madeline and Max appeared to struggle designing activities on their own that fit the play criteria of early childhood outlined by Vygotsky. During the field experiences in both Phase I and II, the participants had trouble sustaining explicit imaginative contexts with consistent, explicit roles to be assumed by both learners and/or students during drama-based activities, which would allow for the creative imitation of societal behaviors. Without providing explicit directives for the students that detailed the imaginary place, roles, and the rules of behavior, relationships between one another on the imaginary plane became ill-defined and ambiguous. Consequently, the power dynamics that existed between learners and students became unclear (i.e., what behavior was permissible, what was impermissible), while expectations and parameters of conduct (for both the teacher and the students) became vague (e.g., do the teachers/students follow the rules and routines of normal classroom procedures, or does the traditional become interrupted while engaged in the drama-based activity?)

Without providing the conditions necessary for a play activity (as defined by Vygotsky), it was impossible for the participants, and their learners, to be drawn into distinctive playful/learning ZPDs where the possibility for targeted mediation of L2 concepts might occur during DBI activities. Instead, mediation within formal-learning ZPDs took precedence throughout the DBI activities as evidenced by the teacher-dominated I.R.E./F pattern of
classroom discourse and the inconsistent fluctuation/maintenance between the fictive roles/rules assumed by those inside the imaginative drama and the tendency to revert to their traditional implicit counterparts, which were rooted in the everyday reality of the language learning classroom.

8.3 DBI in the L2 Classroom: Challenges and Affordances

Madeline and Max experienced several challenges and affordances (linguistically, pedagogically, and cognitively) in their attempts to implement DBI in L2 instruction across each of their field experiences. In Madeline’s particular case, her concern with classroom management and maintaining her perception of ‘good’ student behavior during lessons may have overshadowed her willingness to engage in drama-based activities where the traditional roles/rules that are typically followed by teachers and students can become ruptured. In drama-based activities, the pre-existing dynamics of the classroom are challenged due to the possibility for emergent, and unpredictable, student contributions from their efforts to satisfy the conflict(s) of the presented classroom dramas. It is possible that such an emergent pedagogy was difficult to control for novice teacher-candidates.

For both participants, uncertainty regarding the students’ L2 skills and meaning-making capabilities during drama-based activities, often led to instances of one-sided dramatic activity wherein the students became positioned as spectators, rather than partakers, of the drama-based activity. It is important to remember that both Madeline and Max were in the process of developing their own expertise as both teachers and, in the case of French, users of the target language. DBI required the participants to teach through the target language in contextualized, communicative situations while incorporating additional instructional supports to match the proficiency level(s)/language needs of their students.
To design their drama-activities, the participants often made assumptions about their learners’ everyday experiences; experiences that were necessary for the students to draw from in order to make meaning of the dramatic action unfolding within the lesson. If students voiced connections between their growing L2 conceptual knowledge and their everyday knowledge (or growing scientific knowledge in other academic disciplines) that was caused by participation in the drama activity, the participants seemed unsure how to handle their learners’ revelations. This resulted in the participants’ either maintaining a narrow objective-oriented focus during their lessons, or lengthy teacher-dominated responses to student inquiries.

Accordingly, without a firm awareness of what students might say or do during the drama-activities, or reliable pedagogical conceptual knowledge from previous teaching experiences facilitating DBI activities in L2 instruction, it would have been impossible for the participants to predict what their learners might have needed in each unfolding moment nor how to best supply them with the necessary tools for successful, mediated learning to take place inside the drama activity.

As such, drama-based L2 instruction carried with it a sense of pedagogical risk; a risk that the participants may have been reticent to take in the early stages of their teacher-development. If the students did not take to the drama scenario or were not capable of interacting successfully in the L2 on the imaginative plane, the participants risked potential personal and professional embarrassment as well as a loss of valuable instructional time.

Compounding these challenges was the insufficient training provided to the participants to successfully facilitate drama-based L2 instruction. Both participants acknowledged that the singular workshop provided during methods course was not enough to internalize the learning principles needed to design effective drama-based lesson plans or learning activities from a Drama-as-Methodology perspective. Madeline and Max indicated they would have benefited from additional hands-on training or observations of an in-service L2 teacher engaging students
with this particular approach to DBI. Neither of these options were available to the participants due to time restraints in their teacher-preparation program, and the unavailable access to known in-service L2 teachers who regularly incorporate DBI that support playful/learning ZPD activity. Despite the intermittent challenges in implementing DBI in the L2 classroom (from both a Drama-as-Tool and Drama-as-Methodology perspective,) both participants consistently indicated its value and relevance in the L2 teaching/learning process throughout their field experiences and regularly expressed a desire to implement it into their curriculum. Citing DBI as a mutually pleasurable option (for both the teachers and the students) that afforded a departure from traditional methods of L2 instruction, Madeline and Max viewed drama as a way to enhance L2 skill retention through kinesthetic forms of learning. From their perspective, drama afforded students a unique opportunity for embodied language experiences that they may have felt were not present in other, didactic approaches to L2 teaching/learning. In addition, in their opinion, drama offered the potential for increasing learner engagement during L2 instruction and it was posed as a viable alternative for exploring concepts of the second language that may be limited by other methods of instruction. Likewise, seven of the ten participants expressed value in Vygotskian-informed DBI and an interest in further developing their skills in using it as a particular method of L2 instruction in their future teaching practice.

8.4 Second Language Learning: DBI and Teachers’ Perceptions

Using DBI in the L2 classroom appears to have reinforced, rather than qualitatively affected (positively or negatively), the participants’ perceptions of their learners’ L2 knowledge and development. While each DBI activity was designed to support or teach a particular L2 objective, the participants’ reflective comments tended to remain broad in nature with individual student assessments reserved for personal student conduct during the activities (e.g., were
students following prescribed directions, were they completing actions in the drama as intended, etc.), and their ability to comprehend the teachers’ L2 directives.

Indeed, mediation, and the participants’ subsequent reflections on their students’ L2 learning achievements during the DBI activities were often focused on whether they, themselves, had created the optimal conditions to support learners in their attempts to accomplish prescribed tasks in the drama activity, rather than assessing the learners’ range of success in the purposeful application of the lesson’s L2 objective(s) or identifying teachable opportunities where students may have been able to be exposed to additional unanticipated L2 concepts.

Participants appeared to have initially made assumptions about learners’ emerging L2 abilities during the field experiences which subsequently effected their teaching choices while engaged in DBI activities. When they were unsure if students were able to comprehend their speech in the French classrooms, both Madeline and Max frequently relied on direct translation as a non-negotiable signal that ensured both teacher and learners shared mutual understanding even if the act of direct translation ran contrary to the imaginative situation they had invoked.

Additionally, in Max’s case, perceptions of student’s L2 knowledge complicated his choice to incorporate, or discard, DBI strategies. He seemed to operate under the impression that students studying French should reach at least a “French II level” before he believed they would be able to successfully engage in spontaneous forms of interpersonal communication; a notion he began to question as he approached graduation from the teacher preparation program. Viewing L2 proficiency with a focus on function (i.e., what learners can do with the language at various stages of development) rather than form (the amount and type of linguistic structures acquired by the learner) appeared to be a difficult concept for him to internalize and seemingly effected his choice of L2 methodology as well as his perception of students’ classroom performance abilities.

Interestingly, in the EFL classrooms, Max, as well as Madeline, appeared to function under the opposite assumption; that is to say it was anticipated that the Swedish students would
already possess the necessary L2 knowledge needed to complete the DBI activities they designed due to the length of time English was taught as a subject of study in the public schools.

Consequently, while teaching abroad, Max and Madeline began the design of each DBI activity by choosing a topic that students might find relevant and interesting. This topic would then be taught through the medium of English with L1 support occurring only during occasions when a native Swedish-speaking teacher was available for direct translation purposes.

This approach to DBI design differed from the one taken in the domestic world languages classroom where the participants focused on a specific function, or form, of the target language and then allowed the topic of the drama activity to follow suit. This difference in approach to L2 teaching/learning may have been due, in part, to the broad nature of their mandated L2 objective (increase students’ oral production in English), their lack of language proficiency to teach in both English and Swedish, and/or their limited awareness of the EFL curriculum studied by the learners. Nonetheless, neither participant chose to narrow the focus of their DBI activities to develop specific features of learners’ L2 oral skills during the EFL field experience.

8.5 Implications

8.5.1 Implications for Language Teacher Preparation and L2 Pedagogy

Analysis of the data has provided several insights into the complicated process of developing teacher expertise in a modern L2 teacher preparation program. Teacher expertise is understood as the participants’ growing awareness of the “academic concepts and pedagogical resources that form the basis of [teacher-candidates’] instructional decisions and activities” (Johnson and Golombek, 2016, p. 10). First, throughout the study, participants’ conceptual understanding of their students’ developing language proficiency, as well as their own, appears to
have influenced their instructional decision-making in the language-learning classroom including how and in what ways to use DBI in L2 pedagogy. As both emergent teachers and users of the target language, DBI appears to have been a challenging method to incorporate during the participants’ field experiences. Expectations and assumptions related to students’ achievement abilities in the target language as well as a form-focused orientation to second language acquisition created obstacles in designing drama activities to support the attainment of L2 concepts.

Second, while both participants felt that language learning occurred best through meaningful, contextualized communicative interactions their pedagogical actions within the drama scenarios tended to revert to their pre-conceived notion of how learning in a second language classroom should occur; that is to say through traditional learning strategies that seemed to privilege memorization and rapid recall of pre-established language concepts via highly structured teacher-dominated interactions. Thus, the students were either not provided with opportunities for individual creative imitation during DBI activities, based on their everyday conceptual understanding of the roles provided in the presented dramas, or discouraged completely from seemingly divergent playful/learning behavior when it ran contrary to the teacher-candidates’ pre-conceived notions of how students should behave in the L2 classroom. Consequently, both teachers and students tended to shirk the guise of the drama in favor of interactions reflective of traditional schooling behavior and learning outcomes thus maintaining a sense of understood classroom decorum.

It is possible that drama may have held the capacity to rupture the conventional script of schooling in the L2 classroom by affording students opportunities to actively negotiate meaning with peers and teachers alike in unpredictable, and highly individualized ways, based on their everyday conceptual understanding of the roles that might exist in the imaginative contexts created by the teachers, and their emerging knowledge in the second language and across content-
area disciplines. DBI requires the teacher to put themselves in the position of the learner to anticipate their needs and to understand their points of reference (culturally and linguistically) to successfully engage in the drama scenario. In any instruction, but particularly in DBI, the teacher and student must enter into a dialogic relationship wherein students’ unique understanding of the rules that determine the behavioral acts of the roles they assume in the dramas is seen as a valuable contribution to the L2 teaching/learning process.

However, as demonstrated in this study, both the participants, and their students, seemed to struggle to break free of the routine roles they implicitly play each day while ‘performing’ their everyday conceptual understanding of school behavior. Whether intentional or unintentional, from the participants’ perspectives, this meant students should respond and react as passive participants during teacher-directed DBI activities. For the students, it meant complying to the teachers’ classroom expectations of behavior and selecting, or physically embodying, singular “right” answers and/or mannerisms during learning activities to achieve “success.”

Third, in order to embrace the communicative, emergent nature of DBI in the L2 classroom, participants appeared to require a degree of pedagogical content/conceptual knowledge that they may not have yet internalized from either their coursework or their field experience opportunities at the time of its initial introduction in their first methods course. Embracing, and understanding, the implications of a function-oriented view to language proficiency on L2 teachers’ methodological choices (i.e., what learners ‘can do’ at a particular stage of language development vs. what type of grammatical knowledge they possess) appears challenging for these novice teacher-candidates. Without strong pedagogical conceptual knowledge in using communicative-language teaching methods, DBI became difficult to facilitate in the L2 classroom.

In addition, a tension appeared to exist in how teacher-candidates came to conceptualize the use of DBI in the language learning classroom. DBI strategies could be considered as another
pedagogical tool in a teacher's eclectic collection of instructional tools (i.e., the metaphorical "teacher's toolbox" that contains a variety of teaching methods and strategies) that support an array of teaching methodologies, or whether DBI stems from a coherent theoretical view of learning and development that requires a major reorientation to L2 education (i.e., the Vygotskian-informed approach to DBI introduced to the participants in the fall 2015 methods course.)

Drama-based strategies in classroom instruction, requires teachers to both anticipate and be responsive to spontaneous and emergent contributions by students during learning activities. As the participants’ demonstrated, teacher-candidates without extensive classroom teaching/learning experiences to reference, or the necessary language proficiency to handle spontaneous student/student and student/teacher interactions, may have difficulty designing and implementing drama instruction in the L2 classroom early in their teacher-development without proper support and on-going training. Issues related to classroom management, topic selection, learner motivation, and the role of the target language in L2 instruction all posed challenges to the successful facilitation of DBI during the participants’ field experiences.

8.6 Limitations of the Study

There were a few limitations involved in the execution of this study that must be acknowledged. The first limitation of this study involves the quality and quantity of audio/visual data that was available for analysis. The study relied on self-recorded video data collected as part of the participants’ educational record (which was subsequently destroyed after analysis). Since the participants’ coursework only required one self-recorded lesson per week during the elementary field experience and one self-recorded lesson of each type of lesson taught while in Sweden, not every instance of DBI was available for in-depth analysis.
In addition, each participant used one laptop-based video camera to record their teaching practice(s). The quality of each video recording was selective and contingent on the placement of the video recording in relation to the participant. Occasionally, observations of teacher practice were obscured by other people and objects moving in and out of the classroom context. In addition, audio levels were intermittently hampered by more than one person talking or the use of low pitch/volume when speaking, which resulted in an inability to accurately transcribe every teacher and learner utterance during DBI activities.

The second limitation involves analyzing only those learning activities that were self-identified by the participants as having incorporated DBI after the completion of the field experience. By narrowing the analysis to only these learning activities, other lesson plans that may have unknowingly incorporated DBI during the field experiences remained unanalyzed.

The third limitation is in regard to the national testing that occurred in Sweden at the time of the students’ EFL practicum. Due to the nature of the national assessments, the quality of expert mentorship between the EFL teachers and the participants was limited.

A fourth limitation involves issues related to the observer’s paradox. While it was impossible to be available during each teaching episode conducted by the participants during their field experiences, my physical presence may have had a direct effect on their behavior during the occasions when I was able to observe in person. In addition, both participants were aware that I was studying drama-based instruction in the classroom, which may have influenced their practices and perspectives related to drama instruction in the L2 classroom. Finally, the last limitation is in the number of participants involved in the study. As a case-study, the results cannot be used to generalize for larger populations.
8.7 Concluding Statement: Future Directions

The insights and implications for language teacher preparation and L2 pedagogy provided by this study offer unique considerations for language teacher-education and future research. First, in order to educate language teachers to use drama to support communicative-based language teaching, a drama-based methodology must be taught explicitly and systematically to exploit its full potential as a viable learning strategy. Teacher-candidates need ongoing professional development that includes observation, guided, and individual practice in drama-based instruction both during and after their teacher-preparation program. Viewing or reading about drama-based activities, and/or participating in university-based classroom examples of drama strategies is a good first step to introduce DBI to teacher-candidates. However, language teachers also need to be provided with precise steps that discuss how, why, and in what specific ways a wide range of drama-based instructional strategies can be used in established, and newly-designed, L2 curricula. To accomplish these tasks, teacher-preparation in DBI needs to incorporate a combination of direct observations of classroom practice by an expert in-service language instructor skilled in DBI and mentored teaching experiences during field placements using the method in question.

In addition, in-service teachers may benefit, and indeed fare better, with opportunities for training in drama-based instruction due to the nature of their more developed pedagogical conceptual/content knowledge and individual classroom experience(s). Undergraduate, and certification-only, teacher-candidates have only begun the process of internalizing and developing teaching skills that reflect the wide range of topics that will come to comprise their teacher expertise. In developing this expertise, language teacher-candidates find themselves negotiating a compromise between their emerging teacher-identity, influenced by their growing conceptual knowledge of pedagogy, with their established learner-identity that has been formed through their
everyday experiences of the language learning classroom. Their experiences as language
learners, in both K-12 and university settings, may influence their conceptual understanding of
how, and in what way(s), L2 teaching/learning should take place. They are engaged in ongoing
negotiations regarding their philosophies of education and language learning. As such, DBI, with
its unique pedagogical challenges, may be more successful when introduced to practicing
teachers that have spent more time developing their pedagogical conceptual/content knowledge
and L2 proficiency skills.

Recognizing the challenges experienced by teacher-candidates as they pursue the use of
DBI in the L2 classroom, as well as an awareness of drama’s potential as an effective tool for
instruction in the classroom (e.g., Gaudart, 1990; Kao, Carkin, & Hsu, 2011; Maley & Duff,
1982; Rothwell, 2011; Wagner, 1998), will result in additional research on language teacher-
education in DBI methods. This study revealed more information than was possible to analyze
owing to financial and time restraints. Accordingly, I plan to conduct further research with the
following adjustments to the study procedures: a larger sample of cases to incorporate other
taught languages, audio/visual recordings from every teaching episode where DBI use is
anticipated during field experiences, video-cued teaching reflections of facilitated DBI activities,
purposeful mediated intervention to develop participant skills in drama-based pedagogy, and an
extension of the study into the participants’ teaching context(s) upon completion of their teacher
preparation program.

The themes and implications that are discussed in this dissertation are only samples of
what could be further developed from the presented data. Owing to the insights I gathered from
the data, several lines of research may be pursued. This includes an in-depth study of the process
teacher-candidates’ undergo to internalize new pedagogical conceptual knowledge, the influence
of every day schooling experiences on L2 methodological considerations, the relationship
between proficiency level and instructional choice, and the role of playfulness in language learning contexts.

As Vygotsky (1978) famously argued, “…in play a child always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior; in play it as though he were a head taller than himself” (p. 102). It is quite possible that engaging in play-based activities, including drama, at any age may provide individuals with the confidence to use and strengthen unimagined skills.
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Appendix A

Phase I Course Syllabi

Methods I: Course Syllabus

Course Description. The purpose of this course is to introduce pre-service educators to methods for the teaching of world languages to elementary school children. Course content emphasizes current theoretical perspectives on the nature of learning, language, and language teaching in the elementary grades, as well as the practical knowledge necessary for developing and implementing a world languages curriculum. Understanding of course content will be demonstrated through the use of three high leverage practices (HLPs) that are essential for effective second language teachers: (1) providing comprehensible input, (2) supporting language development through culture, and (3) teaching grammar inductively (adapted from Troyan, Davin, & Donato, 2013).

Communities of Practice. According to Ball & Forzani (2009), professional training that engages HLPs includes in-depth examinations of each practice, the dissection and analysis of instruction and student work, and the practicing of each HLP under close supervision and coaching. We will follow this framework in World Languages Methods of Elementary Teaching and engage in collective learning of each HLP within communities of practice, each of which will include three to four students. Within each community of practice, students will work together to analyze videos that highlight their use of the three HLPs from their field experience at the elementary school. Group members will meet during class throughout the semester to watch instructional videos and provide constructive feedback to one another. All group members will reflect on this process and how the community of practice supported their instructional improvement. In addition, each course participant will develop an online world languages teaching portfolio. Communities of practice will view and discuss each community member’s online portfolio to provide constructive feedback and to share ideas for teaching activities and lessons.

Course Objectives. In this course, students will: Apply second language acquisition theory to explore instructional methods for teaching world languages in the elementary grades. Demonstrate understanding of a variety of methodologies for supporting the second language acquisition of young learners. Become familiar with the National Standards for Foreign Language Education and apply them to instructional practice. Constructively evaluate their own and others’ instructional practice. Review and critique instructional materials for world languages in the elementary grades. Discuss program models for teaching world languages at the elementary school level.

Course Texts. Required:

Course Requirements.

Attendance. Students are expected to arrive to class on time, attend all class meetings, do the required readings, and actively participate in class discussions and activities. Absences and late arrivals will result in the reduction of your participation grade, 3% per absence, 1.5% for late arrivals (more than 15 minutes). Students are expected to come prepared to class, having completed all required readings and/or assignments. An essential component of this class is engagement in a community of practice. Students are expected to actively engage with other members of their communities in discussions of teaching practice, including but not limited to reflections, critical reviews of instructional materials, in-class teaching demonstrations, and analysis of instructional videos.

Teaching Workshops. Each teaching group will use workshop time to design lesson plans for the following week and discuss pedagogical issues related to their elementary field experience. Teaching Groups will present complete (though rough) outlines of their activities to one another to receive constructive peer feedback with instructor support. Students may be asked to demonstrate select activities for clarification purposes and to ‘try out’ diverse teaching methods. Evaluation will be based upon completion of written lesson plans and participation.

Course Blog. Students are expected to maintain a personal blog or website during this course and the elementary field experience with three labeled pages: (1) Reflections, (2) Critical Reviews of Instructional Materials (CRIMs), and (3) Film Reflections/HLPs. On the Reflections page, students will post responses to 6 reflection questions (listed below, 5 points each). Each post should address the reflection question in enough detail so that it is a usable resource for classmates. In addition to details about lessons or activities, each reflection should include at least one specific reference to the course textbook or class discussion. Responses should be posted before class in order to be shared with members of the community of practice during class. Another page of the course blog should be devoted to critical reviews of instructional materials. Materials development and adaptation is a crucial part of effective teaching, and the materials you employ in your lessons should clearly relate to your instructional goals and to the ACTFL standards. For this assignment, students will provide evidence of the process they go through to identify, select, adapt, and create materials for use during the field experience. Students should comment upon three of the following: (1) commercially available materials used “as-is”, (2) materials that are adapted, (3) materials that are created “from scratch,” or (4) authentic materials. Each review should include an analysis of how the materials helped engage learners in meaningful interaction and in developmentally appropriate activities that helped to realize ACTFL standards, and a discussion of how the materials could be improved and/or modified for different grade levels and language proficiencies. Students should post their reviews to their blogs before class and be prepared to share their materials and reviews with their communities of practice. All three critical reviews must be compiled (and revised according to peer and instructor feedback) and uploaded to Taskstream by the end of the semester.
Final Paper. Students will write a 5-7 page paper that describes their emerging philosophy as a world languages educator of elementary school students. The paper should include a description of the student’s ideal world languages program, how they would set up their classroom and the types of materials and resources they would use, and the kinds of instructional practices they would employ. All ideas should be based on course readings, discussions, or the field experience, with specific examples provided.

Reflection Topics (To be addressed on the blog)

Reflection 1 (Three Modes of Communication): Describe how you could use a story or storytelling to support interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational communication over a series of lessons.

Reflection 2 (Languaculture): Describe a classroom fantasy or virtual trip you could co-construct with students over the course of your field experience, and how you could teach a grammatical element or structure during one part of the virtual trip.

Reflection 3 (Classroom Materials): Describe how you would set up your own world languages classroom for elementary students. Be sure to include detailed descriptions of the classroom, books, and general resources. (This reflection was cancelled in Fall 2015).

Reflection 4 (Interpersonal Communication): Describe two partner or group activities that you could use to help students practice the target language in your field experience classroom.

Reflection 5 (Presentational Communication): Describe two activities for a shared reading activity with a bilingual book that would encourage students to use the target language.

Reflection 6 (Inductive Grammar): Design an activity to either foreshadow a grammar explanation through integrated discourse (stories, poems, songs) or co-construct a grammar explanation by discovering patterns or consistent forms.
Elementary Field Experience: Course Syllabus

Course Description. Practicum situation where prospective World Language teachers will demonstrate acquired knowledge on second language learning/teaching and educational theories. Prospective World Language teachers will have assigned school placements and will attend a weekly seminar where issues in World Language learning and teaching will be discussed. At their assigned school placement, prospective World Language teachers will have many opportunities to observe/work with children in grades 1-5 (1) focusing on second language learning/teaching and the socio/cultural issues associated to classroom practices while implementing and self-evaluated own designed activities and lessons; (2) weekly seminars will engage students in reflective activities that will enable them to analyze each week's events; (3) inquiry projects on teaching and learning of World Languages.

Course Requirements.

Initial Lesson Plans. Prior to the field experience, each teaching group will create cooperatively a curriculum outline made up of 13 lessons that include all elements of the attached lesson plan template. Each week prior to the beginning of the field experience we will work on some of the elements of the lesson plans in a workshop format. Sufficient time to complete the plans for weeks 1-4 will usually be provided in class, but any work not completed in class must be finished by the group outside of class. For weeks 5-7, you will only submit final lesson plans as outlined in the course schedule. You must use the template provided for all lesson plans.

Final Lesson Plans. As a group, weekly plans are submitted online. This document will be due by NOON the Friday prior to teaching the lessons and filed in your curriculum binder. I will provide feedback by Sunday night. Please read over the feedback immediately as it may require last minute changes in your lesson. If I ask for a rewrite of a lesson, rewrite it, resubmit it, and after it has been approved, print the document and put it directly in your curriculum binder. If I suggest changes, but do not specify a complete rewrite, you can put the document (with feedback) in your curriculum binder right away. You should still follow the suggested revisions. The purpose for storing the documents with the feedback is so that if you want to refer back to them later to tweak for a secondary ed lesson, you'll have the feedback, too. As with the initial plans, groups are responsible for compiling all individual lessons together (arranged chronologically) and submitting one group document. Please refer to the Lesson Plan template for required items on each lesson plan.

Final Curriculum Binder. At the end of the field experience, each group will have developed a total of seven weekly units including two lesson plans per teacher per week. Also, throughout the field experience each group will have collected student work samples and class pictures, adapted or created materials, and developed a final project shared with the students’ families. All items should be assembled into a final organized curriculum binder that includes:
1. The group’s name and unit plan
2. Seven sections each comprised of:
   a. the group’s initial plans for each week,
   b. final lesson plans,
   c. materials,
   d. class pictures,
   e. student work samples.
3. You will also include one final section including a description and sample of the group’s final project

**Teaching Reflections.** Throughout the field experience you will submit 8 individual teaching reflections. These reflections should be posted on your course blog under the page ‘Reflections’ and titled appropriately to differentiate from your Reading Reflections in your World Languages Methods of Elementary Teaching course. All reflections are due on the dates specified in the schedule below. Teaching Reflections will be written on your blog. Videos are submitted at the same time on VoiceThread. See schedule below for specifics. Each reflection is intended to cover a one-week period of the field experience and thus will pertain to two days of teaching, but your VoiceThread video only needs to record one of the two teaching days. For this assignment, you will write and submit an individual reflection that includes the following:

A. Your own impression[s] about your lesson/experience (on the blog)
B. Supervisors’ questions/comments (list) and your responses/thoughts to those questions/comments (on the blog)
C. 1 brief video with at least 3 different coded examples that demonstrate how you (individually) addressed the specific weekly theme (see below for themes). (On VoiceThread)

Overall, at a minimum your reflection should:

- Address your performance (strengths/weaknesses) on the weekly theme and your teaching in general.
- Describe at least one difference between what you had planned and what you actually did, along with a detailed explanation of why the change occurred.
- Discuss any dilemmas/problems of classroom practice that you faced that week along with how you attempted to solve them and an assessment of your solution (Did it work? Why/why not? etc).
- Share (in detail) one of your values/assumptions/beliefs about teaching (language teaching or teaching in general) that was either supported or challenged based on a situation or incident that occurred during your lessons.
- Plan of action and rationale for changes/improvements to subsequent lessons.
Teaching Reflection Themes During The Field Experience  *Note – These themes coincide with the themes in World Languages Methods of Elementary Teaching beginning in Week 6:

- Week #1 (9/29 & 10/1): Student Engagement/Classroom Environment (Teaching Reflection #1)
- Week #2 (10/6 & 10/8): Target Language Use (Teaching Reflection #2)
- Week #3: (10/13 & 10/15) Classroom Management (Teaching Reflection #3)
- Week #4: (10/20) Languaculture Methods (Teaching Reflection #4)
- Week #5: (10/27 & 10/29) Inductive Grammar Instruction (Teaching Reflection #5)
- Week #6: (11/3 & 11/5) Assessment (Teaching Reflection #6)
- Week #7: (11/10 & 11/12) Instructional Design/Classroom Communication (Teaching Reflection #7)

(Please Note: For Week #7 of the Field Experience this theme will not coincide with World Languages Elementary Teaching Method’s weekly theme)

- Week #8: (11/17) Consider the questions as you look back over the whole field experience (Teaching Reflection #8)

Teaching Performance. I will formally assess your teaching performance twice during the field experience. I use an evaluation sheet based on the K-6 Elementary Teacher Education Performance Framework to observe and assess your teaching performance in the following areas:

- Domain A: Planning and Preparation
- Domain B: Classroom Management
- Domain C: Teacher Decision Making & Flexibility
- Domain D: Professionalism
- Domain E: Language Use & Assessment

Evaluations are planned out ahead of time. The schedule of evaluations will be posted in ANGEL. They begin during the second week of the program and go until the second to last day of the program. I will attempt to see everyone at least once in between formal evaluations for an informal evaluation. All evaluations done by the district supervisors and the course assistant are informal, but should be carefully studied to help you progress, as evidence of development is something I really look for in the second formal evaluation. The weekly videos you post to your reflection should also show your ability to think reflectively about what happened in the classroom and how it relates to what you are learning about teaching in World Languages Methods of Elementary Teaching as well as what we talked about in this seminar.

Grading. As is the case with other field experiences in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction, you will receive a grade of Satisfactory (SA) or Unsatisfactory (UN) for this course. In order to pass the course with a grade of Satisfactory (required for remaining in the major), you must do the following:
• Develop and submit 7 Initial Plans, 14 Final Plans, and the Curriculum Binder
• Submit 8 individual Teaching Reflections as per assignment requirements
• Earn a Satisfactory on 2 formal teaching performance evaluations
• Attend all seminars and field experience sessions

MATERIALS: Supplies will be provided through the school district’s community education program. Additional supplies you might want will need to be purchased from your own funds. You are not required to make such purchases. Plan to return any unused supplies after the program has finished. Non-consumable materials like scissors and markers should be carefully counted at the end of each day in order to be sure you will be able to return them complete to the community education office.

ELEMENTARY FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAM INFORMATION:

Theme: Stories Without Borders!

Purpose/Objective: Learning another language provides access to a different culture, including values, perspectives, stories, and customs. For children, language learning has the possibility of coming alive through the art of storytelling. By using folktales from places where Spanish and French are spoken, students will both learn and use their new language as they meet exciting characters and follow their adventures. With guidance from their language teachers, students will engage in a variety of extension activities aimed at exposing learners to beginning language skills in Spanish and French while providing access to valuable cross-cultural exposure. Through this, students will come to understand intersections between language and culture and how language may be used in particular ways and for particular purposes.
Appendix B

List of Semi-Structured Interview Questions

**Biographical Information**

Age?

Tell me a little bit about why you chose your language and your experiences with learning the language? [How many years? Where? Who?]

Elementary Experience? Secondary? College?

Motivations for learning the language?

Family members who speak the language?

Why is it important to know the language?

**Participants’ View of L2 Teaching and Learning**

How do you believe L2 learning happens?

What do you believe fosters optimal L2 learning?

What makes L2 learning more effective?

What makes L2 learning less effective?

What procedures and practices do you think are most effective in L2 learning?

**Participants’ Understanding of Drama-Based Instructional Practice in the L2 Classroom**

What do you consider to be a drama-based method of instruction?

Tell me about your experiences using drama both inside and outside of the L2 classroom during your primary field experience.

Describe any challenges and successes that you have experienced so far with your learners when engaging in drama-based instruction during the primary field experience.

What do you see is the value of using drama-based instructional methods in the L2 classroom?
Do you anticipate using drama-based instructional methods in your future teaching practice? Why or why not.

How have your attitudes towards L2 teaching changed from the beginning of the primary field experience to the end?
Appendix C

Strategy Questionnaire

Learning Activity Date:

I believe that this learning activity used Drama-Based Instructional (DBI) Methods:

Yes_____              No___

If you marked Yes, please indicate which features of DBI you believed were used in the lesson. Please see attached glossary of terms for definitions:

Pantomime _______  Improvisation _______  Storytelling_______

Narrative Pantomime _______  Panel/Interview_______

Sound scape_______  Improvisation ______

Alley/Gauntlet_______  Tableau_______

Side-Coach_____  Guided Imagery_______  Props_______

Puppetry_______  *Role-play_______

*If Role-Play is selected please indicate which type:

Teacher-in-Role ______

Student-in-role_______

Writing-in-role_______
Why did you choose these DBI features to teach this linguistic concept?

If you marked No, please indicate why you chose not to use DBI to teach this linguistic concept:

If you marked No, OR if you believe you used multiple methods of instruction in this lesson, please mark the alternative method[s] used:

Grammar-Translation Method___________     Audiolingual Method____

Total Physical Response Method _______     Group-work _______

Learning Game ________________            Other [Please Name] __________

Song______

Not Sure _______

Briefly explain why you chose these methods of instruction for teaching this linguistic concept:
Appendix D

Transcription Conventions

Jeffersonian Transcription Key


. (period) falling intonation
? (question mark) rising intonation
, (comma) continuing intonation
- (hyphen) abrupt cut-off
:: (colon(s)) prolonging of sound
Word (underlining) stress
Word the more underlining, the greater the stress
WORD (all caps) loud speech
*word* (degree symbols) quiet speech
↑word (upward arrow) raised speech
↓word (downward arrow) lowered pitch
>word< (more than and less than) quicker speech
<word> (less than and more than) slowed speech
< (less than) jump start or rushed start
Hh (series of h’s) aspiration or laughter
.hh (h’s preceded by dot) inhalation
(hh) (h’s in parentheses) aspiration or laughter inside word boundaries
[word] (set of lined-up brackets) beginning and ending of
[word] simultaneous or overlapping speech
= (equal sign) latch or continuing speech with no break in between
(0.4) (number in parentheses) length of a silence in tenths of a second
(  ) (empty parentheses) inaudible talk
(word) (word or phrase in parentheses) transcriptionist doubt
((gazes)) (double parentheses) non-speech activity or transcriptionist comment
$word$ (dollar signs) smiley voice
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