



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

The Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Sydney

‘ALWAYS IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING’

(FREIRE, 1998)

HOW FIVE EARLY CAREER DRAMA TEACHERS BUILD
THEIR WORLDS THROUGH LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE

Alison Louise Grove O’Grady

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2015

Author Declaration



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

Faculty of Education and Social Work
Office of Doctoral Studies

This is to certify that:

- I. this thesis comprises only my original work towards the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
- II. due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used
- III. the thesis does not exceed the word length for this degree.
- IV. no part of this work has been used for the award of another degree.
- V. this thesis meets the *University of Sydney's Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) requirements for the conduct of research.*

Signature:

Name: Alison Louise Grove O'Grady

Date: August 2015

Dedication

Lovingly dedicated to my parents,

Suzanne and Michael Grove

And in memory my brother

Patrick Mark Hunter Grove

(1967 – 1996)

Acknowledgements

This work was only possible because of the generosity of a number of people. To the early career teachers who gave their time and insights, you have been a well- spring of inspiration and I thank you. I will watch your journey in education with great interest. To my friends and colleagues in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Sydney, your encouragement and scholarship gave my thesis meaning. Thanks especially to Janet Dutton who introduced me to the work that has become so important in my life and to Associate Professor Jackie Manuel, a leader in the field who always had faith in me and generously guided me to the end. To Professor Michael Anderson who advised me often with humour and always with integrity, to Professor Robyn Ewing who offered critical friendship, to Kate Smyth for company, conversation and friendship and to Dr Jen Scott Curwood who championed and encouraged me all the way I am thankful to you all.

To my supervisor Dr Kelly Freebody a rare intellect, generous colleague and friend, you have given me a gift and I celebrate you for every conversation, quiet encouragement and direction. Thank you for everything, literally.

Special thanks to my mother and father who continue to inspire me and who encouraged my imagination and love of learning. Thanks to my sister Charmian for her worldly insight and for kindness and courage in equal measure.

Finally, to my husband Patrick, always in my corner and always in my heart, I am grateful to you and for you, and to my three heart strings and loves of my life, Gabriella Juliet, Annaliese Grace and Xavier Patrick, this is for you.

Abstract

This thesis is a study concerned with the way early career drama teachers utilise, adapt, challenge, absorb and assimilate the big Discourses of drama in the process of developing their identities as new drama teachers. A key focus of the study is to capture the ways in which five early career drama teachers, based in a large Australian city use language to talk about the work they do as teachers and the effect of their ideological predispositions on the way they recruit and teach drama pedagogy, in order to improve the life chances of the students they teach.

The study examines the ways that the early career teachers conceptualised their role as drama teachers and to what extent the discourse of social justice shaped, influenced and informed their professional identity as teachers. As the early career teachers wend their way through the classroom and their new practices, they find their ideological alignments are tested and challenged by the work they do and the schools and systems that they teach in. This study endeavours to understand and provide insight into the complexities faced by the early career at this critical juncture of their careers as drama teachers.

For its framework and analysis, this study owes a theoretical debt to the work of James Paul Gee (1998) and his research into the affect of Discourses in shaping and constructing identity and affinity groups. He argues that Discourses are large conversations that enable human beings to recognise and distinguish themselves from other people and groups. The analytic field of Discourse Analysis provides the methodological setting for this thesis, particularly the way themes and ideas are revealed in the teachers' talk and writing. The early career drama teachers provided their teaching philosophies at the beginning of the data collection process and were then interviewed twice during their first year of teaching. During their final interview they were asked to revisit their teaching philosophies and to reflect on their experiences during that year.

Discourse Analysis is a broad field that encompasses a variety of approaches and advocates the use of various tools for applying the method. The approach of this study has been to analyse language and patterns of language with consideration and account taken of the social and cultural contexts in which the language is used. This has allowed for a close understanding of the distinctive ways the early career drama teachers have assigned value to various practices and to theories and beliefs about their teaching.

The study reveals that the early career drama teachers conceptualised their role as teachers, with deference to the part that social justice played in shaping their identity and how this was influential in the way they taught their students about 'knowing the world' (Harris, 2014). The study also found the early career teachers' personal proclivities and subjectivities ideologically aligned with some of the big Discourses that are privileged by the drama community generally. These included: the affordances of drama and the unique capacity the early career teachers believed resided within the subject to teach students about the world around them; the synergy between drama and social justice, and the way it can lead students to an engagement with other people and how this can then precipitate an improvement in the lives of their students and an awareness of privilege; that the discourse of democracy and fairness is central to teaching students about being a global citizen, and that teaching in student centred ways can activate new possibilities (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) for the ways students think about the world and the future.

Thus the study aims to provide insight into and understanding of how the early career drama teachers conceptualise the work they do, and how they believe that drama pedagogy when taught and transacted in particular and specific ways, allows their students to know the world and to reveal their humanity. In doing so, this study aims to provide a continuation of inquiry and opportunity into exploring more fully, the

ways early career drama teachers and teachers of other disciplines engage with notions and practices within the social justice corpus. Further, there is also opportunity for educators and researchers in the field to acknowledge and investigate the place and purpose of thematic Discourse Analysis in terms of researching and understanding social phenomena more generally.

Key Terms

Affordances	A quality of an object or space that allows an individual to perform an action (Anderson and Cameron, 2013, p.228). Originally a term used in psychology.
Discourses	A term encapsulating the various forms of convention, code and representations of language specific to a particular social, cultural, or historical setting. This thesis borrows from Gee's (1999) definition of Discourses (capital D) that argues Discourses are language used in conjunction with, but not limited to different ways of thinking, acting, valuing and interacting in order to make sense of different worlds, situations and social groups.
Futures Discourses	A way of thought which highlights the shift from short to long term thinking, with a focus on emerging innovations. This thesis refers to futures Discourses as those that promote pedagogies and ways of thinking about the future propelled by imagination and creativity (Sardar, 2010).
Neoliberalism	A political theory that holds a free market capitalist philosophy. This concept is argued in the thesis as an ideological system that refers to tensions between the intellectual, the political and the bureaucratic. Smyth (2011) uses the term neoliberalism as a counterpoint

or impediment to critical pedagogy in the Australian context.

Post-normality

A state of uncertainty, representative of the perceived chaotic and increasingly fluctuating conditions of the modern world. Post-normality describes the complexity, chaos and confusion about the future of education and society as argued by Anderson (2014) when discussing the capacity for drama in education to mediate this tension.

Social justice

An educational approach that aims to engender agency and social responsibility from all students to ensure full and equal participation in all groups of society. Social justice in this context also refers to the development of an approach (Bell, 2007) whereby students and their teachers have a sense of how this acquisition of agency develops their social responsibility more broadly, as citizens of the world.

Teaching philosophy

A personal rationale, typically in the form of a written or verbal statement, which explores an individual's beliefs and approaches towards teaching. Beatty, Leigh and Dean (2009) argue that these statements provide an opportunity for teachers to clarify what their purpose is in the classroom and are used as a tool for reflection and contemplation. There is also an opportunity that resides in writing these

statements for a conscious reassessment of strengths and weaknesses (Grasha, 1996).

Contents

Author Declaration.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Key Terms.....	viii
Chapter 1: The Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	19
Part 1.....	19
Part 3.....	37
Chapter 3: Methods.....	59
Chapter 4: Teaching Philosophies	81
Chapter 5: Building the World Through The Affordances of Drama .	92
Chapter 6: Building A More Socially Just World Through Drama	119
Chapter 7: Building The World By Teaching The World.....	160
Chapter 8: Building the World Through Students.....	202
Chapter 9: Conclusions.....	237
References	252
Appendices	269
Appendix A: Approval Letter – Human Research Ethics Committee	269
Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet	271
Appendix C: Participant Consent Form	273
Appendix E: Participant Recruitment Email	275
Appendix F: Participant Interview Questions.....	276
Appendix G: Sample Participant Interview Script – Georgia	277

Chapter 1: The Introduction

*'You'll get mixed up, of course,
as you already know.
You'll get mixed up with many strange birds as you go.
So be sure when you step.
Step with great care and great tact.
And remember that Life's
A great Balancing Act.
Just never forget to be dexterous and deft.
And never mix up your right foot with your left'
(Oh, The Places You'll Go!, Dr. Seuss, 1990)*

Overview

This excerpt from the iconic tale by Dr Seuss serves as a metaphor to illustrate the journey that the teacher takes from the beginning as a pre service teacher through to stepping into the teaching world as an early career teacher. As the early career teachers in this study wend their way through the classrooms of their new practices and as their ideological alignments are tested, challenged and assimilated in the work they do, they develop their teaching philosophies in order to make sense of the work they are doing, the pedagogy they are recruiting, and the values they are transacting and imbuing. How the teachers' identities are developed and manifested through attendance to various Discourses, particularly in drama, is the essence of this study.

This thesis has emerged from my experiences as both a teacher of English and Drama, but more recently from my experiences teaching in the combined secondary degree in education at the University of Sydney. My experiences as a classroom teacher in low socio economic areas of western Sydney ignited a passion and firm belief in the affordances of

drama to improve the life chances of those I taught and for other students of drama.

The impetus

I am always conscious of the rare privilege I am given teaching undergraduate students at the University. The research idea for this study was borne of my great interest in how pre service teachers talked about their students and their experiences teaching drama on practicum and their perception of the unique capacity they felt, resided in the Discourses within drama to attend to the work of social justice practices. The participant teachers in this study spoke about the classrooms they worked in on practicum where they honed their craft with great commitment and insight, often using a language and lexicon that aligned them to particular Discourses in drama, but also identified them as particular 'cultural models' of drama teachers teaching drama in particular ways.

Why the Discourses in drama matter is a central concern of this study. How the early career teachers talked about and assimilated, challenged and absorbed these Discourses constitutes part of the contextual frame for developing teacher identity and the conceptualisation of the subject that is drama, by the teachers.

This study was theoretically influenced by the work of Gee (1999) and his research into the centrality of Discourses in shaping and constructing identity and affinity groups. Discourses are essentially large conversations that enable us to recognise who we are in the world and to recognise and distinguish ourselves from others. In the case of the teachers in this study, it is how these five teachers construct themselves as drama teachers, as distinct from teachers of other subjects that was of interest. Discourses facilitate this recognition and it occurs when as human beings we align ourselves as members of groups and of associations.

As the five early career teachers in this study attest, they are all part of a diverse and yet heterogeneous group that recognise and identify themselves as drama teachers. As Gee averred in his work, 'language has magical properties' (1999, p.11). Part of the magical work of language is how those properties assist the teachers in constructing their identities as members of the group or society that can be described and identified as being drama teachers. Gee (1999) describes the work of Discourses and language as, 'building the world' (p.19.) and this understanding is iterated through the chapter headings to emphasise the way language and other attributions shape and influence the early career teachers' new practices.

Aim and Purpose

This thesis is concerned with how early career drama teachers utilise, adapt, challenge, absorb and assimilate the big Discourses of drama to develop their identity as drama teachers. A key focus of this study is to capture the way the drama teachers use language to talk about the work they do and their ideological predisposition for teaching this pedagogy, in order to improve the life chances of the students they teach. This research is informed by the intersection of three key fields of inquiry in the study: the current research and theory that explores teacher identity and specifically, drama teacher identity; the theory and research that informs current Discourses in drama regarding social justice principles; and the analytic lens of Discourse Analysis, specifically five theoretical tools of analysis as posited by Gee (1999).

This research is interested in the ways that early career drama teachers conceptualise their role as drama teachers and to what extent the Discourses of social justice shape and inform their professional identity. How the teachers' concept of 'self as teacher' (Danielewicz, 2001) is mediated and represented through language is also analysed for the implications this has for the way the teachers understand and conceptualise their identity and purpose as drama teachers. The study examines how early career drama teachers in their first year of teaching

discuss and write about their beliefs and views and how these personal proclivities and ideological alignment to the Discourses in the pedagogy, shapes their identity.

These themes are reflective of the central question in the thesis: to investigate how using language and ‘other things’ (Gee, 2011) the early career teachers conceptualise their identities in relation to their intentions with the critical pedagogy (O’Toole, 1992) that resides within drama pedagogy, and is reflected through social justice practices and the Discourses that emanate from this understanding.

Finally, the analytic field of Discourse Analysis provides the methodological setting for this thesis. Discourse analysis is a broad field encompassing a broad scope of methodological approaches and various tools for applying the method. This research is informed by the belief that language is inherently political, social and contextually influenced. Therefore, the methodological approach of this research analyses language and patterns of language with consideration to the social and cultural contexts in which the language is used. In doing so, the distinctive ways the participants place value and assign attributions to various practices, theories and beliefs about teaching may be realised. Understanding this then shapes and informs their expression of themselves as particular cultural models of drama teachers.

These three intersecting areas and fields of inquiry offer a unique perspective on the relationship between language, social justice theories and practices, drama education and teacher identity. The way teachers use language to talk about teaching drama allows insight into their proclivities to teach about particular things, in particular ways, and for particular purposes. Recent neoliberal agendas in Australian education policy have placed an increasing focus on the quality of teachers and the quality of teacher education programs, evident within governmental reports such as, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Council, 2014). While definitions of ‘quality’ are perilous and

debatable, if teachers are posited as central change makers in their classrooms, and in our society more broadly, then understanding the relationship between their identity construction and classroom practice allows insight into an increasingly complex role.

Research Question

The overall question that this thesis aims to answer is:

- How do five early career drama teachers, based in a large Australian city, adapt, challenge, utilise and assimilate the big Discourses of drama and how does engagement with these Discourses shape their identity as drama teachers?

More specifically;

- How do the participants make sense of their identity in relation to drama education Discourses, with particular attendance to how they talk and write about social justice practices and the ideological alignment of this Discourse to the work of drama?
- How do the participants in this study view the subject of drama in schools and its attributions and affordances, to teach their students about the world?
- How do the participants view their relationships with students and their role as a drama teacher as expressed in their teaching philosophies and interviews?

In answering these questions, the aim of the study is to understand how these five drama teachers conceptualise the work they do and how they talk about their identities over the course of a year. The study also addresses the way the teachers discuss and write about the pedagogy and how they believe their engagement with it engenders their students with a capacity to know the world and to revel in and reveal their humanity. These questions then form the basis for the analysis and findings chapters. The teachers in this study align the work they do and use language to

describe the work as ideological. Through the analytic lens of Discourse Analysis, combined with the architecture of contemporary research and practice Discourses in drama, the emergent Discourses of futures' orientation and the Discourse of democratization, among others, are revealed and probed.

Identifying the Dominant Discourses in Drama

The early career teachers in this study come to the work of drama teaching with previous experiences of, and exposure to, the dominant Discourses of education and drama through their undergraduate degree and coursework. These Discourses have been derived from a number of sites and experiences, including government policy. The policies include documents such as, *The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* (Craven et. al, 2008). This report informs and shapes other Discourses in education generally, the tenets of social justice, and the importance of improving educational outcomes for all students. This policy document is not specific to drama and the rhetoric shapes and informs the Discourse of other seminal education policy documents. Drama Australia's, *Equity And Diversity Guidelines* (2005) argue explicitly how these guidelines should shape the practices of drama to ensure equity is practiced in drama classrooms and that students should have opportunities through their exposure to drama pedagogy to ways of knowing about the world, including social justice practices and principles.

Additional discussion papers and models such as the, *Quality Teaching Framework* (2003) provide a reference point to focus attention on, and also frame, rhetoric about pedagogy for teachers and members of the community. Further still, blueprint documents and discussion papers such as those drafted by the New South Wales (NSW) Board of Studies, Teaching and Educational Standards (BOSTES) *Great Teaching, Inspired Learning – a Blueprint for Action* (2013), also contribute to the general rhetoric in education. At a deeper level, they inform and shape early career teachers' perceptions of what skills they might attain and how they can

achieve their goals for excellence in their classrooms. This thesis also discusses how the early career teachers are apprenticed into these Discourses through teaching in the classroom, where they believe a divergence from the Discourse may be necessary sometimes because it contraindicates their personal predilection and ideological beliefs about their role as teachers in recruiting pedagogy.

During their undergraduate coursework in Drama curriculum units of study at university, the early career teachers also engaged with the Drama syllabuses, both years 7-10 and Stage 6, preliminary and HSC. This understanding of the tenets and rationales articulated in all these documents is reflected in the ways these early career drama teachers manifest these Discourses in their language when they talk about their practices. The extent that the teachers enact, embrace, challenge and subvert the Discourses inscribed in not just the syllabuses but manifested in the daily business of the school also shapes their identity and the way they talk about the way they teach.

The major Discourses that this thesis identifies and analyses have been derived from the aforementioned policies, syllabuses, and the language and talk of the teachers and their ideological predispositions as they articulated them in their teaching philosophies. Therefore, the following Discourses have been identified as coming from a range of sources including syllabuses and discussion papers and they provide the themes of the findings chapters:

- The affordances of drama as a subject and the way the teachers view the subject as having unique capacity and attributions to teach students about the world around them.
- The synergy between drama and social justice leads to students understanding and engaging with other people and how this fundamental understanding can mean improvement in the lives of the students.
- How the practice of student centred teaching in drama activates

new possibilities for students and the way they are able to navigate and understand the world.

- The Discourse of democracy and global citizenship. That is how the drama syllabus expressly articulates that studying drama should precipitate an understanding of the importance and privilege of being a global citizen and how the teachers in the study concur with and corroborate this understanding.
- The emergence of new Discourses. That is, how through their talk and engagement with their students, the early career teachers in this study articulate and form new ways of knowing the world that is theirs in drama teaching.

The Participants: A Snap Shot

All names in this study are pseudonyms to respect the privacy of the participants.

Nick

Nick is currently teaching in a low fee paying Anglican school in western Sydney. He believes he was employed at the school because he spoke at length in his job interview about his commitment to drama pedagogy and particularly, critical pedagogy, to improve literacy in the school. As a committed Christian, Nick says his views, regarding teaching and his relationship with his students is shaped by a firm resolve that teachers should be, 'moral agents'. He also believes that teachers need to divest themselves of ego in order to affect change in the classroom. He believes that an ideological alignment to service makes him vulnerable and yet open to the students and therefore this makes him a better teacher. Nick had also done some teaching in Vietnam as part of an outreach program. His experiences in Vietnam and the use of drama pedagogy to enhance literacy, he says, strengthened his resolve in the capacity for drama to improve literacy and therefore the life chances of his students.

Georgia

Georgia was initially teaching at a comprehensive high school in south-western Sydney on a one year contract to teach History and English. Despite not being History trained, she took the position and within a semester teaching at the school had established a lunchtime drama club for the students and also as an outlet for herself. Georgia applied for a promotion position that requested a home- room teacher who could teach with an emphasis on social justice practices. She is committed, in her words, to students developing agency through self-devised and directed learning. She was involved as the primary organiser of a whole school program to, 'Wear it Purple', a campaign that seeks to recognise the LGBTQTI community and to bring awareness to students of the effect of discriminatory language and prejudice generally. At the end of her first year of teaching, Georgia had made a huge impression on the school and the Principal. She is currently applying to work as a teacher on Manus Island with asylum seekers. She describes herself as still seeking her place in the world.

Jane

During this study Jane was awaiting notification of permanent placement to a comprehensive high school in Sydney's northwest. As a recipient of a NSW Department of Education and Communities (DEC) scholarship, she was assured of a permanent placement teaching in a school. However, because of Jane's visual impairment the Department and the school wanted further assurances and legal confirmation that her disability would not add an additional liability on the school and that Jane would be able to successfully complete the work of a teacher in that school. As a result of these inquiries and transience, her first year was quite unstable and she believed this instability had an effect on her ability to develop a robust practice as a drama teacher in the school. She was told towards the end of this study that she was to be made permanent at that school. Her language and her conviction about her teaching transformed to reflect her confidence and relief to be made a permanent teacher. Jane's

passion and driving concern is in her own words, 'access' for all students and this, she says, is because she has felt the effects personally of being denied access to mainstream learning, because of her visual impairment.

David

David is currently teaching in a permanent position at a comprehensive girls' high school on Sydney's north shore. He writes in his teaching philosophy about his commitment to teaching using student-centred pedagogies. David says he is a 'social constructivist' in terms of teaching theory and he has a particular affinity with teaching Invasion theory and Aboriginal history. David says that teaching drama allows him a different opportunity to talk about and test boundaries with his students that may not be afforded in other subject areas. He describes himself as very ideological and by his own admission he misses University and the proliferation of ideas that flow and are discussed in tutorials. He feels conflicted by his commitment to student centred learning practices and what he believes is the reality of teaching in the classroom and the need to often recruit teacher centred strategies.

Elena

Elena undertook a practicum experience teaching in a rural school and it is this experience that she felt shaped significantly her views regarding the efficacy of the teacher-student relationship and how important the community is in shaping students' views and perceptions about the world. Elena laments throughout her interviews how difficult she feels it is to cater for, or affect every student who comes through her classroom. She believes in the value of site-specific theatre as an opportunity for all students to step outside of the classroom and negotiate a different world. Elena identifies as a teacher/artist and she is currently auditioning for the National Institute of Dramatic Art (NIDA) in Sydney and is hopeful of pursuing an acting career. At the time of submission she was pursuing her acting career and casually teaching.

Significance of the project

There has long been a symbiotic relationship between drama education and social justice (Freebody & Finneran, 2013). Recently, however, the field has been calling for a greater interrogation of this relationship. This research contributes to theoretical development by providing a consolidation of Discourses that manifest in the relationship between social justice theory and specific discussions of teacher practice. The research also provides an emerging understanding of purpose – why and how teachers orient to social justice in their classrooms, what they believe can be achieved through the pedagogy and practice, and why they think it is important.

The methodological significance of this research is two-fold. Teachers talk about their work in complex ways and yet, interaction analyses, aimed at unpacking language use for specific purposes, is an under-utilised research methodology in the area of arts education generally (Eisner, 2004). It is anticipated that this study could inform researchers by providing an example of the use of thematic Discourse Analysis for understanding the relationship between teacher language, social justice and drama education. Secondly, this research can provide new methodological perspectives on current research trends. This research aligns with a range of current research concerns in drama and education that include: social justice; futures Discourses; and post-normality. Using new methodological approaches to explore these trends allows fresh perspective and insight into the field.

The early career drama teachers in this study explicitly discuss the ways in which their pedagogy in the classroom provides opportunity for their students to learn skills and competencies to navigate the world in socially just ways. This provides pre service teachers and teacher educators with an understanding of the ways practice and theory are

recruited and coalesced in graduate teacher discussion and Discourse. The professional implications of this research allow an awareness of how teacher education is viewed as useful or otherwise by early career teachers and demonstrates the benefits of allowing opportunities for pre service teachers to unpack their ideological proclivities and explore examples of how such proclivities manifest in teacher practice, whilst undertaking their studies as teachers.

There is a particular role for the place of ideology and ideological predisposition. In today's particular policy landscape where the commodification of 'quality' within a neoliberal global education reform movement dominates conversations (Smyth, 2011), understanding the perspectives of teachers, the work they do, the Discourses they align with, notions of quality, and the perceived importance and purpose of social justice is essential for the development and discussion of emerging Discourses that extend from this proposition. These include ways to prepare students for the future, the place and role of drama as appropriate curriculum for this purpose, and the development and extension of teachers' perceptions and dispositions to teach critical pedagogy in drama and other disciplines.

Contextualization

This study was conducted in the state of NSW in Australia and all five participants were at different times in the study teaching the NSW syllabuses. It is within this context that they negotiated their new and emerging practices. However, one of the participants – Nick, had an experience teaching in an international context and as the findings chapters discuss, this experience had the effect of affirming his commitment to particular pedagogical theories and ideological alignments. The teachers were informed by NSW Department of Education and Communities policies and procedures in terms of their practices, and policy discourses, including Nick, who taught in a low fee paying Anglican school in western Sydney. All five participants in the study were graduates

from the combined secondary degree program in Education at the University of Sydney. My research was motivated by an interest in understanding the views of the participants on the research questions, however my attitudes and previous knowledge about them as former students influenced and motivated this study.

Because the early career teachers had been students in the combined secondary degree program they were familiar with the form and function of teaching philosophies. These philosophies are used in the education program as an opportunity for students to articulate their hopes and dreams and to write their own narrative. As a researcher/practitioner I take an interpretive stance (Walsham, 1995) that acknowledges reality and the creation of knowledge as a social construction. My position and attitude to my research derives from my commitment to developing my own practice as a teacher but also through what Freire (2000) described as 'praxis' that is an educational practice that conjugates theory and practice in order to create new theories and ways of knowing the world. I believe inherently in the capacity for teacher/practitioners such as myself to contribute to the field through an articulation of observations and research that formalises some of these observations and findings.

In the case of the courses in Craft Knowledge and Professional Practices, the students are asked to write a teaching philosophy at the beginning of their course in first year and this is revisited in their final year of the degree. The participants in this study were not given parameters or specific guidelines to write their philosophies, as they were familiar with the format of teaching philosophies. Participants in this study were previously my students in their undergraduate degree and were sometimes taught by me in curriculum and pedagogy courses. They were not however students of the University during the study and their teaching philosophies were written specifically for the purpose of this study not as part of coursework in their undergraduate degrees.

Preview of the thesis

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Following on from the introduction, the thesis begins with a literature review that is written in a two-part structure, to reflect the intersecting areas of inquiry in the study. These areas of inquiry encompass and also reflect the major themes that the analysis chapters argue.

Part 1 /Part 2

This section discusses the sociological setting for the study and scrutinizes the literature about the affordances of the subject drama and specifically the implications and influence this recognition of affordances has for teaching drama curriculum. This section also discusses relevant literature pertaining to identity and critical pedagogy and how it shapes and influences teachers and their practices. The chapter also examines the complex capacity that some of the literature has identified as being integral to teaching drama with the intent to teach about the world and how to interact in that world as socially just citizens.

Part 3

The review then focuses on an additional sociological setting – the place of social justice in education, specifically in drama education. The nuanced meaning of this particular pedagogy is interrogated with respect to the theory of social justice education. The three main themes are discussed as: the theoretical foundations for social justice education; social justice pedagogy in action and practice (democratic education, critical pedagogy, multicultural and race education), and social justice and drama pedagogy. The chapter concludes with a discussion of why it is critical in the current educational climate both globally and locally, to focus on the capacity that resides within drama to enhance understanding of the ways social justice practices are manifested in the early career teachers' practices.

Overall, the literature review explores and establishes the framework and empirical foundations for this study and acquaints the reader with the range of debates and Discourses that are currently contended in the educational sphere with regard to early career teachers and their professional identities; emergent Discourses in drama education and teaching; social justice education and its influence in shaping pedagogy and practice in early career teachers' work.

Chapter 3: Methods

The methods section of this thesis is contained within one chapter and outlines the methodological choices taken in this study to explore and seek answers to the research questions. The chapter situates the research questions and acquaints the reader with the participants, the context within which the study takes place, and the philosophical underpinnings and rationale for the use of Discourse Analysis in the study. Within the chapter, consideration is also given to the role of ideology in discourse and how this dimension of the teachers' work can be explored and discussed in the ways the teachers ground their beliefs. The theoretical framework for the study is discussed in order to situate the reader within the Discourses as they become apparent in the results and analysis of the thesis proper. The place of new and emergent Discourses and how these were examined through the lens of new and contemporary practice are also scrutinized.

The methods section of the thesis owes an interpretative debt to the research and work of Gee (1992) and his seminal work in language in social, cultural and political contexts. The analysis chapters of this thesis are informed by his theory that all language serves the purpose of constructing or, 'building things in the world' (2011, p.84) through language. The methods section outlines for the reader the decision to inform and shape the chapters using Gee's idea that language builds the world for us as human beings. The theoretical framework adopted for the study sought to find a balance between analysing the text and talk that the early career teachers conducted in different situations and enabling a

unique methodological framework that allowed a close interrogation of how the participants used language to talk about their work and their engagement with the big Discourses of drama.

Chapter 4: The Teaching Philosophies

This chapter is a collection of the early career teachers' teaching philosophies that have been collected and analysed as data for the purposes of this study. Allowing the reader to situate themselves in the narratives of the teachers gives a depth and texture to their talk and the way they articulate their aspirations, values and beliefs as early career teachers. This thesis does not use arts-based research practices however it acknowledges the importance of narrative methods (Leavy, 2009) as an attempt to access, in a collaborative way, the early career teachers' life experiences in order to understand their values and beliefs about the work they do. This use of an expressive and creative narrative allows the reader a perception or insight into the story of the early career teachers and affords an empathic understanding of them as the participants in the study.

Chapter 5: Building The World Through The Affordances of Drama

This is the first of the analysis chapters and it is concerned with how the early career teachers in this study talk about, write about, discuss and make sense of their new world, that is the school and the classroom particularly as drama teachers. These early career teachers discuss their perceptions and views regarding what they argue are the affordances of drama. The teachers argue that drama has particular attributions that are different to those found in other subjects and that it through the enactment of the subject that is drama that their students can mediate and understand their experiences in the world in particular ways. Being a drama teacher, according to the teachers, is part of an identity or cultural model that has particular attributions. The early career teachers talk about their views and beliefs that drama shapes the students and their capacity to understand human interactions in the world.

Chapter 6: Building A More Socially Just World Through Drama

This chapter seeks to analyse the particular ways that the early career teachers in this study orient to and assimilate social justice pedagogy and practice and how through this corroboration of ideology, beliefs and values, they teach in particular and nuanced ways to imbue this pedagogy in their work. This chapter also explores ways that the teachers constructed their cultural model or ways of being a drama teacher that incorporates a dimension of activism and social concerns. The chapter also attends to the understanding of what is social justice in education and unpacks for the reader the ways of understanding social justice as the early career teachers talk about it.

This chapter also discusses how the early career teachers recruit theories derived from drama teachers and practitioners to extend the work they do in the classroom to incorporate social justice pedagogy. Reference and attendance to how social justice pedagogy and practice sometimes means railing against or defying dominant Discourse, when the early career teachers believe that a different and more inclusive pedagogy or practice is of greater benefit to the students.

Chapter 7: Building The World By Teaching The World

This chapter analyses the significance of how language and discourse is used by the early career teachers in order to construct ways of being drama teachers. The chapter also probes the effect of ideology in Discourses as the teachers discuss and reveal how they believe their teaching can affect the opportunities they see for their students to become citizens of the world. Through a democratic classroom structure and through the enactment and transaction of critical pedagogy, the early career teachers' talk about the work the pedagogy must do in order to prepare students to be democratic and future citizens. An iteration of the early career teachers' discussion is the role they believe they have in the

classroom in developing the students in particular ways for a life well lived, outside of the school.

Chapter 8: Building The World With Students At The Centre

This chapter examines the way that the early career teachers talk about their students and their relationships with them. The teachers use a particular lexicon that they recruit for the purpose of discussing this relationship and the influence of theory on their new practices and the reality of the classroom. This chapter also discusses how the teachers conceptualise their ideology and practices in relation to the major Discourses of education, and how the teachers as a result of this alignment with student centred pedagogy, want their roles and identities to be perceived.

Chapter 9: Conclusions

This chapter is the capstone of the thesis that summarises the major findings and the discussions that emanate from the analysis. This chapter also answers the question initially posed in the introductory chapter of the thesis. In summation, the chapter also discusses the implications for ongoing research in this area, and for the Discourses and discussion that have emerged from this examination. The chapter also identifies the limitations of the study and discusses where the futures Discourses may be located in the community of drama. The opportunities that may result from what is learned through this study is also discussed with reference to the development of and provision for new lines of potential inquiry.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Part 1

This thesis focuses on an examination of early career drama teachers and their engagement with the 'Big Discourses' of drama; specifically how they attended to and assimilated these Discourses into their teaching. This project sits at the intersection of three key areas of theory and research: Theoretical and practical fields of Drama education and teacher identity and the methodological field of Discourse Analysis. This literature review is concerned with the first two areas canvassing research and theory related to the key questions and findings of this research. To achieve this it is segmented into three sections:

1. Teacher identity and development, with a key focus on, but not limited to, work concerning drama teachers
2. Drama education Discourses, informed by theory and research in drama education
3. Social justice practices, and the relationship between drama and democracy in the literature.

This chapter and therefore the third section concludes with a discussion of why it is important, in Australia's current educational climate, to maintain a focus on the significance of drama in contemporary curriculum, and to seek to develop an understanding of the ways in which social justice practices are assimilated into the practices of early career teachers.

Part 1: Teacher identity and development

Research and theory discussing the effect of drama pedagogy, and it's potential to offer students unique ways to know and learn will be the focus of Part 2 of this review. Prior to this discussion, there is recognition that the work and the pedagogy can only be achieved through enactment and this role lies principally with the teachers who will transact the pedagogy into their classrooms.

The role of identity in the development of teachers is the subject of a raft of literature (Britzman, 1991; Danielewicz, 2001; Alsup, 2006) including how to understand the composition of the professional identity of a teacher (Sutherland, Howard & Markauskaite, 2009). Understanding the influences that shape and develop identities, particularly those of drama teachers, allows insight into the way identity effects teaching and the transaction of pedagogy in the classroom (Danielewicz, 2001, p.9). Understanding how teachers engage with their work and the increasingly complex nature of teaching also informs the field regarding ways that drama teachers might develop or extend a teaching persona that reflects and resonates with the core values espoused by the drama community (Drama Australia, 2015).

Teachers' identities are strongly influenced by factors including experiences of being taught (Manuel & Hughes, 2005). Some come to the profession to avenge the poor teaching they experienced or because of a desire to replicate positive experiences and in fulfilment of a personal and social consciousness (p.11). Teachers can express their identities in a range of ways, one such way, being the focus of this research, is through narratives and teaching philosophies. Dixon et al. (2004) noted that teacher Discourse reflects a form of thinking and uses language that is largely derived from beliefs, attitudes, values and theories that constitute a story of teaching (p.15).

A more formal practice of articulating values, beliefs and ideologies is through a teaching philosophy document, as a means to communicate and narrate the altruism and idealism that brought the teacher to the classroom initially (Alsup, 2006, p.21). Palmer (1998) writes about the role of a teacher and how their identity is intrinsically linked to their integrity. He describes the connectedness to the work as a, 'call to teach' (p.19). Similarly Alsup asserts that teaching 'as a calling' (p.20) has both positive and negative implications for both the larger profession but more particularly for the novice who may struggle to remain in the profession.

Understanding how a call to teach might influence the way pedagogy is recruited and taught in a drama classroom, for example, is effected by the identity of the teacher transacting the pedagogy. This can be in some ways interrogated or further understood through a teaching philosophy. Researchers Beatty, Leigh and Dean (2009), pre-empted the importance of using teaching philosophies in pre service teacher education coursework as a tool for guided imagery. Their study sought clarification about the effectiveness of teaching philosophies as an opportunity for developmental reflection (p.115). Goodman (1998) identified through case study research the potential of teaching philosophies as a means by which teacher educators could gain insights into the way their pre service teacher students thought about not only their students, but what they believed and valued as pedagogy. The opportunity that resides in the teaching philosophy to both collate and communicate perspectives and values is seen as a useful tool for understanding the assumptions that teachers hold about their students, what they do in the classroom and their style of teaching (Fitzgibbons, 2005). A teaching philosophy can also provide both the teacher and the reader with an opportunity to articulate their ideological alignments and proclivities or to acquiesce or challenge a school's ideology (Goodman, 1998, p.125)

The antecedence for a formal or narrative teaching philosophy can be attributed to Dewey (1916) and the manifesto or creed he wrote arguing his position of the place of education within a democratic context. His capturing of ideological proclivity, intrinsic in the work serves as a precedent document for the shorter teaching philosophies like those that Beatty, Dean and Leigh (2009) analysed when researching the effect of engagement with teaching philosophies for reflective and developmental reflection. These authors pursued an understanding of what constitutes authenticity in teaching when examining values and beliefs provided in documented form. They found that the teaching philosophies provided a sociological perspective as both an analytic tool that allows a close

examination of how values, beliefs and ideals are expressed and how these might align with Discourses in the education community and expectations of their work in classrooms. In drama education, this might include alignment with the philosophical stance of critical pedagogy – which has been historically connected to work in drama education through the seminal educator Augusto Boal (2000) and (Grady 2003). Despite much writing in the field of drama education about the ideological positions of practitioners (Grady, 2003; Snyder-Young, 2013; O'Connor, 2016), the connection between what a teaching philosophy reveals about ideological positions of drama teachers is currently under researched.

Understanding how and why teachers orient to theories that reflect their ideological proclivities is also a dimension of reflective practice and a process that allows both teachers, community members and teacher educators to be mindful of approaches to work in the classroom (Brookfield, 1995). Understanding the 'multiplicities' of identities that present themselves in teaching philosophies provides necessary context and perspective within the larger educational community. Understanding the kinds of people (Gee, 2000) that drama teachers are, and the social languages that communicate their ideas and beliefs, enables a further understanding of the power and elements that influence the work of teaching drama.

Critical pedagogues argue that neoliberal political and social forces have an impact on education systems and practices (Apple, 2006; Giroux, 2015). However research by McLauchlan (2009) has found that, even in these contexts, drama teachers see a central part of their work as resisting hegemony. Additionally student perspectives of drama teachers in the study aligned with this view, claiming drama was an environment that was an 'emotional oasis' that encouraged opinions (2009, p. 40).

Cochrane-Smith and Villegas (2015) are also concerned with the impact of neo liberalism on the identity of schools and the impact of this climate on teachers' lives, work and practices. Their research into teacher

preparation in a neo liberalist environment has found unique challenges for teachers who considered themselves to be critical pedagogues (Kincheloe, 2008; Apple, 2005), including normalisation of curriculum, increasing diversity of student population, and a focus on narrow achievement measures.

A key study exploring the identity of drama teachers, Wales' (2009) work analysed how the subjectivities of female drama teachers influence and explicate the work of drama teachers. Her research acknowledged the complex parts that constitute being a drama teacher. The many sub-identities (Sutherland et al., 2010) that influence the classification 'drama teacher' include, according to Wales, roles such as being wives, mothers, daughters, partners and carers, these sub-identities were found to influence the way teachers viewed their roles and positions as drama teachers. Understanding how subjectivities might affect the role that teachers enact when in a drama classroom and how teachers understand their work influences the way students are exposed to ideas about the future, the world and the 'post normal' (Anderson, 2014).

The early career drama teachers in Wales' (2009) study strove to achieve best practice in both pedagogy and classroom dynamics because they believed so strongly in the potential of the pedagogy to not only educate their students, but to necessarily inhibit and also free them. Wales also points to the obvious connection between teaching students about subjectivities in drama and the affect of personal subjectivities and ideological predilections to the way these teachers approach their work in classrooms. These, she finds, are synergistic and inseparable from the work. The teachers in her study all attest that their work is motivated by altruistic intentions. They say that they strive to do their best work and to be good at doing that work in the classroom.

Drama teachers, therefore, have multiple identities that reflect the multiple ways they recruit pedagogy, potentially including as activist

pedagogy and ideas in the classroom (O'Connor, 2014; Wales 2009). This gives rise to the hypothesis that drama teachers are particular agents of change. O'Connor's (2014, p.115) identification of drama teaching as part of a broader social movement that engages and commits to democratic citizenship extends this argument. The paradigm of activism that argues schools should be places for ideas and for reinvention is propounded by hooks (1994) and her philosophy that conceptualises the classroom as a radical space where possibilities can be provoked and learning is dialogic (hooks, 1994, p.11). To commit to this work, she argues that the teachers' personal proclivities and values must align with this belief in education as a 'practice of freedom' (hooks, 1993 p.13). This corroborates the views held by the drama community discussed above and goes to furthering insights into how students develop ways of knowing the world and becoming socially just and active citizens within that world of their making.

Understanding why teachers view their work as ideological and why drama teachers see their subject as having synergy with activist propensities is again the subject of much writing in the field for example (Gattenhoff, 2009), but aside from the notable exception of Wales' (2009) work, has not been explored empirically in the field of drama education. Understanding how English teachers' personal subjectivities influence their desire to enter the profession was examined by Manuel and Hughes (2005) who found that teachers' ideological and vocational suppositions were profound influences on their view of the work and also how the teachers regarded their capacity to stay in the profession, despite compromises to their ideological positions and the 'moral work of teaching' (2005, p.11).

The influence that a teacher's identity and their beliefs have upon students in the classroom is rarely contested and is an accepted dimension of a constructivist position (Vygotsky, 1978) of education. Teachers have argued that their work is 'an unavoidably moral endeavour' (Oser, 1994)

and current Discourses in education that reflect neoliberal concerns, posits that teachers who have occasion to thwart these edicts and subvert dominant political Discourses, in order for their work to align more positively with their ideological proclivities, may not align with those arguments contended by policy. Pajares (1992) argued that it was naïve to believe that teachers' views or judgements which affected their behaviour in the classroom was not influential in students' lives and in their acquisition of knowledge. He argued that interrogating the belief structures of teachers and teacher candidates was essential if the field was to learn and improve teaching practices. If one accepts Pajares argument, then the close examination of teaching philosophies and interrogation of them as true reflections of the ideological positions of teachers is useful to the field.

The historical connection between drama education and critical pedagogy can seem drama teachers labelled activists or agents of change (O'Connor 2016), under the current trajectories and new capitalism that pervades Discourses of education. The focus on social embodied work in drama can be seen as disruptive to current practice and the status quo (Neelands, 2009). Whether this provocation to the drama teacher is troubling or problematic remains an un-researched question.

There is, therefore, strong evidence to suggest that the central role that identity plays in determining the ways teachers enact their roles in the classroom are influenced by a profound range of philosophies, theories, and personal subjectivities, including ideology and moral compunction (O'Connor, 2016, Wales, 2009). One of the tenets of this understanding, is the extent to which drama teachers believe that their subject has requisite attributions and affordances that reside within the pedagogy, that when enacted can precipitate a process that encourages and engenders in the students an ability to navigate the future as actively democratic citizens. They are then positioned to be active participants in the broader Discourses of the future. The second part of this review will

examine key Discourses in the field of drama education – including an exploration of the perceived affordances of the pedagogy. Part 3 of the review will examine the literature that pertains to the way social justice is perceived in an educational context, and the implications that teaching about and for social justice has for the drama community moving forward into the future.

Literature Review

Part 2:

As this research is concerned with the ways participants align or disrupt key Discourses in Drama Education, this review is, in large part, concerned with identifying key Discourses in the Drama Education literature. This chapter, therefore, will explore the elements of drama education that are taken to be central – philosophically, empirically, practically, or historically – to the work of drama teachers. It will outline both philosophical perspective on drama education as well as current research exploring how and why drama is used and/or useful.

One overarching Discourse, as noted by Gurgens Gjaerm (2013) is Legitimation. Legitimation he argues is therefore belief that drama (or in this case theatre) does good. That it ‘could and should educate’... ‘that the theatre was a necessary part of a healthy, liberal society’. (Gurgens Gjaerm, 2013, p. 353). This broad Discourse appears at the heart of many of the key themes in drama education literature and a general review of this idea will begin this chapter. Following this, more focused Discourses will be explored, ideas that are currently prevalent and powerful in the research, theory and practice of drama. These are:

- The affordances of drama
- The creativity agenda
- Futures and post-normality.

This Chapter will also canvas literature and research that critiques or problematises these Discourses, attempting to provide an in-depth understanding of the complexity of these ideas in the field.

Prior to this exploration of drama doing good, a brief discussion of the history of drama education in NSW is provided. This is a contextualising discussion, important because the history of a curriculum subject informs

its current practice and esteem, and because it outlines the foundations, the assumptions and preferences, on which the research participants have entered the field.

The drama curriculum that the early career teachers in this study attended to in their teaching is that prescribed by the NSW Board of Studies (now known as BOSTES) in 2003. The syllabus describes drama as, 'an art form with a discreet body of knowledge...a cooperative approach to exploring the world through enactment' (NSW Board of Studies, 2003, p.8). The way drama pedagogy is approached in the curriculum and articulated in the syllabus focuses on the process that the students undertake when they engage with the conventions of drama to explore issues and discover new ways of knowing and learning (Freebody, 2009). The terminology and lexicon that informs subject drama has many interpretations and incarnations and can include, drama, theatre, acting, make believing, theatre in education, process drama and the burgeoning area of research that is applied theatre (Anderson & O'Connor, 2015).

Drama the subject has been a contested aspect of curriculum for over half a century (Hornbrook, 1989). Some would argue (O'Toole, 2002) that despite inclusion in the curriculum, recognition of the capacity for drama to teach skills and competencies students require to navigate and mediate the world, is still untapped by many in the educational sphere.

The affordances of drama

Practitioners within the field have long advocated for the multiplicity of applications drama pedagogy has to offer students as 'the new basic' (Anderson, 2002). This part of the review will focus on the area of subject drama to better understand the 'legitimising' (Gurgens Gjaerm, 2013) Discourses in theory and research advocating drama education, drama curriculum and drama pedagogy.

This review, in part, identifies the 'aspirational pedagogy' (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) of drama, as affordances of the subject. Drama as an art form has its antecedence in the ancient Greek form and as it was in its time,

utilised to give voice, to contest, to assimilate, to challenge and to celebrate society (Neelands 2016, p.31). Neelands (2016) argues this history strongly informs the contemporary research and practice of drama in the twenty first century. Others agree that strong historical ties to philosophies of critical pedagogy (Finneran & Freebody 2016) have shaped the way practitioners and researchers in drama curriculum understand the purpose and benefits of the subject. The ways of thinking about and around the subject have therefore been deeply influenced by seminal education and/or drama theorists and practitioners in the community that include, Boal (1979), Bolton (1984), Freire (2000), Heathcote (2009), O'Neill (1995) and O'Toole (2002). The capacity that lies within drama to teach students about the world that lies beyond the classroom is writ large in the community as a prevalent and pressing notion in the discourse.

The Discourse of subject drama as a tool for educating a citizenry is evident in work such as Sardar (2010) who discusses with fervour the need for processes and ways of thinking about the future to include the elevation of creativity and the imagination to the fore of our thinking, both as human beings existing in the world, and as educators teaching and preparing students to navigate an uncertain future. O'Toole agrees,

'The possibilities of drama in the schools are only just being discovered by education systems and their masters... There's a desperate urge to find people who can hypothesise (in other words, can think as one of the most basic of drama's catchphrases), empathise, think laterally, make fictional models of possible realities and communicate them to others – all the core business of drama'. (Dunn & O'Toole, 2009, p. 52)

This assumed capacity that resides within drama to teach about the world has been central to emerging theory in drama, creativity and education (see also Anderson 2014), though little research has been done to extend this theory.

Research has explored, however, the role of the arts both locally and internationally and where drama resides within that spectrum. Ewing's (2010) meta-analysis into the role of arts in the Australian curriculum, demonstrated that the arts were imperative in the provision of opportunities for students and their teachers to understand what it actually means to be human and to be actively engaged in the world around them (p.1). In the American context, the *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic Achievement* (Deasy, 2002) report found that access to the arts and art making was a fundamental right of children and an arts rich curriculum was relevant in order for students to remain engaged, critical thinkers. This then compounds the global relevance of the topic and indeed of the literature.

The qualities and capacities of subject drama has been explored extensively by Anderson and Dunn (2013) through an expanse of research and contemporary practices including, the way curriculum can be activated using dramatic interaction in disciplines such as Science (Warner, 2014) additional language Learning (Piazzoli, 2014) and Historical consciousness (Kempe, 2014). Australian research conducted to understand how drama can be used to combat the effects of bullying (O'Toole et. al, 2005) has demonstrated successful use of drama pedagogy in classrooms to affect change and to influence the learning and experiences of students at school.

Recognition of the capacity that resides within drama to engage students not only in their curricular subjects, but more generally in cross curricula and various disciplines, was the purpose of a longitudinal Australian research project (2011); *TheatreSpace: accessing the cultural conversation*. A distinct finding was that when young people engaged with live theatre, they were able to relate to the intensity of emotions that were performed by actors on stage and as a result, empathise both cognitively and emotionally (Bundy, 2014, p.118). When confronted with characters that were in abusive or unsatisfactory circumstances, for example, the students could surmise what the character needed to do next to extricate

themselves from harm or to make different life choices. As such chance and risk play both play a role in understanding why drama enables democratic thinking and acting which often requires dissent from the norm

Even further beyond the classroom, research into the affordances of drama, extends to include the ways in which drama pedagogy can be enacted in other fields such as health education. The role of drama in teaching about health and human relationships is the area of research and specialisation of Cahill (2014, 2016). In this context, drama is seen to educate students and young people about healthy practices in social and psychological issues. The usefulness of this pedagogy, according to Cahill (2014) Nicholson (2005, p.75) includes the provision role-play conventions and reflective discussion to act out health related choices. Although a relatively simple use of drama pedagogy, the convention of role-play, Cahill (2014) argues, serves five functions and purposes that are immutable in the success of these programs and they are; describing their experiences; rehearsing ways to problem solve or to seek help; critical thinking where the students think about the broader ramifications that effect health behaviour; deconstructing social expectations; and envisioning ways that students can make decisions and imagine new possibilities. The research in this field (O'Dea & Maloney, 2000) and (Smith et al. 2004) provides evidence to demonstrably argue the efficacy of drama in providing this way of learning and achieving outcomes that measure health and healthy practices in students:

‘Drama strategies provide the opportunity for students to try out solutions in-action, test the viability of their strategies and in doing so develop their communication assertiveness and problem-solving skills’ (Cahill, 2014, p.182).

Part of the work that pedagogy has to do is prepare students to chart their own course and personal future (Freebody, 2004). The argument that Cahill (2014) advances also discusses that while a student or an individual feels they must choose or navigate an individual course, sometimes the

choice is illusionary rather than steeped in reality. Drama can enable a critical engagement with these future Discourses by promoting and teaching explicit critical thinking skills. Drama can create that 'new hope' and possibility of what can be.

Recent research (Finneran & Freebody, 2016) argue that tensions in the field include the notion that applied drama is a continuum of aesthetic and pedagogical activities rather than a canonical history or idea of drama (p.15). It is because of these tensions that a critical analysis of drama for social change the authors argue, needs to be understood and actively interrogated.

The creativity agenda

There are substantive links between creativity and student success in ways of knowing and understanding about the world and their place in it (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). The relationship between creativity and innovation in curriculum, politics and economics has been explored extensively by Harris (2014). She explicates, among other facets of argument, the de-education of students in contemporary classrooms and the need for more creative pedagogies within the curriculum. Current Discourses of creativity have much to offer the field, as the natural parity between drama and creativity needs little explanation. However, as Harris has explored, creativity and aesthetics in the 21st century bring with it an understanding around the way creative pedagogies and practices can meld to create opportunities for students and teachers. The affordance that lies within drama and the broader arts encapsulated under the auspices of creativity includes understanding how as educators and participants in a global world, our participation can be powerful and how, 'the producers of these new creative economies are, and how they are remapping the imaginaries' (Harris, 2014, p.10).

At the intersection of drama, creativity and innovative pedagogies, use of digital technologies and the creative capacities that emerge from this dimension of drama is a flourishing Discourse in the community. Work in this area by Mooney (2004) in film and video, and Jefferson (2012) in film learning as aesthetic, has recognised the creative capacity for this technology to develop skills and creative competencies in students. Anderson and Cameron (2013) also recognised the learning that could ensue when 'digital natives' harnessed the ways drama can activate learning with technology in critical and creative ways. Their attendance to the, 'symbiotic mix of drama and technology as opportunities for learning – not just in terms of formal curricula, but around the passions and interests driving a resurgence of making culture' (2013, p.228) adds weight to the argument verifying the limitless possibilities for learning in and through drama in contemporary practices, particularly those that harness creativity as the central force. This place and force for technology and multi-modality in the suite of capacities residing in drama, argues that in concert with technology as an agent for change, it is also a means for creatively exploring the impact of technology to explore change. The capacity therefore that resides within the drama field and within the pedagogy itself when enacted, allows students, teachers and practitioners alike opportunity to innovate and create, not just in classrooms but in terms of forward and future thinking (see Dunn & Anderson, 2014, p.293).

Futures and post-normality

When arguing the purpose and affect of applied drama Nicholson (2005) points to the way drama can provoke questions of allegiance and of identity and belonging. In teaching about the world, educators are provoked to consider, 'how conceptions of citizenship, culture and community might be constructed and understood' (Nicholson, 2005, p.13). This Discourse in drama education and applied drama claims drama can play a key role in learning about democratisation (Neelands, 2006). This argument also elaborates upon the notion that drama, particularly through role-play, can allow participants insight into contexts different

from their own and provides impetus for understanding the social citizenship obligations of others (Cahn, 2014, p.80). In discussing her views regarding applied drama and the ways in which it has historically contributed to enabling students to understand world views, the work of Ackroyd (2000) claims drama offers, 'Intentionality – specifically an aspiration to use drama to improve the lives of individuals and create better societies' (p.13).

The recent work in the field of applied theatre and research by O'Connor and Anderson (2015) has well defined implications for the way teachers and practitioners view the work of drama and the potential for applied theatre practices in classrooms. Their research into the place of critical and applied theatre in 'post -normal times' (Anderson, 2015, p.118) articulates both the concerns and hopes for the future that beset teachers particularly when engagement with a futures Discourse is a strong consideration of their classroom practice. The authors argue that the nexus between research and democracy is, as Dewey (1916) recognised it to be, the importance of talk in a democratic classroom. The authors have extended this understanding to explicate it in the following way, 'the freedom and ability to talk in a way that is not constrained by the powerful, that is open to the possibilities of dissent, and that actively challenges and resists dominant ideologies' (O'Connor & Anderson, 2015, p.19). Therefore, according to their work, a key affordance of drama is its contribution to understanding democracy and Futures Discourses in a post-normal world.

One of the dimensions of drama pedagogy, according to several researchers in the field, is the capacity that resides in the subject to allow students ways to challenge dominant ideologies, to make informed decisions about the world they live in, and the sort of contribution they wish to make as citizens within that world (Neelands, 2016, Chan, 2014, O'Connor, 2014). O'Connor (2010) recognised the vast potential that resided in the writings of practitioner and researcher Jonothan Neelands and his masterful interrogation of the capacity of drama to teach

compassion and to, 'temper imagination with empathy' (2004, p.115). This collection of significant writing and research advocates for drama as a way to not only teach about the world but to do so in ways that are humanising and empathic.

Drama has since ancient times been the 'shape shifter' (Heathcote, 2004) and continues to provide communities with artistic forms of self-expression that teach in pro-social ways (Neelands 2009, King & Grainger Clemson, 2016). Neeland's work has ensured that practitioners and particularly classroom teachers have access to the potential of drama as participatory democracy. His work provides teachers and the community more broadly, with tools to enact ensemble-based drama that takes the subject beyond the classroom in order to impact the lives and the learning of young people more broadly. This recognition of the potential of both theatre and drama to enable students to be taught about the world as active participants rather than passive receptors is a distinct argument of those that claim orientation to a futures Discourse as a key affordance of drama work.

Although many in the field consider the work of drama to be essentially positive in terms of educating about democracy (eg. O'Connor, 2010,) and transacting values (Misson 1996; Gallagher; 2000; Cahill, 2016), O'Toole (1998) posits the concern that drama can also be disempowering if the drama is imposed or the teacher is dismissive of a student's view or concern. Wales extends on this concern in her research (2009) offering the community a provocation: 'we must ask ourselves as teachers, how do we decide what values are positive? Do we rely on our own values? How do we know our values are the right ones?' (p.276). Passion and socially just subjectivities may reside in a teacher's emotional and pedagogical tool box, however recognising other views and ways of knowing the world need equal consideration. Questions about whose values are privileged have recently been made problematic by applied drama and drama education researchers (Snyder-Young, 2013; Finneran & Freebody, 2016). The way that teachers envision their work and practices, replete with their

inherent subjectivities, beliefs and ideologies, all coalesce to influence and shape the futures of their students who are the beneficiaries of the pedagogy.

Literature Review

Part 3

'The possibility of emancipation or achieving improved situations of social justice seems to lie in the space and opportunity afforded by the safe and imaginary world of drama'. (Freebody & Finneran, 2013, p.61)

Overview

The first part of the literature review outlined theory and research concerned with teacher identity. Part two of this review was written to scrutinize the literature that explores the way the affordances of drama has implications for teaching students in the curriculum but also for teaching students about the world and the future that lies uncharted before them. This third part of the review focuses on the literature that relates to key themes in the research including social justice practices and the relationship between drama and democracy. To achieve this, the review is organised into three sections:

- Definitions and conceptualisation of social justice education
- Social justice pedagogy in practice
- Drama pedagogy and the affinity with social justice

Social justice in the context of education has culturally specific and nuanced meaning according to various systems and educational contexts. There is an increasingly detailed and complex body of literature in this field (Ayers, Hunt & Quinn, 1998; Cochran-Smith, 2004; Kumashiro 2000, 2004; Nieto, 2005), and these researchers interrogate through their work, social justice in education and the way social justice can be incorporated into the curriculum in specific ways.

Interest in social justice in education can be attributed to the fundamental tenets of education as a right of children (Cahill, 2016, p.157). However, given that the corpus of literature in this field is vast and

can be differentiated culturally and ideologically, this review will focus on the literature that reflects the argument for pedagogy that encompasses the challenges of economic paradigms on students' access to education and does not therefore, leave the students 'unprotected' (Freebody, 2014).

Definitions and conceptualisation of Social Justice education

Social justice education defined by Bell (2007) sees social justice as a term of reference and of nomenclature for this research, because of its breadth of applicability to pedagogy. Bell argues that social justice is both a process and a goal (2007, p.21) and this conception of the term as one where a full and equal participation from all groups of society can be expected. This reflects the aim of social justice education in seeking a process that engenders agency and social responsibility from all its participants in order to achieve a common good for all citizens as active participants (Neelands & Nelson, 2013).

Bell's definition of social justice as a process and a goal relies on having a requisite or complimentary theory of oppression (2007, p.22) and she argues for a theoretical consideration of the way she contends the term, in order to encompass discrimination, bias, prejudice and bigotry. The definition also reflects what can be termed as institutional biases and those that are, 'embedded within individual consciousness' (2007, p.23). This study acknowledges the proliferation of definitions that reference social justice education in other countries and other cultures that have varying foci and areas of priority. In addition to Bell's definition, this study aligns with the idea from Freebody and Finneran (2014) that social justice is a 'hopeful' subject matter. Identifying, delineating and understanding how inequity affects students is a priority for many teachers, not just in the confines of the drama community and this has the potential to improve the outcomes for young people both locally and internationally (Sutton, 2016).

The pioneering and formative work of Freire (1974; 2000) still remains a criterion by which the impact and understanding of social justice is measured in the drama community. Freire's work is considered seminal to the drama community including the ideas regarding, 'critical consciousness, *metaxis*, dialogue and reflection' (Freebody and Finneran, 2013, p.49) His experiences as a child in living with oppression served to shape his views regarding class struggles but also the political value of equity and educational access. The significance of Freire's influence on social justice education in drama is substantiated through literature particularly in drama theory and practice and is validated through the pervasiveness of his theory and model of 'praxis' (Freire, 2000). The practical and pedagogical influence of this work is most notable in social justice and drama pedagogy and is influential in the way drama teachers often conceive their practices (see Boal, 1979; McLaren, 2000; and Kincheloe, 2008). The theoretical considerations of this work and understanding of the conceptualisation, includes the following exhortation to those who investigate epistemology without practice and vice versa. Thus, it serves as a timely exhortation in this work:

'We must not negate practice for the sake of theory. To do so would reduce theory to pure verbalism or intellectualism. By the same token, to negate theory for the sake of practice, as in the use of dialogue as conversation, is to run the risk of losing oneself in the disconnectedness of practice. It is for this reason that I never advocate either a theoretical elitism or a practice ungrounded in theory but the unity between theory and practice. In order to achieve this unity, one must have an epistemological curiosity – a curiosity that is often missing in dialogue as conversation' (Macedo 2004, in Freire 2000, p. 19).

This understanding correlates neatly within the definition offered by Bell. Social justice is both a process and a goal, and within that process theoretical considerations must be accounted for.

Distinct and additional theoretical perspectives regarding social justice education are posited by Anyon (2005), a researcher who is informed by the socio- political perspectives of Marxism, and aligns to social movements in education that encompass public policy and urban education. Her argument concerns the development or engagement of a social movement with urban educators providing the, 'fulcrum of a movement building' (2005, p.177). The theoretical view substantiated through her argument surrounds the conception of concerns for urban schools at the centre of the failed, in her view, existing policies of federal and regional policies (2005, p.178). Social justice in education is therefore for her, a social movement and ideally a reaction to policy.

Rather than advocate specificity in curriculum design, Anyon's view builds on a theoretical perspective based on where social capital is found – in urban schools. Educators in urban schools, she contends are in excellent positions to develop a, 'constituency for economic and educational change in urban communities' (2005, p.179). Anyon's contention is that educators in urban schools if they are respectful and engaged are best placed to communicate and develop political conversations and dialogue with students and the community. Her proposition that positions teachers as those best placed to enact this movement because of their identities and vocational disposition is reflected in the early career teachers' interviews and conversations analysed further in this thesis. She says this of the idealism and suitability of teachers for this movement:

'I believe that those of us in education who have social justice as a goal can play a crucial role in movement building for economic and educational rights of the poor. We can do this in our daily lives as we "cast down our buckets" where we are. We can commit to the radical possibilities in our everyday work in schools, despite the onslaught of institutional mandates'. (2005, p. 179)

Both implied and explicit to various degrees in the previous literature and theoretical and definitional argument is what can be defined as socio-economic structures and status (Saunders, 2005). The issue of economy and poverty is discussed in Johnson (2002) and he examines the effect of policies on combating poverty in communities from the perspective of institutions concerned with distribution such as the Brotherhood of St. Laurence. Poverty is not the specific focus of this review or study but a distinct dimension of the work of social justice awareness and should be acknowledged as profound in the work of social justice in education.

The seminal research in the Australian context regarding schools, families and social division *Making the Difference* (Connell, Ashenden, Kessler & Dowsett, 1982) contained a detailed study of schools and social inequalities. It provided ground-breaking theory, research and politics in its time. The issue of poverty and inequality has not, unfortunately, been ameliorated over time in the Australian context (see Vinson, 2007). Connell and Colleagues (1982) and further research from Connell offers practical solutions to addressing inequality in schools and schooling and despite being made over thirty years ago they still resonate in the current climate. The contributing factors this and other similar research posits, that shape inequality are classified as four main types:

- Differences in individuals
- The characteristics of schools and families
- The relationship between home and school
- Class lifestyles
- Place of schooling in social structure (Connell, 1993, p. 184)

Connell and Anyon's research distinctly argue the cause of the problem of inequality, as systemic and institutional and argues for a renewal of educational systems and structures that centralize public education and renews ideology that places 'working class kids' at the centre of the pedagogical aspirations in the school (Connell, 1993, p. 206). This work has been a defining theory in Australian educational rhetoric

pertaining to class and privilege and is a central consideration in theory regarding social justice education and class structures (ibid).

Research into the way forward in engaging teachers in the work of social justice education investigates issues such as how schools and communities reconnect. Gale and Densmore (2003) suggest that schools need to develop a community based focus in order to exhaust the cultural capital that resides within them, to create diverse communities replete with opportunities that are not limited by or through what Young (1999) highlights as social barriers such as class. One of the framing questions of this research is to establish what equality, freedom and justice really mean in contemporary school culture. Within this is an exploration of what part schools play in relation to these values. In identifying and extrapolating the Discourses surrounding the engagement of teachers in the work of social justice education, Densmore and Gale (2003, p.71) noted that the work of teachers required them to make judgments about a range of issues based on their professional insight and this can be problematic or conceptually biased.

The difficulty with the previous model posited by Densmore and Gale (2003) of the teacher as professional is that it can emphasize a 'banking system' (Freire, 2000, p.94) of education, critiqued by Freire as detrimental. This 'banking system' (p.94) disavows teaching as a more complex role rather than teachers as merely imparters of knowledge. For this theoretical framework to gain traction these authors argue the following:

'If teachers do not learn to connect knowledge, science and technology to the, histories, cultures and everyday experiences of their students, especially from backgrounds of poverty...if the experiences of students do not become part of the knowledge base of teachers, teacher judgments and practice will most likely, if

tacitly, reflect a Eurocentric world view and reify the status quo'.
(Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997)

Social Justice Pedagogy in Practice

In much of the literature about social justice in the classroom, there are arguments for using frameworks or scaffolds in order to frame and guide pedagogy. Researchers such as Hackman (2006) developed 'five essential components for social justice education' (p.104) that provide an eloquent and clear focus for practitioners and teachers to focus their content and processes in the classroom. Hackman's identification of five tools allows for planning in classrooms, that she argues, should lead to critical educational environments, where both students and their communities are the beneficiaries of that planning and engagement. In propagating an approach in this manner, Hackman reminds teachers that social justice is not just about examining and critiquing difference or diversity (although this forms a major part), but it is also about paying attention to systems that replicate privilege and that institutionalize oppression (2006, p.104).

Similarly, the 'funds of knowledge' approach (Moll, 1992) whereby community capital can be interrogated for the purposes of developing the unique links between the homes and home lives of children and students from diverse communities, fits this theoretical framework of social justice education. Although heavily informed by a research study, the approach is aimed at informing pedagogy and attaches value to developing the links between urban education, the community and the classroom in the advancement of equity and opportunity for students. Teachers are encouraged through this framework to develop the reservoir and richness of knowledge and competencies that students and their communities bring to the classroom. This marriage between the practice and the theoretical concerns provides practitioners with instructional strategies that are critical to their work in the classroom, teaching about and for social justice.

Dover's (2013) conceptual framework for teaching social justice practices, argues for five particular themes for developing and teaching the pedagogy of social justice education. They are:

- Democratic education (e.g., Dewey, 1916)
- Critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1974)
- Multicultural education (e.g., Castles, 2004)
- Culturally responsive education (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1995)
- Social justice education (e.g., Adams, Bell & Griffin, 2007).

Social justice education attends to work that aims to improve the life chances of students in various ways and ideally reduces the disparities and inequalities that impede students in trying to attain their full potential, as a right (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1974; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Teachers and practitioners not only require access to pedagogy and instructional strategies for doing this work, but in many cases it requires a paradigm shift or a conscious acknowledgment of the need to explicitly teach with this in mind, 'We know that...changing what we teach, means changing how we teach' (Culley & Portges, 1985, p.2).

There are a number of pedagogical challenges that the teaching of a social justice education faces both systemically and ideologically according to the literature (see Adams, Blumenfeld, Castaneda, Hackman, Peters and Zuniga, 2000). These authors argue that teachers in their attempts to promote an equitable and justice focused curricula must be ideologically predisposed to the work that this pedagogy does and fundamentally believe in the capacity of this education to impact and affect change.

The challenges of teaching about and for social justice can be ameliorated by effective frameworks, according to Adams (2007). Her pedagogical framework lists the following foundations that are, in her estimation, a useful method for analysis of the actual content of what teachers teach:

1. Establish equilibrium between the emotional and cognitive components of the learning process.
2. Acknowledge and support the personal and individual dimensions of experience, while making connections to and illuminating the systemic dimensions of social group interactions.
3. Pay explicit attention to social relations within the classroom.
4. Make conscious use of reflection and experience as tools for student centred learning.
5. Reward changes in awareness, personal growth, and efforts to work toward change, understood as outcomes of the learning process. (Adams, 2007,p.25)

Dover's (2009) conceptual framework similarly identifies the components and aims of social justice education. As the proliferation of social justice literature reflects, the practice of social justice education whilst often written about is sparsely critiqued in terms of attempts to measure impact. As critics such as (e.g., Will, 2006) noted, an ambiguity about affect sees this pedagogy as dichotomous with academic work despite what Dover (2009) argued was research that supported the position that both academic and pedagogical concerns can be assuaged within the social justice curricula and focus.

Rather than advocating a specific framework, the work of Ladson-Billings (1995) refers to culturally responsive education through the lens of race informed pedagogy. Her argument that 'culturally relevant pedagogy' (p.469) is the most effective means by which teachers can attend to the work of social justice education and to engender reform from within, examines through narrative accounts the way teacher identity can shape or influence the acquisition by students of this culturally relevant pedagogy. Ladson-Billings also observed that teachers in her study whilst all teaching different disciplines or subject areas, 'had a strong focus on student learning, developing cultural competence and cultivating a socio-political awareness in their students' (1995, p.9). This observation

authenticates her assertion that culturally responsive pedagogy must be attuned to the work conducted in the classroom and in the identity that is manifested through the teachers' work and thus reflected in their own social, educational and ideological predispositions.

This endorses also the findings by Dover (2009) that a cultural competence found in a culturally relevant pedagogy and framework can explicate and facilitate a culturally rich classroom that interrogates the Discourses of power and privilege and therefore teaches about and for social justice.

As part of the interrogation of the efficacy of a culturally responsive pedagogy and its delivery in the classroom, Delpit's (2006) essay that argues the merits of 'teaching the literate discourse' (p. 152) discusses some of the preoccupations of this pedagogy of social justice, through a culturally specific lens. For example, her argument that literacy is much more than reading and writing is largely uncontested by proponents of social justice pedagogy and critics alike, however her analysis of Gee's (2004) position regarding access to literate Discourses is contested.

Gee's argument that students should be taught explicit grammar, form and function of English language is informed by his belief that in order to gain access to a dominant Discourse one must be able to speak the language of the Discourse to therefore understand and be empowered to contribute to the conversation – his argument is based on his inherent belief that this access is a fundamental tenet of equity (Gee, 1999, p.21).

Delpit's problematising of Gee's position argues that acquisition of literate Discourses predisposes some cultural groups who are inducted or inculcated into dominant cultural Discourses because of their home lives (Moll, 1992). Those not born into these homes are distinctly disadvantaged as are the teachers of these students, who can be left feeling powerless to affect change on their students' behalf. Conversations

and Discourses can marginalize culturally and socially and in order to learn some Discourses of the middle class, others may have to die out or be relinquished. The Discourses that are most often relinquished are those that relate to cultural identity and particularly where they pose a different set of values to the cultural norm or the status quo.

A critical question posed by this thesis is, how are some Discourses acquired and acted upon by teachers of drama particularly, and how these teachers then respond to these Discourses, given the challenges of accountability in curriculum. Further still, how the teaching of some Discourses that may be seen as problematic in schools and requires on the part of the teachers, a subversion or subjugation of dominant Discourses, in order to teach a new and emergent Discourse, that is more socially just. While many of the frameworks discussed above emerge from educational or cultural theory rather than research, it is frameworks such as this that are utilised in undergraduate education programs such as the one attended by the participants, and that often inform professional development work in schools and systems (Freebody & Freebody, 2013)

Pedagogy that explicates social justice education in the classroom and the 'what we teach' is developed by Christensen (2000) in her texts and exemplar lessons, that argue reading and writing is a political and ideological act. Her identification of the power of literacy in the hands of the students and the act of reading as 'emancipatory acts' (2000, p.7) coalesces with pedagogy that is culturally responsive and critical. She argues that as a teacher, her students needed to be literate and required the appropriate tools to avoid illiteracy and the consequence that resulted in 'mute rebellion' (2000, p.11) Her observation also recognized the role of the teacher in transacting a pedagogy and a process that engendered self-determination in the students in order to 'rise up' and contribute to the shaping of new Discourses in a new world, where they could be meaningful contributors and shape new Discourses and conversations.

Christensen's (2000) provocation to teachers is that in order to 'read the world' (Freire & Macedo, 1987) students must be able to challenge texts in order to engage in meaningful dialogue and conversations about them. Her experiences teaching students who use non-standard language, allowed her to develop pedagogy that acknowledged difference and then harnessed that difference to shape the self-concept of students and to help the students access power.

This work in the classroom that identifies pedagogy such as literacy and reading as emancipatory acts also requires a commitment from the teachers who enact the pedagogy to be in many cases, activists for this work. As Manuel and Hughes (2005) noted in their research study, the reasons why teachers enter the teaching profession is because of the altruistic and social justice dimension in both the work and the pedagogy. Part of this work can require that teachers dissent from the Discourse or the rules as laid out for them systemically and bureaucratically.

As previously discussed, the work of Christensen (2000) noted teachers in the social justice sphere are influenced by a vast array of approaches and one of these approaches can be described as a political dimension to the work. This should not be confused with a politicization of the work, but rather an attempt by teachers to promote equity and justice in the classroom, through the pedagogy and within and sometimes, around the system (Smyth, 2008). As Gee (2007) observed, the Discourses that are proliferated in classrooms tend to reflect those of the middle class and prejudice the inculcation of literacy, for example, by virtue of the home life that a student may live in where Discourses of school and the language of the classroom are rife. In acknowledging this paradigm, the work of Swalwell (2013) argues for social justice pedagogy that 'bursts the bubble' or 'disturbs the comfortable' (p.53) for both middle class teachers and their students. She posits that this is important for acknowledging the diverse backgrounds and identities of teachers and of students and that both students and teachers need to be part of this pedagogy.

In disturbing the comfortable, Swalwell argues for the educating of 'activist allies' (2013, p.13) in both teachers and students. How different teachers approached teaching this pedagogy reflected their identities, the socio- economic status of the students at the school, the school contexts and teacher's personal histories. The two distinct differences in her research address the issues in social justice pedagogy by enlisting the privileged in order that they may be complicit in activating changes for the betterment of others. It is an important consideration according to her research, that students and teachers alike do not 'romanticise' the marginalized or 'exoticise' the 'other'. This leads to reifying stereotypes rather than engaging students through the work and their teachers in Discourses that question world-views and read other perspectives through a strong social perspective. The teachers who were participants in Swalwell's study articulated their frustration at sometimes feeling marginalized because of their commitment to the practice of social justice. The work can sometimes be paradoxical in this way.

'We've got this amazing mission and I totally believe in the mission and I think we do more than any place I've ever been. We think about it, we try to fulfil it, we do it imperfectly, but it's there. Sometimes I feel like the more I push it, the more I get marginalized.' – Liz (Swalwell, 2013, p. 86).

This articulation acknowledges that the work of teaching social justice is often contentious and frustrating. Receptivity to the work exists in many teachers and their beliefs and values, however there is no homogeneity of teacher values, and finding a consistent, socially just teaching philosophy, as part of every teacher's repertoire is not born out in the research. As Wood (1990) noted, 'engaging students with the big questions that fire the imagination and the forces that shape their lives is the work of a socially critical teacher – teaching a socially just pedagogy' (p.35). Smyth (2011) makes two assertions in arguing for critical social justice pedagogy and

those are that, 'teachers should be intellectuals in neoliberal times' (p.31) and thus students with this provocation in the teaching, should be, 'activists in their own learning' (p.31)

The position advanced by Smyth (2011) borrows from Gramsci (1971) and his argument for the reclamation of the tradition of a teacher as an intellectual, and also from Giroux (1985) who rather than arguing for teachers being apolitical suggests a model of teacher that is built on a construction of intellect and values. The argument that reconstitutes the work of teachers as posited by Giroux and McLaren (1986) says teachers should be construed as:

'Bearers of critical knowledge, rules and values through which they consciously articulate and problematize their relationship to each other, to students, to subject matter, and to the wider community' (pp. 225-6).

If the previous literature provokes the claim that teachers need to be re-construed as intellectuals and through this new Discourse emerge as activists, the students then must, by virtue of the new paradigm, be re-construed as activists themselves.

The idea of students as activists conjures associations of unruliness or non-compliant behaviour. This is not the conception of the idea of students as activists rather it is the idea that students can have dominion and determination over their contribution to their learning in a meaningful way, having been guided to this position through critical pedagogy. Postman and Weingartner (1971) referred to this as, 'the soft revolution' in their book about school change and in turn this idea proliferates how the teachers in their teaching philosophies conceive the work they do and significantly, the work they aspire to do. Smyth (2011) identified what he described as 'the shibboleths' (p.58) of education and the way schools are organized. He argues that these are eminently

interruptible and proposes a new conception of views that place the students firmly at the centre of the work and of the decision making processes – some of these views accord with what the early career teachers identify as, the ideal circumstances for learning. Postman and Weingartner (1971, p.9) identified these as:

1. That learning takes place not when it is conceived as a preparation for life but when it occurs in the context of real daily life.
2. That each learner must organize her own learning her own way.
3. That problems and personal interests are more realistic than are 'subjects' for organizing learning experiences.
4. That the students are capable of directly and authentically participating in the intellectual and social life of the community.
5. The community needs them to do this.

This work requires activism on the part of the students who organise it, disruption to the beliefs of some students (and teachers), and then from this work emerges a resistance or an emergent Discourse that is demonstrably more democratic and inclusive.

This review and the literature discussed therein, has found that there is a commonly held belief that social justice education, when enacted, needs to disrupt and change unjust situations. In doing this, students particularly, may have a betterment of situation and therefore be able to access and contribute to developing Discourses that affect them and their worlds. The inter-relationship between the pedagogy, the students and the teachers is significant in achieving this connection. The challenge remains as to how socially critical educators succeed in the implementation of these aspirations. The literature (Ayers, 2001; Bartolme & Trueba, 2000; Darder, 1998; Freire, 1974; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2001; Sleeter, 1996) argues that in order to do this work, teachers must possess a political or ideological clarity and critical consciousness to enact the pedagogy and ensure it is reflected in their planning, for example.

A defining distinction in the aforementioned literature is the definitional difference that these previous authors advocate in social justice education and its transaction in the classroom. They argue that a critical educator is cognisant of the need for social change and is prepared to enact the pedagogy in the classroom. Montano and colleagues (2010) argue a more radical view and definition. They attest that teachers should identify as, 'teacher activists' and should actively be involved in the transformation of their community they work within, much like the advocacy suggested by Anyon (2005). Teachers should also be actively involved (in the view held by the authors) in arguing for the betterment of public schooling, equitable distribution of resources and to 'engage in dialogue and social action' (p.52). The discussion extends to this observation:

'Learning must develop in the spaces between co-participants actively engaged in struggle. A teacher activist who engages in a social movement enacts a social justice philosophy by choosing a curriculum and activities that invite students to challenge educational and social inequities in their schools and their communities.' (Anyon, 2005, p.267)

Social justice 'in action' looks different in different locales and has differing specificity as previously averred in this review. In the Australian context, an example of field-work that was conducted with a socially just critical focus is the 'FAIR GO' project (Johnson & O'Brien, 2002). Derived from the Australian axiom, to 'give people a fair go', the researchers observed and analysed the pedagogies and principles of five teachers in low SES schools in the greater western area of NSW. The narratives and interviews of the five teachers had a common theme, and that was educational success is strengthened when the pedagogies engage students in different contexts. The critical pedagogy propounded by the teachers in this project reflected the 'critical hope' (Freire, 2000) argued as

imperative and that can be considered as the hallmark of social justice education. Hopeful and critical teaching and learning that evinces the original argument of Bell (2007) that social justice is both a process and a goal is encapsulated in the following literature regarding critical social justice pedagogy in action and, importantly what it looks like in drama.

Drama Pedagogy and the affinity with Social Justice:

The natural affinity that exists between drama and social justice is the subject of new and burgeoning area of research (Freebody & Finneran, 2016). Drama the subject is described in the NSW syllabus as, ‘...an art-form with a discrete body of knowledge including conventions, history, skills and methods of working. It is an integral aspect of our society’ (NSW BOS, 2003, p.6). At the centre of what the syllabus defines drama as, is at the very least, the study of humanity and an investigation into how that humanity behaves towards each other. O’Toole (2009) noted that as drama depicts human behaviour and attitudes, it also examines the values and judgments that may be attached to those attitudes and behaviours, drama therefore offers perspectives in order to probe and investigate these behaviours.

This assessment proffered by O’Toole corroborates the assertions of the drama community at large and their argument that the specialisation of drama and its unique capacity to engender discussion and to enact Discourse is fundamentally a dimension of social justice education. This assertion or belief is not without its criticisms. As noted in Heathcote and Bolton (1995), the work can be construed as, ‘drama for a change of understanding’ and this construction has met challenges to this ideology, where the work is noted as being ‘too charged with political values’ (p. 108). Gallagher (2007) by contrast uses conflict to positive effect by acknowledging difficulties in the work but resolving her commitment to socially just practices in her ‘locations of possibilities’ (2007, p.88) she argues, will eventually produce democratic conditions for students to learn and be heard. Similarly practitioners such as O’Connor,

(2008) and Neelands (2009) believe in the inherently promising capacity for drama that does good.

This ideal is precisely what draws some teachers to the work (Manuel & Hughes 2005). The difficulty then lies with discerning whose political values are most viable. In this thesis the early career teachers argue that the opportunity to develop and theorise pedagogy through the lens of Boal (1979), for example, and his theatre of oppression is a central tenet of planning for their pedagogy in the classroom, thereby corroborating O'Toole's (2009) argument regarding drama, values and social change –they are inexorably entwined as theories and as pedagogy.

The work of Finneran and Freebody (2013) contends that social justice is emancipatory work and the affect of its enactment is, and should be, better circumstances for students who are beneficiaries of the pedagogy and process. As the authors noted, drama is often seen as a salve for the worlds' ailments – a pedagogy that offers opportunity for hope where hope may be found wanting, however this is an overwhelming tasking of the subject. The authors offer instead what is a theoretical and practical framework for the intersection of drama and the work of critical pedagogy in social justice education, drawing distinction between drama *for* social justice and drama *about* social justice (2013, p.51).

The community of drama teachers believe that drama allows students a particular forum for knowing the world. As Grady (2000) advised readers of her book, drama can be used as a strategy for critical analysis in the work of teachers to examine rigorously how privilege operates and how bias and stereotypes can have detrimental effects on people particularly students who are developing their views of and about the world. Her attention and concern is around notions of class and how those can enculturate a code or Discourse that can dominate or influence the work, to the detriment of students who do not identify with that class. Grady also argues that for drama pedagogy to address the issues of class,

teachers should first teach about class-based codes in order that they be examined and understood.

For those who work in education, drama and theatre, (Finneran & Freebody, 2013, p.60) the key is to be watchful and reflexive about pedagogy according to the arguments within the literature. It is perhaps the mindfulness required of the pedagogy in drama that attracts the early career teachers in this study to discuss and write about where they see the synergies or intersections between their work in schools and classrooms, and the critical pedagogy of social justice education (Smyth, 2011). The emergence in the 1990s of 'applied drama' and 'applied theatre' (Nicholson 2005), provide alternate and yet symbiotic dimensions of the work of drama and social change. As Ackroyd (2000) remarked, the difference in the work was 'intentionality' – a specific aspiration in the work to improve the lives of the people involved and therefore to contribute and shape a better society. The profession of the work of teachers as personally fulfilling and meaningful is synergetic to the fundamental tenets of not just drama pedagogy, but the emergent and evolving work of applied theatre in classrooms and to teach about and for social justice.

In a similar vein, Gallagher's (2007) research has found that part of the problematic aspect of schooling is that they are responsible for significant socialisation of students. When that socialisation fails the implications and consequences are to label students as 'at risk' or 'hard to teach' (p.8). The way a classroom can provide a solution for students to test ideas and to rail against them can mitigate some of these problems by providing a forum to develop new ideas and Discourses that are student-led. In the foreword to Gallagher's book, Fine writes that:

'The drama classroom is a construction site designed for desire, bodies and voices to speak. The space of performance invites urban youth, so fiercely cast as dangerous and fixed, to engage in

performances of self that are incomplete fiction, with profound moments of discovery.’ (2007, p. xi)

The drama classroom can be a space where there is a suspension of the strictures and of the formalities that beset some classrooms (Freebody, 2009). This circumstance enables a learning environment and a community of learners (Lave & Wenger, 2000) to work on issues that reflect their concerns as adolescents but also to develop their attitudes to each other and to principles of, for example, democratic citizenship, for example.

The significance of the pedagogy and the theatrical and aesthetic traditions that are inherent in the work of drama, among other attributions of the subject as discussed in the part 2 of the literature review, allow students to take on roles and to adopt different personas that may test the boundaries of previously held beliefs (Kempe, 2013). This disruption and disturbing of ideals is a critical component of the work of social justice education. Importantly, the opportunity that drama provides is to enact different viewpoints and to reflect and review positions:

‘Reflection can be understood as Shakespeare understood it: by looking in the mirror one seeks to see the true nature of things, or see the imitation of oneself.’ (O’Connor, 2010, p.54)

The value in drama, O’Connor proffered, is the learning experience that encourages students and teachers to work on devised or dramatic situations and to examine or ‘hold a mirror’ up to their views and as a result of that insight, perhaps change views or gain an ‘empathic understanding’ (Arnold, 2005) of the plight or circumstances of others. Understanding the world through the perspective of another human being is a foundational concept in teaching drama. That is, drama is perceived as a conduit to understanding the world and thus contributing to meaningful

Discourses as democratically engaged citizens is the benefit for the student (O'Connor, 2008). The teacher's role is then one that has inherent in the daily work, to attend to providing students with opportunities to access these Discourses through imagination, creativity and play.

Drama can be the province for learning about morality and reality according to Freebody (2009). As previous literature in the review has suggested (Smyth, 2011; Neelands, 2009; Kincheloe, 2008) social justice education relies on the ideological predisposition of the teacher to engage with the pedagogy. It is dependent on that ideological predisposition of the teacher, if and whether it aligns with learning about gender, race, class, religion and bias, all from a respectful and bi-partisan position.

The importance of drama as pro-social pedagogy, the firm place of drama in the social justice education spectrum and the observation that drama can be seen as a democratising and therefore socially just response to global events is argued in a collection of the work of Jonathan Neelands (O'Connor, 2009, p. 115). Neelands', *11/09 Space in our hearts* (2002) was written to demonstrate the largesse within the capacity of drama and its teachers to affect change and to counter act the alienation and marginalisation felt by human beings after trauma. He says this:

'At the heart of all drama and theatre is the opportunity for role-taking – to imagine oneself as the other. To try and find oneself in the other and in so doing to recognise the other in oneself. This is the crucial and irreducible bridge between all forms of drama and theatre work.' (2002, p.122)

Conclusion: Drama and social justice education – symbiosis

The synergy that exists between the work of drama and social justice education has been recently (Freebody & Finneran, 2013) recognised as a crucial and critical area for discussion and theoretical concern. Drama and theatre practitioners have acknowledged the

symmetry between their work as an investigation into human concerns and the power of humanity in many and varied ways, through texts in time and through classroom practice as acknowledged in this review. The work of applied theatre and drama as therapy (Bundy, 2003) for example, is also acknowledged as a fundamental and epistemological dimension of the work in drama and related fields. While not strictly relevant to this discussion and therefore not reviewed here, it is acknowledged as a parallel field engaging in similar discussions.

This study is concerned with how these early career drama teachers, talk about social justice as a pre-eminent concern of the work of teaching drama. The teachers each have a personal and unique understanding of what social justice means and what it looks like when enacted in the classroom. This understanding engenders new and emergent Discourses from the students as the teachers enact and provide opportunities for their students to test ideas and to develop their democratic voices in the classroom (Neelands, 2006). Indeed, to revisit researchers and leaders in the field, the intent is, 'to explore possibilities for doing better' (Freebody & Finneran, 2013, p.47).

Chapter 3: Methods

Overview

This chapter outlines the methodological decisions made in the quest to answer the research question posed in the study. A goal of this research has been to gain a better understanding and insight into the way early career teachers assimilate the big Discourses of drama, particularly with regards to those of social justice, but how they also attend to these with conscious concern for their ideological predispositions. Within this goal, I investigate not only how the early career teachers engaged and assimilated these Discourses but how their engagement with these Discourses affected and shaped their identities as teachers generally and specifically as teachers of drama.

The capacity and affordances of subject drama to affect change and develop student agency has long been an assumed understanding and discourse privileged in the drama community (O'Toole, 1991). The purpose of this study, therefore, has been to understand how these affordances of drama, in particular the capacity of drama to teach about and for social justice, is manifested in the ideological predispositions of early career drama teachers and how through their text and talk, this preponderance shapes their cultural model and ways of being a drama teacher.

This study is also concerned with how early career drama teachers, utilise, adapt, challenge, absorb and assimilate the big Discourses of drama to develop their identity as drama teachers. A key focus of this study has been to capture the way the drama teachers use language, to talk about the work they do and their ideological predisposition for teaching this pedagogy, in order to improve the life chances of the students they teach (Freebody & Finneran, 2013).

This study sought to interrogate the ways early career drama teachers oriented to theories and ways of teaching and then assimilated the Discourses they encountered in their work as drama teachers. As Anderson and Dunn (2013) argued, understanding the capacities that reside within drama enables not only an understanding of different ways of knowing about the world, but in order to further understand the work of teachers and teaching, it is imperative that an explication of the way teachers may conceive the work they are doing, allows insight into improving and understanding practices in the classroom (Schon, 1987).

Research questions and focus

This study sought to understand in more nuanced ways how the early career teachers talked and wrote about their work as drama teachers. My interest in this area was piqued as a result of my interaction with pre service teachers at university through their undergraduate coursework and because of what they describe anecdotally, as their unswerving commitment to the pedagogy of drama and its capacity to teach about the world. They therefore contend that drama as a subject is best placed to prepare students to live lives with attendance to social justice and their relationships with other people.

At the heart of the study were questions about how the drama teachers perceived themselves as early career teachers and how much influence their ideological alignment had on shaping their practices and their way of teaching as a result, the methodological choice to recruit Discourse was naturally synergistic to the work. The way the teachers wrote and spoke about the work they were doing provided allowed an analysis of the discourse language in specific contexts (Cameron & Kulick, 2003) to be recognized in the specific settings and to be contextualized.

As data was gathered and emerging findings became apparent the research sought to address and understand further a range of associated questions, specifically:

- How do the participants make sense of their identity in relation to drama education Discourses, with particular attendance to how they talk and write about social justice practices and the ideological alignment of this Discourse to the work of drama?
- How do the participants in this study view the subject of drama in schools and its attributions and affordances, to teach their students about the world?
- How do the participants view their relationships with students and their role as a drama teacher as expressed in their teaching philosophies and interviews?

Discourse Approach As Research Methodology

Language is the principle means by which human beings communicate with each other (Gee, 1996). However language is best understood in context when accompanied by actions that include valuing, ways of believing, ways of acting and interacting. Because Discourses are essentially large conversations that human beings conduct within the membership of different groups with whom they align, understanding why language is used and for what purpose, is paramount in understanding why or how a social activity such as drama teaching, can be recognized and understood. The history and the philosophy of Discourses and Discourse approaches can be attributed to the forefathers of the epistemology and critical linguistic study, such as the French Discourse analysts such as Foucault (1972) and Bourdieu (1977) and seminal researchers in the field such as Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew (1979) and Parker and the Bolton Discourse group (1999).

This study owes a methodological and theoretical debt to the work of James Paul Gee (1992) and his inquiry into the “Social Mind”. His work contends that all language, thought and action is ‘inextricably social,

ideological and political' (Gee, 1992, p.xv). As Paltridge (2012) also argued, understanding how language is used and for what purpose allows for insight and understanding into social and cultural contexts and their influences. Understanding how language is used to not only communicate and to speak but also to, 'continually and actively build and rebuild our worlds not just through language but in tandem with actions, interactions and distinctive ways of thinking, valuing, feeling and believing' (Gee, 1992, p.12).

Discourse analysis as a methodology sits within the qualitative frame and as Freebody (2003) argued it is necessarily subjective. My choice of Discourse analysis is informed by a recognition that to understand the subjectivity (Wales, 2009) that comes with language choice my objective was to gain insight into the way the early career drama teachers talked and wrote about their new roles as drama teachers and how their ideological commitment to particular theorists and theoretical frames, influenced and shaped their relationships with their students and their work as teachers in the classroom.

The methodology for this study was determined by the nature of the research aims and the questions asked. As the early career teachers in this study were drama teachers their alignment to ways of talking and writing about their cultural model (Strauss & Quinn, 1997) influenced the way the research was conducted and analysed. In this study a cultural model is understood as an explanatory theory that enables identification of a social group, in this case, drama teachers and ascribes a particular storyline (Gee, 1996) to their identity. Language has "a magical property" (p.11) and in order to understand, capture and research this ephemeral quality that resides in language the methodological framework needed to provide the requisite opportunity to understand relevance (Freebody, 2003, p.30).

Despite being the principle means by which human beings communicate with each other, language can only be understood and contextualized if it is accompanied by other actions and ways of being.

‘In the end a Discourse is a “dance”, that exists in the abstract as a coordinated pattern of words, deeds, values, beliefs, symbols, tools, objects, times and places in the here and now as a performance that is recognizable as just a coordination. Like a dance, the performance here and now is never exactly the same. It all comes down to what the “masters of the dance” will allow to be recognized or will be forced to recognize as a possible instantiation of the dance’ (Gee, 1999, p.19).

Therefore this study is interested in understanding the way the early career teachers used language to communicate not only their engagement with the big Discourses of drama particularly, but the way they became apprenticed into these Discourses through the use of drama specific Discourses and how this assimilation shaped their teaching.

There are many theorists, philosophers and proponents of the discipline and method that is Discourse, and consequently there are many different ways to define and interpret the method. The forefathers as previously referenced included those from various schools and disciplines including the French school of Discourse (Foucault, 1972; 1973; 1977; 1978), and seminal theorists in the discipline including, Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995), Miller (1984), Bourdieu (1991), and Geertz (1973). The work of Gee (1999) differs from these theorists as he defines Discourse in an expansive way to include the political and the social. His understanding of how language works and influences our way of knowing about things and the impact on human lives resonated with both the broader questions asked in this study about the social and the political, and the way the early career teachers used language for particular purposes.

Gee's view and philosophical belief of the affect of Discourses interprets 'individual participation in discourses as more active or engaged than Foucault' (Alsup, 2006) and for this reason the participatory approach that Gee advances was synergistic and relevant for this study. The philosophical underpinning of Discourse analysis as evinced by Gee argues that human beings can also participate in opposing or binary Discourses, for example. This philosophical consideration accords with the research in the study and the intersection of the teachers' ideological predispositions and the challenges they face when contending with dominant Discourses that may detract, in their view from their belief in the way the work should be conducted.

Ideology and Discourse can be argued as two inexorably entwined concepts. To understand Discourse, an understanding of ideological disposition must also be understood and navigated. Danielwicz (2001) posited that all individuals are constituted subjects and their identities are produced through 'participation in Discourse' (p.11). For this reason, she argues that 'Discourses are powerfully constructive of identities because they are inherently ideological' (p.11), but at the same time she acknowledges that Discourses can be performed and negotiated according to hierarchy. Belonging to the membership of one Discourse may require at times conflict with other memberships to competing Discourses.

The early career teachers in this study described through text and talk, when they felt their ideological alignment or commitment to a practice or way of teaching conflicted with a dominant Discourse. They also acknowledged the power that resides in being able to speak the Discourse in order to navigate and mediate the world and they argued that this was a fundamental principle of social justice in their teaching. Allowing students to access, assimilate, navigate, negotiate and mediate Discourses was a central tenet of the practice of teaching drama and teaching social justice according to them.

The researcher

My experiences as an English and Drama teacher for over twenty-five years and my experiences currently teaching in the undergraduate program at the University of Sydney have all influenced my research and the way I have approached the analysis of this study. My life has been marked by the journey I have taken both as a teacher immersed in the subjects I am passionate about, but also my creative life as a writer and importantly as a reader. I have loved and used language imaginatively and have sought as a teacher to listen to the ideas and the idealism in equal measure of my students.

I attribute my desire to know the world (Freire, 2000), to my engagement with the world, through language. In choosing a topic and area for research I am mindful of the words of Umberto Eco, a writer and researcher who claimed that:

‘Your topic should reflect your previous studies and experiences. It should be related to your other research; and your political, cultural or religious experience’ (Eco, 1977, p.7).

My experiences as someone immersed in language in my teaching, allows me insight into the way teachers talk about their roles and the content they teach. As Eco said, the thesis should reflect your experiences and for this reason I have engaged with early career teachers and their navigation of Discourses in order to understand more fully the work they do and their identities that become articulated in their work.

This understanding acknowledges the influence of language on identity and has informed my decision to research through Discourse Analysis. Because qualitative research allows for ‘thick descriptions’ (Stake, 1995) the way this research was both conducted and analysed allowed me to interpret as a researcher all views of my participants and render them as valuable and equal in the research.

My role in the research is necessarily partial given that I have taught the participants during their undergraduate course work in pedagogy and in curriculum areas. I have a vested interest in the work they are engaged in and I have a deep knowledge of the training they have undertaken and the way that this has been communicated and taught to them. As Stake (1995) commented 'intention of research is to inform, to sophisticate, to assist the increase of competence and maturity, to socialize and to liberate. These are also the responsibilities of the teacher' (p.92). As the former teacher of these participants, understanding how they assimilated and recruited theories and Discourses that they had engaged with during their studies and then transacted in their teaching allows me an insight and familiarity to the new world they inhabit as early career teachers and the impact and affect of Discourses on their burgeoning careers.

As a researcher and participant in the research a number of decisions were necessary in order for the research to resonate in the drama community and to demonstrate integrity of purpose and meaning. Those decisions and role choices (Stake, 1996) included making choices about participating personally in the activity and, 'how much to pose as an expert, how much comprehension to reveal and how much to advocate a position' (p.103). These decisions were negotiated prior to the research commencing. For example, my work in the University as a lecturer and teacher requires me to listen and engage with my students and to discern their views regarding teaching in particular ways and with attendance to individual ideological alignments.

The relativity of the role of researcher can be mediated to include acting often as an evaluator (Yin, 2009) and the role should also reflect 'the talents and the role preferences of the researcher' (p.103). As a teacher and lecturer in English curriculum, pedagogy and practices and with my passion and interest in social justice, this research allowed me as

a participant to also develop insights into the ways the teachers used text and talk to discuss and assimilate their views and ideas about these and other issues. This was practically managed as I was in a position to also act as a mentor to the participants as they navigated their experiences as early career teachers, and I was able to provide a sounding board for the teachers to discuss ideas for planning and teaching lessons and units of work.

As Richards (2012) noted most qualitative researchers put simply, want to learn from their data and are likely to have strong views and values regarding what constitutes their topic. This idea is evinced strongly in my study as I believe that the participants bring a unique capacity to understand, assimilate and teach the Discourses of not only Drama but those articulated in and through theory, particularly those that reflect teaching social justice.

The germination of the idea for this study as previously discussed was through my teaching and lecturing in teacher education. Stake (1995) observed that, 'the researcher should have the connoisseur's appetite for the best persons, places and occasions' (p.56) and my recruiting of these five early career teachers reflects that argument. During my teaching of these teachers as students I was able to observe them in my classroom and listen to their talk regarding what teaching drama meant to them and how they perceived the work of social justice to be inherent in the teaching of drama, among other attributions of the subject. This understanding and insight informed and ignited my interest in their views for the purpose of study and analysis.

Research design, data collection and participants

The study involved five early career drama teachers in the first year of teaching that participated in three phases of the study. In phase 1 of the study the teachers were recruited in their final year of their education degree at the University of Sydney through their involvement in drama curriculum. The participants were asked to write an 800-1000

word teaching philosophy specifically for the purpose of this study that outlined their attitudes and ideals about teaching, students and the subjects they teach. The curriculum class were contacted by the course coordinator via email and asked to indicate their interest in the study. The class of eleven students responded in the affirmative however the decision to use the five chosen participants eventually was made based on gender balance and interest in the project more generally. Participants had the option of requesting a series of guiding questions to inform the philosophy but all five participants chose to write without guidance.

After the initial recruitment the participants were asked if they were willing to continue their participation in the second phase of the study where they would be interviewed twice for the study. The first interview would take place at the end of their first semester teaching and a final interview took place at the end of the early career teachers' second semester of their first year of teaching. This interview again visited some general questions regarding their experiences as graduate teachers. The interview also revisited the initial teaching philosophy and discussed elements that might have changed, the participants' reaction to revisiting the document and elements of the document that they believed were strongly evident in their practice.

The participants were:

Nick – a male teacher who had begun teaching in a low fee paying Christian school in Western Sydney who had previously taught in English in Vietnam. He is teaching both Drama and English in this position. Nick was an undergraduate student who married during the course of his degree. At the end of his first year of teaching he became a father and by his own admission became very focussed on the importance of the relationship between students and their teacher. Nick is a devout Christian and his personal beliefs he says, have a profound influence on his teaching. Social justice for him is a

tenet of his faith and is deeply influential in guiding the choices he makes in the classroom and how he builds and fosters relationships with his students.

Elena – a female teacher who was employed teaching in an after school program where she teaches using site-specific theatre techniques. She is active in the Fringe theatre scene in Sydney and is casual teaching in inner city schools in Sydney. Elena is currently auditioning for NIDA (The National Institute For Dramatic Art) Sydney, NSW. Elena did some of her practicum teaching in rural NSW. Elena's Greek heritage and attitude towards cultural responsiveness in schools is influential in her attitude to her students. She has been the victim she says of racism both as a student and as a student teacher. She believes strongly in the capacity for Drama and specifically Theatre to mediate racism and as a didactic tool.

David – a male teacher who is employed as a permanent English and Drama teacher at a comprehensive girls' school in Northern Sydney. David is a passionate advocate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. He says that as a young Asian teacher he is conscious of the impact that racism and exclusion can have on a developing adolescent. He argues that an Invasion theory or view of History should be prevalent in the classroom.

Georgia – a female teacher employed in a year-long contract to teach English and History in a low SES comprehensive high school in South Western Sydney. She is not employed to teach Drama however she instigated and established a drama club at the school. She was appointed on merit, to a specialist position of home -room teacher during her second term of teaching. Georgia did her high schooling in the Australian Capital Territory. She says that her grandparents had the most profound influence on her and shaped

her views about learning and inspired her desire to know more about the world generally. Georgia by her own admission pushes boundaries. She does not like to be pigeon holed as a History/Drama teacher but would like to be perceived as a generalist teacher with a commitment to teaching students how to be socially just. Georgia wants to instil in her students the capacity to be agents of change and to be heard in the community. At the time of writing this thesis she was applying for a position as a fly in fly out teacher on Nauru Island.

Jane – a female teacher who was initially employed pending an occupational health and safety assessment of her suitability to work and teach in a high school because of her visual impairment. Jane says that she has come to teaching because she believes students should be able to learn despite any impediments, particularly physical disabilities. She is an Olympic team member and during her undergraduate degree competed at the Olympics in London. She has since been given permanent status in her position at a comprehensive high school in Sydney's North-Western suburbs.

Analysis of the data

1. *The Teaching Philosophies*

The first data to be collected in the study were the participants' teaching philosophies written for the purpose of this study. Goodman (1988) argued that in order to improve practices of both teaching and in teacher training, 'we must first gain an insight into their thinking' (p.121). During their studies in teacher education the format of teaching philosophies was used to capture values and ways of thinking about the prospective role that the early career teachers and is used in education and curriculum subjects, and it was therefore a familiar format and genre for the participants. As a document it also provided an opportunity for, 'thick descriptions' (Stake, 1995) and for the early career teachers to

narrativize (Bell, 2007) their thinking about the role they were undertaking as teachers. Goodman also contended the use of a teaching philosophies in research allows for a, 'move beyond the assumption that students' thinking can be adequately captured by static dichotomies such as traditional versus progressive, conservative versus liberal or custodial versus humanistic' (p.121).

This opportunity for the teachers to encapsulate and articulate their ideas and beliefs about teaching also provided them with a forum for their ideological alignments, and to explore the significance and influence of subjectivities (Wales, 2009) on their neophyte practices.

Once the teaching philosophies were collected they were themed according to common ways they used language, common ways they used theory and commonalities that could be established regarding views and beliefs about teaching drama. Initially the teaching philosophies were analysed for repetition of phrases and key words and this data was applied to a word cloud to generate information about words that were given prominence by the participants. This thematic analysis provided links between the teaching philosophies; 'coding is not just labelling it is linking, it leads you from the data to the idea, and from the idea to all the data pertaining to that idea' (Richards & Morse, 2007, p.137). These themes and pre-eminent ideas in the teaching philosophies provided the impetus for interviews and questions about their teaching of drama and their insights and ideological alignments. In presenting for the reader a perspective that allows for not just insight but also 'vicarious experiences' (Stake, 1995, p.62) the teaching philosophies also provide a description of what the participants were feeling, what they believe and what they hope for as teachers in their work. The teaching philosophies provide an experience of 'being there' in the context of the early career teachers' work through their writing.

2. (a) Interviews

The early career teachers were interviewed twice in semi structured interviews as previously mentioned and both interviews were recorded and then transcribed. Each of the participants had unique stories to tell and singular views and ideas about their new- found roles as teachers. As Spradley (1979) argues, an open phenomenological approach to learning from an interviewee is because of this reasoning: "I want to understand the world from your point of view. I want to know what you know in the way you know it" (Spradley, 1979, p.34).

Therefore, the interview needed to provide a forum in which to explicate the ideas they had advanced in their teaching philosophies while also providing an opportunity for their views to be listened to. As new teachers, they were wrestling with a raft of complex ideas and presentation of issues including behaviour management and school bureaucracy.

As previously stated the first phase of the study involved the participants writing a one page teaching philosophy statement that was not guided. It was anticipated that the philosophies would reveal the teachers' aspirations, ambitions, ideals and views on a range of issues related to their teaching.

The interviews in the second phase of the study referred to the participants' teaching philosophies. They were then asked to expand on their ideas and to reflect in greater detail on their comments and therefore not all questions were uniform. The interviews used the philosophies as a starting point for conversations but the participants were not limited to this.

Questions included;

- Tell me about your views regarding social justice in education

- How important is it to you to use drama strategies in your teaching?
- Why do you choose particular activities or texts for use in the classroom?
- What are your biggest concerns as a graduate teacher?

The second phase interviews asked the participants to reread their teaching philosophies and make comments regarding their current teaching in light of what they had originally espoused in their philosophies. The participants were given the opportunity to discuss what they believed were the most important or significant issues they had written about in the teaching philosophies, they were also given opportunity to ask what they would change in light of their recent experiences.

The interviews were then read, 'as a form of narration' (Kvale, 1996) prior to being analysed for language and intended meaning through the Discourse approach, in order to complete a holistic profile of the early career teachers, so that upon close examination of the texts and talk, insight could be established into their values, beliefs and ideological alignments.

2. (b) Interviews

After the interviews had been concluded in both phases of the data collection, the transcription of both interviews were analysed through a Discourse approach. This approach was informed by the seminal work of James Paul Gee (1999) and his approach to language and analysis. This approach is but *one* of the versions of analysis within the corpus. His approach which has been appropriated and ameliorated by me in this research, attends to the idea he propounds that "analysis of language as it is used to enact activities, perspectives and identities" (p.11) is one of the functions of Discourse Analysis.

As previewed in the introduction, the iteration of, 'building things in the world' has been appropriated and applied from the Gee (1999). This theory reflects his argument that when we speak and design what we have to say fits the context in which we are communicating it. He also proposes, 'we use language to build and to destroy things in the world' (p.84). The early career teachers were building their worlds as teachers of drama, through text and talk in conjunction with their ideological proclivities and ways of being.

Hence, the interview transcripts were analysed as Gee (2011) advised, 'using tools and issues which interest them' (p.11). Taking Gee's method under advisement, I appropriated five of the theoretical tools developed in this framework and applied them to my data, in both my interviews and teaching philosophies. The process of the Discourse Analysis began with the recommendation of Gee where he suggested that emergent themes, points and issues could be illuminated through particular data (Gee, 2011). Additionally, as suggested in this interpretation of the method a piece of data was chosen (in this case the teaching philosophies) and key words and phrases were identified and the *situated meanings* were analysed initially for their context and what this indicated about cultural models implicit in drama teachers and drama teaching.

The analysis was then organised to relate to themes as they emerged from the initial analysis. This provided the key themes for analysis of the data and ultimately provided the titles for the findings chapters. The themes were identified as; the teaching philosophies; Building the world through the affordances of drama; Building a more socially just world through drama; Building the world by teaching the world; Building the world through students. As advised by Gee (1999) the Discourse Analysis was then conducted by developing the building tasks and the way these extended the analysis. All coding was conducted by hand and at no time was a software program used to analyse or provide computerised themes or codes. This approach coincides with the tenets of

Discourse Analysis as 'humans constructing their realities' (Gee, 1999 p.94) The five theoretical tools used in the Discourse analysis are identified in the following paragraphs and were used and applied in the following ways:

1. Significance – This tool is used to analyse how language is made significant and to give meaning in many and varied ways including how significance is built into language. How the teachers use language to ascribe or attribute particular significance to a word. The word, 'access', for example is used by one of the teachers to mean a particular thing to her. Her experiences as a visually impaired student and then as a teacher meant that when she used this word, it had a particular significance and meaning and thus connected to a deeper Discourse of access and ability.
2. Activities – this tool was used to examine the way the teachers in both teaching philosophies and in the interviews talked about the practice of drama and teaching. Words they used such as 'encouraging' or 'developing' were indicative of the way they perceived and spoke about the activity that is teaching drama. This tool allows for an analysis of perception, ways of thinking and knowing the craft of teaching drama as evidenced through the Discourse.
3. Identities – this tool recognized the way the teachers used language to build their identities and to construct their personas as teachers using language and Discourse. For example when they speak and write about being a drama teacher and a socially just drama teacher they may use a lexicon of language that is different to the language they use when they are speaking to a friend. Their identities are constructed through a particular lexicon and through 'social language' that identifies them with a particular group or Discourse.

This analysis of identity and how it reveals itself in and through the cultural model of teaching also allowed for insight into how the teachers aligned with various cultural models that incorporated social justice in their teaching. A cultural model can be akin to a storyline (Gee, 1996) that explains how a social group might connect to a word or to ways of being. The early career teachers in this thesis argued that there was a way of being a drama teacher that demonstrably indicated an affinity with teaching social justice. Therefore the data was analysed in order to understand, ‘why do these things hang together?’ (Anglin, 1977).

4. Relationships – the way the teachers used language to describe their relationship to their subject, drama and to their roles as teacher in different milieus gave an insight into how they developed and built relationships. The way they viewed their relationship to the organization and administration of the school for example was also reflected in their text and talk. When speaking about the implementation of social justice education, for example, some of the graduates spoke using combative language to infer a relationship of inequality, between the school’s processes and the students’ acquisition of this pedagogy.
5. The Big D Discourse tool – this tool was used in two ways. Firstly as a tool to analyse the data and understand the conventions associated with being a drama teacher and being a socially just drama teacher. How the teachers “walked the walk and talked the talk” (Gee, 1999, p.177) and how these Discourses are about being “certain kinds of people” were revealed in the teaching philosophies and then in the interviews. The second way this tool was used was to identify some of the seminal Discourses that are hypothesized in the drama community and how these are postulated as future Discourses. These were derived from the Drama Australia Equity and Diversity Guidelines (2005) and the

core elements were used as headings under which, each early career teachers' data was reflected upon and analysed.

Validity and authenticity

There is conjecture about what constitutes validity for a Discourse Analysis. As this thesis appropriated five of the theoretical tools and analysed teaching philosophies and interviews through a thematic lens, validity is established in two ways; firstly it is established because, 'humans construct their realities' (Gee, 1999, p.94) and the data gathered for this study is reflective of both the early career teachers' realities of teaching drama in their first year and secondly because Discourse Analysis is composed of language, it is the 'language plus situation' (p.95) that provides the researcher with the capacity to interpret data in certain ways in order for the analysis to be rendered as meaningful. The data was comprised of teaching philosophies and interviews and provided this perspective into how the teachers used language in concert with other attributions to talk about their work. As Gee (1999) reminds the researcher, 'Validity is social, not individual. A given piece of Discourse work will have a major point or theme, or a small set of them' (p.95).

As Creswell (2007) contended, the terms validity and authenticity should be viewed as part of the researcher's process that includes trustworthiness and authenticity and with this in mind I ensured that I clarified any bias from the outset of the study and to the participants who had been former students. I clarified my epistemological position as a strong advocate for both drama and social justice practices as a teacher, and as an interpretive researcher. I discussed with participants the preliminary analysis in the form of descriptions and themes that emerged from the teaching philosophies. The participants were also given opportunities in the second interviews to review and reflect upon their teaching philosophies and to make comments or oral emendations to the document in light of their experiences teaching during the year in which they wrote the document.

Although not current students, all participants had previously been enrolled in courses on which I teach. Therefore acknowledgement of the potential for 'teacher-pleasing' responses must be made. In order to minimize this, no guidance was given to students for their teaching philosophies – encouraging them to highlight issues of importance to them. All interview topics and questions were derived from these philosophies, ensuring the participants' ideas were the key focus of the discussion (rather than the researcher's ideas and motivations). Any key guiding questions was deliberately broad as to not lead the participant to preferred answers.

Ethical Issues

Ethics approval was obtained through the university IRMA system. The approved documents for the study included; participant consent form; participant information statement; recruitment letter/email; Interview questions Approval for the study was obtained in consideration of the following:

- Continuing compliance with the national Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research involving humans
- Provision of an annual report on this project to the Human research Ethics Committee from the approval date 15th October 2013
- All serious and unexpected adverse events should be reported to the HERC within 72 hours
- All unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should be reported to HERC
- Any changes to the project including changes to research personnel must be approved by HERC

All conditions were met and adhered to during the duration of the project. To ensure confidentiality, pseudonyms were allocated to participants. All identifiable data (such as teaching philosophies) were de-identified with pseudonyms prior to storage.

Limitations of Research Design

The limitation of this study is principally the small sample size of the early career teachers. Rather than being generalisable, the conclusions that can be drawn from the study can only claim to contribute to the growing conversations and Discourses that abound in the drama and education community. The study was able to argue as previously stated, that rich data was gathered in the form of personal and insightful documents such as the teaching philosophies. These personal documents provide opportunities for nuanced understanding of early career drama teachers and their ideological proclivities present in and through this work in the classroom. A key aspect of this study is the way the understanding of the synergy between drama teachers and social justice manifests in and through teacher identity and in the proclivity the teachers argue, for teaching about the world and in specialised ways, with the affordances of drama.

Conclusions

This research sought to understand how early career teachers, particularly those teaching drama, wrote and talked about their hopes, ambitions, ideas and values regarding the role of teaching. The adaptation of Discourse Analysis as a research approach, allowed for an examination of the way the teachers assimilated, challenged, subverted and acceded to the various Discourses of teaching, particularly the Discourses in drama that attend to the work of social justice. This research pays homage to the emerging identities and the discourses of the early career teachers. The affect of Discourse Analysis as an approach allows for a view of the world as posited by language. Because Discourse Analysis focuses on how human beings do things beyond language it also allows for an especial focus on

ideas and beliefs and how these are a vestige of identity and ideological disposition.

The following chapters recount the findings of the research under the headings that were derived from the policies, syllabi and the language and talk of the teachers and their ideological predispositions as they articulated and identified them in their teaching philosophies. They are these: the affordances of drama as a subject; how drama and social justice enables a particular understanding and engagement with other people and how this can lead to an improvement in the lives and opportunities of students; how the work of drama precipitates a way of teaching students about the world and the privilege of being a global citizen; how students at the centre in teaching drama activates new possibilities for the way they learn and navigate the world; and how through the emergence of new Discourses, the early career teachers articulate and form new ways of knowing the world that is teaching.

Chapter 4: Teaching Philosophies

"All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players. They have their exits and their entrances; and one man in his time plays many parts" –(Act II, Scene VII), As You Like It, (William Shakespeare, 1623)

Overview

The first part of this thesis has concentrated on establishing the purpose of the study and the methodological and theoretical position that propel an understanding of how the early career teachers engage with the big Discourses of drama.

The teaching philosophies are an important means by which the research question can be interrogated and thus understood. They provide insight into the unique ways the teachers conceptualise the work they do as drama teachers but importantly the teaching philosophies provide a written reflection of the early career teachers' altruism and their ideological propensities. These philosophies provide a contextual background for the way the teachers articulate their ideas in the ensuing interviews.

Presenting the teaching philosophies as vignettes or narratives within the thesis allows for a point of connection across the chapters and provides a pattern of meaning (Eisner, 1978, p.178). To understand who the early career drama teachers are and how they conceive their identities as reflected in their teaching philosophies, assists in understanding also how they perceive their professional identities, what motivates them to do the work they do and what their expectations are of themselves as teachers and of the students they teach.

In order to maintain the fidelity of the teaching philosophies and to reflect their individuality and intent, the original formatting and

presentation including spelling, grammar and syntax has been maintained. The teachers have been de identified but their voices remain authentic and true in their writing. As was discussed in the previous chapters, teaching philosophies can be written for a range of reasons and intentions. The participants in this study had no restrictions placed upon them in terms of format, length or style. They were offered guided questions if they required them and yet all five participants opted to write in their own style and form in a way that best reflected their identity, at the time.

This study is not informed by arts based research practice and yet is deeply sympathetic and perhaps empathetically informed by it. As Leavy (2009) argued, narrative and arts informed research allows us to continue conversations about the place of qualitative research and the affect of using methods that challenge and provoke. This chapter does not seek to provoke, per se but rather provide a platform for the early career drama teachers, their teacher artistry and their passions and positions to be better understood. The methodological and epistemological debt of this study is to Discourse Analysis as the analytic field and yet that field is of course, about language. It is language therefore, used particularly and purposefully by the early career drama teachers in their teaching philosophies, that is a part of the story of themselves.

The following teaching philosophies reflect the early career teachers as players in role – the role of emerging practitioner, artist and activist. They are the protagonists and actors within the play and the drama in and of the classroom.

Teaching Philosophy: Elena

My name is Elena, I'm 22 and I'm almost a graduated English and Drama teacher. I say almost, because I don't really feel like I'm a full blown teacher yet. In my undergrad combined Arts, Secondary Education degree at the University of Sydney I've only completed two pracs, one in each of my respective disciplines. My first prac was at my old 7-10 high school and

I taught Drama, for four weeks (one of which was observation) and I didn't feel like it was long enough to get a 'real sense' of it. My second prac was an English one, for 5 weeks at a co-ed selective high school in the Hills district of Sydney, which was a lot more insightful and gave me a richer sense of what the teaching career might be like. My 7 week internship approaches (sometimes I feel like its looming) at the end of the year, and I hope that by the time I complete it I will have a much stronger sense of my capabilities, persona and beliefs as a teacher.

I believe that a teaching philosophy is a fluid and organic product, growing from a desire to become a teacher and changing as the teaching journey progresses. My teaching philosophy has changed dramatically since the moment I decided I wanted to pursue this path, and I know it will continue to shift. I remember the moment I decided on the course at USYD, making it my first UAC preference gave me a strong sense of direction and purpose. I was so excited. It was the perfect way to combine my love of acting, theatre and literature with my strong philanthropic nature. It was a way to inspire kids in a way I had been inspired, show them what it was to love the arts, love English, love learning. In those very first moments when I received my ATAR and knew that I'd be starting my teaching degree the following year, I recalled the teachers who'd influenced me towards my decision. My year 9 Drama teacher, who supported and encouraged me since my first lesson and my English and Drama teachers in my senior years, who worked tirelessly, with genuine concern and interest until the HSC came and went. I was finally getting the chance to be like them, to be in a position like they were! I was stoked, to say the least.

When I began my degree, I saw myself as a 'Drama teacher' with an English minor, but getting to the point of even 'seeing myself as a teacher' was a journey in itself! For a period towards the end of my HSC I wanted to pursue my passion for acting by doing an acting degree in university. After a lot of consideration (at a strong influence from my Mum) I decided to pursue teaching, the more 'sensible' option and my second choice at the

time, at least “until I was more mature”, at which point I could reconsider the pursuit of acting. Putting my acting dreams on the backburner, I turned towards education, the drama teaching a worthwhile ‘replacement’ focus in the meantime. As my degree progressed however, I began to see the inherent relationship between my disciplines, remembering my fondness for novels, film and poetry, deciding that I wanted to major in both. My strength in English returned and was built through various jobs as an English tutor outside of university. Similarly, I was becoming heavily involved in the drama scene at university, directing, designing, and acting in productions alongside my studies. With practical knowledge in both my disciplines, I feel like I have a good foundation to jump into teaching, lacking only in the ‘real classroom experience’ I will hopefully attain in my internship.

All my experiences so far through prac, the DEC’s “Beyond the Bridge” and “Beyond the Line” programs, university and private tutoring have shaped me into someone who has particular values and beliefs as a teacher. I believe that every child has a right to education, no matter what their circumstances, I also believe that that right, doesn’t mean every child will value the education they receive. Not every student will like me, or want to learn from me and that’s been hard to learn and accept, but, every student has the right to learn and be given an education, and I know it’s my job to help provide that, even if it’s not coming from me personally. I believe strongly in both my disciplines, Drama especially. Its power to change, empower and create intrinsic motivation in students is immense, frequently underappreciated and underutilised in NSW (and Australian) schools. I also hold myself up to particular values, values of honesty, consistency and patience. To be truthful to my work and myself, consistent in my practice and engagement with quality pedagogies and patient with my students and the career itself. Teaching, for me, has always been and will always be about the kids. If that ever changes, I hope I’ll be able to tell, because that’s when I know I should leave the profession. Hopefully that never happens, but if it does, I’m pretty confident there’ll be another

young, enthusiastic, passionate teacher ready to take on the challenges and rewards of the teaching profession.

Teaching Philosophy: Georgia

I knew I wanted to be a teacher when I was six years old. During holidays, my grandparents (who were both teachers) use to set up 'farm school'. At 'farm school,' my brother, sister and I would travel to different places around the south coast and be taught an array of information by my grandparents. My siblings and I would listen intently due to the enthusiasm and passion that was always present in each lesson. My grandparents made learning relevant, fun and left a desire to know more. This desire to know more led me overseas in my gap year where travelling Europe enlightened a passion for learning about history, learning about new cultures and languages and gaining new experiences. As a graduate teacher, I want to instil in my students the same passion and yearning to know more.

Understanding why I want to be a teacher underpins my approach and ideas about education and my role within a student's education. In the modern day classroom, there is an increasing need for educators as reflective practitioner to adapt their teaching in order to meet the multifaceted needs of students. Schools in Australia reflect society, where individuals have their own needs due to their background and experiences that have shaped them. It is up to the teacher to foster these needs and build upon them in order to shape successful citizens academically and socially.

I value the role of the teacher in maximising the learning experiences and outcomes of students by building relationships and designing inclusive and positive learning environments - these understandings are cornerstones of my practice. It is thus vital that the teacher can implement modifications, adaptations and adjustments to

their teaching in order to accommodate the needs, learning styles and interests of the diverse classroom.

Over the past three years of experience within classrooms, I have tried to ensure student's learning experiences are maximised by providing personalised learning activities and differentiation. This can be demonstrated by the way that I can flexibly and quickly consider and take action to support students through adaptations to content, process, product and the learning environment. This inclusive skill supports and personalises all learners across the classroom as well as extending students to go further through negotiating the curriculum.

I have also found it vital within a diverse classroom to deliver the content in a way that students identify the relevance of the learning with their background. When planning learning activities and assessments, I try to adapt my teaching and the content delivery to meet the range of experiences and interests of my students to build connectedness and engagement within a fun, supportive and structured learning environment. This helps to build a culture of student engagement and achievement whilst also meeting curriculum outcomes.

Teaching Philosophy: Nick

I have a strong passion for the English and Drama, and a respect for the skills and opportunities that they can offer to students. I am especially interested in the enriching relationship between the two subject areas. I believe that both can aid in the development of experiential learning environments and the self-reflexive skills of my students.

The following sentiment by the poet, E.E. Cummings, encompasses the learning environment and the type of student engagement that I wish to develop as a secondary teacher:

“I am going to utter a tree,
nobody can stop me.”

These words value creativity and a positive development of one's identity: two aspects I believe are integral to the development of a secure yet academically-challenging classroom.

I believe that a community that values creativity and identity development will ultimately develop members who are engaged in active citizenship. I take this term to mean a proactive, compassionate approach to positive change that is for the good of others.

Perceptions of Role Responsibilities

I perceive the role of the teacher in this classroom context to be an empathy agent: a figure who provides access for students to develop their capacity for embodying, respecting and, caring for, others.

I believe that a teacher is responsible also for providing students with the means to comprehend the moral responsibilities that comes such access, and the need to develop an awareness of socio-cultural sensitivity.

Through this, I believe the teacher fulfills their key vocational requirements: serving others while positively challenging their students' perceptions of their role in their school and wider community.

Teaching Philosophy: Jane

I strongly hold the philosophy that every child deserves access to equal educational opportunities and I believe that public education is the key to achieving this. I believe public education helps foster an education system that is inclusive and supportive of all students.

I want to become a teacher to provide children with the positive foundations education can offer and to empower students to learn and feel capable of learning. I would say this stems from my own experiences at school. Inevitably teachers will impose their views and judgments upon their students. Unfortunately some of these views are potentially

detrimental, particularly to adolescents trying to assert themselves as capable and valued citizens in society. On the other hand, teachers have the potential to empower and encourage students to see that they are capable of what they so may desire.

In saying this, I believe that as a teacher I can equip students with valuable life skills that come from learning beyond the curriculum. I want to develop students' creativity, their critical thinking and reflection, their independence and autonomy. I realise that school is the precursor of society and the importance of the teacher to provide the support and guidance to young people to help them develop into capable citizens. As a teacher I want to be a role model for these young adults, helping them realise and achieve their full potential irrespective of any inhibitions, situations or background.

I would say this has influenced my choice of curriculum areas: Drama and English. I have long held a passion for Drama as it provides a creative and accessible way for students to express themselves. Teaching Drama you see students developing skills beyond the curriculum such as confidence, charisma, teamwork and creativity. My passion for Drama naturally links with English. English gives students a connection to other contexts through text, providing a deeper knowledge and insight of themselves and their world. Both English and Drama allow students to develop their own opinions and their own expression. I want to foster this in my students. Give them the freedom to explore the world through literature and play, opening up the possibilities these subjects have to offer.

I guess at this point my greatest fear is that I cannot become the teacher I want to be. At the moment I would say there is a significant amount of self doubt. I worry that my personal limitations may make teacher very challenging – after 5 years now I am thinking it wasn't the smartest career choice for my circumstances! While I know there are

strategies around this, I also worry that I won't have the support from my colleagues, or perhaps their acceptance, to work out an alternative way of doing things to cater for my needs. Additionally I fear that bureaucracy, an emphasis on testing and accountability will force me to become narrow sighted, focusing all my attention on syllabus outcomes and losing (sic) the greater picture of education.

Teaching Philosophy: David

Education is a gift that students gladly accept as a given or realise and understand its worth, value and importance to successfully thrive in life. As an educator, I believe I must use the necessary and most appropriate means to nurture a love of lifelong learning in all my students. This is achieved through my passion for the English language and literature and the transformative and imaginative experiences created in the Drama classroom, a strong commitment to guiding students' understanding of themselves and the world within and beyond the classroom.

Teachers are facilitators of learning and they ascertain each individual student's needs and then teach accordingly. I believe in a social constructivist approach to teaching where learning and development is increasingly social and fostered through collaboration between the teacher and the students and between students. Using a Vygotskian approach, this is enabled through adapting to a student's Zone of Proximal Development and a strong attention to scaffolding learning. Education is learner-centred. This informs how I plan programs, scope and sequence units of work, and write and teach individual lessons. That said, what is learnt in my classroom is connected to students' personal, cultural and social lives so that they may understand the significance of their learning.

Schools are safe yet challenging environments that foster a love of learning and positively assist students' development. They are supportive, respectful and inclusive communities in which the voice of each student is

heard, valued and respected. It is a place that allows each learner to free express their ideas, thoughts, beliefs without having to feel judged or discouraged. Students are inspired to set goals for their learning, are academically engaged and equipped for effective problem solving and critical thinking skills.

The English classroom is a site for language learning and immersion in literature, but also a space for probe and investigate real and imagined worlds and contexts that will allow me to challenge students' preconceived ideas about the world around them. I particularly believe in educating students about the invasion of Australia by British and European settlers and the rich yet traumatic history of the Indigenous peoples of our country. Furthermore, I also believe in using Drama to assist students in their understanding of power in human interactions in the world. Of note, Boal and Freire's work on oppression is a means to empower students about the power imbalances entrenched in socio-cultural contexts in their own world and the world beyond them.

An effective teacher successfully plans and implements teaching and learning strategies and opportunities, which guides learning and extends students. With a strong knowledge of their content areas, they know who their students are and how they learn. Effective teachers plan and assess for learning and use different methods and means to cater to individual needs as well as for whole-class instruction. As powerful communicators, they communicate with students, staff and parents within the school community. I believe they create quality-learning environments that are safe and supportive and challenge students in their learning. They manage challenging behaviour and classroom activities through effective classroom instruction. They are always learning and seeking to improve their pedagogy. They are reflective practitioners, reflecting on their teaching and reflect-in-action within the classroom. They are professional, collegial and successfully contribute to their faculty, their school and the

community they work in. Effective teachers integrate social justice practices in their teaching and model these in their own lives.

I believe education transforms lives. A teacher has done their job when a student has been equipped for lifelong learning and has been empowered to enter society as a responsible active and global citizen ready to constructively contribute to the wider world.

Chapter 5: Building the World Through The Affordances of Drama

'Many of us were called to teach by encountering not only a mentor but also a particular field of study. We were drawn to a body of knowledge because it shed light on our identity as well as on the world. We did not merely find a subject to teach – the subject also found us' (Palmer, 2010, p.26).

Overview

This chapter is concerned with how the five drama teachers in this study, talk about, write, discuss and make sense of their new worlds as drama teachers. Particular attention is given to the way these teachers orient to the subject drama and how they view the subject as having particular attributions and capacity to teach about the world in a unique way. The teachers argue through their language and their teaching philosophies that through the enactment of drama, students are able to navigate the world in particular ways because of what they have learned and experienced in this subject. The chapter also draws from the teachers' talk and writing, their attachment to a particular 'cultural model' of what it means to be a drama teacher and how this cultural model of teaching shapes the students and their capacity to understand human interactions in the world. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the way the teachers view the affordances of drama and their attachment to the pedagogy as an integral dimension of their professional identities.

Drama teachers and their pedagogy

When these drama teachers talk about themselves and the work they do in the classroom and the pedagogy they recruit when they are teaching, they project themselves as particular kinds of people. The context in which they are teaching, the physical space and the circumstances they are teaching in, all coalesce in order to produce an

especial kind of identity. In this chapter, close attention is paid to the drama teachers who as novices, grapple with who they are in the classroom, what they think is the right kind of pedagogy to teach and how their personal proclivities and ideological predispositions fashion and shape the teaching. Their identities as drama teachers can be homogenously categorized, however they argue separate and quite distinct proclivities and priorities for themselves as teachers and for their students.

One of the current Discourses that are privileged by the drama community is grounded in the idea that drama has unique capacity to teach about the world and its embodied nature (Kemp, 2012). Given the uncertainty of the future, there is perhaps more than ever a need to embrace this pedagogy and teach it to our students who will have to navigate uncertain futures (Anderson, 2014). Neelands' (2004) contention of the special qualities that reside in drama are captured in the following view, but what he postures regarding how this pedagogy is enacted relies on the good teaching of drama:

'Drama cannot, of course, of itself teach in any kind of way, nor can it, of itself, be powerful. It is what we do, through our own human agency, with drama that determines the specific pedagogy' (Neelands, 2004, p.48).

The teachers in this study affirm this view in various ways by talking and writing about their resolve in the capacity for drama to mediate change and to arm their students with the necessary tools to navigate the world. Jane gives as an example of this talk that:

"Teaching Drama you see students developing skills beyond the curriculum such as confidence, charisma, teamwork and creativity...Drama links naturally with English and gives students a connection to other contexts through texts, providing a deeper

knowledge and insight into themselves and their world” (Jane, TP. Lines 21-23).

There are three main themes that emanate from the teachers’ talk and their writing in their teaching philosophy. They corroborate Neelands’ (2004) argument by saying in different ways, that drama is powerful pedagogy but only when it is used or taught in particular ways. The three significant themes that emerge from the teachers’ discussions are: (i) drama is a tool for students to mediate an increasingly complex and uncertain future; (ii) drama, because it uses space in unique ways, creates a learning environment that is conducive to talking about and discussing sometimes painful or controversial issues; and (iii) being a drama teacher is a particular kind of cultural model of teaching, that uses a particular lexicon of language in the classroom which aligns with socially just ways of teaching about the world. These three themes coalesce and connect the way the teachers through their text and talk discuss and affirm their views regarding what they believe are the especial qualities that reside in drama and as a consequence, in the teachers and their manifestation of the content.

Drama as a tool to mediate experiences in the world

The five early career teachers in their teaching philosophies and in their interviews use language and talk to describe the role and function of drama in the learning that takes place in the classroom. In their various views and despite limited teaching experience, they say drama provides their students with tools or skills that enable them to navigate a changing world in ways that other subjects, they argue, cannot. Their view is that drama provides a skill- set to enable students to confront the challenges inherent in navigating various power structures that may prevent them from experiencing and negotiating the world effectively and in its entirety. Georgia also talks about drama differentiating itself as a subject because students have a freedom to express themselves as themselves.

“I suppose drama is an outlet for me and I also know it’s an outlet for kids to express themselves, and I feel that sometimes in other subject area they aren’t able to do that.” (Georgia, Int. 1, Turn 6)

In another way Elena talks about her idea that wanting to be a drama teacher and having experienced what it was like teaching drama in the classroom she describes what she believes is the need for drama on wider scale. By teaching drama Elena also believes that the students learn skills that are important for them to know outside of the classroom. She says:

“It has opened my eyes to the need for drama on a larger scale than just in the school setting. The experience that as a drama teacher I could influence kids through a lot of the drama and through performance, for all the things it does like confidence, exploring your own creativity and problem solving and teamwork and all those sorts of things.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 12)

The teachers particularly Elena and Georgia believe that to fulfil their various potentials not only as learners, but also as participants and responders in the social world the students need drama and the skills it provides.

All five teachers spoke at some point in either their teaching philosophy or an interview about what they felt were the properties of drama that were unique to that subject alone. At different times some of the teachers spoke about the relationship between drama and English, highlighting the synergy between the subjects. However, they still felt drama and its ‘uniqueness’ offered a different way to view the world and therefore the way they described and spoke about drama, gave the subject particular attributes.

“I don’t want to say traditional for English or any other class, that’s a really bad word, sorry, I don’t want to use that word, but I think in one way you’re in a seat just writing stuff down. I don’t know, I think that would be a little bit more confronting for like say a subject with that, but I feel like in drama you can, yeah, that sort of expectation that a student is, I don’t know, not allowed to explore these heavy things.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 52)

They described the subject through language and different meanings. Drama was often compared to, or contrasted with, other subjects by the teachers as a counter point to describe the characteristics of the subject that allowed or identified it as particularly ‘unique’. For example, when the teachers discuss or describe the ‘space’ that drama is taught within, they describe uniqueness and a specialization that affords a different learning experience because of the physical environment in which the learning takes place.

These teachers collectively and at different points in both the teaching philosophies and the interviews, explored and explained why they felt drama enabled their students to mediate their experiences in the world. The participants made this similar point in various ways:

“And now because I’m using drama they know how to treat each other which they didn’t have in science and in other classrooms I’ve seen them in.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 23)

As new teachers, their connection and relationship with their university identity was evident in their teaching philosophies in the way they oriented to language that is theoretical and was part of their lexicon in pre service teaching. They wrote idealistically and using active tenses, like ‘using’ and ‘treat’ to describe the potential they saw in drama to give their students a wider experience of the world and for their students to be better prepared for the world in which they were embarking upon.

The teachers also described how they actively recruited theory in different cases where they believed that this was beneficial in shaping the classroom intent. David recruits Boal's (1979) theory of oppression when he wanted to draw attention to issues of sexism. Nick actively recruits theories of empathic intelligence (Arnold, 2005) and moral reasoning practices (Freebody, 2009) for both the purpose of shaping pedagogy but also as an integral aspect of his cultural model of being a drama teacher. Georgia recruits the funds knowledge approach to develop her students' voice, despite what she says, is her frustration at the very theorized instruction she received at university. Jane recruits the NSW Department of Education policy and practice when she teaches to ensure that access is equitable in terms of both resources (including human resources) and physical resources. Elena had her own theory that was influenced and informed by her belief in site- specific theatre to give students different life experiences. Through the acquisition of these skills and competencies the students then have an opportunity to navigate the world.

In his teaching philosophy David said that:

"I believe in using drama to assist students in their understanding of power and human interactions in the world." (David, T.P., Line 29)

The fact that he specified drama as distinct from his history method of teaching can be analysed as building particular significance into drama and its unique attributions to teach about these things. David's use of the verb 'assist' suggests that drama is not the sole contributing factor in this repertoire of skills the students may need, but in his view it is significant in preparing them to successfully mediate the world. The background information and the subtext of 'assist' is the implication that the students will develop those skills elsewhere, in other subjects and in different

aspects of their lives and schooling, but more particularly through drama and therefore carries significant meaning in this context.

Students understand power and where it resides in the world

When David writes about the students' understanding of power and human interactions in the world, he makes the words 'power' and 'human' imperative by making them the focus of the sentence – this is significant. The way David has used power and human in the same sentence also develops a relationship between the two concepts and an attribution of meaning beyond words. As a teacher, David sees his role as a facilitator of information and experience. His is not a view that withholds information from his students. Rather, he says that students need this understanding to be fully functional as human beings in the world. Neelands' (2004) quote above posited that it is not the pedagogy itself that is powerful, it is the human agency that propels the pedagogy to be powerful. Inherent in this statement is also the implication that students need to learn about the world that is outside of the specificity of curriculum – they need to know where the power lies, in order to mediate the world and be actively engaged in it. Drama and its affordances as mediated through the pedagogy is what the early career teachers say, is essential to the students' and their learning about the world.

David describes a lesson he has been developing in drama whereby his students are interrogating the Commedia style of drama that is stylistic and one-dimensional. The students decided to develop a scene based on the information he had given them, to appropriate the work into a modern style of the reality program, 'The Bachelor'. During the program, prospective women are paraded before a suitable 'bachelor' and the bachelor then makes his choice of partner based on the woman's ability to please him or to be compatible with him. He says this about the lesson:

"This group has decided to do a spin-off of, 'The Bachelor' and they've included, I mean I'm happy to let them do it, they've

included all this sexual innuendo which comes from the Commedia style, which is crude and vulgar and infused that. Now are they going too far? I think it's fantastic that they break those boundaries." (David, Int. 2, Turn 53)

David evinces the idea that drama can provide both the teacher and the student with an opportunity to teach in a way that gives students experiences that can intertextualize their work in the classroom in drama with what they are exposed to through popular culture. Drama, he says, is the opportunity to examine these ideas and to have this opportunity. His conversation also talks about the difference between the learning conditions in one subject as compared with the learning conditions in a drama classroom. His previous conversation mentions that he thinks it is important that his students challenge boundaries and that they test ideas and social mores. He goes on further to discuss his views regarding the conditions in drama and how they can also provoke difficult issues for the students. It is in this conversation that he admits to recruiting the theory of Boal (1979) and the way this theory can shape the content in drama in order to garner the students' attention to an issue. He says that:

"I feel that in drama the expectation is that a student can explore these things, many heavy things. With Boal you can explore so many horrible things, things about oppression and things that are really painful. And that's fine, as long as the students realise that in drama it's drama and sometimes we need to do these sorts of things." (David, Int. 2, Turn 53)

This admission that in drama difficult and painful things can be discussed and in fact the discussion of these things is necessary to the students even if it proves painful for them.

David's identity as a drama teacher is also affirmed in this conversation. The way drama allows students to mediate the world also

enables the reader to establish a mental representation of David as a teacher who collaborates and negotiates with his students. He is building relationships between the language he uses and through the action he commits to as a teacher. By construing and connecting the distribution of power and where it manifests in the world, according to him, a perception of David as a teacher and the relationships with his students is built through language.

Because he is building on transactional language in the way he talks about teaching as compared with language that imposes a sense of rigidity or inflexibility – he recruited the word ‘assist’, when he wanted to talk about how his students access and understand about power in the world. He is providing the students with opportunities to develop agency, and a mental picture begins to be constructed of a teacher who is building a world for his students, through drama, democratic principles and the transaction of ideas through theory.

This cultural model of David the drama teacher can be attributed to the way he talks and writes about drama as a tool for learning. He aligns himself to a particular way of being a drama teacher that says controversial and sometimes painful issues need to be examined and boundaries broken by students in classrooms, specifically in drama classrooms. Drama, in his view, provides this platform for experience and expression of ideas that other subject areas do not. Drama in this situation does two things, it is a tool that allows the students an opportunity to mediate the world but it also acts as a tool for the teacher, in this case, for David to inform and mediate his cultural model and identity as a drama teacher.

“Imaginative experiences are created in the Drama classroom, a strong commitment to guiding students’ understanding of themselves and the world within and beyond the classroom.”
(David, T.P., Lines 5-7)

Drama and physical ability

When Jane talks about drama as a tool for mediating the world she does so by using a very specific example of classroom practice. Jane acknowledges her visual impairment is a seminal part of her identity and it influences what she believes about drama and its capacity to prepare students to mediate the world. She openly admits that her views are predicated on her own schooling experiences.

“This stems from my own experiences at school. Inevitably teachers will impose their views and judgments on their students. Unfortunately some of these views are particularly detrimental, particularly to adolescents trying to assert themselves as capable and valued citizens in society.” (Jane, T.P, Lines 6-8)

As anecdotal evidence of how drama can be used to empower students, she speaks in her first interview about a casual class she took in the IM (intellectual impairment) department. She spoke about the fact that the teacher had left no set work for the class, which in her view undervalued them as a class and because there was no set work, her instinct was to recruit drama to teach the students:

“I think drama skills for me is what it can bring out in the students.”
(Jane, Int. 1, Turn 31)

She wrote in her teaching philosophy about how she believes drama generally can give students agency to express themselves and then in her interview she was able to corroborate this philosophical idea by referencing a class where ultimately, it was the physical dimension of drama that gave the students a way to express and articulate themselves when they were not able to do so through literate means. Her philosophy said this about drama:

“It allows students to develop their own opinions and their expressions to explore the world.” (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 31)

This philosophical statement does a number of things in developing a ‘cultural model’ or a view of the type of teacher Jane is. Her statement uses active verbs such as ‘allow’ and ‘develop’ foregrounded in the sentence that provides a connection between the relationship of subject drama and the students’ capacity to navigate the world. It suggests that this is an ongoing process and continues the learning trajectory of the students.

The ephemeral quality and indefinability of the word ‘expression’ suggests that Jane believes that something significant that can occur when a student is able to engage with the content and ideas in a drama classroom and then use that skill to live in the world. Similarly to David, there is identity-building work that is conducted in the sentence that construes the word ‘opinions’ to suggest that Jane is a teacher who values student agency and what the students actually think about for themselves. The sentence also implies that part of the special work that drama does, is to allow students to have a voice of their own and of their own making. It indicates to the reader that in drama, Jane thinks students can develop their own ideas in a democratic and negotiated way. She does not qualify this in any way grammatically. She does not suggest that it is imposed or developed according to rules. It exists and happens because drama allows it to.

Jane’s example of teaching drama on the spur of the moment to teach a class of students with special needs uses language that corroborates David’s argument that drama allows students to understand human interactions in the world. As she talks about the class in her interview she pauses to recruit the word she thinks best describes the activity she is speaking about:

“Just ...these kids who, some of them were almost illiterate in reading and writing were creating the most ...they were creating cars, bicycles with their bodies.” (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 31)

The meaning in this sentence is complex as meaning often is. Jane’s search for the right word has the effect of developing an understanding of what she values or believes is significant in her teaching of drama. She knows that these students have a different capacity for doing the work in drama, but because the pedagogy also allows for physical work, the students are able to work using their bodies. ‘Just...these kids’. Her use of the word ‘just’ is an expostulation and reflects the way she understands this interaction in the classroom. She just can’t believe the students are able to execute such complex ideas in a physical way. The foregrounding in the sentence of the word ‘just’ is used by Jane not to describe a noun or to speak about the act of being ‘just’. She uses it as a way of pausing to contextualize that the students, who she personalizes by using the vernacular ‘kids’, are unremarkable as students, absent their disabilities and yet they were able to do something quite remarkable in the way they used drama to create something meaningful despite the learning difficulties she says they have. This sentence works as an affirmation of Jane’s belief in drama, that all students, despite their limitations can access drama pedagogy.

Jane also repeats the word ‘creating’. This active verb with its evocation of innovation and imagination describes a transformation that occurred when the students were able to use their bodies in unique and self-devised ways to physically express their ideas. The way Jane describes this class and the opportunity to teach the students and for them to embrace the pedagogy through a physical interpretation develops an association between the creating that Jane facilitates and the attributions of subject drama, which allow for this interpretation of the work.

In this description access to the pedagogy is not limited to students with high literacy or intellectual function, drama as a subject can offer students ways into the world on different levels and for different purposes, as Jane has described, ‘just with their bodies’. For Jane, as a teacher with a disability, she is concerned by student access but as evidenced by this example, she says that whatever a student’s capacity or ability, drama allows them opportunity to learn about the world. Whatever their capacity as students, they can derive meaning and understanding about the world through drama:

“It’s that drama, just giving people the confidence or the skills to address themselves who might normally be a shy student because they’ve tried being a character or using their body or sound or whatever that might be if they don’t have those tools. Drama gives them those tools, I think. Team-work.” (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 31)

Explicitly in both Jane’s interviews and in her teaching philosophy is the idea that all students and their teachers need an equitable access to both resources and opportunities to learn and engage. Outside of the classroom Jane is conscious of the challenges her students face in mediating the world for themselves. Drama for Jane is an opportunity to find time for students to be different, to test divergent ways of being, particularly physical ways to know and be in the world. Of the five teachers in this study, Jane is the only teacher who iteratively refers to the physical dimension of learning in drama. As a teacher with physical challenges she is acutely aware of the need to meet these challenges when faced with the world and she wants her students to be able to learn to navigate this also.

Drama and vulnerability

The teachers in the study attended in different ways to the idea that drama pedagogy produced a state of vulnerability in both the students and the teachers. They spoke about in different ways, needing students to

think and behave empathically and through their learning, to develop a keen understanding of what it might be like to be the 'other'. Through understanding and empathizing with other people they were able to gain insight and perspective into the lives of other people in not only their classrooms, but in the wider world. This experience for the teachers was central to the ways of knowing in drama.

The word 'vulnerability' is used by some of the teachers to describe a by-product or a 'state of being' that ensues, for both teacher and the student as a result of the activities and learning that takes place in the classroom. The specialization of the space and the physical nature of some of the activities allowed for a particular kind of vulnerability. The word 'vulnerability' is used in two significant ways at various times throughout the teaching philosophies and the interviews. It is used to both describe a 'state of being' that is achieved through the work of drama and as an activity – a way to achieve a particular outcome in the classroom. The word 'vulnerability' and its use in this context does not have the negative connotations it might do in different situations outside of the classroom with the exception of when David refers to bullying in his classroom. Its use by the teachers as part of a social language system or lexicon in the context of a drama classroom is part of a process to achieve insight or to develop an empathic understanding of others in the classroom and the community. It is both a requisite tool in the pedagogy and in the process.

When David was asked in his second interview to revisit his first ideas regarding the vulnerable state that he says can be achieved or developed through the drama classroom, he spoke about how he still believed that the drama pedagogy and the drama space was inherent in achieving this state of 'vulnerability' and that this was still, in his view a desirable effect of the pedagogy in the classroom. He describes what he means by 'vulnerability' and its relationship to work and understanding in the drama classroom:

“I definitely feel like in a drama classroom it’s more open, you become more vulnerable as a student. You have to open yourself, you have to work with people that you might not want to work with.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 51)

The way David talks about opening up in, and to, the class implies that in other subjects there may be a more closed approach that requires less introspection or examination of self than in drama. Part of the Discourse regarding the efficacy of drama as a subject says that it prepares students for the future, a particular capacity the teachers say, this subject has to meet the needs of preparing students to face the reality of the world (O’Connor, 2012). These experiences working with other people who you may not choose to work with or in Jane’s case, creating and participating in team-work with people who have different capacities are all the consequence of working in and through drama.

The place for teachers to open themselves up and become vulnerable is discussed by three of the teachers who all address this need for vulnerability in different ways. David says it is by being a teacher in role, Nick says it is a by-product of divesting oneself of ego and becoming a servant of the students and Elena says it is through site -specific theatre where boundaries are blurred and performances are less contrived, that this vulnerable state can occur. David says this:

“Where you don’t become a teacher, you become a character, you become someone else. The minute you become vulnerable is the minute they realize that they can become vulnerable. I’ve really tried to step into breaking down the fact that I’m a teacher and saying literally I’m one of you and I want to show you.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 34)

This aspiration that David says, he has to ensure that the students see his performance as human and equal to them, is important. He says that

ensuring they (students) see the role of being vulnerable as not just the domain of the students – that growth and insight can be achieved if the teacher and the student are both in role together, together on a trajectory of learning. Part of that understanding about the world can be seen when a teacher as a role model, or in role, can break down the traditional barriers between students and teachers. Students in drama can then learn about human interactions when they see their teacher as one of them – testing the boundaries, being a character, making mistakes and opening themselves up to possible criticism through the drama.

“I find drama challenges kids to really, yeah, become vulnerable, to sort of step outside of who they are.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 20)

This Discourse of perspective and insight that David speaks about is also reflected in the drama community, through the privileging of the idea that drama enables students to see perspectives, to navigate the world and to argue for democratic principles not just for themselves but for others (Neelands, 2002). David says that stepping outside of who you are as a student and as a teacher and being the ‘other’ even when you may be uncomfortable, and when you may have to work with something that is painful, is all part of the complex dimensions of the work of drama.

Elena on the other hand describes vulnerability as a ‘necessary’ state of being that can transform the teaching and learning in the classroom. She describes it as part of the process of subject drama. Elena talks about a year seven drama class who were very comfortable with working in their groups and developing and devising their drama work. She describes the moment she asked them to perform in front of each other rather than concurrently working on pieces in the classroom and how they reacted badly when asked to perform in front of others:

“They were fine but when it came down to showing everyone else they freaked out.” (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 13)

Elena uses the vernacular of 'freaking out', to describe in ordinary terms how confronting this performance was for the students in the classroom. Again the drama needs to inculcate a state of vulnerability in the students in order to navigate difficult issues. In this case, Elena's students had no problem working together or designing and planning the drama, but the public performance produced a vulnerability that was confronting but necessary, in her view.

From this state of fear and anxiety, the reticent group then became the group who brought props in, delivered a piece of drama using multiple voices and modes and Elena says, "completely blew me away" (Int. 2, Turn 13). She says that they came to this place in the class through a state of vulnerability. They were initially confounded by what was being asked of them in terms of public performance but through this exposure their engagement and attachment to the piece became even more significant. The activity of creating a climate of vulnerability and then being engaged enough to conquer fears and produce quality work, was a natural effect of the process she enacted in the classroom, she says. The students then grew the drama and the process of performing allowed them to develop personal and social dimensions through their learning in drama.

Nick's views regarding vulnerability are predicated in his statement that describes his particular cultural model of what it means to be a teacher and specifically a drama teacher. His firm commitment to an ideology of the teacher as moral agent that theorises moral reasoning practices and the teacher as a moral guide, informs the work he says he does in the classroom. Nick speaks about his need to be vulnerable to his students as a by-product of the attitude of service he wishes to imbue in his classroom. Nick's talk regarding his views and the cultural model he builds through his language argues that to be in the service of the students is to be ultimately rewarded. From vulnerability comes liberation and dominion that in turn builds agency and competence in both the students

and teachers in the classroom. This ideological view, he says, is unpopular with other teachers who view aspects of their work as superior or in his words, entitled:

“If you choose to be a servant, that’s the most powerful choice you can make because it says I have relinquished any sense of entitlement.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 30)

Nick’s conviction that by relinquishing the power and position of authority and making himself vulnerable to his students, turns the dominant Discourse of students as subordinate to teachers on its head. His language describes a radical shift from popular or traditional conceptions of what it is to be a teacher to a different Discourse. He says that drama is the conduit or the best placed pedagogy that enables this enactment of servitude. His view that teachers have a sense of entitlement to their roles and their positions, he describes as a negative attribution. Rather than be entitled, he says that even before he has planned or prepared the class or the work, he thinks about how he can be of service, and this is the driving factor that shapes his work in the classroom. He says this:

“The fact that I’m here to serve the children as they are now rather than necessarily thinking how they’ll be when they’re sitting an exam per se. I more think about how to prepare them for life where there are points where you just have to commit to other people, regardless of how you feel.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 30)

Nick acknowledges that students need to be prepared for examinations and for testing but before that work can take place or as part of that preparation, he argues that they need to know how to navigate the world. That knowledge of knowing about the world, he says, is through committing to other people and he avows his commitment by relinquishing his authority in some ways and exploring relationships with the students, even when those relationships may not be successful or

necessarily what you want to do. This is all part of preparation for life that occurs through the enactment and affordances of drama pedagogy.

All of the teachers in this study identify the unique capacity of drama to teach about the world. As a direct consequence of that unique quality of drama, they speak about vulnerability as an action or consequence of being part of that pedagogy. To be vulnerable is to be open, perhaps to criticism, to be reticent about participation or perhaps a reluctance to be emotionally open or available.

The teachers ascribe particular attributions to the activity of being vulnerable. This is never a negative connotation even if the content that informs the drama is painful or controversial. As part of the relationship, they say they engender through the activity of being vulnerable, the result of this vulnerability is that their students and as teachers, they can learn about another dimension of their humanity and how that humanity can be used to mediate the world they inhabit.

Drama and the use of space

These early career teachers spoke about the way drama can utilise space in unique and meaningful ways that other subject areas cannot. They spoke about the fact that a drama space has different indices of behaviour and different ways of being, for their students and for themselves. As previously mentioned, when David was in a drama class and the students wanted to explore the role of patriarchy in popular culture they used sexual innuendo to describe a particular action in the drama. He felt that this was the right place or the apt subject in which to explore these ideas, however controversial. The drama 'space' is both a literal and figurative one, where the teachers say there can be an absence of stricture. In the case of Georgia's drama club, a space free from assessment and the pressures that are associated with performing or learning that requires summative assessment.

“It’s just the atmosphere that is created in all the drama spaces, whether it’s due to the way that it’s laid out or the way that the teacher facilitates a class, or just the fact that the kids are together in a space where there are minimal distractions and they can express themselves in a different way. They don’t have to write things down, they can be kinaesthetic about it.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 28)

The use of space in subject drama is repeated in the teachers’ talk and writing in both the interviews and the teaching philosophies. They speak and write about the impact of the space on shaping their ability to teach in a particular way and often for a particular purpose. Elena describes her unique opportunity with her teaching at the ATYP (The Australian Theatre For Young People) after-school program and also through her teaching in a rural setting with the ‘Beyond The Line’ program. She makes strong connective links between the drama space and experiential learning. Her use of the term ‘experiential’ while semantically different to ‘experience’, ‘explore’ and ‘create’, are words that the other teachers use in different ways to mean similar things, that build significance in very similar ways both in terms of explaining the teachers’ practices and their identities.

Drama space and equity

Elena speaks at length in her first interview about the links between space and learning in drama:

“I think that in a drama space it’s a completely different space, all the classrooms, you don’t have your desks and chairs and suddenly everyone can be on an equal level in terms of their presence in the space.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 28)

The significance of the reference to space in drama is attributed in two ways. Elena foregrounds the inherent importance of the drama space by

distinguishing it from the way space might be used in another subject. By foregrounding how a drama classroom might use space in a different way, 'it's a completely different space' doesn't just mean that the physical space might be different, she uses the noun 'space' to also describe attributions of pedagogy – space to explore, space to talk, space to develop and perform. This is different to other subjects and the connections between space and a unique learning environment are made clearer for the reader. The fact that the drama classroom has no chairs or tables signifies that 'different' ways of learning takes place in the space and therefore a different acquisition of skills can be acquired. Of particular significance in the attribution of meaning and space, is the way Elena leaves until the end of the sentence, the issue of conduct or ways of being in the space for the students.

In a similar way Elena argues that the teachers' role in drama is also different to that in other subjects. Everyone is equal in the drama classroom and everyone is on equal terms. Elena and Nick and David express through their language a democratic dimension of their work as drama teachers. Nick's idea that this is promoted through service, David's ideas about equality and vulnerability, and Elena's observation is that the space acts as a facilitator for equitable participation. Teachers and students exist on an equal level much in the same way they will find they have to navigate the world – equally and with others. The absence of tables and chairs in a drama classroom, Elena says, means that there is an equality of behaviour and conduct that differentiates this space from another. Foregrounded as important because it is repeated in her conversations and texts, and yet placed at the end of the sentence, is the comment that 'everyone' can be equal. Leaving the fact that everyone can be equal to the end of the sentence says that Elena thinks that equality is a continuous way of being in the classroom and yet, where she places this observation in the sentence also implies that in being equal, there may be a level or element of subversion in this practice. Not everyone may think and act as teachers the way she does. Her proclivity is to conduct her

teaching in the space in a way that promotes equity. Elena's identity whilst not overtly described in the sentence is however established through the implication of her presence in this space as a teacher, on equal terms with her students. She is building through her talk, a vision of a democratic classroom made possible by the inherent attributions of subject drama.

The drama space as subversive

As previously discussed in Elena's teaching, there is an element of subversion that the teachers treat as a requirement of them in order to teach in the space and to teach the way they believe enacts the pedagogy with fidelity. Elena discusses the need for everyone in the classroom to be equal and Nick, in the following observation, discusses his overseas experience where the value of drama was not part of the cultural paradigm of the classroom. A high value was placed on a very Westernized approach to the traditional classroom and a particular reverence for tables and chairs in rows meant that to teach in a meaningful way according to his beliefs about effective instruction and drama pedagogy, Nick had to resort to subversion of this traditional structure.

Nick undertook a period of teaching overseas in Vietnam as part of a volunteer program. He describes drama as the principle pedagogy he recruited, for teaching students and teaching staff, one hundred percent of the time. The language of instruction he describes as, 'British English'. The staff at the school had limited capacity for understanding the content they were required to teach in this British English much beyond the out-dated textbooks they had as their only resource and Nick felt that the reflexivity and the use of space that drama provides was the way forward in terms of teaching these students, in a brief period, about the world beyond the classroom. However, he was discouraged from doing so by the teachers in charge of the program, some of whom were also Australian. The teachers at the school felt that he was subverting the curriculum by teaching this way. He said in his first interview:

“They were like, why are you taking them out of class? They need to be sitting at their desks and I was like no, let’s go outside and try to learn a different way.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 10)

The idea that drama is a unique pedagogy and that it can be used for different purposes is reflected in Nick’s conversation. The fact that drama can be seen to subvert traditional teaching practices such as sitting at tables and chairs inside the classroom is seen as problematic by the administration in that particular school, and yet Nick sees a natural affinity between using drama practices and pedagogy to teach the students in a more effective way. The other teachers he notes are more comfortable with teaching in the traditional way and place enormous value on the model of the traditional classroom.

The way Nick thought the students could learn best about money and marketing was if he could role-play going to the markets and buying produce and conduct the drama in English. After role-playing the marketing experiences, he scaffolded the experience on the board for the students and they had to write up a narrative of their experience. He said that it was his training in drama that enabled him to recruit this pedagogy for this purpose. He said:

“At the end of the lesson they had to stage a dialogue for me, then they had to reflect on what it felt like to be in the market place and what it felt like to be a buyer and what it felt like to be a seller. So all of those aspects and drama strategies that I’d learned and the teachers had never put them in a real life situation which I would never have unless I had been trained to do it.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 10)

The idea that drama teaching and the preparedness for teaching in different ways is also a component for teachers to develop the requisite skills that they can then share with their students that will enable them to

mediate the world they are going to inhabit. In Nick's lesson on marketing, he asked the students to enact both the role of the seller and the role of the buyer therefore eliciting different opportunities for empathy and empathic understanding in his students. Nick says that learning outside or in a drama space is not necessarily better but is 'different'. Elena, David and Jane all acknowledge in sometimes overt and often subtle ways, that drama occasionally requires subversion of the norm or the dominant Discourse in order for the enacted pedagogy to resonate and to have the requisite effect of teaching the students about the world they live in and the relationships they need to forge.

Physical freedom in the space

When David was asked in his second interview to revisit his first ideas regarding the vulnerable state that he says can developed through the drama classroom, he describes what he means by vulnerability and its relationship to space this way:

"I think kids are given a sense of freedom. The moment you can move your body, you can walk around, you can sit, you can stand, you don't have to sit rigidly in a space. The minute you do that it gives them...I think it alters their perception of, maybe not learning, but what you do in the space. So when you do that you reshape what they're thinking about, what they do at school. The drama classroom is almost like a – almost- maybe this is too dramatic but it's like a portal, it's like, let's enter the space and we're not going to do what we normally do like in Maths, English and Geography, we're going to do something different." (David, Int. 2, Turn 51)

Inherent in David's talk is the notion that in other subjects there is a sense of being physically confined. He posits the idea that for students to flourish emotionally and socially they need to be able to move their bodies. This observation of the physical dimension of the pedagogy is iterated in the

other early career teachers' observations about the capacity of drama to develop a physical dimension to the students' learning.

David's use of the word 'portal' is notable for the qualities associated with that word. In drama, David suggests, this means an opening to a different way of knowing, a different way of seeing the world and perceiving others. He acknowledges that in this classroom with its opportunities for physical difference in its constitution and learning configuration, it is not the learning that differs, but rather it is the way of learning that provides the students with a unique opportunity to engage with the pedagogy. Both David and Nick expressly distinguish, using talk, that the space and the ontology in the classroom is not better, it is 'different'. This is the distinguishing factor in the affordances of drama.

In contrast to the work that Nick and David are doing formally as drama teachers, Georgia decided that the school she was working in, with its requisite social and cultural complexities, needed the pedagogy that in her view drama offered. Her development of a drama club at lunch-time, she acknowledges, comes from a desire to maintain her cultural model as a drama teacher, but also because she remains firm in her ideological commitment to the opportunities that the pedagogy presents the students. In terms of the physical space, she says this:

"I hope it's a way to explore their ideas and their thinking, discover more about themselves in an environment which would seem less structured. I would hope it would provide those opportunities."
(Georgia, Int. 1, Turn 22)

Again, there is a repetition of the opportunities in the physical space, to allow the students new ways into knowing. An iteration of the early career teachers' talk is the idea that as distinct from others subjects, drama is the pedagogy that has within its affordances, these separate and peculiar

attributions allowing students insights into themselves, how they learn and ways of understanding others in the world.

Conclusion: Being a drama teacher is a particular cultural model

The early career teachers' talked about the affordances of drama with unequalled commitment, and this constructs their identities in ways that ascribe nuanced qualities not just to their subject, but also to their way of teaching the subject, in singular ways. As the literature reflects (e.g., Brookfield, 1995) understanding how and why teachers, in this case drama teachers orient to theories that reflect their ideological proclivities is important in order to understand the multiplicities of identities and subjectivities (Wales, 2009) that influence and shape them. Additionally, the participants' perspectives of drama teachers in this study aligned with this view that drama teachers are a particular kind of teacher and the drama classroom provides an emotional oasis that encourages opinions (Wales, 2009, p.40). The teachers' talk in interviews and writing in their teaching philosophies validates the supposition of the cultural model and what it means to be a drama teacher that argues that this identity cannot be communicated singularly through language, it also requires especial and distinctive ways of talking, valuing and of perceiving the world. The early career drama teachers can also recognise themselves through this lens by enacting socially recognisable identities as drama teachers. This perception and articulation of the drama teachers' identities would align them as critical pedagogues, as Apple (2006) Giroux (2015) conceive this idea.

As the teachers spoke in discrepant ways about what drama particularly afforded them in their work as teachers, they engaged in a larger Discourse. That Discourse can be recognised as a distinctive cultural model of being a drama teacher or a cultural model. Being a drama teacher means acknowledging that there are many and varied ways of looking at and perceiving the world, not only as a teacher also as a teacher

transacting and recruiting pedagogies for specific purposes. Those specific purposes are referable to issues such as using drama as a tool to prepare students to mediate the world in complex ways, including the way the teachers say they need to enact and recruit pedagogies that engender vulnerability, as a consequence, for example. Drama teachers therefore have multiple identities that reflect different ways they recruit theory and pedagogy. Sometimes those theories and pedagogies align them as potential activists and the pedagogy as activists (O'Connor, 2002). This goes some way to affirm the hypothesis that drama teachers can be particular agents of change.

Recognition of the cultural model of being a drama teacher is not homogeneous, as is reflected in the teachers' talk. Instead, it reflects these early career teachers' engagement in broader conversations and perceptions of what it means to be a drama teacher according to them. This includes how they enact pedagogy and how they recognise these insights influencing the way they understand their students. As Gee (2011) argues, Discourses enable us as human beings (as students and as teachers) to be recognised as a distinctive sort of *who* doing a distinctive sort of *what* – teaching drama.

To revisit the original premise of this chapter, which was to examine how the five early career teachers in this study talked, wrote and discussed their worlds as drama teachers, the examples of text and talk that give a dimension of texture and insight into what the teachers say, are the affordances of drama, substantiates the initial provocation of Palmer's– 'We did not merely find a subject to teach – the subject also found us' (2010, p 26).

Chapter 6: Building A More Socially Just World Through Drama

'I believe that those of us in education who have social justice as a goal can play a crucial role in movement building for economic and educational rights. We can do this in our daily lives as we "cast down our buckets" where we are. We can commit to the radical possibilities in our everyday work in schools' (Anyon, 2005, p.179).

Overview

This chapter seeks to interrogate the distinct ways the early career teachers in this study talk and write about social justice pedagogy and practices and their ideological alignment of the discourse to teaching in drama. The Discourse around social justice and drama is neither new nor revelatory it is however, a burgeoning area of research in the drama community and is consequently privileged in current conversations and Discourses.

The early career teachers in this study were asked about their engagement with social justice when they were asked to write about their teaching philosophies and asked in interviews about the ways in which they assimilated social justice practices and pedagogy They were also asked about how their ideological alignment to this Discourse shapes and frames their teaching. The synergy that exists between drama and social justice is privileged in the drama community and in the Discourse because of the theoretical and historical connections that have long been associated between these two constructs (Neelands, 2002). Practitioners and teachers in the drama community conceive the pedagogy to have affordances that reside within both the pedagogy and practice of drama that can facilitate students' understanding of where power resides in the world and where inequity and inequality exists (Finneran & Freebody, 2009). The teachers in this study acquiesce through talk and writing to this understanding.

The early career teachers in this study write in their teaching philosophies and explain through their talk in interviews that the work of social justice practices is inherent not just in their teaching of drama but inherent in their identities as drama teachers.

Part of the recognition of being a drama teacher with a socially just outlook means being ideological is explored in more detail in when David describes his view of teaching generally:

“But I do believe that, yeah, how I work is very ideologically inspired. I still think that I need to maybe hold onto these a bit more closely to how I teach.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 12)

The early career teachers in this research are cognizant of their role in transacting the broader Discourse of schooling and education and their role in ensuring equitable access to various opportunities for students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. The recognition by the teachers of their role in providing opportunities for their students to access the rhetoric in the classroom, is examined through the chapter in tandem with understanding how their ideological alignment to the work of social justice and critical pedagogy, predisposes them to teach in a particular way. This corroboration of ideology, beliefs and values in the teachers’ talk and writing reveals a fundamental understanding of the innately social and political nature of the work of teaching drama.

Again, the reiteration of Gee’s (1999) theory and framework that language continually builds and rebuilds our worlds is applied to the way the teachers in this study argue the tenets of social justice practice, as seminal to their teaching and to being recognized as a cultural model of drama teacher. Part of the complex work of being a drama teacher is attending to ideological predispositions and how this then shapes the way content and competencies are taught and transacted in the classroom.

The teachers' values, beliefs and ideologies

The teachers ever there is a more complex dimension to the work they do in the classroom in addition to just teaching content. As part of their role as teachers they believe they need to teach students about wider social issues such as homophobia and racism. When David talks about how he approaches teaching a text in year seven he draws on what he has learned at University and also reflects on what was important to him in teaching a unit with strong issues of race and identity;

“We’re looking at *Born to Run*, which is Cathy Freeman’s autobiography. And that was actually good. I mean it’s not heavy on her indigenous identity; it does focus on particular aspects but we did have 2-3 lessons where we looked at racism and discrimination and I did that whole -- I think we’ve done it at uni, like the blue eyed, brown eyed kids being discriminated and you get them to really feel what it’s like to feel discriminated. I felt like that was -- perhaps I could have imparted my passion for getting kids to realise that indigenous people have historically gone through so much and they need to know that. Like it’s not something we can just shrug off or think that it’s another generations fault or that it wasn’t us that did it. We still need to be taught about these things ‘cause we’re Australian and it’s part of our history, it’s who we are and we still have, particular issues that need to be addressed. I’m quite surprised that I was able to teach that.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 28)

The early career teachers in this study such as David articulated through their talk and their teaching philosophies the complexity of their roles and how they viewed their role as the teacher to be inextricably linked to their beliefs and values in educational practice and as members of the drama community. When David talks about his approach to teaching issues of social justice he reflects that he is surprised that he is able to teach not

only the content but in a particular way that reflects his ideological position regarding racism in Australia.

The early career teachers' values, beliefs and ideologies are articulated in and through interviews and teaching philosophies. Nick says in his teaching philosophy that teaching is a vocation and his views of what social justice is, is shaped through this lens of vocation. He says:

"I believe the teacher fulfils their key vocational requirements, serving others while positively challenging their students' perceptions of their role in their school and wider community."
(David, T.P., Lines 25-27)

The identities that the teachers construct for themselves and co construct through these texts and talk reveal a strong commitment to and yet highly individualistic perception of what social justice is. The teachers in this study argue that the practices they developed, taught or sometimes enacted in the classroom and school could be construed as engaging in subversion in order for their teaching practices to reflect their ideological alignment. Despite the belief the teachers say, that the school system expressly articulates through policy (The Melbourne Declaration On Goals For Young Australians, 2008, for example), the enactment and performance of the rhetoric of social justice, required the teachers at times to subvert the dominant Discourses residing in the school and to react individually and ideologically against these, through pedagogy and praxis.

"Actually I would probably make an effort to address it in class. It wouldn't even cross my mind not to." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 35)

What emerges through the teachers' talk and writing is a commitment to the implementation of social justice as a crucial and critical aspect of their repertoire as teachers and a significant dimension of their values and beliefs in their developing practices as drama teachers.

The early career teachers express in the following ways, drama and social justice as imperative in their practices as teachers and through language and talk, they ascribe significance to the Discourse of social justice practice.

Being apprenticed into the Discourse

The early career drama teachers in this study are inducted into the practice of social justice through their courses in the Combined Degree program at the University of Sydney and through the distinct Discourses they inculcate in drama curriculum for example. David says in his first interview that his experiences in his second year with drama curriculum and how that focused on social justice practices had an impact on shaping the way he engaged with the ideas.

“In drama we did a lot of – I don’t think it was explicitly social justice but we were definitely taught and a lot of it involved and it was underpinned by social justice issues. I think a lot has impacted on my teaching.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 6)

The broader Discourses of education that the drama teachers engage with could be derived from a number of policies including the syllabus that informs and shapes the way the teachers perceive the work of social justice in their classroom. Separate and distinct from these policies and syllabuses are the individual ways the teachers say they discern the policies and how their engagement with them informs and shapes the way they conceptualize their teaching in social justice. At times the teachers believe that a divergence from the Discourse may be necessary because of personal predilection and ideological beliefs about their role of pedagogy in their practice as teachers and their goals in teaching social justice.

The argument that resides in the literature (Fairclough, 2002; Gee, 1999; Lemke, 1995) regarding the acquisition of Discourses,

acknowledges the tensions that exist between enactment of social justice and the way dominant Discourses, are often controlled by socially powerful groups. These groups are often reluctant to allow access or membership to the Discourse unless it is performed in a particular and subscribed way, engaging in student centred teaching, allowing students greater autonomy when they are in the drama space, for example. The experiences of the early career teachers in this study corroborate this argument.

Through text and talk the early career teachers contend that being apprenticed into the Discourse of teaching social justice gives them capacity to imbue their teaching and therefore their students with access to dominant Discourses that they may otherwise be locked out of given their marginalized status or because they simply lack access to the language of the Discourse and conversation. The teachers acknowledge that this is prevalent in minority or marginalised groups and this requires great attention. For example, Georgia's experience with running a school celebration day where students were challenged to think about diversity and difference had an impact on her personal views regarding social justice. She says:

"We don't have a huge Arabic population at our school but there is a substantial amount. We did a wear it purple day for Lesbian-Gay-Queer kids and others. We celebrated that. I went shopping for that and I was a bit worried because of the reactions from these kids but we weren't trying to enforce it on them, they could come to the event if they wanted to, or not, but we ended up having a DJ there and I set up a bit of a rave, and there was this moment where we were in the pit and there were 400 kids all watching, including the kids who had earlier in the day made those comments about gay people or whatever." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 51)

Having explained how the day was organised Georgia went on to reflect on her own views about inclusivity and how she wanted them to be part of her teacher life and teacher self. She reflects by saying:

“I do believe in equality, so why is it not in every sphere of my life? So it wasn't me trying to challenge the kids but just make them think.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 59)

It is noteworthy in the context of how these early career teachers are apprenticed into the Discourse of social justice particularly to consider the emergence of new Discourses. The teachers talk about social justice Discourses, as part of the activity building they conduct through language and how that leads them to deviate from dominant Discourses they may have been explicitly taught, in order to create new Discourses that they prioritize and cultivate through their talk and writing.

One of the major Discourses that the early career teachers are enculturated into is the *Drama Australia Equity and Diversity Guidelines* (Drama Australia, 2005) and the way they expressly articulate the ideology of subject drama but also the ideological position of the drama community with regards to the work of social justice. This Discourse is privileged by the community because of the belief in the work of drama to enable change not just for the students who are engaged in the curriculum but because of the affordances that reside within it as a subject, and the particular capacities that can precipitate change and difference in the world.

This chapter uses examples of how the teachers engage in and with the principles outlined in the following document. The themes and motifs of this chapter are derived from the current *Drama Australia Equity and Diversity Guidelines* (Drama Australia, 2005). This framework positions the Discourse in drama as one that reflects the language and practice of social justice and therefore provides a frame of reference for this chapter and the

analysis. The guidelines expressly articulate the relationship between social justice and the affordances of drama.

Through their engagement with the policies, syllabuses and practicum placements in their undergraduate degrees, the early career teachers were able to engage with and develop integral ideas regarding what social justice actually is in both the school and the classroom. The teachers' have a heterogeneous understanding of the terminology and the lexicon but conceptualize individually, the interpretation and assimilation of the meaning of the words. The teachers assimilate, absorb, adapt and challenge these Discourses and conceptualizations and through this process, develop their professional identity that includes for these teachers, an ideological alignment with the work of social justice.

Social justice unpacked

The early career teachers in this study understood social justice homogenously in this way – their role in social justice is fundamentally to improve the life chances of the students they teach. Distinct and often nuanced interpretations of what social justice is emanate from this definition of improving life chances of students and unifies the early career teachers' understanding of what social justice is. The teachers fathom social justice to be a distinct and inherent dimension of their practices as teachers generally and specifically as teachers of drama. The lexicon and vocabulary that follows is derived from the teachers' teaching philosophies and is not exhaustive but is iterative. Teaching with, about, for and to, the following abstractions; democracy, equality, equity, compassion, empathy, ethical practice, moral agency, self-reflection that leads to an understanding of the 'other', disadvantage, marginalization, injustice manifested through social, political, relational, legal and educational issues. This list uses the participants words to capture the intent of the teachers' understanding of the term social justice.

The *Drama Australia Equity and Diversity Guidelines* (Drama Australia, 2005) explicate social justice in these terms; Equity; Inclusiveness; Pluralism; Diversity; and Empowerment. These terms are influenced by the liberatory politics that influence and shape the pedagogy with deference to the forefathers of drama and social justice Paolo Freire (2000) and Augusto Boal (1979). The way the early career teachers use the language and the lexicon of social justice reflects in part the Discourses they have engaged with but their language also reflects their developing identities as early career drama teachers and their alignment with the membership of the drama community which requires them to perform and use the 'right' language, as is found in the guidelines, in order to be a member of that community.

The competency and relationship the teachers have with the lexicon of social justice is attributable to their membership to a wider Discourse within teaching and as teachers of drama. No two of the early career teachers recruit exactly the same terminology or specific vocabulary to describe their understanding of social justice or the way they teach social justice pedagogy in the classroom through drama, they do however sympathetically use language within the corpus of social justice and this reflects their apprenticeship into the Discourse through university, practicum and engagement and assimilation of policies and guidelines.

Equity

'Principles of fairness, social justice and respect for individuals and their contexts underpin the various processes of drama in education'
(Point 1, Drama Australia Equity and Diversity Guidelines, 2005)

The following analysis reflects many of the tenets of the guidelines as prescribed in the guidelines. The heading of 'Equity' is reflected and exemplified in the way David talks about the principles of education generally and his ideological alignment with this key guideline.

David writes in his teaching philosophy about the value he ascribes to education generally. He says:

“Education is a gift...I believe I must use the necessary and most appropriate means to nurture a life-long love of learning in my students. (The classroom) is also a space to probe and investigate real and imagined worlds.” (David, T.P., Lines 1-3, 24-25)

He writes in detail about the importance, of social justice in his classroom. He uses specific vocabulary as iterations in his text and talk when he describes the work that social justice and pedagogy has to do in his classroom. He uses the words, ‘supportive’, ‘inclusive’ and ‘respectful’ to describe the climate he wants to achieve in his classroom that he believes will be the effective conditions for teaching in socially just ways. He attributes particular and new meaning to the word, ‘respectful’. David’s interpretation and use of this term implies a mutual obligation and means not only garnering the respect of the student and how they react and work with him in the classroom but the placement of the word in his teaching philosophy implies the approach he wants to take with his students. This development of a culture of mutual respect, David promotes as the ideal relationship in order to achieve the relationships that are conducive to teaching drama in socially just ways. In this way, the discourse of education that impugns teacher centrism is challenged by his assimilation of this discourse. He says this about the qualities of a drama classroom that has inherent within it the tenets of social justice,

“The classroom should probe and challenge student’s preconceived ideas about the world around them.” (David, T.P., lines 24-25)

David’s view that the drama classroom can provide the context within which to advocate this praxis reflects his ideological predisposition to teaching in thoughtful and provocative ways. The concept of classrooms

as crucibles of ideas and visible thinking is not new Discourse (Dewey, 1897), rather the inference in David's writing is that the journey must be negotiated through mutually acceptable conditions in the classroom, in order to achieve and reflect equity, among other attributions and affordances of social justice pedagogy.

The words, 'probe', 'challenge' and 'preconceived' suggest that some of the views of the students may be bigoted, prejudiced or uninformed or perhaps they contraindicate the views that David holds, as the teacher. It is suggestive that what currently resides in classrooms, according to David, may be practices that pay homage to dominant Discourses that may reinforce stereotypical views as distinct from providing opportunities to closely and critically examine dominant Discourses. David argues that in counteracting what may be considered limited or uninformed views, he may sometimes need to subvert the syllabus or the Dominant discourses, in order that his students are exposed to multiple perspectives, and what he argues, are the best informed of these viewpoints.

David's year nine drama class, he refers to as an example of where he has tried to shape social justice practices and principles inherent in the theoretical work he learned in his degree and how he applies the pedagogy he recruits for this class. The insight he says he gained from studying the 'Theatre of the oppressed' (Boal, 1979) has enabled him to theoretically design units of work that are replete with opportunities to engage in socially just Discourses within the drama classroom. He also uses the interview process as an opportunity for self- reflection about the way he teaches content in the classroom and how in his view the classroom is the conduit to equity in practice:

"I think social justice practices are the way you teach." (David, Int. 1, Turn 20)

This view regarding how Discourses of social justice are performed in the classroom incorporates David's view of social justice, which he argues should focus on the content and the facilitation of the pedagogy in particularly nuanced ways to reflect the tenets of social justice. In his text and talk he articulates a particular theoretical position and intertextualizes his philosophy with examples of what he describes as influential theory. David argues that rather than a discreet curriculum social justice is really about the transaction and the teaching. He also discusses the premise of modifications to accommodate this praxis in the classroom. He says that he does this to ensure:

"I create equal opportunities for students and their learning."
(David, Int. 1, Turn 22)

In his first interview, David describes how his ideological preponderance was challenged because of the pedagogy he recruited to teach this year nine class and the failure of the pedagogy as enacted by him, to perform a particular role. He says that he thought he had shaped the classroom to engender equity principles but he was confronted by an incident of bullying in the lesson. He describes the way that more articulate students can be the subject of derision and inferential bullying through eye rolling and facial expression to reflect disapproval:

"The nerdier girls often give quite articulate responses to the questions that are posed in drama." (David, Int. 1, Turn 22)

Because some girls in this class are intellectually able and articulate he says that these responses are met with eye rolling and disdain by other less able and less engaged students and he says he sees correcting and addressing that sort of derision and behaviour is part of the work of a social justice classroom, where students are free from bullying and are able to express their opinions and they are intellectually safe doing that:

“I want to address that.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 22)

He says that he wants to address these issues by teaching expressly about equity as an ongoing issue. David says in his interview that the way he teaches he believes promotes equity in the classroom but this is sometimes difficult to achieve.

“If I say yes. If we go back to the way we teach and trying to create equal opportunities and things like that, and reducing inequality, yeah, I think this is where I’m going. But are you going to let students choose their groups or are you going to have people move around so people aren’t left out, people aren’t excluded?” (David, Int. 1, Turn 22)

This is a distinct dimension of the way he wants to be recognized as a cultural model of drama teacher. He says he is conscious of the inequity in the actions of the students who rolled their eyes and he is also concerned for the student who is articulate and needs the intellectual quality of her comments validated, but he says he is actively thinking about ways to address this problem.

Through building a culture and climate of access, equity and opportunity, in the classroom David says he is doing the work of social justice. He was asked in an interview how he built that climate and the ways he ensured fidelity of the implementation:

“It’s how you address certain students, how you plan group work, how you try to make modifications to create equal opportunities for students and their learning.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 34)

The way David talks about the planning he is doing in the classroom is attributed an added importance by the way he speaks about planning work and the content he teaches. He says that part of the work he

needs to do is in addressing the students, the way he speaks to and engages them and also the way he says he needs to make them aware of the deficit way they may behave in the classroom. For David, being respectful is both a mutual and desirable practice. His ideological alignment is to a Discourse that argues students and teachers need to be respectful of each other to provide the fertile grounds upon which to foster rich relationships in the classroom. This is part of the work of social justice pedagogy, in his view.

In projecting his ideological alignment onto a particular perspective of social justice David says he was really confronted by an incident in this same class. He describes an incident with one of his students who has Asperger's syndrome. David was completely aware of this and was conscious of accommodating her and yet not identifying her as different in the class. He says when they broke away to do pair-work she could not find a partner or a group who would engage with her. He reflected in his interview about his view that you need to think about modifications to create equality and equity.

He elaborated on the situation and retold how the students were asked if they, 'Were open to a group of three?' He describes the students' responses as very considered and mature in their receptiveness. He believes this is in part a reflection of the climate he had established in the classroom. However he did engage in some self-criticism on reflection when he felt the arrangement did not succeed:

"So that was my fault, I should have paired with her in role." (David, Int. 1, Turn 34)

David's evaluation of the situation in the classroom reflects his identity that he says is one that his students can judge him by. He believes that the way he negotiates the climate and the content with the students in the classroom is a consequence of his enactment of social justice practices.

The social language that describes his actions also builds significance in his world of teaching in socially just ways and his use of evaluative terms and language such as, 'open' and 'fault' is also his way of making sense of what happened in the lesson and analysing it through talk. David is not the only early career teacher to explicate through his interviews and writing, an alignment to the equity principles advocated by Drama Australia, this discussion of his alignment to equity provides a singular but poignant example.

Inclusiveness

'The notion of inclusiveness in drama involves more than providing access. In order to be included it is important that the participants also feel recognized and valued within the full range of drama experience' (Drama Australia, 2005).

The language and lexicon of social justice Jane uses through her teaching philosophy are words that evoke and construct her identity that focus on the main concern in the classroom, which is 'access', in order to promote a climate of inclusivity. Jane says that there is a 'right' way to teach students to use language that is inclusive, and that all students have a right to this access. She writes in her opening paragraph of her teaching philosophy about her belief in the fundamental right of every child to access education.

"Every child deserves access to equal educational opportunities'.
(Jane, T.P., Line 1)

In this brief sentence, Jane's language does a number of things overtly and a number of things covertly. The words she places in the sentence such as *deserves* gives this sentence political attributions. She argues that the education that she believes every child needs, is one where they do not need to behave, act or perform in any special way in order to

be deserving of it. The implication of what Jane believes politically is that while every child may deserve access to equal educational opportunities, they may not, as in her case, have or have had access to it. In foregrounding 'access' in her statement, she positions herself ideologically as an activist for access of opportunity and in this way also corroborates the ideals of a public education system, a system she is a strong advocate for.

Jane discusses in her interviews her views regarding the language of social justice. She argues that without correct use of language students are left unprotected and are at a disadvantage in negotiating meaning in the classroom and beyond. Jane describes what she says is the 'right way,' to use language. Her views are derived from Discourses that have shaped her impressions of the public education system, which she attended. She describes her own experiences as 'mostly successful'. However she believes there is only one way to communicate with people when using the language of access and what she describes as the 'language of ability'.

Because Jane's identity is strongly tied to her views about inclusion she says that people who use language that is deficient in terms of describing ability are 'not educated properly', and she describes this as a failure of education and the teaching of the Discourse of ability. Jane's example of how nuancing of language in the classroom is in her view critical to the work of social justice, is illustrated by her in an incident when she was teaching text in drama. She describes the central character in the text that as one with a disability and she goes on to elaborate on the encounter with the student the following way:

"It's just picky little things, and a kid said 'autistic' and I said you should say a person with autism." (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 3)

The way she engages with the language and semantics of social justice she says are very important even though she trivializes them by her

description of the semantics as being 'picky'. As she continued to describe this incident in the classroom during the interview she added further comment to rationalize what she believed was important in this exchange. Although she qualifies this further by saying:

"It is a bit politically correct. I don't think you should take offence, you should just teach people the right way." (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 13)

While Jane regards the language and semantics as perhaps being too prescribed and politically correct in her words, she does not resile from her initial view and ideology which is, people should be taught the 'right way', to use language when discussing ability. Her belief is still that being educated in the language is part of the work of social justice and reflects her perspective regarding how teachers should speak about the issues of access and ability. Jane believes in using politically correct language in teaching about social justice and in a similar way, Georgia in her interview talks about her views regarding the importance of the use of meta-language for similar purposes. Georgia's views are unpacked in detail under the sub heading, 'Empowerment'.

Both Jane and David corroborate each other's views and ideologies regarding use of language and the semantics of social justice. Jane views this as a necessary acquisition whereas David believes it is about:

"Recognizing and showing them there is a better way of phrasing things." (David, Int. 1, Turn 17)

Both these early career teachers acknowledge through talk, the importance of the integrity that resides in the social language and lexicon of social justice and how through the acquisition and apprenticeship in the classroom the students can perform and engage in the Discourse and therefore cultivate informed views.

Because Jane and David believe so strongly in the importance and instrumentality of the language they are also reticent that lack of language should not be a reason to be isolated from the conversation and Discourse of the classroom. Jane describes this as, 'a fine line'. She says that if the students are reluctant to talk about issues in the classroom, for fear of not using the correct language then the topic or the classroom as a forum for engaging with controversial ideas or discussions about disabilities will in her words, become, 'taboo' and this becomes another barrier to students accessing the Discourse. This conflict between accessing the Discourse and the language is an issue that all the early career teachers reflect on in terms of the ways they might ameliorate this in the classroom.

Pluralism

'This is a philosophy where there is an acknowledgment of difference, of multiple perspectives, of multiple truths and identity locations. Drama processes and products are often multi- vocal and collaborative endeavours' (Drama Australia, 2005).

This concept of pluralism as articulated in the guidelines, is exemplified in some ways by the following analysis, where Nick discusses through his text and talk, the importance of valuing difference and acknowledging the role of the teacher in this process of acquisition. Nick's relationship with pluralism is complex and at times contradictory.

Nick's identity as a teacher is firmly entrenched in his beliefs regarding the teacher as a 'moral agent'. His view regarding teaching about social justice is inseparable, he says from his belief that all teaching whether it is content or knowledge, emanates from the teacher as the model and as the exemplar for moral behaviour. For Nick, behaviour that is ethical includes taking into account other people's views about the world, their views about the environment, about religion and the way the students are treated by him, in the classroom and by the school and community more broadly.

“You really have try hard not to force your own morality on your students or tell them what to think or what to feel; you have to facilitate them in figuring it out on their own.” (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 4)

Nick’s ‘identity work’ when he writes in his teaching philosophy places all responsibility for a students’ moral development in the hands of the teacher. This deviation from the mainstream belief that the development of students, moral or otherwise occurs through a confluence of actions and exposures to a myriad of factors develops a new Discourse. Students learn through a multitude of ways and their moral development, which may include learning about socially just practice is not considered to be the sole responsibility of the classroom teacher in the dominant Discourse and Nick’s views challenges that articulation. In many ways this view whilst expansive is anti-pluralism.

Nick’s philosophy defies the status quo and he argues for an entirely new and emergent Discourse where he provokes the idea that teachers need to divest themselves of ego and of what he describes as, “the poisonous aspects of being a teacher” (Int. 1, Turn 30). He argues that the entitled aspects of being a teacher, to give marks or to take marks away among other capacities, is for him emblematic of the problem in teaching. His emphatic use of the word, ‘poisonous’ in the context of the sentence is both pejorative and figurative. The description is intentionally shocking and denotes what he believes is problematic about teaching and it also foregrounds his ideological predisposition and what he says about his role as a teacher and the moral responsibility of the job. He believes that moral agency is the anecdote for what he sees as entitlement in the job or role of teaching and is in his words, ‘poisonous’. This is a new and emergent Discourse because it divests the teacher of a dimension of assumed power or entitlement.

“I’m entitled to say this about you because I’m in this position. I’m entitled to use my teacher power in this way. I’m entitled to give you a B instead of an A. I’m entitled to my whatever.” (Nick, Int. 2. Turn 9)

The view Nick espouses through Discourse and the meta-language of social justice in his second interview extends to coalescing with what he has previously said about the need to divest oneself of ego and entitlement in order to be of service to the students and the school community. For Nick, the language and associated meaning of service and servitude becomes part of a new language that he intends to purvey in and through his teaching for social justice in drama specifically and generally in his teaching life. The complexity that resides in this new Discourse is that he wants to control elements or aspects of this new discourse and yet it is a way of viewing the world that he argues, should divest itself of ego-centrism and yet must emanate from the teacher in order to be enacted or performed. This argument is paradoxical in many ways.

As integral to his belief system and the reflexivity of the context of the classroom is his argument that the responsibility for students extends to the way he speaks and uses language in the classroom. He says in his interview that:

“It really made the responsibilities that I have as a teacher even more apparent and more serious, just in how I talk.” (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 9)

The importance of how he speaks about students he says is paramount in his classroom practice. The value he accords to the way he speaks about and to his students he describes as fundamental to his ideological alignment to being a ‘moral agent’.

There is a synergy between all five of the early career teachers and their views regarding how important language is in teaching in a socially just way. As all five teachers reveal particular ideological proclivities in heterogeneous ways there is distinct homogeneity also in the way they all give credence to how the language enables the practice – the praxis of or confluence of social justice and teaching. Whilst all five teachers conceptualize in unique and slightly nuanced ways, their views about teaching, they are also forming identities that have crucial ideas about what it is to teach in a socially just way and the importance of this way of teaching their students in the classroom.

Teachers Living In A Socially Just Way

David describes his views about social justice through the lens of his personal beliefs about how this can be achieved. This view corroborates the guidelines regarding pluralism. In his teaching philosophy he notes:

“Effective teachers integrate social justice practices in their teaching and model these in their own lives.” (David, T.P., Line 46)

David’s description of what he believes is an effective teacher comes with some attributions that imply that teaching should include transacting not only content and how you teach that content but how the way you live your life affects your interpretation of that content and pedagogy. His teaching philosophy argues the need for social justice to be achieved in his classroom as an ideological position and he sees the achievement of that ideal as directly referable to the way he lives his own life and how the students perceive that through his facilitation. He believes that unless he has demonstrated these practices he has not taught well. He implies that unless as a teacher you are living in a socially just way you cannot be an effective teacher. However he does not explicate what living in a socially just way looks like in practice.

Because David had argued strongly that he wanted to be identified as a socially just teacher, he was asked how he intended to achieve this ideal in his final interview. He was uncomfortable when he was asked if he still oriented to this idea and audibly groaned when asked to explain this further:

“Do I live it, believe it? Yeah I do believe it. But at times I think.... mean that’s why the adjective ‘effective’ is still there, because you can be a teacher and perhaps you do these things but perhaps you don’t act on them as consciously in your classroom as you would like to.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 69)

David avers that in order to be the effective teacher he denotes as the ideal model for his students, his practicing of social justice should be at the forefront of his teaching and his planning. As a novice David says he needs time to reflect and to assess if he has in fact achieved this goal of being ‘effective’. He extends on his talk during the interview, his perception of what this effectiveness means to him and how it is manifested in his view in the classroom. He says he believes strongly in the idea that teaching about social justice means, living a particular way but also addressing bigger ideas and challenging dominant Discourses in a critical way. His assessment of what an effective teacher is involves conversations as well as actions and beliefs. He develops this idea further when he says that:

“But I do think that if you’re an effective teacher that is part of your teaching, it is to highlight in whatever content you are doing these sorts of issues, power issues that are still...people in power. I do think that teachers need to for their students highlight certain things about whether it is power struggles or power relations or the indigenous histories or even migrant stories.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 69)

David's views regarding teaching in a socially just way are almost always around the way he thinks content should be taught. He returns in the second interview to what he discussed in his first interview and reiterates what he believes are the issues that students need to discern in order to become effective members of the community and to be discerning as citizens.

"Learning from our historical mistakes, definitely. And I don't know, perhaps if they know about these things then they can realise that even in the current world, things to do with like say ISIS, breaking down those things and saying these things... The Holocaust is from a long time ago, the Stolen Generations is still recent history but in parts of the world we still see these things. Like it hasn't escaped us; it's still living in the world. It's there and it's real and perhaps maybe we live in a country where we're so far removed from it but we need to be consciously aware of these things in teaching." (David, Int. 2, Turn 72)

His ideas align with Discourses that are politically contentious on one view and necessary to educating about the democracy. For example, his view about teaching content is that it should be taught through a lens that acknowledges Indigenous identity and power struggles and this should be informed through planning units of work and lessons.

Jane by comparison talks about social justice and the way she lives this paradigm through her views regarding 'access' and the discourse of ability. As a teacher with a visual impairment, she says her own schooling experiences heavily influenced her views about how teachers should teach and that her views regarding social justice are tied to her unswerving belief in students having access to schooling and to opportunities for learning whatever their physical challenges. Her experiences she says have made her aware of how she needs to really exemplify this mantra of access if she is to be a socially just teacher:

“I think in terms of having a vision impairment and coming from that background and having some horrid teachers, I hate to say it, I think I’m even more aware of what an impact a teacher can have.”
(Jane, Int. 1, Turn 13)

Jane says that her orientation to living and acting in a socially just way is a consequence of her own negative experiences at school. She recounts in an interview her experiences of being denied access to Art classes during her high school years because of her visual impairment. She was denied access to the subject she says because of her impairment and yet she believes access to subject choice is a fundamental tenet of social justice, but more importantly she believes it was the failure on the part of her teacher to enact social justice practice as a person and then as a teacher. Jane believes teachers need to advocate for their students. Jane argues that she should have been allowed to participate in Art classes to her own capacity and derive enjoyment and meaning through a personal engagement, shaped by her challenges.

Georgia also adheres to the view that social justice is very personal and multi-faceted. That it is a personal interpretation and journey of how she wants to live her life and the way she wants to model this for her students. She describes this process as part of her emerging identity as an early career teacher:

“I’m trying to work out my purpose in life, what I’m meant to be doing. I’m not really religious but I feel like everyone’s got a greater purpose and I’m not sure what mine is yet. I feel like that’s something I would be good at on Manus Island. I think it could shape me and my teaching in the new Australia.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 74)

Because Georgia says her view is personal and evolving she does not commit to a fixed view of what living in a socially just way is for her. The implied meaning in her talk attributes her emerging ideas and identity to rhetoric of social commitment on the part of the teacher as an individual. She does not say that all teachers should examine their consciences and decide where they should teach or for what purpose, for her it is an entirely personal journey and evolution. Her reference to the, 'new Australia', mediates a reflection of her teaching in a diversely populated school. This has, she says had a huge impact on her perception of what the needs are, of students in a school like hers. Her comments also allude to a new and emerging Discourse that she argues is imperative for students, which is capturing the, 'student's voice'.

In the following text Elena also talks about how she views teaching in a socially just way and how she perceives this belief system impacts her teaching in the classroom:

"I would probably say that patience and honesty are the two things that correspond most strongly in relation to teaching for social justice. From my experiences, keeping in mind obviously the duty of care and you're not supposed to divulge too many details about your own life, being honest about your own personal struggles perhaps or experiences with students who may be feeling victimized or marginalised. Being honest with them and being patient with them or to go through whatever they're going through or even for them to break down the walls they may have put up. I think they're probably the two that are the most effective and are the most important when dealing with kids and social justice."
(Elena, Int. 2, Turn 15)

The importance of patience, honesty and truth telling that Elena builds into this conversation is grounded in her belief that she must be honest in modelling her own vulnerabilities as a human being in order to

teach in a socially just way. Elena compounds the two ideas in her teaching philosophy and interviews that honesty is a fundamental and critical dimension to teaching in a socially just way. Her perception corroborates the discourses articulated in the drama guidelines that express the capacity drama has for emancipatory outcomes to improve the lives of the students.

In a previous interview Elena had expounded upon her commitment and belief in the affect of using pedagogy that inculcated the work of theorist and practitioner, Boal (2000). She says that his work with oppression and the 'Theatre of the Oppressed' (Boal, 2000) influences and shapes the way she conceives the Discourse of social justice in her classroom. Her commitment to being honest and open to her students, in order to empathise with the students on their learning journey is also a Discourse of ensemble and participation privileged in the drama community. As she previously argued, the lives of people with whom the teachers work and teach can be made better through these practices of honesty and integrity.

Building Student Resistance To Discourses

One of the significant conversations in the Discourse of drama is about the affect of critical pedagogy in the classroom to teach students about the power of the art-form to emit change and to 'hold a mirror' (O'Connor, 2010) up to the social conscience of a community at large. The work in this area is informed by the regard within the drama community for the efficacy of using critical pedagogy to enact change and as a means by which students can be empowered to access the conversations and Discourses and through that access, change the course of the conversation through participation and performance. By engaging in this Discourse, students can challenge dominant ideologies because of the way they have been taught.

Nick's teaching philosophy and his subsequent interviews are redolent with his entrenched ideological preponderance that argues classrooms should enact moral agency with the teacher as the central ideologue through which the Discourse and conversation of values, can be emitted. His concurrence with the Discourse privileged by the drama community is that students need to access critical pedagogy through 'process drama', (O'Neill, 1995) in order for them to be able to understand and perform resistance to dominant Discourses is reflected in his talk. He believes that one of the most powerful tools for ameliorating the effects of inequity and marginalization in resisting Discourses is by using critical pedagogy (Apple, 2005). In the following conversation Nick discusses building resistance in his students and in the classroom. This example and discussion reflects the tenets of pluralism as advocated by Drama Australia, also. He says:

"The one thing that really sticks out for me is probably just respecting others and doing things for others rather than yourself that's something that we treat not with the same type of critique that we treat other types of moral certitudes, like things to do with religion or things to do with who's good in this story, whose bad in this story. I think we critique why we should respect or why we should do things for other people rather than ourselves." (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 4)

Using a critical pedagogy and process drama approaches, Nick advocates through his process drama approach the idea that students in the classroom need to invigilate rigorously the hegemonic ideas that are taken for granted in everyday discourse. This pedagogy Nick promotes says that moral conjecture should be applied to how students view each other in relation to the world and how they perform particular functions based on effective criticism. This is an empowering discourse that corroborates the guidelines outlined by Drama Australia, and yet as Nick describes, it is controversial and requires subversion at times in the

classroom, to ensure this critical pedagogy that he believes in is taught with fidelity.

Nick also talks about texts as tools that disrupt the dominant Discourses. He says that students need to criticise practices and examine binary oppositions as they present themselves in and through text. Interrogating why a character is perceived as 'good' needs to be critiqued and this provides the students, he says with skills of moral reasoning and resistance. Students can make informed judgments based on their empowered and skills of understanding, acquired through drama. In this way, multiple truths can be told.

Diversity

'In the world of the arts diversity is highly valued. A diversity of participants in a group enriches all involved and enables an exchange of ideas, perspectives and stories to fuel the artistic process in drama' (Drama Australia, 2005).

Elena frames her idealism and values as a teacher by describing her, 'strong philanthropic nature', (T.P., Line 16) in her teaching philosophy. Her language builds an identity that argues the importance of giving back to others from what you may materially and intellectually have acquired and this shapes her identity in a particular way. A picture of what Elena's classroom might look like begins to emerge and she says that her own proclivity for volunteer work, particularly in the arts' world means she places a high value on the world of artistic endeavour and also on the subject of drama. In her classroom she expects students to develop a social conscience that values volunteerism.

Elena argues in her text and talk that classrooms are and should be diverse ideologically and culturally. She says that her experiences teaching in a remote country town in regional NSW as part of her 'Beyond the Line'

teaching had a profound effect on her because of the lack of diversity she saw and experienced culturally and this she says:

“Shaped me into someone who has particular values and beliefs as a teacher.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 12)

These values she goes on to say are central to her as a person and as a teacher, she views them as mutually exclusive. She argues that a lack of tolerance of diverse cultures and ideas is repugnant to her. If she accepts or ignores behaviour that contradicts what she believes about the value of diversity, she contradicts herself. Elena says that she needs to mediate these qualities that embrace diversity in the classroom in order:

“To be truthful to my work.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 37)

Again, Elena returns to the value of truthfulness in both her work as a teacher and her relationship with her students but the inherent value of truth in living a particular way. She argues that she needs to satisfy her artistic and her ideological work in her classroom and through her teaching. She cannot have one without the other – they are inseparable for her and reflect an identity that combines teacher artistry and practice.

The significance of this ‘identity building’, work that she writes in her teaching philosophy is also informed by what is implied in the statement. The idea that if she is not practicing her values and beliefs and these are not evident in her teaching she is being untruthful or deviant in terms of her ideological position and the social justice practice she believes fuel her teaching. This is a conscious model that says she needs to behave, speak and act in a particular way or she corrupts who she inherently is. She is prepared to subvert a system or way of being if it conflicts with her ideological position. Elena says she cannot perform the work of teaching if she doesn’t believe in what she is doing or it conflicts with her ideological proclivity.

In her first interview Elena spoke about her own values again and the fact that:

“I considered myself to be fairly open minded – somebody who was quite aware of social injustice.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 22)

Elena posits throughout her interview that the values and beliefs she holds are important in shaping and framing the way she says she will teach the content in her classroom. She is also conscious, as Jane also is in her interview, of the fact that an:

“Awareness of social injustice needs to be in every classroom.” (Elena, Int. 2, Line 17)

Elena says she will need to reinforce this after her experiences teaching in a remote area after she talks about the difficulties she encountered in this experience. She speaks about her concern regarding a lack of physical resources such as internet access but of greater concern to her, is what she considers is the lack of access to a Discourse of diversity and inclusivity among staff and among students. She was concerned by the homophobic views that members of the staff displayed through their talk and the impact this had in shaping and influencing the views of the students. Elena also reflects on the fact that as a Greek/Australian she was the only ethnic teacher these students had ever met or been taught by.

The teaching experience that Elena had during her second practicum experience was seminal, she says in shaping her views about the importance of active social justice practices in the classroom and the way language is used to change or shift paradigms. She spoke about how, in the public school she was teaching in, a campaign to end homophobia and to create a more inclusive and diverse environment for students who identify as gay was being developed by one teacher in her staffroom. Elena

was keen to participate and to be a part of the campaign particularly she says, after her experiences in rural NSW and as part of her commitment to volunteerism and philanthropy. She says her experience teaching in the country both shocked and defined her as a teacher so she relished the chance to be part of an awareness campaign. The central focus of the campaign was to 'Wear It Purple', which involved wearing a purple badge that signified a student or a staff awareness of students who had been marginalized by identifying as LGBTQTI.

Elena pre-empted the recount of 'Wear It Purple' day by talking about how influential the work of Augusto Boal (2000) had been in teaching her about issues of access and informing her approach to teaching. She said:

"Participation and inciting participation is really important for social justice." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 27)

The foregrounding of the word 'participation' indicates that Elena believes if participation does not happen or is disallowed then the true purpose of social justice and in this case, recognizing the marginalization and under representation of a particular group cannot be realised. The conditions must be met for participation to occur. Elena then spoke about what was pertinent in her words to the campaign and why it failed:

"The campaign didn't even go that long before being shut down and it was due to complaints by other students, predominantly in the Christian collective but also by parents and teachers themselves." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 27)

The interesting aspect of this outcome of the campaign is that Elena, similarly to Jane, are both advocates of a strong public school system, which is where this campaign occurred and yet they both feel the system is flawed. Despite the express articulation in the policy of the

department that inclusivity and diversity is an inherent dimension of the public school's charter, the campaign was shut down by a group and their dominant ideological position. Both Jane and Elena talk about how it is through personal endeavour and practice that this Discourse can be changed.

"You know equality is something that is not just a given, you actually have to work at it. It's not just something that happens."
(Elena, Int. 2, Turn 10)

In a similar vein of reflection Jane talks about the bigger vision of social justice and then she interprets the work to say it can be the smaller things that matter in the teaching. Fundamental issues like the welfare of your students. She says this on reflection:

"It's about all those ideas and then there's actually teaching it, but then it's looking out for the social justice of your students, in a sense. It can be as small as asking if a student is ok or just observing them. You're teaching your students that everyone deserves equal chances." (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 10)

Elena's comments on reflection about the campaign are particularly sanguine when she reflects on the failure of the 'Wear It Purple' campaign and her personal engagement with the process and she says:

"It struck me quite hard." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 27)

She acknowledges the difficulties and the reality of implementing her own beliefs and the tenets of social justice as she interprets them in the classroom and in the school, however the way she continues to talk about how she aims to continue developing her identity as a philanthropic and truthful teacher is hopeful rather than defeatist in the face of what she describes as bigger difficulties such as educating about homophobia.

Having acknowledged the need for social justice to be embedded in every classroom and in every practitioner's repertoire, Elena reflects on the uncertainty about the affect of what she advocates in the classroom. She discusses her experience in a staffroom and recounts where she encountered some racist and homophobic overtures from both students and staff in her practicum experience in rural NSW:

"I don't know, they have deeply embedded biases that can't change." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 27)

Rather than giving up or compromising her beliefs and ideological position as this talk might suggest and in spite of what she sees is the intransigence of some teachers and students, Elena goes on to develop a connection between the practices at the school and the significance she sees in her particular way of teaching about social justice. She goes on to argue in her second interview that this work that she sees as seminal in the classroom and in the school, to educate about bias and stereotypes may require some subversion on her part. However she says:

"I wouldn't shy away from it. Actually I would probably make an effort to address it in my class. It wouldn't even cross my mind not to." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 37)

This activist identity and how she describes this in her teaching philosophy reflects that even though she is part of a larger Discourse of public school values where she speaks a common language in the school, within that school she is prepared to and in fact is emboldened by what she sees as important and significant to the work of social justice and to her identity as a teacher and as a person– "it wouldn't cross my mind not to" (Int.2, Turn 35) – to stand up for what she believes in and to be truthful. She says she would not compromise or acquiesce to a Discourse that was passively or actively biased or bigoted. These examples are

reflections of some of the early career teachers' views and ideas about diversity, among other social justice issues. They argue that cultural diversity, sexual diversity, diversity of ideas among other attributions should be acknowledged and embraced within the classroom.

Empowerment

In her teaching philosophy Georgia writes about her strong belief that classrooms in Australia should reflect in their pedagogy and practices the huge diversity that is found culturally, within them. She reiterates this tenet when she is interviewed and returns to talking about her role in, 'the new Australia'. She says that her role in the classroom and school is inherently relational and without these factors she cannot do the work. She says this:

"Building relationships and designing inclusive and positive learning environments – these are the cornerstones of my practice." (Georgia, T.P., Line 16)

Georgia uses the lexicon of social justice and her reference to 'inclusive', resonates with the way the other early career teachers have described their work. For each of these teachers the word inclusive has a cognitive affect – it is a way of thinking as well as a way of being. The performance of inclusivity is a dimension of the 'identity building' of values and beliefs of the teachers in heterogeneous ways. This way of thinking that is inclusive is also, in Georgia's view, empowering for her students.

In her first interview, Georgia was in her second term of her teaching position and her conversation is peppered with evidence of the apprenticeship to the wider Discourse of teaching. The relevant aspect of this apprenticeship to this study is the way she speaks using language of inclusion to describe not only teaching and the act of teaching, but she is also self-reflective about her ability to be inclusive in her comments.

“It’s funny because we talk about teaching all the time that we’re going about it in a socially just way.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

This sentence is building a relationship between what Georgia thinks about teaching, the conversations generally in the school setting and the broader Discourse of teaching. Georgia includes herself in the community by talking about ‘we’. Her talk builds a relationship between the way she sees the significance of teaching, ‘in a socially just way’ and the fact that for her identity she sees this is an iterative conversation rather than a unique or stand-alone conversation. The work of teachers, she says means talking about teaching this way, all the time. This is a constant conversation.

Implied in this talk is the assumption for her that ‘we’ talk about teaching this particular way all the time. She is referring to her colleagues at school and also to the Discourse of teaching. The tenets of teaching in a socially just way are inherent to her beliefs and values. She does not countenance in her talk that other teachers may not hold the same views or in fact talk about this issue of social justice all the time. For Georgia, social justice practices are the work she does daily and the way she speaks about this is an invitation to others to take up this position and perform this particular Discourse.

The social justice home-room is empowering

In her second interview Georgia reveals how integral social justice is in her beliefs and identity when she gives an example of how she applied for an internal promotion within the school. She explains that as a graduate teacher she did not feel she would get the position due to her lack of experience but the position was for a home- room teacher who could develop programs and bring awareness of issues of equity and diversity to the students. She says she believed with her passion for social

justice mediation that she would be a good candidate for consideration in spite of her inexperience.

The Principal rang her and asked her to take the home-room position and she was excited by the prospect of her own classroom. The recount of this occurrence reflects Georgia's commitment to the ideal but the unique way she approached the role. She says:

"It's a social justice home room – learn to live, I think that's what it called, that's what it's called, interact, learn to live." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

The importance of this home-room to Georgia was not the home-room structure but it was the opportunity for her to commit her way of teaching and her personal interpretation of the pedagogy in a classroom setting. The school's mission in establishing this home-room arrangement she said was to:

"Meet the needs of the community." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

Georgia saw this homeroom as an opportunity to implement social justice pedagogy in a specific setting. She did not elaborate on what she thought the idea behind meeting the needs of the community really meant. She took this role as an opportunity to do what she argues is the important work of social justice and to develop pedagogy that accords with her ideological disposition. Georgia argues that students need to lead the learning in order to be empowered by it. She therefore saw the role of the homeroom as different to what was originally planned by the school but took the opportunity to assimilate and promulgate her views about social justice practices. Georgia specifies the room quite definitively in this way as a "social justice home-room." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

In developing a new way of conceptualising the homeroom Georgia is covertly performing a new or secondary Discourse within the school conversation. While she says she was pleased to be appointed to this position she does not talk about whether or not she happened to discuss the way she wanted to structure or shape this classroom with the Principal or with any other stakeholders in or outside of the school. She did not seek any approval or approbation for the implementation of her ideas or her philosophies. She uses the lexicon or language of the Discourse to shape the way she views the classroom. Georgia makes the decision based on her identity as a teacher with a strong view about the importance of this pedagogy, to shape and form this classroom in her way and with her interpretation of the mandate. This way of teaching and empowering is a Freirean idea (2000) and reflects an enculturation of Georgia into the Discourses privileged by the drama community.

For Georgia, the opportunity to be the architect of a classroom that is specifically dedicated to social justice practices means she needs to examine closely what she believes is inherently important pedagogically about teaching social justice. She says that the importance of acquiring literacy and the meta-knowledge of the written code is paramount for these students but there are larger concerns for her in how she will empower the students to develop and acquire these and other competencies in this classroom.

Fundamentally, she accepts that an emphasis on literacy is key to enabling them to be active and engaged citizens, as David believes in his drama classroom, however Georgia's interpretation of social justice specifies that her role in the social justice classroom is to act as a facilitator for the students and that the classroom should allow them to acquire leadership skills that will enable them to have agency in the school. Georgia says that leadership skills are what the students need in order to be empowered to engage in wider Discourses. She says they need these skills:

“So they can enact what’s important to them within the school.”
(Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 19)

Georgia’s view of the role of social justice pedagogy for students to acquire leadership skills and independent ways of thinking, certain conditions need to be met. Her beliefs and values is to encourage independence and agency in her students in order that they can achieve the inclusivity and relationships in their own world through their learning in the classroom. Elena, by comparison is explicit in stating that the way to address injustice and to actively promote social justice concerns is to teach by honesty and truth telling.

David’s way of valuing and acting in his classroom is to evaluate how he teaches. He says to successfully capture the students and to activate their thinking about inclusion requires reflexivity on his part. He says:

“This is a risky business and as a teacher, you can be at ‘fault’ if the lesson or the engagement with the students does not go to plan. You can fail at this.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 69)

The acquisition of the language of social justice by both the early career teachers and their students is acknowledged overtly and covertly in the teachers’ philosophies and in their interviews. However Georgia and Jane articulate explicitly the importance of speaking and modelling the lexicon of social justice for the students and how through enculturation the students can then use this acquired knowledge and language to engage in Discourses, knowing what it is they are learning about and learning for. This is the essence of where the power in language and acquisition lies, according to Georgia and her views regarding student ‘voice’. She says in her second interview that it is important to her to:

“Use that meta-language and ensuring when I’m using it, it’s in a positive light.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 11)

Georgia acknowledges that the practice of social justice as a social language is critical to the students’ understanding and the inculcation of these tenets in the classroom. Georgia’s explicit use of a specialised term ‘meta-language’ does a number of things in building identity through talk about the language of social justice. She builds significance into this pedagogy by referring to a specialized Discourse that reflects her intellectual competence and ideological alignment to this practice. She places a high degree of importance on the students having access to the Discourse through the acquisition of the language. She corroborates the argument that Gee (1999) avers which argues that to be in the Discourse you must speak the Discourse.

As an early career teacher Georgia indicates how she actively engages in the conduct or act of being a teacher for social justice. Her values, actions and the associated meaning shaped through language give her a particular identity as a teacher – a teacher for social justice.

The early career teachers were asked to think about and evaluate their first year of teaching and to reflect on their teaching philosophies in light of their new-found experiences. Georgia’s reflection had similarities to Elena’s because they describe school awareness campaigns however they had dissimilar experiences with the outcomes of the campaigns. In Elena’s school there was no particular social justice club or dedicated home-room for social justice however both teachers took part in awareness campaigns about sexual orientation. Georgia’s experience in being part of the ‘Wear It Purple’ day is by contrast to Elena’s experience where it was shut down, resoundingly successful. While the outcome for Elena of her ‘Wear It Purple’ day, was disappointing and she was affected deeply. She was, ‘struck quite hard’, by the failure. By comparison, at Georgia’s school she says the day the school dedicated to equality by

supporting the 'Wear It Purple' day, with a sausage sizzle and a celebration, will go down in her memory as one of the most successful learning occasions she was part of.

Georgia was asked to describe the reason she thought the 'Wear It Purple' awareness campaign was so successful at her school and she spoke about the diverse cultural population in her school and the need in her view, for all groups and cultures to be included in this social justice campaign. When she describes how she explained the rationale for the campaign to her home-room, she says that gave the reason for the day to the students as a deliberate provocation. She said:

"I believe in equality, don't you?" (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 57)

As the students became engaged in planning for the day and as they engaged further with understanding the reason why the school was deliberately targeting an understanding of diversity in sexuality among other issues and awareness, Georgia says in her classroom:

"We celebrated that." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 49)

Georgia describes the moment she and her students were all engaged by the music and the festival-like celebrations for the diversity celebrations. She says that students who might previously have been making derogatory comments about different cultures or groups were watching and participating:

"We weren't trying to enforce it on them, they could come to the event if they wanted to, something clicked in their heads and it's probably not going to change them but perhaps it's going to impact the way they speak." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 49)

This observation and the description of how the students learned about diversity and inclusion corroborates Georgia's previous talk that argued the critical importance of meta-language in teaching for social justice but also that the opportunity to engage in activities that students enjoy or relate to are a key also to engaging them and reinforcing their understanding.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the distinct ways that the five early career drama teachers conceive and discuss their work in teaching social justice. All five early career teachers see this work as integral to their practice not only as teachers in the school and the classroom, but also as models and agents of the practice of social justice in their own lives. Understanding why the impact of these teachers' concern for social justice teaching is important is also reflected in the literature (see Finneran & Freebody, 2016). These authors call for an interrogation of the field in order to improve the life chances of students in different contexts and countries. Teaching about, and for social justice is unanimously accepted by these drama teachers as an important part of their role. How the teachers speak about this conception of social justice varies and is unique to each teacher. As hooks (1994) argues a commitment to this work (a classroom space where possibilities are provoked and norms are challenged) requires that teachers, specifically drama teachers see their work as activism. Activist drama teachers are also the subject of research by scholars such as Gattenhoff and Radvan (2009). These participants in this study orient to various theoretical perspectives, in some cases the orientation to theory is to describe the way they recruit and plan the pedagogy. However the common denominator between them is the way the teachers say they align and assimilate the work as part of a teacher identity that has inherent within it social justice values of equity, inclusiveness, pluralism, diversity and empowerment. These Discourses about social justice are for these five drama teachers those that they argue really matter to them.

Chapter 7: Building The World By Teaching The World

'Drama provides the opportunity to introduce politicized curriculum which directly addresses questions of power and agency. The pedagogies of drama seem to be effective in both promoting and providing opportunities for learners to engage in active citizenship in a world where marginalization and unequal power relations dominate' (Anderson & Dunn, 2013, p 295).

Overview

Discourses are large conversations that enable human beings as members of groups to recognize each other and to align themselves with other memberships or groups of people who share our predispositions or ideological alignment (Fairclough, 2003). Drama education also enables this. There are many diverse ideological predispositions prevalent in the drama community and within that community there are a range of Discourses that are privileged by that community. As the data from this study attests, there are Discourses that the early career teachers talk about, as having greater consequence, influence and meaning to them, than others that influence their teaching practices.

Through their language, the teachers construct and reveal their identities as early career teachers, and the way they connect with and align to Discourses, that they say matter to them. This chapter examines the Discourses that the early career teachers identify as critical in teaching their students about the world. These Discourses, the teachers argue are seminal to the pedagogy that teaches students to engage in the world around them as democratic, global citizens.

The description of Discourses being much like a dance is an apt metaphor for drama and arts based learning in this study. The abstraction

of the dance, the symbols and importantly the language of the dance and the performance is what really enable the Discourse to be recognised. It is the affect of those Discourses and how the early career teachers in this research adapt, challenge, describe and assimilate them that is the focal issue in this chapter. This study shows that early career teachers particularly in the field of drama education, orient to Discourses that they individually identify and believe are important work because they believe they align with their ideological proclivities. In describing this work like discussions around social justice they use language that is at times combative and sometimes requires subversion of dominant Discourses in order to remain faithful to their identities.

This chapter examines the place and role of ideology in the identities of the early career teachers in the study and the way they talk about their work as drama teachers. The chapter also discusses the different Discourses that the teachers say are important for their students to access in order for them to be successful citizens of the future. The chapter examines the role of social languages in the classroom discourse and how the teachers describe the work of the drama lexicon in providing the requisite enculturation for the students into the dominant Discourses both in the classroom and the future.

The Discourses that are currently privileged by the drama community include the need for teachers to build capacity in their students through critical pedagogy, skills that allow their students to resist and question dominant Discourses in the community. The teachers in this study, through the data, argue the importance of access to some of these Discourses in shaping and preparing students for the future, preparing students to be socially just citizens and preparing students to navigate the challenges of post normality.

This research and the place of ideology

This study endeavoured to ascertain among other questions, how early career teachers, particularly in the drama classroom, conceptualised their own ideological predispositions beside the dominant Discourses and ideology of the drama community, the school community and teaching generally. The teachers were initially asked to submit their teaching philosophies to build a picture of how they wanted their classrooms and their practices to be structured and to gain an insight into their ideological alignment. One teacher used poetry to frame his ideas and aspirations, another used 'anaphora', the poetic technique to give precedence to the leading idea in the paragraph, and one teacher appropriated the ideas or 'ideology' from the New South Wales Department of Education and Communities in order to bring her conviction about this institution to the fore. The teaching philosophies were as redolent with individuality as the ideologies and Discourses they ventured (the teaching philosophies are contained in Chapter 4 of the thesis).

In their teaching philosophies, the early career teachers captured a number of sentiments and ideologies in detailed ways. The following extracts reflect some of the sentiments briefly. Elena said that she wanted to, 'show them what it is to love the Arts' (Line 17), David said he wanted to, 'empower students about the power imbalances in the world', (Line 31) Georgia said, 'I want to instil in my students the same passion and yearning to know more' (Line 8), Jane wanted to, 'encourage students to see what they are capable of' (Line, 9) and Nick says he, 'values creativity and identity development to develop members that are engaged in active citizenship' (Line 11).

These sentiments that the early career teachers expressed are indicative of the passion and belief they say they want to reside in their teaching. The ideology that drives them in their work as teachers is articulated through their teaching philosophies and argued and discussed further in their interviews. Their individual proclivities align with some

the Discourses they say are important in the work they do in the classroom and in the school.

Discourses Are Necessary Tools For Students And Their Teachers

Discourses are tools that the teachers and their students use to 'build their worlds' (Gee, 1999) through recognition. The most powerful aspect of big Discourse and little discourses is how they are established and negotiated. This study probes the way the teachers talk and write about the capacity for Discourses to exclude or marginalise members or prospective members, if they lack fluency or fail to adhere to the rules subscribed by the membership of a particular group, such as teaching. If you cannot speak the language of the Discourse, you can be ostracised or fail to be accepted into the community of the Discourse.

Because of the power that resides in accessing and speaking the Discourses of schooling particularly, the teachers in this study recognise the capacity that Discourse has, in schools and classrooms and therefore the implications for them, in facilitating how their students gain that access. This means for students without access to the Discourse of literacy for example and often for students in low socio economic areas, in the case of Georgia and Nick's school, the students are offered impoverished or compromised choices both within their schooling and then in their life chances. This then leads to a lack of agency in their own lives and indeed futures because of their inability to speak and access dominant Discourses of schooling. Georgia says in her teaching philosophy that:

"Schools in Australia reflect society, where individuals have their own needs due to their background and experiences that have shaped them. It is up to the teacher to foster these needs and build upon them in order to shape successful citizens academically and socially." (Georgia, T.P., Line 12)

Georgia recognises the influence teachers have in shaping students capacity for understanding of how the world works, relies also on the integration and understanding of personal story and Discourses. The role of the teacher in conveying meaning and the understanding of how Discourses work is significant according to her and her experiences teaching in a culturally diverse and socio economically challenged school, reflect this.

The way to 'pull off' a Discourse, says Gee, is if, 'you put language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools and places together in such a way that others recognize you as a particular type of identity engaged in a particular type of activity' (1999, p.18). The relationship between these early career teachers' ideologies and the Discourses matter because it is one of the fundamental ways for students to understand how Discourses work. This is a key reason as to why Discourses matter in our society and in the work of teaching.

Teachers are the principle conduit for students to gain access to Discourses in and through pedagogies such as content delivery, speech, classroom conversation and relationships. This position is one of power and responsibility and the particular Discourses or ways of knowing that the teachers align themselves with, may affect students' chances to access conversations and knowledge about the world, dependent on the teachers' beliefs or proclivities. David speaks about his concern about students having access to appropriate (in his view) content in order to learn about the world. He says this influences his approach to organising his lessons in the classroom:

"So how you model or how you design your lesson or how you try to create specific ways to reduce inequality. How you address students, how you plan group work, how you make modifications or things to create equal opportunities for students and their learning." (David, Int 1., Turn 20)

Drama and social languages

All five early career teachers demonstrated through their talk a capacity to utilize social language (Gee, 1999) found in the Discourses of drama teaching and education more generally. The five teachers had a common experience they shared, which was their university education and how they assimilated and engaged with the Discourses of drama and education through the syllabus and the various policies and blueprints mandated through various governances. This common bond connected them in terms of how they were apprenticed into the teaching profession through their exposure to curriculum and through professional experiences and this then allows them membership to the realm of drama teaching.

However, the early career teachers' experiences, their practicums, predilections and subjectivities were as diverse as the teachers themselves and their alignment to different Discourses reflects that differentiation of experience.

"It (drama) is transforming in terms of learning. You're learning new knowledge, you're growing as a person.' In terms of the social, like Boal and Commedia integrating some of Boal's ideas about power and using theatre to teach and break down power relations is important." (David, Int. 2, Turn 53)

This example of how one of the early career teachers uses the social language of the drama lexicon to talk about what he wants to achieve in terms of the learning taking place in his classroom, reflects the way the teachers are able to recruit language that reflects theory and practice to explicate meaning because they have assimilated these theories and theoreticians and the Discourses they represent.

When the teachers wrote their teaching philosophies there were a number of words and repetitious social languages that they had acquired during their apprenticeship at university that were evident in the text. For example all five teachers referred to access, however none of the teachers used this term in exactly the same way. They used the word as part of a social languages lexicon and their use of the word reflected their personal proclivities and beliefs around the word. Their words were made 'lived', (Freire, 2000) as they progressed their way through their first year of practice and these words developed additional, richer and more tangible meaning for the teachers.

For example, Georgia expressed that as her teaching became more confident she focused more closely on *how* she used language in the classroom and the way she framed language for her students. The way she used language she felt gave the students opportunity to learn and engage in Discourses because when she consciously used language for specific purposes, this allowed her students access to knowledge and to a way of speaking and knowing *about* things. For her, this was how she conceptualized access:

"Using meta-language and ensuring that when I'm using it it's in a positive light, framing it in a way where the kid is reflecting on it."
(Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 11)

The teachers oriented in their description of their teaching, to words in the drama lexicon like, 'reflection' and 'creative'. These words are not the exclusive domain of the drama curriculum, however their attributions have subject specific meaning when contextualized in this curriculum area. Teachers and people who work in education are generally cognizant of the meaning attributed to a word such as 'pedagogy', for example. They may have a slightly nuanced understanding of how that word may be used in the classroom however they will all be capable of using it to converse in an educational dialogue or conversation.

Similarly the teachers use language in their teaching philosophies and interviews that have assumed meanings in the context of drama teaching.

The specialisation of drama language as a social language can be attributed to seminal practitioners and researchers in the drama in education world. For example, the work of Paolo Freire (2000) is revered and exulted for its relationship to social justice concerns, democracy and equity and this work is also closely tied to the work of Augusto Boal (1979) and the 'Theatre of the Poor'. The work of Dorothy Heathcote (1995) is also referred to as a guiding Discourse for her pioneering work in the field of process drama – as an example. Being able to speak this language and use it to refer to work you are doing or enacting is part of the apprenticeship of being a drama teacher.

Both Nick and David demonstrated an ideological alignment with the work of Freire and Boal. Nick described, 'being drawn to Freire, obviously' (Int. 1) and David talks about Boal and his work as influential philosophically and theoretically, to his work in the classroom:

"Of note, Boal and Freire's work on oppression is a means to empower students about the power imbalances entrenched in socio cultural contexts in their own world and the world beyond them." (David, T.P., Lines 30-31)

Some of the words that are found in the teaching philosophies and the associated lexicon contribute to the Discourse of drama generally and then in a more micro way, in the classroom. Just as a doctor may speak in specialized language about medicine or about a patient in her work as a member of that group or Discourse community, so too the drama world and its 'social language', have common properties specific to that practice. For example, when Nick speaks about 'empathetic agency', he assumes an understanding of what he means by this term and the type of teaching this implies. He means by this term, that the teacher will not position

themselves as superior to the student rather they are a facilitator and guide for the students in their learning journey. The teachers also make associations between Discourses in the classroom and how the elements of drama provide the context and framework for this type of learning. This is developed in and through the affordances of drama.

In the early career teachers' teaching philosophies words that belong to the lexicon of drama teaching and education were often used to emphasise belonging and identity. These words were common to all the teachers in their teaching philosophies and their interviews, for example, empower, access, creativity, critical thinking, oppression, equity, social justice, values, citizenship (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) are words that the teachers in various ways, used to describe their teaching and the way they conceived their teaching practices. None of these words are the private or exclusive domain of the drama teacher and yet they have particular meaning as part of the social language that drama teachers speak in their membership of that group.

Building Student Resistance To Discourses

One of the conversations privileged in the drama community Discourse is that of the affect and use of critical pedagogy in the classroom to teach about the power of drama as an art-form to emit change and to 'hold a mirror' up to the social conscience of a community at large. O'Connor's (2010) seminal work in this area is underpinned by a view regarding the efficacy and importance of using critical pedagogy to enact change but also as a means by which students can access the conversations and Discourses and through that access, change the course of the conversation through participation and performance. This argument is evinced in the early career teachers' talk and conversations about the work of the Discourse.

In his first interview Nick discussed the way he wanted to infuse his teaching with theoretical influences. This was in order for students to

see how the world could be mediated, and the students could be empowered to contribute to conversations and Discourses about power and where it resides in the world. He also wanted to illuminate how students can use their voices to enact change:

“I was really drawn to Freire, obviously and particularly reading *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*’, and then things about having kind of democratic voices and allowing people to have a voice and how easy it is to silence that voice without even really having it as a goal.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 24)

In a similar way to the critical pedagogy approach that O’Connor (2010) advocates through his process drama approach, is Nick’s idea that students in the classroom need to invigilate rigorously the approaches that are taken for granted in everyday discourses. This pedagogy Nick advocates is that moral conjecture should be applied to how students view each other in relation to the world and how they perform particular functions based on effective criticism, is a critical and emergent Discourse.

Nick argues an ideological position as a function of teaching about ethics and moral reasoning in the classroom. As a teacher who aligns his work and views to that of a moral agent he makes these comments regarding the place of ethics in critical pedagogy and the response that can emit from the experience:

“A mode of ethics is based on the fact that if you see the face of another individual you are in that time, as soon as that happens then you are then ethically responsible for that person’s wellbeing and that person’s health. I thought that this is such like an extreme approach but it’s so necessary.” (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 4)

Nick’s argument that students need ethics as a seminal part of their development is part of his personal and ideological alignment to teaching

about the world through a moral agency lens. He talks about the need for students to develop a moral compass in order to navigate the world in a just way. He believes that the way the students encounter the world may necessitate them challenging dominant Discourses and in order for them to do this effectively and in his view, morally, they need the skills to do this, that he says he can provide as a teacher. His is a singular example, taken from the early career teachers' talk and writing to illustrate this argument.

Preparing students to be democratic and socially just citizens

One of the seminal aspects of the work the teachers believed was inherent in their role was to prepare students for the future and in order to do that work they saw themselves as facilitators of conversations and Discourses that allowed the students access to these conversations. The key ideas that emanate from the teachers' conversations and writing are; preparing students to be democratic and socially just citizens; preparing students to be future citizens; and preparing students to navigate the Discourse of post-normality.

The current Discourse around how drama activates the future has inherent in its conviction the idea that reflective practice is at the core of performing this act of forward and future planning, and part of this planning, is preparing students to be citizens of the world. Teachers are currently preparing students for jobs and roles in the future that do not yet exist. For this reason thinking about and for the future has become a necessary conversation in the Discourse of drama. Drama practitioners and teachers are used to historically situated thinking. History reveals the human condition and how humanity responds to these vagaries of time and place is a consideration in the work of drama teachers (Anderson, 2012).

The argument that, 'drama offers the chance for abstraction as an act which springs from the past but is directed towards the future, and is

always great with things to come' (Langer, 1957; Anderson & Dunn, 2013, p.303) is a view that it reiterated and confirmed through a close reading of part of Georgia's teaching philosophy. She says that part of her ideal and her desire to become a teacher is because of the challenges of the future and how she feels these can be met in and through the practices she performs and enacts in the classroom. She says:

"Understanding why I want to be a teacher underpins my approach and ideas about education and my role within a student's education. There is an increasing need for educators as reflective practitioners to adapt their teaching in order to meet the multifaceted needs of students. Schools in Australia reflect society, where individuals have their own needs due to their background and experiences that have shaped them. It is up to the teacher to foster these needs and build upon them in order to shape successful citizens." (Georgia, T.P., Lines 12-14)

Because Georgia has acknowledged the importance of her role as a teacher in the text and in particular the role of the reflective practitioner, she is acquiescing to the Discourse of activating the future. Her views coalesce and coincide with the Discourse of research and practitioners in the field. She also writes about the critical role that diversity plays in shaping the future. The background of the conversation and Discourse reflects her role as an early career teacher in a highly diverse school, with a plethora of voices and ambitions to be directed towards the future. Georgia also acknowledges the pivotal role and responsibility of the teacher in achieving this multiple future (Harris & Sinclair, 2014).

The Discourse from the teachers says that in order to achieve this future, the students will need the good guidance and scaffolding of practitioners who are willing to reflect, to adapt and change their praxis, without compromising their view of the necessary values that will drive the course of the future for their students.

As privileged in the Discourse of the drama community, the future should provide students with, 'opportunities to engage in futures Discourses. Fortunately the, 'geography of drama seems to offer this necessary scaffolding', (Anderson & Dunn, 2013, p.304). In Georgia's teaching philosophy she says she believes that the key to achieving this futures Discourse with her students will be through the conduit of reflective practice that takes into account the importance of the various needs of the students that are academic, cultural and social.

Preparing students to be future citizens

One of the common themes in the teaching philosophies and in the interviews of the early career teachers is their talk about their role in developing students for a life outside of the classroom. Each of the teachers in very nuanced and different ways write and speak about the role they play in preparing students for the future. They see their role and how their success can be measured as directly referable to the quality of life their students will have outside the classroom and in the world. The unifying factor for the teachers is their commonly held view that in order to live this life outside of the classroom and with success, experiences and learning in the classroom must prepare the students for 'good citizenship', and to contribute not just economically but intellectually and socially and in a meaningful way in the world.

"I believe education transforms lives. A teacher has done their job when a student has been equipped for life-long learning and has been empowered to enter society as a responsible active and global citizen ready to constructively contribute to the wider world."
(David, T.P., Lines 47-49)

These are the final lines taken from David's teaching philosophy written before his first term of teaching. When he was asked to revisit this document in his final interview he was even more convinced given his

drama teaching experience, of the teacher's role in enabling and enacting ways for students to become prepared for the wider world. He believes that his practice of teaching drama shapes the discourse in the classroom and impacts not only on the student and content they are learning, but also to a futures orientation. What David argues as important for students to know about the world are skills that enable them to be life-long learners, to always be seeking new ways of understanding and perceiving the world. This way of engaging with the world is in his view an active and organic action. It must be active and ongoing and the resultant factor is then agency and dominion for the student and soon to be citizen. This is, he argues important in preparing students for the future.

Because David describes his role as a facilitator in the classroom, the way he discusses knowledge acquisition is through his relationships with not just the students but also with the way he teaches. He sees these two ideas as entwined because he believes that he cannot teach any other way other than to 'transform'. Education in his view is enacting a process of development that is both intellectual and social with the ideal outcome being the development of a citizen who is cognizant of the world around them but that can also meaningfully engage in Discourse and conversation more widely in the community. David sees this as a fundamental tenet of his teaching critical pedagogy:

"I just think that human beings need to know. I know that sounds sort of 'wanky', but as humans, it's like I feel that these are the things that people need to know and understand. If education is the site where we are cultivating the future of our society – this is where our future is, in these students' hands, or their lives." (David, Int. 1, Turn 34)

David establishes a particular identity through this text. He makes connections between the work he is doing as a teacher. He is unapologetic about what he believes the students need to 'know' and he engages with

language that explains not only his commitment to this view but also to a way of teaching. As a component of this Discourse of teaching students skills of citizenship and humanity he also uses language that acknowledges that he is the arbiter of the kind of information he believes his students need to know and this is a powerful privilege that he acknowledges. In David's case, he believes that students, for example need to be taught about the invasion of Australia and that this view in concert with his ideas about teaching about social justice will inform his students and he believes should permeate the way he plans and teaches his lessons and the way he chooses texts and materials.

David does not talk about how he will deal with students who might reject or challenge this Discourse. At no time during his text or talk does he countenance the idea that students may not embrace this way of knowing and navigating the world. He wants to be recognized as a teacher who has a futures-orientated and global view to teach his students and prepare them for lives beyond the classroom but also to identify as a teacher with a strong and political orientation from which he does not resile.

In comparison to David, Jane is quite specific in her language that describes the way she initially believes she approach achieving this 'democratized' student. She sees her role also as one that stretches beyond the limitations or confines of content or subject specificity and sees the role in this process as more complex and holistic. She writes about her view of her role in democratizing the students:

"I believe that as a teacher I can equip students with valuable life skills that come from learning beyond the curriculum. I want to develop students' creativity, their critical thinking and reflection, their independence and autonomy. I realize that school is the precursor of society and the importance of the teacher to provide

the support and guidance to young people to help them develop into capable citizens.” (Jane, T.P., Lines 13-15)

As distinct from David’s view of teaching and democratizing his students by teaching them what in his view they need to ‘know’, Jane specifies that learning must be beyond the curriculum, that there are skill sets and ways of knowing that students need to access in order to be successful and prepared for the future. She specifies that in her view this can be achieved through not only ways of teaching, such as creativity and critical thinking but also through the way the teacher models and orientates to the discourse.

Because Jane uses the third person to describe the role of the teacher in democratization, in her teaching philosophy there is an implication and a sense that she remains slightly outside the membership or the Discourse. Her position as a novice gives a perspective from ‘outside’ the Discourse, that she has not yet claimed membership. Her expression that, ‘the importance of the teacher’ says that whilst she wants to be recognised as that teacher who does that preparation and is equipping her students for the world beyond the curriculum, she is tenuous about her belonging in the Discourse. She is not fully enculturated or socialized into this membership – she is still being apprenticed. In her final interview with three terms of teaching practice to reference and the security of a tenured position she begins to speak in a way that puts herself at the centre of the conversation and the future and she begins to refer to herself and her work in the first person:

“I think I’ve proved who I can be. Will everyone respond to my style, though? I think I’ve got some assurances after this year.”
(Jane, Int. 2, Turn 109)

Because she felt tenuous about her position Jane was reluctant to enact the ideals she had expressed in her teaching philosophy and to

articulate her strong views about the need to model and prepare students for the world. On learning of her tenured position she said that she felt secure now in order to change and alter her teaching and her programs to reflect her views about preparing students not just for 'tests and assessment' but for the future. The security that a permanent position gives her also gives her the necessary courage to really teach the pedagogy she believes in rather than what may have been imposed upon her. She said that she would enact this in this way:

"Maybe I'm the newbie – I don't know how much I can change the programs but our year 9 program is crap. I want to change it, but I'm going to do it gently. I will probably do more creative activities, more projects based learning." (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 109)

Nick's teaching philosophy uses a repetitious device and the poetic technique of anaphora and places the significance to him of good citizenship firmly at the centre of his teaching and ideology. He theorizes that the idea that community and school must intersect with the teacher as the conduit and the agent of change by saying:

"I believe that a community that values creativity and identity development will ultimately develop members who are engaged in active citizenship. I take this term to mean a proactive and compassionate approach to positive change that is for the good of other." (Nick, T.P., Lines 14-17)

Nick's use of the poetic technique anaphora can be interpreted as an act in language that gives emphasis through reiteration. The, "I believe" technique Nick has appropriated places him in control of the Discourse as an active determinant and not just a passive member. This technique corroborates the idea that Discourses are about language but not language alone. Nick conducts particular 'recognition work', through his choice of technique and form in language. His use of the term, 'active citizenship'

can be interpreted as his view that students are at school for more complex and ideological reasons other than knowledge acquisition and sees his role that develops the 'social good', that is the student and their future role in the community.

Nick's use of the word 'compassionate' in his teaching philosophy to describe the approach in his teaching is a deliberate choice made in order to structure a distinct identity as a teacher but also to deliberately engage in a Discourse of intent that says he believes his job is complex and has a conscious dimension of emotional and social quality. Nick's view of the world and of the classroom accords with a new and emergent Discourse about educating students for critical, global citizenship. Global citizenship should enable students to engage with their learning and should reflect an empathy that enables them to see other people's points of view and appreciate their own in that context.

In a similar way Georgia writes about her views of the role of school in developing students as future citizens:

"Schools in Australia reflect society, where individuals have their own needs due to their background and experiences that have shaped them. It is up to the teacher to foster these needs and build upon them in order to shape successful citizens academically and socially." (Georgia, T.P., Lines 11-14)

In this philosophy statement Georgia is establishing her values and beliefs as part of a wider Discourse in the place of teachers and teaching in preparing students for the future. Her philosophy is replete with a cultural implication that is implied and yet not explicitly articulated by the other teachers. Georgia teaches in a highly diverse and multicultural school and this fact permeates the way she views her teaching and particularly her role. She believes that good teaching incorporates an acknowledgment and

enhancement of the cultural experiences and proclivities of the students themselves.

During her second interview and with three terms teaching experience to inform and shape her responses she says again that school is not just for the acquisition of particular content or knowledge. All five of the early career teachers talk about needing to teach their students to be good citizens and this is their view of teaching about and for democracy – good citizenship is the way they assimilate and appropriate the construct of democracy. For example:

“I would say that I’ve always believed that school’s not just about the academic side of things. It’s also about the social development of a person and that the school’s there as a mini society. So you are providing- allowing them the opportunity to stuff up but that you need also to shape them into the better person so that they enter society fulfilled, being able to.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 55)

Georgia and David both talk about school giving students the forum to explore ideas and to challenge ideas in the status quo. Jane also talks about the way schools develop skills outside the curriculum. Georgia identifies and articulates that failure might be a consequence of this exploration and enactment in learning. She describes school as the place where students can ‘stuff up’ but then have opportunity for restitution that in her view enables them to be more discerning about their role in society than they might be if those mistakes or ‘stuff ups’ were enacted outside the confines of school. She sees her role in this as giving them space and opportunity to learn these non -assessable or measurable things.

The teachers all talk about their role as having broader implications and parameters apart from teaching and attending to their subject and content area. They argue that as part of their role teaching, they must enable and enact conversations and Discourses that allow

students the opportunity to engage with meaningful opportunities to learn about being a good citizen. In their collective view this also prepares their students to navigate an uncertain world, because they have been prepared by the work of the classroom, to be mindful of their role in determining their future in socially just ways.

Preparing for the future

Drama pedagogy has some significant advantages, according to the drama community, to educate and prepare students for the future. Drama as an art form and a chameleon that can change its spots or stripes to suit the needs of the context and time. As many of the Discourses in education and not just drama argue, the future is emblazoned in ambiguity and uncertainty but certainly in adventure and above all hopefulness. According to the membership this is what drama does best – provide hope and insight and the early career teachers in this study are the architects in the classroom of that hope.

The teachers in this study strongly believe that drama has special attributions that allow it to provide the pedagogical framework from which the students can then navigate the world, well prepared for the future because of their access to critical pedagogy that attends to the complexity of the future. This, the teachers say provides the students with opportunities to engage with Discourses and debate about it. This argument has been further developed in Chapter 5.

The Discourse in the drama community argues that drama and theatre allow students to respond to ambiguity, conflict, indifference and complexity through creativity and other attributions of the art form. In David's teaching philosophy he writes about his idealistic view and the importance of critical and creative learning in order to navigate the world in and through the drama classroom.

“It is also a space to probe and investigate real and imagined worlds and contexts that will allow me to challenge the student’s pre-conceived ideas about the world around them. I also believe in using Drama to assist students in their understanding of power in human interactions in the world. Of note, Boal and Freire’s work on oppression is a means to empower students about the power imbalances entrenched in socio- cultural contexts in their own world and the world beyond them.” (David, T.P., Lines 25-32)

David’s impassioned view that his classroom will be a place of discovery and investigation of ideas and critical thinking is also a view espoused in the Discourse of ‘post normality’ (Anderson, 2014). This averment says that drama however marginalized or pushed to the peripheries of the curriculum by dominant forces, its teachers and practitioners will ensure that the Discourse of drama and its efficacy remain in the conversations in the classrooms and at the fore of the pedagogy and praxis particularly in the practices of new teachers like David.

The work of a ‘big D discourse’, (Gee, 1999) is to take conversations beyond language and into the territories of actions, interactions, values and beliefs. The teaching philosophies of the early career teachers provide language as evidence not only of the way they enact and perform their ideas and their interactions with the big Discourses, but also to enable a perspective of inter relationship between language, communication, conversation and beliefs as the Discourses express themselves.

In Nick’s philosophy he says:

“I believe that a community that values creativity and identity development will ultimately develop members who are engaged in active citizenship.” (Nick, T.P., Lines 14-17)

Nick's conviction that from the classroom and directly referable to the work he conducts within it, creativity has the capacity to shape students in a way that will have more long term effects than he can currently envision, or so he speculates.

As neophyte members of the Discourses of drama, the interviews, texts and the teaching philosophies give texture and insight to the way the drama teachers talk about learners, talk about communities and talk about the future. The early career teachers, as part of their apprenticeship into the Discourse need to corroborate or acquiesce to the Discourse or justify any diversion from it. The new journey for them and how Discourses change the future is performed through new and emerging Discourses. Each of the teachers has a particular proclivity or prejudice towards a particular Discourse, how they enact and perform this Discourse in new and unique ways is fundamental in the emerging and shaping of the new ways of teaching. The following snapshots demonstrate each of the early career teachers' alignment with different Discourses and how they believe these should affect and be assimilated into their teaching.

Nick – the teacher as servant

Nick's teaching philosophy and subsequent interviews are replete with his ardent belief in the teacher as a moral agent and harbinger of social change and activation. His personal philosophy combines the role of teacher/activist in what he believes is a very privileged position. Nick's view of the role of the teacher is a unique provocation that goes to the notion that classrooms must balance acquisition and learning. He argues that through the teacher a 'humanity that teaches', is transacted. He flouts in many ways the traditional paradigm of what a teacher and their role is, and argues for a new Discourse of servitude:

"Whereas for me, if you choose to be a servant, that's the most powerful choice you can make because it says that I've relinquished any sense of entitlement, any sense of pleasing myself and those to

me, those two things are for me probably the two most poisonous aspects of being a teacher is if you are entitled to – I’m entitled to say this about you because I’m in this position I’m entitled. I find it really challenging that there is such negative Discourse. Where the stigma is about teaching as a service and how that stigma can be changed. I want to change it by how I talk to my kids and the way I talk about my kids and how I can make sure I am always living my expectations of myself.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 30)

The argument that Nick articulates is manifest in how Discourses become hybridized and reflects how he intends to enculturate his students by modelling a new Discourse of service and servitude. In this way, he refers to two competing Discourses; serving the students as their teacher and being conscious of the way he uses language in the pursuit of that service and the entitlement of adults to make decisions for students.

This emergent Discourse challenges the dominant Discourse of teaching as being a way of transacting information through teacher talk and modelling. He argues for a paradigm shift to allow students to talk about what they have learned through a lens of personal empowerment and agency as made available through his teaching as the conduit. This forms part of his view regarding students and their need to be informed for the future. His role, he argues in enacting the Discourse of service in order to prepare his students for the future.

David – ‘I am unapologetically ideological’

David’s teaching philosophy is in his words ‘unapologetically ideological’ (Int. 2, Turn 12). He contends that his perception of teaching and the way he wants to teach content and values is through the predisposition to a particular ideology. He is an admirer of the work of Boal and the ‘Theatre of the Oppressed (2000)’, and he is also committed to the teaching of a view of the history of invasion, as part of the work he does in the classroom:

“I particularly believe in educating the students about the invasion of Australia by British and European settlers and the rich, yet traumatic history of the indigenous peoples of our country and I actually get to teach that in a unit on voice and identity. We looked at racism and discrimination. I got to impart my passion for getting kids to realize that the indigenous people have historically gone through so much and they need to know that. Like it’s not something that we can just shrug off or think that it’s another generation’s fault or that it wasn’t us that did it. It’s who we are.”
(David, Int. 2, Turn 29)

David’s view that in order to move forward socially and towards the future he argues that shaping a classroom through historically situated Discourses is powerful in shaping student’s identities and the way they view the world. His perspective can be considered ideological but what he is offering to his students is the opportunity to perform a particular Discourse, to view their learning through that Discourse and then emboldened by new knowledge acquired through this discourse they can contribute to the conversation. Criticism of this performance would come from dominant Discourses that may ‘deny’ this view of history or challenge the affects that David posits as truths about history. The powerful consideration for the students lies in how understanding the discourse gives them a capacity to have a voice in the debate and where that debate may reside in the future.

Elena - Equality in the space

Elena is by her own admission conflicted in her role. All the teachers at some point in their interviews admit to being conflicted by the Discourses they enact in their roles. She says in her teaching philosophy that she really wanted to pursue an acting career but that she felt a teaching career in drama would allow her security and the pursuit of her art could be a separate dimension to her identity. In her final interview she

makes the disclosure that she intends to audition for NIDA (National Institute Of Dramatic Art) and try to forge an acting career. She says that her work in the classroom and her work principally with the ATYP (The Australian Theatre For Young People) has been critical in shaping the way she sees pedagogy working in her classroom and reinforcing how she feels drama should be taught in the classroom.

She firmly believes in the ideology of Boal and the 'Theatre of the Poor' (2000), and the way teaching using this theory and practice is critical, in her view in providing students with access to opportunities through performance and creativity. Elena believes strongly in the affordance of the space in drama and theatre to enact opportunities for the students to develop skills:

"I have an affiliation with street theatre and space specific theatre which I think is – the thing I love about both of them is that there are a lot of opportunities within their practices to engage kids who are all different. With site- specific theatre for example all the kids have in common is the space. That gives them the ability to create a piece of theatre there or for indigenous kids having a particular space in the community to engage with and create theatre that way." (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 23)

Elena's view regarding the importance of street theatre and un-reconstructed classrooms reflects the Discourse of drama that argues for dedicated space in which to teach drama. Her beliefs corroborate the widely held view in the drama community regarding the special attributions of drama and critical pedagogy. Elena's perception that site-specific theatre can provide the necessary forum for students to be seen as equal and therefore develop community based theatre that allows them to see the classroom as a space to discover themselves and their place in the world. Elena's advocacy for learning in a forum that provides equality by

virtue of the space is a hybridized Discourse emanating from her identity as a teacher artist.

Georgia – Student led learning

The experience that Georgia recounts in her interview of her first year of teaching provides insight into the significance of personal beliefs and ideologies in the work of teachers in the classroom. In her first two terms of teaching Georgia began a ‘drama club’, because of what she believes is the acute need for the students to have access to drama pedagogy because it is not offered as a subject in the school. Her commitment to this way of learning and to the affordances of drama is inexorably tied to her ideology and philosophy of teaching. Teaching without drama is for her, an unconscionable thing.

In her second term of teaching, a home-room position became available and despite what she believed were the deficits in her teaching due to a lack of experience, Georgia was appointed, by the Principal, to the position. She refers to the home-room as her ‘social justice classroom’, even though this was not the official title of the classroom.

Her belief in social justice and drama teaching and her commitment to this pedagogy. She argues that the importance of social justice teaching in the classroom should include capitalizing on the student’s prior knowledge and their ‘funds of knowledge’, (Moll, 1992) acquired through their homes and lives outside the classroom. Georgia says that in order for the students to be autonomous and to have opportunities to understand various discourses, the classroom must reflect the community. Georgia explains her rationale for referring to the classroom this way that using the language of the Discourse, such as social justice, is critical for the students’ understanding:

“It’s all about meeting the needs of the community and how we are meeting them. I started off saying how I’ve got all these great ideas,

but that's not my role as a facilitator. So I've stepped back and built the student leadership skills so they can enact what's important to them. I'm trying as much as possible to draw on the experiences of the kids." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

In her discussion, Georgia is reinforcing the current Discourses in the drama community that argue for students to be agents of change, empowered by democratic conventions acquired through drama classrooms and how they can then engage with Discourses of and in the future. She maintains that students need dominion and the agency that is gained through acquiring leadership skills in order to challenge, assimilate and respond to conversations in the broader community.

Jane – The Discourse of ability

Jane's ideological predisposition is informed and influenced by her experiences as a student with a visual impairment who is now a teacher. Her own experiences at school striving to access the 'sighted' Discourse have critically shaped her views about how to teach, what to teach and why she teaches. At the end of a complex year of accessing the Discourse and school bureaucracy, she reflects on who she is as a teacher and the concessions she won't make to conform to an ability Discourse. Jane draws connections between her own position and the ideology that shapes and influences the public education system:

"I believe public education helps foster an education that is inclusive and supportive of all students." (Jane, T.P., Lines 2-3)

She argues that her experiences with trying to learn with a disability accord with students who are not, 'mainstream'. Jane has gained a great deal of her knowledge through meta knowledge she says and the experience of critically reflecting on how she learned the Discourse in order to be a member and perform it as a teacher with a disability. She is highly empathetic in her conversations and interviews of students who

find accessing learning difficult because of disability or because of an inability to 'dance' the classroom Discourse. Jane comments on her challenges here:

"I think having a disability it will get harder (teaching). It's definitely harder for me to be a teacher. I have to think constantly – I can't just look over a kid's work and go yep – they're doing the work. I need to do things like collect their books more often to make sure, it takes me longer to read writing. I don't know I'm still learning." (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 101)

Jane's confidence in her ability to teach in a particular way with attention to what she believes is important pedagogy, increased when she found out she was to be made a permanent staff member. Her experiences during her first year of teaching included a raft of what she describes as 'red tape', ordered by the DEC to assess her suitability for teaching with a disability. More than previously, she felt confident and optimistic about what she could do as a teacher and the change she could affect, however her nagging doubts about her chosen profession were still with her even at the end of her first year of teaching.

Pessimism in the Discourse

The common element that binds the early career teachers, their teaching philosophies and their teaching practices together is their idealism and their ideological predispositions. This is prevalent in the way the teachers acquiesce to some Discourses and yet remain fixed in their views according to their personal predilections, proclivities and interests regarding other Discourses they see as interference, irrelevant or as impediments. Some forms of assessment and testing, the teachers argue, contradict the teaching they say is most beneficial for their students or certainly, is more meaningful according to the teachers.

“You have to balance or mediate yourself between two different types of teaching – or situate themselves (students) in a balanced way between the perspective that says you’re in competition with each other, and you’ve got to get the best marks you can, and if you have to put yourself ahead of another student then that’s what you’ve got to do.” (Nick. Int. 1, Turn 18)

However, they are sometimes pessimistic about their capacity to remain committed to teaching what is, in their view, mundane pedagogy such as essay writing for example, or where the school’s hierarchy and executive intervenes to prevent them teaching about a social justice issue, as in the case of Elena and teaching about anti-homophobia as part of a whole school strategy.

Because the philosophies were written before the teachers had experienced the reality of the classroom in a more permanent way other than on practicum or internship they were able to idealize the role, to put their views in a particular way and to describe their work in an idealistic way. Their enthusiasm, commitment and passion for the work they were about to undertake permeated their writing.

When they were interviewed after three terms of practical and practiced teaching they did not resile from their initial ideological commitment to their teaching however they did feel that there were significant impediments and bureaucratic roadblocks to achieving their ideals. They were pessimistic about achieving everything they wanted to achieve in their teaching philosophies because of the realities of behaviour management issues, the influence and demands of the school system and their ability under these strains to remain committed.

Georgia spoke about the difficulty of dealing with a critical incident in her classroom. She saw this as behaviour she was unprepared to deal with and yet in her teaching philosophy and interview, she explained that

students should have the opportunity to ‘stuff up’ (Int. 1, Turn 26) in the security of the school. In her view this is in order for the student to be rehabilitated and to develop skills that accord with being an active and thoughtful citizen – a role that she sees as the preserve of the teacher in the school:

“I mean at Uni you always envision the perfect classroom. Even when you’re told no things will go according to plan, you don’t imagine what those things will be. Like I had a kid today decide to punch a door and ended up breaking his little finger or something, and that’s obviously interrupted the whole lesson and I’ve got no idea why he’s done it.” (Georgia, Int. 1, Turn 51)

Despite the fact Georgia sees this incident as abhorrent to what she would normally consider acceptable behaviour in the classroom, her conversation suggests that her concerns lie more with two different issues and not with the incident itself. The fact that the learning has been suspended and this interrupts the classroom is disappointing to her but critically she says, ‘and I don’t know why he’s done it’. Her ideological proclivity reflects her view that teachers should understand why students act in a particular way and remediate the situation by allowing the student an opportunity to reflect and to correct this behaviour because they have reflected upon it.

Her lack of insight into what precipitated this incident and the behaviour is what troubles her most. She goes on to explain that she dealt with the situation and moved on but remained concerned by the student’s seemingly spontaneous and unpredictable behaviour. Her personal philosophy and the broader Discourse that Georgia wants to be identified as being aligned with, is one that has the students’ needs at the centre. This means understanding why the student might behave in a particular way. She believes in a holistic view of the student’s place in the school and then in the community and she therefore recognizes the difficulty this

student will have if they are unable to modify their behaviour into the future.

David also finds that on re-examination, his teaching philosophy is not a true reflection of his experiences. However he firmly adheres to what he sees as the purity of his ideology and his intent. He reread his philosophy in the final interview and is in his words 'sad' about what he perceives is a 'losing sight' of the ideas and the ideals in his everyday practice:

"I see really rich experiences happening but other times you just get caught up in very miniscule administrative type stuff. So in some ways, yeah, it's a little disappointing that I haven't stuck to this wholeheartedly." (David, Int. 2, Turn 4)

During his interviews, David describes himself as motivated by ideological concerns – in his words his commitment to teaching about social justice and his living in a socially just way are the integral tenets of his teaching. He identifies with a particular Discourse of activism in his teaching. He sees his role as one that instigates opportunities for students to engage with and navigate the world in what he regards as a socially just way – with compassion and empathy for other human beings. The 'rich experiences', he describes are those where the student has the opportunity to engage with the world through relationships with each other and with ideas.

Because David believes so strongly in the principles he wants to enact in the classroom he describes some of the work and the role of the teacher as a stumbling block to his achieving this. For example he sees the mundane and administrative work as an impediment to his teaching that is transformative and also in his view more important than the minutiae and the administrative. He talks about the classroom and the school as having 'rigid things', or elemental aspects that cannot be changed or

altered even if he believes 'other', things in his teaching are more important:

"Lots of rigid things that sort of constructs your day and sometimes you...I don't lose sight of this but I think you get caught up in the very little things. Like this afternoon I was like, okay, I've done that bit that I wanted to achieve, what am I doing next? But I think when you're doing it you don't...these big ideas, these ideological things that are influencing your practice, they're not always at the front of your head." (David, Int. 2, Turn 12)

For Nick, the pessimism he says he feels lies squarely at and with the system. He speaks about the fact he is prepared to circumvent aspects of the system in pursuit of his ideological preponderance to an empathetic and moral agency style of teaching. Other teachers in the study are similarly prepared to challenge the system. His assertion in his teaching philosophy that says that he sees his role as one of empathy agent and as a moral example and he wants his students to be able to 'discern the difference' (Int. 2, Turn 9), in everything they do from the recognition of different forms of speech in differing contexts through to their behaviour in the classroom and particularly in the drama classroom where he believes the preserve for learning about empathy and moral agency, lies. This is the forum in which to test this proposition, in his view.

Nick is a critic in his philosophy and in his teaching practice of the usefulness of assessment and of what he describes as competition in class work. He saw the effects of this mentality when he was teaching in Vietnam and during his internship. He believes that the place of competition and assessment that measures success by using a system of comparison has little benefit for the student:

"You can desensitize them (students) and the kids can develop a hate not just for English but then for learning. Then there's a

competition – that only leads you to be in competition with all the other students in your classroom based on marks rather than on environment where you are all learning together and struggling together.” (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 14)

Because Nick’s view and ideological position is one that propounds the ideal classroom and the ideal student experience as one where the student can learn in a collaborative way, he is aware that the reality of the role he is undertaking means that he will find himself conflicted by the requirements of assessment and testing that are mandated.

In his text and talk, Nick finds the notion of putting a student in competition with another student not only in conflict with his personal ideals but further, in his view it can have a deleterious affect on the way the students view learning. He says he feels it can ‘desensitize’ them to learning. This is problematic for him as his teaching philosophy is unequivocal in its arguing for a student centred classroom. Nick’s use of the word ‘mediate’ in his first interview suggests that he is aware that his job will not be clear cut in terms of his ability to shape and develop a particular style of classroom. He implies in his word choice of ‘mediate’ that a relationship between administration and the school systems will have to be negotiated and navigated carefully if he is to establish his classroom based on the tenets of moral and empathetic agency.

Elena’s views about how she wants to teach and the type of teacher she wants her views to align with, she says is a teacher that values creativity and the place of drama and importantly for her:

“I had the idea that as a drama teacher I could influence kids through performance, for all the things I think it does like confidence, exploring your own creativity, and problem solving and team work. But it opened my eyes to the fact that I may not be able to influence as many kids as I would like to.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 22)

Elena's philosophy aligns with a Discourse of equity and access according to her teaching philosophy. She says in her philosophy that teaching about social justice and to never resile from a difficult or politically contentious view is the most important dimension of her teaching. In her first interview Elena said that she came to teaching and indeed to the teaching degree with some very fixed views about what education could and could not achieve for students:

"Initially, I distinctly remember coming into the education degree with the view that there are always going to be some kids that just wouldn't meet you halfway. They were not going to have the capacity to learn because of whatever circumstances and those kids just couldn't be helped. So you needed to accept the fact that there will always be some kids that will just not learn from you, and that was just something I came in with." (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 14)

Elena's orientation is to a way of teaching that is accessible to all students as is their right and yet she admits that prior to teaching she came with preconceptions about what if any of these ideals were achievable given what she believes is some students' inability to engage or learn. This is a problematic paradox for Elena. She begins her teaching with pessimism about her ability to achieve her ambitions for her students.

To achieve this equitable classroom Elena thinks that students need to 'meet you half way'. In her teaching philosophy she is quite clear about wanting to believe her students can access education, 'no matter what their circumstances', and yet paradoxically she says in her interview that some students would not have the capacity to learn, 'because of whatever circumstances and those kids couldn't be helped' (Int. 1, Turn 14).

Elena also says that she feels that despite believing in a Discourse of equitable opportunity for all students in education that there are some threshold issues for her in terms of how she can enable these opportunities and ideas. She says that she feels some students just cannot be helped to achieving this ideal:

“They’re not suited to the ways of school in terms of learning, in terms of the way teachers operate, the structure of the day, the timing of the day, and the particular age they are when they’re at school, it’s just not for them and that particular structure is not going to suit them. So within my means there is not vey much I can do for those kids except for up to a particular point.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 14)

Elena and Nick both see impediments to achieving their ideals. Nick sees those impediments as more administrative and as coming from the ‘system’ that he needs to navigate whereas Elena sees the impediments as attitudinal in terms of students, and yet shaped by the intransigent nature of the school system. They have similar ideals and yet perceive different stumbling blocks to achieving their ideals.

Jane has a very similar view to Nick about the role of testing and bureaucracy on the ability for her to achieve her ideals and to teach in a particular way. Jane’s view of her teaching is influenced by two significant issues the first issue being her concern regarding the pervasiveness of testing in the curriculum and the second issue is her concern about her disability and how that will affect her capacity to teach effectively the way she ideally would like to. Her teaching philosophy differs from the other four early career teachers because she has articulated her fears and some pessimism about the job in the teaching philosophy, whereas the other early career teachers only write about their teaching in positive and affirmative ways. Hers is a philosophy that weaves positivism and pessimism in equal measure through the text:

“I fear that bureaucracy, an emphasis on testing and accountability will force me to become narrow sighted, focusing all my attention on syllabus outcomes and losing the greater picture of education.”
(Jane, T.P., Lines 32-34)

Similarly to Nick, Jane thinks that there is another purpose that is more important for students to achieve and for teachers to enact in classrooms other than what they both perceive to be secondary or subsidiary concerns. The ‘greater picture’ of education for Jane, she says is, ‘seeing what they are capable of and what they desire’. Neither of these teachers believes that testing or teaching to outcomes will provide their students with this. They see this obligation to teach in this way as incompatible with their ideals and values about teaching.

Jane also refers to her disability as an impediment not to her teaching the way she wants to but to the school system not providing her with adequate support. She says her greatest fear is not being able to become the teacher she wants to be:

“I also worry that I won’t have the support from my colleagues or perhaps their acceptance, to work out an alternative way of doing things to cater for my needs.” (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 109)

All five of the teachers have a reticence regarding the ‘system’ or the bureaucracy both internal and external, and how it may effect their ability to teach the way they want to teach using the pedagogy or theories that they recruit for the best outcome. The teachers use of language that may be combative or subversive, reflects their concerns regarding how they will face up to the challenges that the schools system may present them with.

Optimism in the Discourse

The teaching philosophies and interviews with the five early career teachers are redolent with the optimism, idealism and altruism that bring them to the teaching world and inspired and motivated them to become teachers. As Manuel (2006) noted, 'each no doubt aspires to be able and versatile in the art, science and craft of teaching; to be well regarded by colleagues and students; and dedicated to the holistic development of their young charges' (p.6) These five teachers and their teaching philosophies all attest to and corroborate through their writings and interview, this view.

The teachers are passionate and idealistic and in the case of David and Nick, avowed in their orientation to a Discourse that is ideologically pre disposed. That is, a way of teaching and an inherent belief in a particular theory that they believe is the best method for teaching their students giving consideration to what they see as fundamentally important ways of knowing about the world.

Nick says that he wants his students to view the world through a critical lens and in doing so he wants them to be able to chart their path through a creative and innovative way of thinking. He uses in his teaching philosophy the work of the poet, e.e.cummings to explain why he feels creativity underpins the work he wants to do in the classroom with his students:

"I really, really love e.e. Cummings because he's a very individual voice that you have to work hard to grapple with what he's saying. I want to take that approach with my students that even just their voice and especially their voice with the students around them, they have to work hard at that because if they work hard at that it will produce something strong." (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 13)

In his interviews, Nick articulates his concerns about the encroachment of assessment and testing into the transformative and creative classroom that he envisages will provide the optimum learning environment for his students. However in the provision of this environment Nick sees the place of the students' voice as integral to achieving that end of creativity and innovation. The optimism he says he feels for teaching his students this way is reiterated in his final interview. He is a champion of students having ideas and that for those ideas to be recognized, acknowledged and advanced in the classroom in order to shape their lives and futures in positive and socially meaningful ways:

"I think kids, if they're going to have radical ideas about anything, they should have radical ideas about themselves and about how much they can create." (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 13)

In orientating to social language that uses the word, 'radical' in this personal Discourse, the attribution of the word means in this text, to challenge the status quo through innovation and ideas. The 'radical' element that Nick propounds in his interview is underpinned with a desire to enable students to develop critical thinking skills, that O'Connor (2010) argues, enables students to build resistance to dominant Discourses and to enable socially transformative processes to become realised in and through the classroom.

Georgia by comparison, sees a symbiotic relationship between the way she wants to teach using connectedness and relational teaching and the capacity for these methods or ways of teaching to meet curriculum outcomes. She says this in her teaching philosophy and then revisits this in her interviews. She discusses the idea that while this balance is hard to achieve, she is becoming more practiced as she gains more experience in her teaching. Georgia feels that she achieves this symbiotic relationship best in her lunch-time drama classroom. She recounts a correspondence with a parent whose son was in her class:

“What have you done with my son? He’s changed so much, he’s coming out of his shell, this is fantastic – thank you so much.”
(Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 19)

Georgia describes this affirmation of her teaching from the parent, as the best outcome in achieving her teaching ideals that she says, combines successful student engagement with and through curriculum outcomes. She acknowledges however that the best results in terms of students finding their voice are in her drama club where there are no assessments, just performance space and time.

In her teaching philosophy Georgia spoke about the loving attentions of her grandparents in teaching her about the world through farm school and through narrative and storytelling. She says that she also believes that a dialogic way of teaching allows students opportunity to connect with and find their own voices. Georgia discussed in her final interview her hopes and her optimism she felt that her teaching and her style and way of teaching would engender in her students:

“It’s not just my narrative now – it’s theirs as well – so making sure they’re drawing connections and telling you stories about their life. If they only know their narrative and they don’t share that, then that’s never going to be altered so they need to hear a range of experiences in order to expand their narrative.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 37)

As Georgia reflected on her first year of teaching she recalled some of the most profound moments that for her continue to fuel her with optimism and with excitement about the impact her teaching may have on her students. She remarked that her social justice classroom, her drama club and her diversity campaign, were profound in their impact on her personally and on her teaching:

“They were evolutionary not revolutionary.” (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 51)

The optimism Georgia orients to in her teaching can be found she says through recognizing your own story and voice and through little changes that are found in action and in your own story.

The final optimistic sentiment is attributable to Jane who at the end of her final year of teaching learned of her permanent placement at the school where her suitability for teaching and accommodating her visual impairment was being assessed:

“I think this year I’ve proved who I can be and who I want to be. I just want to be myself, approachable. I’ve got some assurance, after this year.” (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 109)

Despite her lack of confidence in her capacity to conduct herself in the classroom without the support of colleagues or the school system to enable her teaching with her disability, she remained hopeful and self-reflexive about the year that had taken place. She was confident that she could enact meaningful changes in her classroom and in her programs now that she was a permanent staff member.

Conclusion

These five drama teachers all have a different view regarding their understanding of teacher purpose: Nick says that who you are, your preparedness to act as a role model or empathy and moral agent, that is the purpose of being a teacher; David says it is about the content you teach, the way you facilitate and the way you are prepared to shape the content to assimilate theory defines you as a teacher; Elena says it is how you teach, creatively and in the space, your capacity to reach as many individuals as you can, is the role of the teacher; Georgia questions who

controls the teaching, she believes that the students should lead the pedagogy if they are to be really emancipated by it; Jane says that the critical tenet of teaching is access, access to pedagogy, access to equitable resources but importantly access to the teacher and recognition of individual needs.

Understanding the influences that shape and develop identities and attitudes to teaching allows insight into the way identity effects teaching and the transaction of pedagogy in the classroom (Danielewicz, 2001, p.9). Understanding how these teachers engage with and talk about the work they do and the way they perceive themselves as teachers goes to how the community understands the complex work of teaching. Understanding the connections between the 'call to teach' (Palmer, 2010) and teacher identity and integrity has both positive and negative implications for the profession.

These drama teachers acknowledge the influence that their beliefs and ideological positions have upon their role as teachers. Oser (1994) contends that teaching is an unavoidably moral endeavour and these teachers in this study have talked about the need to occasionally thwart dominant Discourses, particularly neo liberal ones, where they feel they are morally conflicted by them. As previously asserted in the literature review, the historical connections between critical pedagogy and teaching drama can have the effect of labelling teachers as activists or agents of change (O'Connor, 2016).

There is strong evidence in the previous literature and corroborated by this small study to suggest that the ways teachers enact their role in the classroom and the way they perceive teaching is influenced by a profound range of philosophies, theories and personal subjectivities, including ideology and moral compunction (O'Connor, 2016; Wales, 2009).

The final words of the powerful commodity that resides with, and in, languages through Discourse belongs to Gee (1999, p.119) when he says that, 'all successful teaching, that is teaching that inculcates Discourse and not just content, is political. That is simply a truism'. This maxim is evinced by the teachers in this study and revealed in their text and their talk as ideologically aligned and committed early career teachers.

Chapter 8: Building the World Through Students

'Young people will inevitably need the support and scaffolding of adults. Where so often they are offered pedagogies of passivity and individualism, educators must find ways to support young people as they co-create future landscapes they want to inhabit. To do this, learning environments free from personal and cultural risk, where collaboration is characterized by critical dialogue and listening, where engagement, emotion and empathy are not only valued but are also in fact, key goals and purposes for learning, and where learning activates activism need to be applied' (Anderson & Dunn, 2013, p. 304).

Overview

This chapter is principally concerned with how the five early career teachers in this study talk and write about their relationships with their students as this has emerged as a key theme from the data. In their teaching philosophies and subsequent interviews during their first year of teaching, their talk is characterized by a preoccupation to ensure their students' needs are met through pedagogy that is informed by theoreticians, but also how as teachers, they can inculcate in their students the requisite skills and competencies they need, in their view, to not only navigate their future, but to enhance their capacity to relate to other people.

The teaching philosophies in this study provide the foregrounding into what Gee (1999) describes as, 'the insight into action'. How the early career teachers say they conduct themselves and their work of teaching in the classroom provides a perspective into the significance of the relationships they 'build through language' (Gee, 1999, p.18). The classroom is the crucible for this work the teachers are doing – there is a confluence of theory, practice, perspective and insight. The early career

teachers say that successful relationships with the students make their teaching richer and more meaningful and when these conditions are met, the students are able to engage in the work and derive especial meaning and understanding from the content.

The chapter discusses three major themes that emanate from the data: (i) how the early career teachers talk *about* their students and *to* their students; (ii) the relationship between theory and practice (praxis) and how this shapes their relationship with their students in the reality of the classroom; (iii) how the teachers talk about the influence of their classroom teaching on the students' capacity to navigate the future.

The teaching philosophies of the early career teachers are rich with the teachers' idealism and ambitions for both themselves in the role as teachers, but also their ambition for their students in terms of what, they argue, the students can derive from these optimal and idealistic conditions. The teachers' privilege the argument that all teaching is relational and about relationships (Pearson, 2013) and the teaching philosophies corroborate this.

Nick incorporates his ideals and ambitions for the students and his classroom this way:

"I perceive the role of the teacher in this classroom context to be an empathy agent, a figure who provides access for students to develop their capacity for embodying, respecting and caring for others." (Nick, T.P., Lines 19-21)

The ideological proclivity that Nick argues in his teaching philosophy and his interviews is an iteration of his views about students and teachers and where he believes his role fits. His reference to the word, 'figure' indicates his perception regarding the teacher as a model for

students to see the 'lived' (Freire, 1998). He says he needs to be this model and agent in the classroom.

Nick is also a proponent of students gaining understanding and experience in ways to live their lives that are unselfish and are mediated by their capacity to work and commune with others. The reiteration in his teaching philosophy and subsequent interviews of the noun 'agent', also builds a world through language where student agency and dominion have a central place in the work. This invocation of the classroom climate and the affect of this do not explicitly reference syllabus or content. Rather, Nick argues that this way of being in the classroom and way of relating to his students, as a figure and as an empathy agent are foremost in his practice. In further interviews he elaborates on what this looks like in practice in the classroom, but critical to his identity as a teacher, is this role as an empathy agent. He returns at every chance, in his talk in interviews, to this iteration of ideals because of the value he ascribes to the relationships he builds with and for his students

Jane believes that teaching texts and literature allows students to learn and develop independent thinking skills. She wants her students to see the connections between drama and English and how they teach about the world. She says this about her classroom:

"My passion for drama naturally links with English and it gives students a connection to other contexts through texts, providing a deeper knowledge and insight of themselves and their world. They allow students to develop their own opinions and their own expression. I want to foster this in my students. Give them the freedom to explore the world through literature and play, opening up the possibilities." (Jane, T.P, Lines 21-25)

Jane talks about the connections between the subjects she teaches as having relevance to the way she can relate to and teach her students. Her

ideological preponderance and idealism is captured by her sentiment of the passion she has for both these teaching areas. Again, there is an iteration of the need to frame the learning and the relationships in the classroom, between the teacher and the text, the students and the texts, and the climate that allows the students to make connections between what they are learning through the material and content, and their capacity to navigate the world for themselves.

Jane's use of the verb 'foster' is a word choice that indicates her belief that students cannot be inculcated instead they need to be shown. This word choice as an act of language demonstrates that Jane believes her students need to be self-directed and derive meaning based on their own discoveries. To 'foster' in them this understanding about the importance of having your own voice and your own opinion, says that she plays a part in cultivating, nurturing and sustaining this way of knowing.

Elena contends that her relationships with her students and with her role as a teacher are likely to shift and change. She sees these roles as connected but fluid in their manifestation. She also acknowledges that her teaching will improve and develop as she gains experience. She talks about how her ideas have evolved since she began her degree and came by her admission to teaching, as a safe path before she embarked on a career as a performing artist. She says this about teaching and her teaching her students:

"I believe that teaching is fluid and organic. It (teaching) was the perfect way to combine my love of acting, theatre and literature with my strong philanthropic nature. It was a way to inspire kids in a way I had been inspired, to show them what it is to love the arts, love English, love learning." (Elena, T.P., Lines 11-17)

Similarly to the teaching philosophies of Jane and Nick, Elena advocates for the students to have enthusiasm, passion and commitment

modelled for them by their teacher in the classroom. The language that Elena chooses describes her decision to teach as a way for her to combine what she loves and to transact that through texts and play to the students. Elena sees her role as one that should inspire the students, not just teach content to them. She wants her students to engage with the content in particular the arts. She believes it can incite them to think and to know the world. Her self-described, 'philanthropic nature', reflects the way she perceives the role of the teacher, teaching the students to include some self-sacrifice and bequest. This language implies that there is a dimension of the role that is not just unspoken, it is probably unremunerated and requires a degree of unselfishness and selflessness.

Georgia posits her teaching philosophy as a narrative explanation of her ideals and views about teaching. She says that she became a teacher because she experienced great teaching from her grandparents who were instrumental in her learning about the world. They instilled a great passion in her, she says, 'to know more'. Georgia says that the work of the classroom and the relationships that support this learning should be grounded in wanting always, 'to know more'. She gravitates strongly in further interviews to the theory of a, 'funds of knowledge approach' (Moll et. al, 1992) whereby her students' knowledge acquired outside of the classroom, through their experiences and culture, should not just be respected but should be actively inculcated in the work. Georgia refers to her experiences in 'farm school' with her grandparents and reflects on how the integration of learning about culture, language and new experiences led her to wanting to know more about the world. This is her approach with her students.

"I find it vital within a diverse classroom to deliver the content in a way that students identify the relevance of the learning with their background. When I'm planning learning activities and assessments, I try to adapt my teaching of the content to meet the range of interests of my students to build connectedness and

engagement within a supportive and structured learning environment.” (Georgia, T. P., Lines 26-29)

Georgia recruits language that is shaped and derived from the NSW Quality Teaching Framework (DEC, 2003) to exemplify how she wants to develop and grow the classroom and the relationships with the students to the work and in turn to each other. An iteration of Georgia’s texts and talks is her linkage between the relevance and interest of the students to the content. She believes that without an abiding interest in the content taught, the students will not engage with the work and experience a deeper resonance and meaning.

The reference Georgia makes to the supportive and structured learning environment she says is trying to create in the classroom reflects her ideological alignment to the practice of teaching and learning in specific ways. She also discusses her teaching in ways that allow students access to the content that are personally engaging for the students and therefore resonate with them and to their learning. Students in her view must be able to learn and develop in safe and supportive environments where the subject and content are enjoyed by both the teacher and the student and this then enables a relationship between the two.

David talks about his commitment to education, and access to it, as a fundamental tenet and human right. Through his language, he presents a holistic view of education as opposed to a personal and specific interpretation when he talks about teaching generally. He also argues that the classroom is the place to test ideas and push boundaries but this can only be achieved through a convergence of text, talk and ideas. He values, as does Nick, the place of imagination and creativity in the classroom and in the way they are taught. David says this about his aspirations:

“I must use the necessary and most appropriate means to nurture a love of lifelong learning in all my students. This is achieved through

my passion for the English language and literature and the transformative and imaginative experiences created in the drama classroom, a strong commitment to guiding students' understanding of themselves and the world within and beyond the classroom." (David, T.P., Lines 2-7)

David's use of imperative language to say he 'must' achieve this in the classroom is an indication of his commitment and idealism with which he views his teaching. The students are compromised if they leave his classroom without, what he says, are the necessary experiences and tools to not only navigate the classroom but the wider world. The classroom, he argues, should provide the genesis of this love and the mandate to achieve this rests with him, and the tone and tenor of the classroom he creates for them.

How the early career teachers talk about their students and learning

The five early career teachers discuss through their texts and talk what they argue is the importance or precedence they give to their relationships with their students and to student learning. Previous chapters of the thesis have referred to the way the early career teachers adapt and assimilate the lexicon and language of drama, for example. The way this chapter analyses language is influenced and shaped by the way the teachers talk about their students and their learning. They also talk about their students needing to use particular words and language in their repertoire that empowers them as citizens. The early career teachers believe this is a significant dimension of their work in social justice.

In describing his relationship with his students, David predicates their success upon whether they have been attained through collaboration. He says that an ideal relationship should be built upon:

"...a collaboration between the teacher and the students and the students and the students." (David, Int. 1, Turn 22)

David believes that if he builds relationships successfully between the stakeholders in the classroom he can create the optimal climate for learning in and about the world. The classroom needs to be built collaboratively for this to happen. In his interviews he also describes the way he says he needs to facilitate and direct the students. He believes that his direction in the guise of collaboration provides the best outcome for the students. David does not objectify his teaching when he describes it through talk. He argues that education is a 'social good' (Gee, 1999), and that engaging in good teaching and maintaining, developing and sustaining meaningful relationships will have extended benefits for society. This is an iteration of David's text and talk that aligns with the idea that his provision of education to the students is a social good. Teaching his students well, in his view, contributes to a more meaningful and productive society. These skills, he argues, the students need for lives outside the classroom. His classroom provides the opportunity for this to be achieved.

In similar ways, Georgia says that the classroom is the conduit or the forum for acquisition of these skills and competencies of good citizenship and participation. As a proponent of education as a life-long pursuit, her modelling of this idea means that she needs to demonstrate passion, which will provide the impetus for her students to engage further in their learning. The students, in her view, will only want to learn more if their interest is piqued through her demonstrable passion for whatever content she is teaching. Her use of the words 'passion' and 'yearning' suggest that Georgia cannot specify what this looks like in the classroom, but she acknowledges these are seminal to the students' learning in her drama club she describes the students as, 'hanging out' for drama. (Int. 2, Turn 19).

Georgia aligns her identity as a teacher to the description of what she sees are integral dimensions of the classroom. She aligns as a teacher who is inspired and passionate not just about her job but also about what

she is teaching the students about the world at large. There are parallels and similarities differently expressed between the two philosophies of David and Georgia. David says collaboration is a key competency, yet Georgia argues it is passion and yearning. These individual expressions affect and influence the way they talk about their students.

In Jane's text and talk she refers to her students needing to be equipped with particular skills and competencies that,

"...come from learning beyond the curriculum." (Jane, Int. 1, Turn 45)

Jane uses language to construct or build something in a purposeful way in the classroom. Her reference to literature and to text as part of that acquisition of knowledge contributes to a dimension of understanding the way she wants to conduct herself as a teacher in the classroom. The word 'equip' as a verb has the association or affect of a positive attribution of language. She is doing something or giving something to her students that is positive. Jane argues that without these necessary skills and the conditions for learning being successfully met in the classroom, the students will not be 'equipped' and this is her perception of the role and identity she constructs for herself. Without this necessary equipping, the students will be deficient for the world and in the world.

Nick sees his role as a teacher and his relationship with students as morally important:

"A teacher is responsible for providing students with the means to comprehend [the] moral responsibilities that come with access and the need to develop a sociocultural sensitivity." (Nick, T.P., Lines 22-24)

The role that Nick argues is important for him to perform in the classroom does not elaborate on what being a moral agent is, or the moral responsibilities that he says are a necessary component and dimension of the learning that should take place in the classroom, according to him. Through his text and talk, Nick aligns himself with an ideological position of the teacher as a moral agent and this is examined and discussed in detail in previous chapters. For the purpose of examining his relationships through the prism of moral responsibilities, Nick's perception and argument around his role as a teacher includes his behaviour and ways of being as the exemplar for the students.

Although Nick's text and talk suggests this role is necessary learning for the students, he does not qualify the way this can be achieved other than to say it can be achieved through creativity and the affordances of drama. Neither does he explicate what aspects of morality he intends to use as the guiding principles. What he does say is that the approach in the classroom should always be 'compassionate', meaning students should come to expect him as the teacher to be respectful and involve listening to the students, giving weight to their ideas and concerns and that this should be reciprocated by them to each other and to him. These are necessary terms and ways of being in relationships, in the early career teachers' classrooms.

Nick and Mindfulness

The way Nick talks in his interview about how he wants to construe his relationships with his students is quite specific. He discusses throughout the interviews his personal view that in order for students to engage with, and in the world, and for them to learn in effective ways, it is necessary for teachers to be mindful about the way they speak about, and to, their students. He gives the example of where his wife was teaching in a school with a high population of refugee students. In this case he recounts the student's background and life experiences had left him so scarred he was barely a functional human being, let alone equipped with the

necessary social acumen to function and thrive in a school. He describes the student's experiences as 'horrific'. What was revelatory for him he says was the realisation as described to him by his wife that, 'actually if you treat him as a human being and talk to him as a human being and even talk about him as a human being when he's not around, he really starts to open up and respond to that type of treatment. Nick's explanation and language used to iterate the word 'human' builds deep connections between the work of being a teacher which he implies through the statement, involves speaking about students in a way that is with humanity and dignity.

As language is used to make the word and the action of being human, Nick builds significance in the word. Through this word-use and its associated meaning that begins to establish and build a picture of how Nick talks about students at the centre of his teaching practice and at the centre of his classroom. The foregrounding of the word 'human' is significant for what it implies regarding the previous treatment and relationships this student has had. The meaning attributed in the sentence is that this student has not been treated in what Nick or his wife deemed a human way. The end of Nick's sentence is also illuminating for its use of the word 'treatment'. In this connotation it is used to mean something very positive and productive. The word 'treatment' could also be understood to mean the antithesis and perhaps the way the student had previously experienced the world. Nick ascribes and negotiates new meaning into this word in this positive context.

Jane and encouragement

In her interview, Jane talks about the importance of encouragement. She argues encouragement is key to developing successful relationships and places students at the centre of her teaching. As discussed in previous chapters, Jane's motivation in teaching generally is to provide access for students. Her own experiences of being a student with a disability means that she is always focused on the importance of

providing access and effective encouragement no matter what the circumstances or even if she feels it may not work.

Jane talks about the school that she is teaching at and the partially selective stream that the school has within it. She describes what she says is the perception that students in other non-selective streams may be overlooked because of where they are placed in the classes. She talks about one particular student:

“[He] writes nothing down, nothing in his book in five weeks, but I tell him, I encourage him – I know he doesn’t do anything but I say, you’re not dumb, don’t think you’re dumb.” (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 30)

In a similar way to Nick, Jane builds connections and associations in the sentence. Her student has not written anything down in five weeks of classes. This lack of achievement could be construed as a failure on the part of the student to meet the expectations of the class and the acquisition of the content but Jane does not believe that. She goes on to describe how when she was teaching *Macbeth*, this particular student gave a complex and insightful answer when asked to describe *Macbeth*. She refuses to give up on him – she sees value in him despite his reticence to write anything down. Her reiteration of, ‘you’re not dumb, you’re not dumb’ says that it is important to Jane that this student does not perceive himself to be of less intellectual value than anyone else in the class. The use of the vernacular of ‘dumb’ can be understood as meaning Jane wants the student to understand in everyday language that she refuses to believe in this prophecy for her student. Again, the reiteration of mindfulness in speaking about and to the students is reiterated in these teacher’s interviews. Jane and Nick say they are careful about how they speak about their students and to their students.

David and collaboration

David's conception of the classroom and his relationship with students is influenced by his political views about teaching and education. David believes the classroom should reflect the democratic principles that the students will encounter or live when they encounter the world. In many ways David's teaching philosophy and interview conversations are textured and coloured by his conversations and firm beliefs in the democratic classroom. In two interviews he does not resile from these beliefs:

"I believe in a social constructivist approach to teaching where learning and development is increasingly social and fostered through collaboration with the teacher and the students and between the students." (David, T.P., Lines 9-11)

David's commitment to a socially constructivist approach is again revisited in his second interview. He reiterates collaboration as significant to him in the classroom. His view of an equitable classroom is a recurring theme or motif in his writing and in his work. He argues the need to imbue the classroom with democratic and collaborative principles for the students to learn about the importance and effect of collaboration and this also constructs his identity as a teacher who acts and speaks a certain way – a collaborative way.

Georgia and sharing the narrative

Georgia framed her teaching philosophy as a narrative of her own. She spoke about how deeply influenced she was by her grandparents and how in school holidays she would be taken on trips with them and how her grandparents would conduct what she describes as 'farm school'. The whimsical and adventurous way she describes these holidays sets the foundation for the way she says she wants to conduct her classroom and establish her relationships with her students. She is very conscious of providing her students with an opportunity to learn in an adventurous and personal way – 'The passion and the yearning to learn more' (T.P., Line 8).

The classroom should be, in her view, a conduit for students to develop a relationship with the wider world by developing their own story and attaching their own significance to that story. She also ascribes significance through her choice of language to the students' learning alongside her and sharing their narrative journey.

"It's not just my narrative now – theirs as well, the students as well – so making sure they're drawing connections and telling you stories about their life." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 37)

Georgia develops explicit connections between the importance of her story and her identity as a person and then as a teacher and links these explicitly to the stories of her students. The way Georgia links the concepts of connections and stories about their lives, gives a reality to the shape of her classroom. The attribution of story adds a texture and a dimension of very personal dialogue and meaning to the way she wants her students to function and learn – stories at the centre of her relationships with her students. This is how she talks about the students, as human beings purposefully 'storying' their own journey through the classroom and into life.

Georgia also uses language and narrative to theorise her work. She says in her interview that she believes that narrative is not only a way of understanding ourselves but also furthers our understanding of the way we learn about and from each other. She has a global view regarding the importance of narrative in the classroom. Georgia says that:

"Without it the students won't understand the array of experiences. If they only know their narrative and they don't share that, then it's never going to be altered, so they need a range of experiences in order to expand their narrative." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 38)

Georgia's response regarding the importance of teaching students in a socially just way creates a number of Discourse connections in the text. She is building activity through expressing her commitment to narrative as a teaching tool. She uses specific language with specialized meaning when she reiterates the word narrative. In this context she gives the word 'narrative' specific attributions that include not just telling a story but an inclusive way of sharing and connecting ideas and experiences in the classroom in order to develop another richer and more detailed story. The word 'narrative' also takes on a political attribution. Narrative becomes something that is not only a way of teaching and learning but in her view, a social good. To withhold this way of learning from her students and not share a narrative in Georgia's view means the classroom and the students are deficient. Narrative becomes something that has particular value and currency for her in her classroom and with her students.

Georgia's view regarding the purpose of narrative also does what Gee (1999) describes as world building. Georgia disavows a world or a classroom in this case that does not have narrative as part of its pedagogy. She builds a world through her language and description that she believes is optimal and cohesive for the students if students can experience other people's stories through her teaching. There is a connection between what Nick has to say about the mindfull way he believes students should be spoken about and spoken to. In acknowledging their experiences outside the classroom and speaking respectfully he wants to build relationships with his students built on a mutual respect. As Jane says, part of building relationships with her students is based on being encouraging. Her role includes supporting students even when they have disengaged or when they have no belief left in their own abilities, as a teacher she feels the need to keep encouraging that – never letting self-doubt pervade.

Elena – 'encompassing all kids'

Elena talks about her life as a performing artist in her teaching philosophy and her experiences teaching in informal classrooms and

through the Australian Theatre for Young People (ATYP). Her view of students as described in her teaching philosophy is based on a precept where she feels an obligation or responsibility for students even when they are not directly taught in her classroom. She sees her views as deeply ideological and politically influenced. However, in expressing a view that she is responsible for all the students she teaches, Elena is also deeply conflicted by this view. She expresses regret in her teaching philosophy that there will be students she cannot reach or help. She says in her first interview that she came into the teaching degree believing that:

“You needed to accept the fact that there will always be some kids that will not learn from you.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 14)

During her practicum experience she says her views became altered and challenged when she saw that students at this particular school had a prominent stream of students with disabilities and also students with what she describes as, ‘troubled backgrounds’ (Int. 1, Turn 14). For Elena, this experience was a turning point from believing, in her words, that there were some students who just could not be reached or could not learn from her to a view where:

“I completely shifted that point of view and my philosophy turned more into one that is kind of encompassing of all kids and the fact that all kids have the capacity to learn.” (Elena, Int. 1, Turn 14)

Elena’s newly inspired views are influenced by her experiences during a practicum at a rural school. Her language ‘builds a world’ in way to reflect her new insights about students. She says she now believes that her teaching, her relationships with, and obligation to, her students, needs to be based on a broader view. She believes that this significant shift can be attributed to an on-the-ground experience actually teaching students. Her previously held view that it was not possible to meet the needs and expectations of all her students has shifted dramatically because of her

experience actually teaching. Her language and the way she speaks about students develops in a way that she hopes encompasses them all – as she previously said, she feels an obligation to the students whom she may not even teach. Her view of students is that they are at the centre of her work as a teacher and in the classroom and she has an obligation to all of them, ethically and morally.

There is also a certain disjuncture between what Elena has previously said she believed about students and teaching students in her classroom and her almost evangelical and newly formed view that she needs to be an all-encompassing teacher to her students. She also talks about sacrificing some students and their learning in order not to forsake those less able. Her view that she needs to be ‘all encompassing’ is conflicted. The way she uses language suggests that the connections she is making need to be refined, she is working out her view of students and her priorities for teaching as she experiences more teaching and experiences teaching more students. She says:

“Some kids may be more difficult to reach, but that’s actually more of a priority to concentrate on that than just sacrificing their learning to be more present to the other kids in the class.” (Elena, Int. 2, Turn 9)

Elena contends that her beliefs about teaching and relating to her students are polarising, there is a right way and a wrong way. For her, there is no question of leaving students behind if they are experiencing difficulties. Her views coalesce with those held by Jane who also believes it is critical to encourage students. As Jane discussed, even those who may find the work completely beyond their capacity to complete, as in the case of her student who wrote nothing in five weeks of class she nonetheless refused to let him give in and believe his learning was futile. Both teachers, in the way they express their views, build strong connections between the way they speak about teaching students and their own teaching identities.

These two teachers are unswerving in their belief, as they have stated that students should be at the centre of their concern in the classroom but with different emphasis as described by them both.

How the teachers talk about the relationship between theory and practice

In the teaching philosophies David, Georgia, Nick, and Elena all cited or referred explicitly to individual theorists or theoretical frameworks that they said they intended to influence their practices. Jane however was convinced of finding her own theories based on what had been modelled in her university course work. In consequent interviews they were asked if these theorists or theories still influenced or shaped the way they related to their students and the way they developed content through practice. Their responses were framed in various ways that suggested they were still heavily influenced and guided by these practices and principles, albeit in more practical ways.

Nick and ‘the compassionate way’

Nick’s views regarding his teaching, why he teaches, the way he teaches his students’ is he says, guided by his moral and ethical framework and by his faith. He speaks in his teaching philosophy of the critical role of the teacher in providing students with:

“...a figure who provides access for students to develop their capacity for embodying, respecting and caring, for others.” (Nick, T.P., Lines 19-21)

The way Nick uses the word ‘figure’ foregrounds his view that teachers are important people who hold powerful positions of responsibility in the classroom and therefore are influential in their relationships with their students.

The way Nick describes the work of a teacher is as a person or in his words as a 'figure' that needs to model appropriate ways for students to relate to each other and in the world. The qualities and values that he ascribes to the language of the classroom are those that are not necessary quantifiable. When he writes or speaks about his students and the relationships he has with them, he speaks of his 'mindful' approach to speaking about them, but also his work that requires him to develop students' ability to relate to each other in compassionate ways. Nick's views regarding teaching and the way he constructs and builds his world through language has moral agency at the heart and axis of his work.

Nick's perspective that teaching is about enabling students to build their own worlds using a compassionate approach, he says, is based on some influential theorists and practitioners that he studied at university which he has appropriated into his classroom and teaching. When he wrote his teaching philosophy he used the words of the poet, e.e.cummings to contextualize his views regarding teaching and learning and specifically his views about teaching creativity:

"I am going to utter a tree, nobody can stop me." (Nick, T.P., Lines 9-10)

This line from the poem whilst not strictly theoretical does however frame Nick's teaching and the relationships he says he builds with his students in a way that engages their creativity and capacity to innovate and be individual. The connections he makes between his teaching and the values he attributes to learning in an independent and exploratory way align his identity, as a teacher who values a student's independence and creativity in terms of how they might approach their learning. Students, in his view, should be unstoppable if they are on a particular trajectory and are learning in creative ways. Nick sees a direct link between creativity and academic success. He believes that one cannot be achieved without the other.

In his first interview Nick was asked about his views regarding teaching students and teaching in a socially just way. To emphasise and corroborate his views in the teaching philosophy he speaks about the theorists who influence his work and continue to shape and guide his practice:

“I was really drawn to Freire, obviously, and particularly ‘The pedagogy of the oppressed.’ (Nick, Int. 1, Turn 24)

This statement does two significant things in describing Nick and his views regarding teaching. Nick’s reference to the work of Freire indicates by foregrounding this theorist, an assuaging and confirming of the views of the drama community and the dominant Discourse that reverses Freire as a seminal theorist. Freiran ideals, according to Nick, will shape his classroom and the way he intends to teach. In acknowledging Freire as deeply influential, Nick’s language paints a picture for the reader of a classroom where socially just practices and access are key components of the learning and the ways the students will learn in this classroom.

Further influential in building connections between language and meaning in this text is Nick’s use of the word ‘obviously’ to pre-empt the word Freire. This foregrounding suggests that to teach without using the theories of Freire and his ideals regarding social justice would be erroneous, so essential to his teaching is this theorist. In a further elaboration of this idea and this theorist’s influence Nick says:

“...things about having a kind of democratic voices and allowing people to have a voice, and how easy it is to silence that voice.”
(Nick, Int. 2, Turn 13)

It can be understood from the way Nick refers to Freire in this comment that the students he teaches will not be oppressed in the same way Freire

was or writes about. However, the connections Nick suggests are made between the democratic principles that people should have agency and dominion over their lives by accessing education and the democratic principles inherent within that access, and the principles Nick wants to establish in his classroom.

Contextually within this sentence Nick also ceases to refer to the students as students. Instead, he prefers to use the word 'people'. This preference for the word 'people' over 'student' says that he thinks of the student teacher relationship as one of equality in the world and this reflects his views regarding democracy.

David and social constructivist teaching:

David's view of teaching in a collaborative way coalesces with Nick's view of allowing people (students) to have a democratic voice and to be heard and valued. David's view of collaboration is similar in the way he connects togetherness and cooperation to the concept of democracy in his classroom. Both teachers see their world through a lens of equality and equanimity and yet they perceive it differently. This affects the way they talk about their students in the classroom and the way they talk about the work they do through a democratic and social justice lens.

David's commitment to integrating the theorists he believes are most influential to him into his work is first raised in his teaching philosophy. He says that he is committed to both a theorist and also to a theory of teaching. In his teaching philosophy he says that he is committed to a Vygotskian approach to teaching because in his view, learning and teaching is best approached from a social and as previously mentioned, collaborative approach.

David also refers to the work of Freire and his argument for people to have access to democracy, and to be heard in the political and wider conversation, as influencing his relationships with the students:

“I think they inform how I teach but also how I view my students. I just think human beings need to know.” (David, Int. 1, Turn 34)

Whilst there is a lack of specificity or examples of where he teaches using Freirean and Boalian principles, it is foregrounded by his use of the words ‘view’ and ‘know’.

David is building specific significance in this sentence through the way he uses these terms to express and make relevant this way of teaching in the classroom. His assertion that he thinks, ‘human being need to know’, informs the reader that David believes that the principles of democracy and collaboration should be inherent in the classroom. Similar to Nick’s use of the word ‘people’, David stops using the word ‘student’ and begins also to refer to the word ‘human’. Implied in this word is the social perspective that every person, teacher and student alike can be made better through accessing this way of learning and of thinking. Again, David corroborates what he says are his views about teaching using theorists or theoretical frameworks to establish the significance of these theorists to his teaching.

During the second interview David was asked about whether he felt he was still influenced by theorists as he was approaching the fourth term of his first year of teaching. He answered in the following way:

“How I work is very ideologically inspired. I still think that I need maybe to hold onto these a bit more closely to how I teach.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 12)

The way David talks about theorists and their influence is as if they were talismans for his teaching is similar to Georgia who, in her second interview talks about aspects of her teaching that are ideologically inspired as being ‘the cornerstones’ of her practice. David, after a year in

the reality of the classroom, revisits this idea of the ideological inspiration he first discussed and reflects that he, “needs to hold onto these a bit more closely” meaning he needs to refocus what he believes about himself to reinvigorate his teaching and realign it, with his beliefs. The activity building that is going on in this sentence suggests that as committed intellectually to the theorist and the theoretical frameworks he says he values highly, in the reality of the classroom, these may be more elusive or less prominent and present than he would otherwise like them to be.

Jane and ‘finding my own method’

Jane’s teaching philosophy begins with a tract of text that by her own admission she appropriated or as she says, ‘lifted’, from the NSW Department of Education and Communities website. She says she did this for two reasons. Firstly, she felt she could use the teaching philosophy in a practical way, so she wrote it to help her with job applications and secondly, because she says she believes inherently and fiercely in the principles of a public education.

When Jane was asked about theorists or influential theories she studiously avoided in her responses adhering to one. She preferred to be guided she said by the theory or the ideology of the public education system. She also advanced the idea that rather than theoretical influence she was influenced more profoundly by her tutors at university during her teaching degree. She did agree however that some of these tutors she admired were themselves deeply influenced by theorists upon whom their work and teaching is based.

The way Jane uses language and speaks about her teaching is in a pragmatic way. Her own identity has been influenced she says by the successful way she navigated her own schooling particularly as a student with a disability. She is very committed to ensuring that students have this same opportunity to succeed in the public school system. As she describes in her interview she attaches a certain cynicism to the term ‘social justice’,

and prefers to develop ways of teaching that are not confined by semantics.

As she approached her final term of her first year of practice Jane was told by the Department of Education that she would be made permanent in her current position. Some of her previous reticence seemed to fall away as she was able to really invest in her classes knowing she would be there to teach them the following year. Jane describes her enthusiasm for taking on a newly formed year nine class. Due to increasing enrolments and the selective stream in this year, the need to open a new class became paramount and Jane applied to take the new class.

When she was asked about particular theories or theorists she may have considered when planning for this class and approaching her teaching, again she avoided being 'pigeon-holed' by a theorist and wanted to demonstrate or prove who she is without defining herself in a particular way:

"I think this year I've proved who I want to be. I just want to be approachable. You still worry – things like behaviour management. As I said I'm not a strict teacher. Will everyone respond to my style though" (Jane, Int. 2, Turn 109)

Jane is adamant that she would rather rely upon her intuition rather than being confined by theories of behaviour management. For example that she wants to teach in a way that is meaningful for her and for the students. She does however build connections in the sentence between having 'proved' herself as a teacher and not being strict. The background of this word 'proved' says that as part of the first year of teaching, a novice needs to demonstrate that they can teach a class competently and in this context that they can manage behaviour.

Strong links and connections between the words ‘proved’ and ‘strict’ lead to an assemblage of identity that Jane wants to construct. While on the one hand she says she is not a strict teacher she also says she feels that she has ‘proved’ that she can manage the challenges of student behaviour. What remains unsaid in the sentence is the implication that would be understood by the wider community and membership of the teaching Discourse, that behaviour management is part of the job – and a large part of a graduate teacher’s concerns.

The articulation of the word ‘style’ in this sentence has similar associations to the words that David and Nick use to describe their work. Whilst Nick discusses his work through the lens of moral teaching and guidance, Nick talks about being ideological – this is their style. For Jane, her ‘style’ is to manage, to encourage and to prove herself. This is the identity work that she constructs in the sentence to describe her own theoretical position.

Georgia and the ‘voice of the student’

When Georgia was asked in her second interview to revisit her original teaching philosophy, she like the other participants still agreed that the document was true to her ideals and aspirations. She did express some disappointment that she had not talked more:

“...about the role of the student and the voice of the student.”
(Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 2)

Georgia had previously spoken about the need in her view for students to be equipped with skills that enable them to negotiate and deal with the world in a successful manner or way. Her comments about her teaching philosophy led her to say that she felt she needed to add emphasis to her commitment to the ‘student voice’. In the reality of the classroom and the rigor of practice it was modelling leadership skills through independent and student led thinking that she felt was a key component in her

classroom. Her views regarding the need to model and engender skills of independent and critical thinking also coalesce and corroborate the views held by David and Nick. Jane's view that encouraging students diverges slightly from the explicit nature of student-centered learning but nevertheless there is a synergy that can be claimed between all three views.

Georgia also speaks about the fact that her teaching philosophy focused more on what she felt she needed to do as a successful teacher and that her belief and commitment to independent learning and the theoretical framework of this concept had remained undervalued in her philosophy:

"Right now I'm doing a lot more student-led learning, trying to learn about the 21st century pedagogies and within that, the role and the voice of the student." (Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 2)

Georgia's comments about the student voice and the connections she builds between the student-led learning and the 21st century pedagogies performs a number of functions in the sentence. It says that in terms of her identity and her developing practice she is engaged with the process of learning new methods and theories that are more applicable and relevant in the reality of the classroom. She says that while she is trying to learn new methods and strategies it is the 'role and the voice of the student' that she is concerned with developing.

The word 'role' and 'voice' in the context of this sentence can both be ascribed with active attributions as verbs but they can also be given particular attributions as nouns – as concrete things. The way Georgia uses these words also suggests that there is a component of measurability in the way she intends them to be understood.

In terms of the role of voice, the background of the word suggests that there is an element of collaboration and also of obligation. If the students play a role in the classroom it comes with attached obligations and concerns. The use of the word 'voice' has particular resonance in the membership of the drama community and within the Discourse of drama more particularly. In common parlance or everyday use to have a voice is to be counted and to be listened to – an inherent quality and attribute of being part of a democratic process. For the drama community and the teaching community, having a voice certainly means being listened to and being part of a democratic process. For drama teachers and the drama community 'voice' has its antecedence in the way Freire (2000) intended it to be used – as tool for achieving liberation.

The way that Georgia builds significance into the statement is by associating and connecting the ideas of the student-led learning and having the students speak and learn in an independent and critical way. These are the tenets of the pedagogy she implies in the sentence. She also builds identity in the sentence through her admission that now she is in the classroom, the theories that she thought in principle would guide her at the beginning of her year of teaching she now thinks that a more student-based way of transacting her teaching is the ideal in the classroom.

Georgia says that for her teaching in the first year, rather than adhere to a theorist explicitly such as Boal or Freire she is interested in the way the core beliefs or tenets of these theories can be applied or ameliorated in practice. She says that at her school there is a large proportion of the student population who are disadvantaged. Georgia's view regarding this dimension to her teaching is to develop the students and to enculturate a climate of independence and leadership. In her second interview she revisits the theme of the students and their role and her role teaching them. Guided by theory she comes to the conclusion that strategies to achieve student voice are critical to achieving the ideal

student-led learning. Her school has also developed a whole-school policy that accords with Georgia's personal philosophy and they are implementing what she described as 'the super six strategy'. Georgia says she is keen to adopt and implement strategies that she feels will give the students an opportunity to develop as both individuals and learners, thereby enacting strategies that afford liberation.

How the early career teachers talk about students and the future

The five early career teachers in this study all write in unique ways about their belief that a key aspect of their roles as teachers is to prepare their students for the world they inhabit and more importantly to provide them with the skills to navigate their world. They see their role as complicit with the school in developing capable and socially just citizens who will be able to make informed decisions about their future.

Jane says in her philosophy that the teachers have the potential to encourage students to, 'assert themselves as capable and valued citizens in society' (Jane, T.P., Line 8). David also believes that a teacher's role has been achieved when a student, 'can enter society as a responsible and active global citizen ready to contribute to the wider world' (David, T.P., Line 48-49). Both Jane and David's view that there is a mutual obligation in the teacher preparing the student and the student taking up the cudgels of independence are made through the relationships between the words 'active' and 'society'. Both Jane and David build the significance of mutual obligation and the importance of this obligation by using an active verb 'active'. This word choice also accords with the idea privileged in the drama community that activation can also mean, 'to change, to make different or to cause transformation' (Anderson & Dunn, 2013, p.xvii). These attributions of the word are ways to understand the conversation and Discourse that underpins this meaning as described by Jane and David.

Nick's philosophy again takes the opportunity to use a provocation in terms of his teaching. He begs the question of himself and his teaching when says he wants to as a teacher:

"Positively challenge the student's perceptions of their role in the school and the wider community." (Nick, T.P., Lines 26-27)

Nick expresses the view that the role of preparing students for the future involves a dichotomy. He says he needs to 'positively challenge'. His deliberate use of what can be construed as antithetical words of 'positive' and 'challenge' reflects Nick believes his identity as a teacher requires him to provoke students through his classroom and through his pedagogy or to be occasionally uncomfortable with what he might suggest or ask them. Nick's view of the students in this preparation for the future means they need to be sufficiently skilled and insightful in order to challenge any dominant Discourses that may challenge their values or where ideas do not align.

Georgia is explicit and says she is firm in her resolve in the classroom as she claims in her teaching philosophy. The role of the teacher as she conceives it to be, through her novice eyes is 'to shape successful citizens academically and socially' (T.P., Lines 13-14). The key words in this sentence are 'shape' and 'successful'. What remains unsaid is *how* Georgia intends to do this shaping and what in fact constitutes success. In her teaching philosophy, Georgia is being idealistic and hopeful. How she intends to achieve this is spoken about in more detail in her interviews. She admits to this being slightly ambiguous in her philosophy.

Elena approaches the view of how the teacher might prepare students for the future in an encompassing way, as is reflected in her philosophy and her interviews. Her approach is one that is underpinned by a political concern – that the right to an education is a fundamental element of democracy – ergo that by having an education you are

prepared to be a global and active citizen. At no time in her teaching philosophy does she write about these as separate concerns. In this way Elena differs from the other four teachers.

Nick's view of the world and the way he approaches his teaching is influenced as previously stated by his deep faith and his belief in moral agency as the determinant factor in achieving an effective classroom and teaching in an effective and affective way. He chooses his words very carefully when he describes the importance of the students' capacity to enter the world:

"Whatever you engage them with, and so for me really places an even more heightened sense of responsibility for me as a teacher because I want them to engage in a way that isn't didactic in telling them this is the way the world works and this is how you should view the world." (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 4)

The connections built through grammar and words in this statement reveal a number of aspects about Nick and his view of teaching but also the way he conceives his students. The world as we see through Nick's language is a place for negotiated meaning. He correlates the idea that there is responsibility on him not just to ensure that the teaching of the students is appropriate and yet he also connects and makes significant the idea of how the students might perceive the world. In previous tracts of texts and in previous parts of his interviews Nick speaks at length about his commitment to teaching through a service lens and his view of teaching as a moral agent.

As readers we connect a number of relevant associations that may not necessarily correlate in other scenarios. For example Nick's assertion that it is not his role to tell students how the world works, but instead students must navigate this path for themselves with his guidance and modelling. He suggests that it will be through engagement with and

through the world, as it is negotiated and engaged through the classroom that the students will derive knowledge of how they should act and be in the world. The reiteration of the verb 'how' is useful to understand the way it signals Nick's intention to do this work by using the students and their experiences as tools. What is unsaid or remains implied in the sentence is Nick's desire to not impose his views on the students – theirs must be an experiential and critical journey.

Because Nick says that he feels the students must undertake a journey of discovery and also of self-direction, he does not articulate how he intends to achieve this. What he is particular in saying is what he won't do and that is 'be didactic'. This idea that Nick will not be didactic can be construed as paradoxical given that didacticism is actually teaching. However he establishes an identity through the use of this specialised word to mean that he won't be dictatorial in the classroom, instead he wants to negotiate with his students.

Nick explains how he will impart the skills needed to negotiate the world to students in his second interview:

"I need to give them something concrete. I need to give them a value. I need to give them an idea that is concrete enough for them to at least reject or accept...and then figure it out on their own and adapt it in their own way." (Nick, Int. 2, Turn 4)

The significance that is built through these sentences and through Nick's personal Discourse is the repetition and reiteration of the phrase, 'I need'. The connections and relationships he develops through the sentence reflect upon his personal belief that he is responsible, morally for the students in his care and how well they are equipped with 'concrete' skills to make choices that might often be difficult.

Because Nick speaks about ‘rejecting’ and ‘accepting’ he puts these two dichotomous words in the one sentence and they reflect the dichotomy he feels may well face his students in their journey into the world. Not all choices will be easy as he foregrounds in the sentence. Without having something ‘concrete’, not having the requisite skills to make these decisions would render him as a teacher responsible for the students’ impoverished decision-making, if they make poor decisions. He promotes the idea in the sentence and through the meaning making that having choice and the skills to make informed decisions are necessary dimensions of students’ capacity to navigate the world.

The reiteration of the word ‘own’ has especial significance for Nick as this reflects his view of the students’ autonomy that he values highly. Doing and building things on their ‘own’ is, according to Nick, an essential part of how his students will be prepared for the future and in order to be citizens of the world.

By comparison David also feels an obligation to prepare and empower his students to function effectively in the world as active citizens. He says that:

“I just think human being need to know. But it’s like I feel that there are things people need to know and understand. If education is the site where we are cultivating the future of our society – this is where our future is, if I can imbue them or instil them with at least a sound understanding of these things, then they can appreciate what that means for them in their own life.” (David, Int. 2, Turn 73)

Again in David’s language and in his conversation he refers to his students as ‘humans’. The way that David is specific in his language by using this word again reiterates and confirms his view that a classroom is collaborative and the relationship between the teachers and the students and the students with each other should be built upon a premise of

equality. What is interesting to note also is the fact that David is teaching in a single sex girls' high school. He never wavers in his language from referring to his students as 'humans'. Implied in this view of his students is not only a perception regarding the students' social status, but their humanity in general.

The affective and cognitive statements that David makes, 'I think, it's like, I feel', are all indicators of the very personal attachment David feels to his role of ensuring these students, these 'humans', have every opportunity in his classroom to develop this humanity and to then be able to live this understanding in their communities and in their worlds. He feels that learning about the world, democracy and justice is part of his role as the teacher.

There is a synergy between what David has to say about the role of learning about the world in the classroom and Georgia's view that in order to know the world the students' experiences outside the classroom and that they bring to the classroom must be validated on the one hand but should also be harnessed as pedagogy. She refers inferentially to the work of Moll (1992) and the funds of knowledge approach she learned at university.

Georgia explains that she has in her words, 'all these great ideas but that's not my role' (Int. 2, Turn 4). She explains that in order for the students in her view to experience the world and be skilled in negotiating it they must first lead themselves through the conversations and Discourses with her guidance as a facilitator.

"Now within the curriculum, I'm trying as much as possible to draw on the experiences of the kids as we always learned about in Uni."
(Georgia, Int. 2, Turn 4)

The pre-emptive comment she makes of 'within the curriculum', suggests she is connecting the idea that learning about the world needs to be framed by the strictures of the curriculum in order to legitimize it. Georgia also elaborates the relationships she wants to develop with the students by connecting through language and drawing on, the experience of the students. This relationship between the curriculum, the students and the experiences forms a new understanding of how Georgia's classroom and the teaching is enacted with student led learning and Georgia as a facilitator of that knowledge and experience.

Because Georgia discusses how she values the experiences and the dialogue that the students offer in their learning, her language constructs a view of her as a teacher. She speaks about her students in a particular way, referring to them as 'kids' using the vernacular as a term of endearment in this case and then associating and attributing particular qualities to these students.

Conclusion

When Anderson and Dunn (2013) argued that students would always need the support and scaffolding of adults in their learning, they also argued that this learning needed to be conducted in an atmosphere of democratic principles at play, where meaning and understanding could be negotiated. Scholars such as Saxon and Miller (2013) discuss the need for students to engage in pedagogy that places them at the centre of learning for not only democratic purposes but for cognitive development. They argue that thinking and performing in drama is required to 'develop learners who see the world through new and multiple perspectives' (p. 111). This corroborates some of the ways these teachers perceive the need in their classroom to place students at the centre of the learning and the space. Similarly, O'Connor's (2013) work on critical pedagogy and re-imagining terrorism argues that students need to understand ideas that are 'below the surface' (p.125). His work and scholarship in this area also posits that an active and engaged curriculum that places students at the

centre has the effect of empowering them 'to question, challenge and remake their reality' (p.127).

In nuanced ways these five early career drama teachers have all spoken about the importance of the student at the centre of the work that takes place in their classrooms. This learning is sometimes student led to engender their understanding of voice and the obligations of citizenship for example and is often in the guise of student centred learning, heavily orchestrated by the teacher in order to model the ways to know and to be autonomous. In order for that learning to occur the conditions for dramatic interaction need to be established. O'Toole and Stinson (2013) observe that the very basis for all drama (learning) is 'putting ourselves in other people's shoes to imagine human situations and contexts that are or might be' (p.161). This is emphasised in the way the five drama teachers speak about their philosophical commitment to student centred learning, even if it requires explicit teacher direction, they argue that students will learn best if they have agency and free will when they learn in drama.

The common theme of building successful and productive relationships with students is written about extensively in the drama teachers' philosophies and then further explained in their interviews. They discuss the importance of achieving the ambient climate in the classroom, to afford these understandings, competencies and skills about the world. This can only be achieved through establishing successful and meaningful relationships with their students in their collective view. As early career drama teachers they talk about the need to engage, listen and model empathy in order to teach their students what it means to live in the world, successfully as good people, rich in their humanity.

Chapter 9: Conclusions

Overview

This chapter serves four specific purposes: firstly to synthesise and to summarise the major findings of the study; secondly to address the implications of these findings; thirdly, to discuss the limitations of the study, and finally to identify the future directions for research in this field.

This thesis has sought to understand how drama teachers, specifically those in their early career, utilized, adapted, challenged, absorbed and assimilated the big Discourses of drama and how these influence and develop their identities as teachers of drama, with a special interest in their attendance to social justice practices. A key focus of this study has been to capture the ways the participants use language to talk about the work they do and their ideological predisposition for teaching this pedagogy, in order to improve the life chances of the students that they teach in the classroom and in the school more generally.

Summary of the main findings

The study found that the early career teachers conceptualised their role as drama teachers with deference to the role that both social justice and their ideological alignments provided in shaping their identity in significant ways. The teachers in the study argued that they were required at times to subvert the dominant Discourses that were privileged in their schools, in order to provide students with what they believed were the seminal ways of knowing (Harris, 2013) about the world.

The study also examined how these early career drama teachers in their first year of teaching describe their views and beliefs and how these personal proclivities and subjectivities (Wales, 2009) ideologically aligned to the big Discourses as privileged by the drama community more generally. The big Discourses were found to be as follows:

- The affordances of drama as a subject and the unique capacity and attributions of the subject to teach students about the world around them;
- The synergy between drama and social justice leads to an understanding and engagement with other people and how this fundamental understanding can mean improvement in the lives of the students;
- The Discourse of democracy and the privilege of global citizenship teaches students about the world and the mediation thereof;
- The practice of student centred teaching and learning activates new possibilities (Anderson & Dunn, 2013) for students and the way they are able to navigate and understand the world.

The major conclusions that can be drawn from the findings of this study are discussed in four parts, before a discussion of the implications and limitations of the study's findings, and avenues for future research.

Conclusion 1: Building the world through the affordances of drama

The central research question informing this study is:

How do five early career drama teachers, based in a large Australian city, adapt, challenge, utilise and assimilate the big Discourses of drama and how does their engagement with these Discourses shape their identity as drama teachers?

When the early career drama teachers talk about themselves, the work they do and the specific pedagogy that they recruit when they are teaching, they project themselves as particular kinds of people. This is an affirmation of Gee's (1996) argument that in order to be a member of a group a human being needs to speak, act and demonstrate values and beliefs that align with that particular group, or risk admonishment or separation from the group. The drama teachers in this study were homogenously aligned to the work and purpose of drama and yet were

heterogeneous and distinct in the articulation of what those affordances might be, within the spectrum of the subject.

There were three distinct themes that emanated from the teachers' talk and their writing in the teaching philosophies, related to the work that drama pedagogy has to do and can perform in the classroom. The discussions reflect that; drama is a tool for students to mediate an increasingly complex and uncertain future, and that drama, because it utilises space in unique ways, creates a learning environment that is conducive to discussing and talking about painful and controversial issues. Drama can also provide an opportunity to contest boundaries and build resistance to dominant Discourses; that being a drama teacher means being a particular kind of teacher or a cultural model (Strauss & Corbin, 1977) and requires a specific lexicon of language in the classroom; and that being a drama teacher means aligning your teaching and your views with socially just ways of teaching about the world.

The early career teachers also discussed how they recruited theory for different purposes when they felt that it was beneficial in shaping the classroom intent and when the theory aligned with their values and beliefs. David actively recruited Boal's theory of oppression (1979) when he wanted to draw attention to sexism and patriarchy in his teaching about *commedia dell'arte*; Nick actively recruited theories of empathic intelligence (Arnold, 2005) and moral reasoning practices (Freebody, 2010) when he wanted to model ways to be in the world as a democratic citizen; Georgia refers to the funds of knowledge approach (Moll, 1992) in order to develop student-led learning in drama and Jane believes the tenets of the NSW Department of Education and Communities policies reflect her views and inform her teaching.

The subject of drama, according to these early career teachers offers a way for students to understand power relations and interactions in the world: drama enables a connection between dramatic practices,

democratic principles and the transaction of ideas through theory. Thus, in the drama classroom boundaries should be broken, ideas tested and Discourses resisted in order for students to have an opportunity to understand ways to mediate the world, specifically in the space that drama provides. Drama, the early career teachers attest, is the platform for this experience and expression of ideas, other subjects do not offer or have inherent in their practices, the capacity and affordances that drama does for this type of teaching. Although these subjects and disciplines may do this also, the participants in this study are shaped by their immersion in drama as a subject.

One of the findings emanating from the discussions with the teachers is the capacity that resides within the subject of drama to transcend physical barriers in order to promote learning opportunities. As Jane argued, because she is a teacher with a visual impairment she is always conscious of the need to provide her students with opportunities, equity and access to learning content. The vignette describing her encounter with an intellectually impaired class and the way they were able to physically express and articulate themselves when they were not able to do so through literate means, is a significant finding. Access to the pedagogy of drama is not limited to students with high literacy or intellectual function: rather, drama as a subject can offer students ways in to the world on different levels and for different purposes. This is a dimension of the affordances of drama that the early career teachers describe as part of their ideological projection onto the work.

This study found that the way these early career teachers talk about the affordances of the subject was with unequalled commitment and passion and this contributes to the construction of their identity as particular kinds of teachers or cultural models. They ascribe nuanced qualities to not just the subject of drama but also to the way they teach the subject. The teachers also validate the initial supposition to understand how drama teachers talk about their work. They communicate their views

in distinctive ways through their talk and through the way they value and perceive the world. This may be the case for teachers in other subject areas too, however this was not the focus of this study. They are recognisable as drama teachers they say, because they enact and recruit this special pedagogy that is drama. Drama the subject, 'found us' (Palmer, 2010) the teachers say.

Conclusion 2: Building a more socially just world through drama

How do the participants make sense of their identity in relation to drama education Discourses with particular attendance to how they write and talk about social justice practices and the ideological alignment of this Discourse to the work of drama?

A key interest of this research was to interrogate the distinctive ways that the early career teachers in the study talked and wrote about social justice pedagogy and practices and how, in their view, this Discourse was strongly ideologically aligned with their work as drama teachers. These notions emerged in response to the second research sub question. The study found that teachers acknowledged that the work of social justice and drama are synergistic and are representative of the Discourses that are privileged in the drama community.

The study found that the teachers were cognisant of the affordances of drama as pedagogy to facilitate an understanding of where power is perceived to reside in the world and where inequity and inequality may exist (Finneran & Freebody, 2016). However, the early career teachers also talked about social justice practices as not just inherent in their teaching of drama but inherent in their identities as drama teachers and reflective of their ideological dispositions. Significant also in this finding is the teachers' articulation of their role in providing opportunities for students to access not just classroom Discourses about social justice through the enactment of critical pedagogy (O'Toole, 2006),

but also the provision of the opportunities to build resistance to dominant Discourses and therefore to develop agency (and dominion) as citizens of the world. What emerged through the teachers' talk and writing was an unwavering commitment to the implementation of social justice practices as a crucial and critical dimension of their work as teachers and as a significant and defining dimension of their values and vocation in their role as drama teachers.

Through a close examination of the distinctive ways that the early career teachers conceive their work in teaching social justice, it was evident that they conceptualise their work as integral to their practice not only as teachers in the school but as agents and models of the practice of social justice in the early career teachers' lives outside the classroom. The early career teachers' orientation to theories that support that alignment enable an assimilation of the values inherent in social justice and as articulated and defined by Drama Australia (2005) in the *Equity and Diversity* policy document. The study found that the values of equity, inclusivity, pluralism, diversity and empowerment were the significant Discourses that the teachers say they align with and explicate in their teaching. These are the Discourses that matter to them.

Conclusion 3: Building the world by teaching the world

One of the key findings that emerged from the data is the capacity that resides within drama to teach students about the world, and how to act and engage in the world. Drama the subject, the early career teachers argued, can precipitate an understanding of the importance and privilege of being a global citizen. This study found that there were Discourses that the early career teachers talked about as having a greater consequence or influence on meaning to them than others Discourses, these notions, policies and practices that might influence their teaching practices at this early stage of their careers. Teaching students to be good citizens of the world and teaching them about poverty, the environment, justice and other concepts were very significant in the teachers' views. The Discourse

of democracy and global citizenship, and how the drama syllabus expressly articulates that drama pedagogy should precipitate students' learning in the classroom and understanding about the privilege of being a global citizen are findings in the discussion chapters 5 -8.

At times, the teachers used language that was illustrative of their need to be subversive and if necessary, to be combative in their approach when teaching this pedagogy. The Discourses of democracy they argue are seminal to teaching the students about their world but do not always accord with the way schools are administered or in the way that classrooms operate.

The teachers spoke to me about the need for their teaching in drama to build capacity in their students to resist and question dominant Discourses in their worlds and they said that the way to achieve this in the classroom is through the affordances of drama, specifically through critical pedagogy (Apple, 2005). Their ideologies were captured in the following sentiments: Elena said she wanted to teach her students about the world by showing them what it is to love the arts; David said he wanted to empower his students to understand where the power imbalances lie in the world; Georgia said she wanted them to know the world and then yearn to know more; Jane wanted students to see what they are capable of in the world and Nick said he wanted his students to engage with the world and value their creative capacities in doing so.

Conclusion 4: Building the world through students

How do the participants view their relationships with students and their role as a drama teacher as expressed in their teaching philosophies and interviews?

The study also found that the way the early career teachers talked and wrote about their relationships with their students was characterised

by a preoccupation with ensuring that their students' needs are met through theoretically informed pedagogy. Further, they sought to cultivate and develop within their students a competency in relating to other people in order to successfully navigate the future. There were three main themes that emanated from the discussions I had with the teachers and these were; how they talked *about* and *to* their students; how the relationship between theory and practice (praxis) shaped their relationship with their students when faced with the reality of the classroom; how the teachers believe their influence in the classroom in teaching the students about the future is an important aspect of their work. This sub question was analysed further in chapter 7.

The Discourse that is privileged in the drama community regarding the acquisition of skills and competencies to know the world also coalesces with what the teachers say is the importance of having students at the centre of the learning. This type of learning, they argue, is necessary to facilitate an understanding of the way they can use their voices to be heard as citizens. They also discuss the obligations that the students need to mediate and understand if they are to be citizens of humanity. The common theme that was found within the teachers' philosophies and their interviews is their argument that only through achieving an ambient climate in the classroom where students understand their obligations to the world, can competencies and skills be acquired that engender a deeper understanding of what it means to live in the world.

Implications of the finding

The theoretical influences that have been discussed in previous chapters propose the idea that we are not ideological vacuums: rather, we are a product of the Discourses and the social activities that reproduce them. The early career teachers were resolute in their ideological commitments and predilections. Traditional assumptions of ideological viewpoints are that there is a right way or view and a wrong view (Lemke, 1995) and consequently the polarities must be argued. The early career

teachers in this study believed that their views did not need to produce adversarial reactions instead their relationships with their students and their learning were made richer and more meaningful particularly when their views could be modelled for their students.

Therefore, this study has implications for classroom practice and theory as it has the potential to disrupt notions that ideological adherence or declarations from teachers are negative or prejudicial in teaching students about the world. By understanding the way the teachers talk about their ideological alignments and how ideology is reflected and then manifested in their identities as drama teachers, can provide theoreticians with another means to analyse and investigate the effect that teachers' subjectivities and ideologies has on their work in the classroom and as teachers of drama, particularly.

Within the field of drama and the Discourses in the community, the relationship between the affordances of drama and the synergy with social justice practices is an emerging area of research (Adams, 2007). This important connection between practice and ideology is evident in the teachers' talk and writing and provides an interpretation for theoretical understanding of the way drama pedagogy can achieve, through a pedagogical process and by engagement with the Discourses, a heightened understanding of, and insight into, the work of teachers.

This nexus between teachers' ideological predilections and the capacity and affordances within drama to develop the students' worldview is under-theorised. The findings of this study confirm and build upon the theoretical perspectives held by the drama community that the affordances that reside within the pedagogy and practice of drama, when enacted in the classroom not only offers students opportunities to explore contested or controversial issues, but also allows them to capitalise on their understanding of what it is to be a global citizen (Neelands, 2002). Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this study attest that valid and

productive theorisations of the place of ideological predispositions in the identity of the drama teacher, enacted through the pedagogy, are an important concern in the early career teachers' development of their practice.

Conclusions from this study also confirm that the work and practice of social justice education is inherent in the work of drama, as evinced by the early career teachers' talk and writing. The teachers also argue that this synergy is immutable from their identities as drama teachers. Therefore, this alignment has the potential to begin a discussion among theoreticians and drama practitioners about the way the Discourses of drama are assimilated, challenged, articulated and tested in classrooms, and dependent upon how the ideological adherence to these tenets is enacted by the various practitioners, the resulting engagement of students is understanding the world and being a thoughtful citizen. Recent analysis of neoliberal agendas in educational policy by Connell (2008) argued that teachers should not transact content through a values neutral lens and this study affirms this provocation through the evidence presented in the study.

The study catalyses conversation about methodology because of the way these early career teachers' ideological predispositions shape and affect their engagement with the big Discourses, particularly social justice through language. In order to further understand the work of teachers, through a thematic Discourse Analysis approach, an insight into improving and understanding practices in the classroom can be explicated.

This study owes an epistemological and methodological debt to the work of Gee (1999) in understanding how language is used by the early career teachers to, 'continually and actively build our worlds' (p.12). For this reason, Discourse Analysis as an approach and method allows for a view of these teachers and their identities as posited by language. Because Discourse analysis focuses on how human beings communicate and act

beyond language, it also allows for a heightened focus on ideas and beliefs as vestiges and vehicles for ideological dispositions. This method provides a rich context in which to uncover and analyse these assignments.

As the early career teachers transitioned from an intellectualised and imagined view of what a drama teacher is, shown in their teaching philosophies through to an informed and practiced understanding of the work as they discussed in interviews, they collectively differentiated in the ways they recruited and oriented to ways of being a drama teacher.

‘To enter this world is to encounter the contradictions that constitute it. There has never been a common agreement as to how one becomes a teacher’ (Britzman, 2003, p.25). As different teachers with unique attributions and alignments the early career drama teachers were unilateral in their adherence to the capacities and affordances of drama in providing the framework for the practice of teaching this subject. Understanding the implications both theoretically and practically for the work of drama pedagogy and social justice is conceptually important in theorizing classroom practices generally.

There are several implications for practice as a result of the findings in this research and they include understanding how different content areas and disciplines espouse ideological alignment to their work and where social justice practices reside within that scope. There are also implications for teacher education practices within coursework and these include an examination of the particular ways pre service teachers understand their roles and assign importance to the work and practice of social justice in the classroom.

This study found that the early career teachers at different points in their first year of teaching were tested regarding their adherence to their ideological commitments and at no stage did they appear to resile from their commitment to this practice of teaching drama in socially just ways. Understanding the affect and therefore efficacy of this adherence allows

for an understanding of how teacher practices provide opportunities and pedagogical chances that give students the skills and competencies to develop ways of knowing about the world. The early career teachers believed that their relationships with their students, the way they taught content and the affordances that drama gave them, were ingredients in successfully preparing students to mitigate and mediate the uncharted territories of the world that awaits them (Anderson, 2014).

Limitations of the research

The predominant limitation is the small sample size of the study. Rather than being generalisable, the conclusions drawn from the study can only claim to contribute to an ongoing conversation about early career teachers and their work and a broader discussion regarding the work of social justice practices in the classroom. As was stated in the methods section of this thesis, the choice of a small sample size and number of teachers was predicated by the opportunity to explore the rich data that was derived from the teaching philosophies in concert with lengthy interviews. However, despite the richness of the data, the sample size is a limitation nonetheless. Subsequent studies can capitalise on the detailed observations made here in a larger or longitudinal study of early career teachers in the field of drama.

Directions for further research

Drama is powerful rhetoric (Neelands, 2004) and of itself as a subject, it cannot teach about the world. It is the engagement with the content, the way it is structured and planned and transacted that gives the pedagogy the requisite power. The early career teachers in this study argued they had a firm commitment to the breadth of pedagogical opportunities within the drama curriculum for teaching about the world. The implications for further research in this field include understanding how the central tenets and intent of subject drama can translate or manifest in other disciplines. Drama teachers, while speaking, acting and valuing particular pedagogy and practices cannot claim to be the only

teachers with ideological preponderances and commitment to their students knowing about the world (Markauskaite & Sutherland, 2011). Therefore, the inclusion of teaching philosophies as evidence of ideological commitment together with interview data can provide insight into the way these teachers conduct their work, specifically in the classroom, and ensuing or further research using this form of data would add much to the field as the philosophies provided a rich seam of data and insight into the early career teachers' views and beliefs.

The research presented in this thesis also adds to discussions and Discourses about the potential role of ideology in teaching drama and social justice within the school. Drama, as a subject with its own distinctive traditions, provides unique ways of negotiating teaching and learning possibilities and as a pedagogical vehicle it holds the ability for this understanding to be implemented across the curriculum for other purposes, such as teaching about homophobia and other prejudices.

Other potentially interesting areas for research emerged from the study and these include hypothesizing the effect of teacher ideological alignment to social justice in teaching practices and explicating and defining the influences that shape a student's capacity to be a global citizen in preparation for an uncertain future and economy. Can this be measured simply by being aware of the democratic processes, or is it likely to be best tested by the competency with which students can resist/understand dominant and neoliberal Discourses in the world? These and other questions remain untested thus far.

Understanding and measuring the capacity of drama as a subject to prepare students in critical and creative ways for an uncertain future (Sardar, 2010) would provide policy makers, teachers and theorists with a unique insight into practices in real time in the classroom. This has the potential to be both powerful and disruptive to curriculum and the status quo. Not only does this insight build an understanding through language

and meaning into the way teachers construct, view, assimilate, act upon the dominant Discourses of drama and social justice, but it also provides insight into the different kinds of facilitation that is possible in classrooms, and the way in which teachers of drama and other disciplines, can engage in discussions about the world and futures Discourses. The knowledge gained from an understanding of how drama teachers engage with these Discourse, particularly social justice practices can be implemented within the curriculum design, professional development, and explicit interventions in the classroom.

This study can contribute to an expansion of the database in terms of exploring more fully the ways in which early career teachers engage with notions and practices within the social justice practice corpus. These inquiries could develop and grow a database that would assist teachers, teacher educators and policy makers to examine educational programs that investigate these concepts and what they can and cannot provide by way of pedagogical preparation for future Discourses.

Further, there is also a need to develop and investigate the place and purpose of thematic Discourse Analysis in terms of researching social phenomena. There are opportunities to learn from the study and to apply this understanding of how early career teachers use language in particular ways to describe their teaching and understand it further in terms of best practice.

Detailed studies such as Ewing and Manuel 2005 reflect the attrition of early career teachers in the profession. The early career teachers in this study say they do not resile from their ideological positions and yet this study shows that the reasons new teachers leave the profession include compromising their ideological positions due to a myriad of factors present in their work as teachers in schools.

Finally, there is an opportunity to use what is learned from this study in terms of researching what the early teachers describe as their ideological commitment in drama to include the work and practice of social justice. Understanding whether early career drama teachers are unique phenomena in this regard would provide a contribution to courses in pre service and in service teacher professional development and provide opportunities for new lines of research.

These suggestions for the continuation of inquiry in this area reflect the major themes that have motivated this study from the outset:

- Inquiring into the way early career drama teachers adapt, challenge and assimilate the Big Discourses of drama and how their engagement with these Discourses shape and influence their identity as drama teachers;
- Looking into the way drama teachers develop their identity in relation to the discourses privileged by the drama community with particular attendance to the way they talk and write about social justice practices and the ideological alignment of this Discourse to the work of drama;
- Understanding the ways the early career teachers in the study talk about, write about and discuss their work as drama teachers and how they view the subject of drama as having unique attributions and affordances, to teach their students about the world; and finally,
- How the teaching philosophies, the talk and the writing of the early career teachers provide perceptions and insight into how they view their relationships with their students and their teaching.

The hope that resides within these lines of inquiry can provide insight into the very reasons why teachers enter the profession not only in order to make contributions to the learning of their students but also in terms of their capacity to imbue their students with skills and competencies that prepare their students to be good citizens of the world.

References

- Ackroyd, J. (2006). *Research methodologies for drama education*. Stoke on Trent, UK ; Sterling, VA: Trentham.
- Ackroyd, J. (2000). Applied theatre: Problems and possibilities. *Applied Theatre Researcher*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Adams, M. (1997). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 30-43). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Alsup, J. (2003). English education students and professional identity development: Using narrative and metaphor to challenge preexisting ideologies. *Pedagogy*, 3(2), 277-280.
- Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher Identity Discourses Negotiating Personal and Professional spaces*
- Anderson, M. (2012). *Masterclass in drama education :transforming teaching and learning*. London ; New York, NY: Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Anderson, M. (2014). The challenge of post-normality to drama education and applied theatre. *Research in Drama Education. The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 19(1), 110-120.
- Anderson, M., Carroll, J., & Cameron, D. (2009). *Drama education with digital technology*. London: Continuum International.
- Anderson, M., & Donelan, K. (2009). Drama in schools: meeting the research challenges of the twenty-first century. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 165-171.
- Anderson, M., & Freebody, K. (2012). Developing communities of praxis: Bridging the theory practice divide in teacher education. *McGill Journal of Education/Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, 47(3), 359-377.
- Anderson, M., & Jefferson, M. (2009). *Teaching the screen : film education for generation next*. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Anderson, M., & O'Connor, P. (2013). Applied theatre as research: Provoking the possibilities. *Applied Theatre Research*, 1(2), 189-202.
- Anderson, M., & Dunn, J. (2013). Drama and the future: Activating new possibilities. In M. Anderson & J. Dunn (Eds.) *How Drama Activates Learning* (pp 293-306). London: Bloomsbury

- Anglin, J.M. (1977). *Word, object and conceptual development*. New York: Norton.
- Anyon, J. (2005). *Radical Possibilities Public Policy, Urban Education, and A New Social Movement*
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. Taylor & Francis.
- Arnold, R. (2005). *Empathic intelligence: Teaching, learning, relating*. UNSW Press.
- Arnold, R. (1993). The Nature and Role of Empathy in Human Development and in Drama in Education. . In W. Michaels (Ed.), *Drama in Education: the State of the Art II* (pp. 56-68). Rozelle: Educational Drama Association.
- Ayers, W., Hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. (1998). *Teaching for Social Justice. A Democracy and Education Reader*. New York: New Press; Teachers College Press.
- Balfour, M. (2004). *Theatre in prison : theory and practice*. Bristol, UK ; Portland, OR: Intellect.
- Balfour, M., Bundy, P., Burton, B., Dunn, J., & Woodrow, N. (2015). *Applied Theatre: Resettlement: Drama, Refugees and Resilience*. London, New York: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama.
- Barr, A., Gillard, J., Firth, V., Scrymgour, M., Welford, R., Lomax-Smith, J., Constable, E. (2008). *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Victoria, Australia.
- Bartolomé, L. I., & Trueba, E. T. (2000). Beyond the politics of schools and the rhetoric of fashionable pedagogies: The significance of teacher ideology. *Immigrant voices: In search of educational equity*, 277-292.
- Beattie, M., & Conle, C. (1996). Teacher Narrative, Fragile Stories and Change. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 24(3), 309-326.
- Beatty, J. E., Leigh, J. S. A., & Dean, K. L. (2009). Philosophy Rediscovered: Exploring the Connections Between Teaching Philosophies, Educational Philosophies, and Philosophy. *Journal of Management Education*, 33(1), 99-114.
- Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice (2nd ed.)* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication : cognition, culture, power*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire : the Boal method of theatre and therapy*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Boal, A. (2000). *Theater of the oppressed* (New ed.). London: Pluto.
- Boal, A. (2002). *Games for actors and non-actors* (2nd ed.). London; New York: Routledge.
- Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as education*. London: Longman
- Bolton, G. M. (1979). Towards a theory of drama in education. In K. Robinson (Ed.), *Exploring Theatre and Education* (pp. 71-87). London: Longman.
- Bolton, G. M. (1990). Four Aims in Teaching Drama. *London Drama*, July, 16-22.
- Bolton, G., & Heathcote, D. (1995). *Drama for learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). "The forms of capital" (1986). In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology*. (pp. 81-93). Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P., & Thompson, J. B. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). Decentering discourses in teacher education: Or, the unleashing of unpopular things. *The Journal of Education*, 173(3), 60-80.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bundy, P. (2014). Engagement and Liveness. In J. O'Toole, R. Adams, M. Anderson, B. Burton, & R. Ewing, (Eds.). *Young Audiences, Theatre and the Cultural Conversation* (pp.115-128). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Burton, B. (2011). *Living drama* (4th ed.). Port Melbourne, Vic.: Pearson Australia.
- Cahill, H. (2014). Withholding the personal story: using theory to orient practice in applied theatre about HIV and human rights. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 19(1), 23-38.
- Cahill, H. (2002). Teaching for community: Empowerment through drama. *Critical Studies in Education*, 43(2), 12-25.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). Introduction: language and desire in theory and practice. *Language & Communication*, 23(2), 93-105.
- Carroll, J. (1996). Escaping the Information Abattoir: Critical and Transformative Research in Drama Classrooms. In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Researching drama and arts education : paradigms and possibilities* (pp.72-84). London ; Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

- Castles, S. (2004). Citizenship, Global Migration, and Education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* (pp 17-48). San Francisco, CA; John Wiley & Sons.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and mind* (Enl. ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language : its nature, origin, and use*. New York: Praeger.
- Christensen, L. (2000). *Reading, writing, and rising up: Teaching about social justice and the power of the written word*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools.
- Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (1994). Personal Experience Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research an overview of the field, part II. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 66(2), 109-121.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connell, R., Ashenden, D.J., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G.W. (1982). *Making the difference : schools, families and social division*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R. (1993). *Schools and social justice*. Philadelphia Pa.: Temple University Press.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.
- Craven, G., Beswick, K., Fleming, J., Fletcher, T., Green, M., Jensen, B., Rickards, F. (2014). *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Government.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design : choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). 16 Implications of a Systems Perspective for the Study of Creativity. In *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 313-335). Cambridge University Press.
- Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Darder, A. (1998). *Teaching as an act of love: Reflections on Paulo Freire and his contributions to our lives and our work*. California Association for Bilingual Education.

- Deasy, R., Catterall, J. C., Hetland, L., Winner, E., & (U.S.), A. E. P. (2002). *Critical links: Learning in the arts and student academic and social development*. Washington D.C.: Arts Education Partnership.
- DEC (2003) Quality teaching in NSW public schools: Discussion paper. Retrieved from http://www.darcymoore.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/qt_EPSColor.pdf [accessed 7 April 2016]
- Delpit, L. D. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. The New Press.
- Delpit, L. (1993). The politics of teaching literate discourse. In T. Perry & J. W. Fraser (Eds.), *Freedom's plough: Teaching in the multicultural classroom* (pp. 285-295). New York: Routledge.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(2), 280-299.
- Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. K. (2008). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*: New Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and education* (Dover ed.). Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications.
- Dixon, M., Hay, T., Ferguson, P., Moss, J., & White, J. (2004, January). Noticing a flow of networks. In *ICET 2004: Teachers as learners: building communities for professional development* (pp. 77-90). International Council on Education for Teaching.
- Dover, A. G. (2013). Teaching for social justice: From conceptual frameworks to classroom practices. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 15(1), 3-11.
- Drama Australia. (2005). Equity and diversity guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.dramaaustralia.org.au/documents/Equity%20and%20Diversity-.pdf> [accessed 1 May 2015]
- Dunn, J., & O'Toole, J. (2009). When worlds collude: Exploring the relationship between the actual, the dramatic and the virtual. *Drama education with digital technology*, 20-37.
- Eco, U. (1995). *The search for the perfect language*. Oxford, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell.
- Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational imagination : on the design and evaluation of school programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

- Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye : qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. New York, N.Y. ; Toronto : Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Eriksson, S. A. (2011). Distancing at close range: making strange devices in Dorothy Heathcote's process drama Teaching Political Awareness Through Drama. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 16(1), 101-123.
- Ewing, R. (2002). Inquiry Based Learning in Higher Education: The M.Teach experience. *Quality Teaching, Online Paper*, 14.
- Ewing, R. (2011). The Arts and Australian education: Realising potential.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK ; Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse : textual analysis for social research*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis : the critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Finneran, M., & Freebody, K. (2015). Tensions and mythologies in the liminal space between drama and social justice. In K. Freebody & M. Finneran (Eds.), *Drama and social justice : theory, research and practice in international contexts* (pp. pages cm). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fitzgibbon, E. (1997). Crossing the boundaries: Drama as Subject and Method. *Drama Matters*, 2(1), 5-18.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1972). The discourse on language. *Truth: Engagements across philosophical traditions*, 315-335.
- Freebody, K., & Finneran, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Drama and Social Justice: Theory, research and practice in international contexts*. New York: Routledge.
- Freebody, K., & Finneran, M. (2013). Drama and social justice: Power, participation and possibility. . In M. Anderson & J. Dunn (Eds.), *How Drama Activates Learning: Contemporary Research and Practice* (pp. 47-63). London: Bloomsbury.
- Freebody, K. (2013a). Discourse in drama: Talk, role, and learning in drama education. *NJ-Drama Australia Journal*, 37(1), 65-75.

- Freebody, K. (2013b). Talking drama into being: types of talk in drama classrooms. *Exchanges: the Warwick Research Journal*, 1(1), 91-113.
- Freebody, K. (2011). Interdisciplinary dialogues with dialogue: Drama, sociology and the detailed analysis of talk. *NJ-Drama Australia Journal*, 35(1), 105-117.
- Freebody, K. (2010). Exploring teacher–student interactions and moral reasoning practices in drama classrooms. *RiDE: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 15(2), 209-225.
- Freebody, P., & Freebody, K. (2010). Teachers researching communities: A review of the research literature. *New South Wales, Department of Education and Training, Priority Schools Program*, retrieved, 80211, 34.
- Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education : interaction and practice*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Freebody, P., Ludwig, C., Forrest, T., Freiberg, J., Gunn, S., & Herschell, P. (1997). *Everyday literacy practices in and out of schools in low socioeconomic urban communities*. Canberra, Brisbane, Australia.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education for critical consciousness*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. P. (2013). *Literacy : reading the word & the world*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fullan, M., Hargreaves, A., Fullan, M., & Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation. (1992). *What's worth fighting for in your school? : working together for improvement*. Buckingham: Open University Press in association with the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- Gallagher, K. (2001). *Drama education in the lives of girls imagining possibilities*
- Gallagher, K. (2007). *The theatre of urban : youth and schooling in dangerous times*. Toronto ; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Gattenhof, S., & Radvan, M. (2009). In the mouth of the imagination: positioning children as co-researchers and co-artists to create a professional children's theatre production. *RiDE: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 211-224.
- Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. New York: JF Bergin & Garvey.

- Gee, J. P. (1999). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and practice. *London & New York: Routledge*.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). How to do discourse analysis: a toolkit. Milton park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (Volume 5019) Basic books.
- Gibson, R. (2015). 1 Perceptions of the role of arts education in Australian schools. *How Arts Education Makes a Difference: Research Examining Successful Classroom Practice and Pedagogy*, 13.
- Gibson, R., & Ewing, R. (2011). *Transforming the curriculum through the arts* (1st ed.). South Yarra, Vic.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giroux, H. A. (2015). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Democracy's promise and education's challenge*. Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53(3), 257-293.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213-239.
- Gjaerum, R. G. (2013). Applied theatre research: Discourses in the field. *European Scientific Journal*, 3, 347-361.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago,: Aldine Pub. Co.
- Goodman, J. (1988). Constructing a practical philosophy of teaching: A study of preservice teachers' professional perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(2), 121-137.
- Grady, S. (2003). Accidental marxists?: The challenge of critical and feminist pedagogies for the practice of applied drama. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 17(1), 65-81.
- Grady, S. (1996). Toward the Practice of Theory in Practice. . In P. Taylor (Ed.), *Researching Drama and Arts Education. Paradigms and Possibilities* (pp. 59-71). London: Falmer Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks, edited and translated by Q. Hoare and GN Smith.
- Grasha, A. F. (1996). Teaching with style: The integration of teaching and learning styles in the classroom. *Essays on Teaching Excellence*, 7(5), 1995-96.
- Groundwater-Smith, S., Le Cornu, R., & Cusworth, R. A. (1998). *Teaching : challenges and dilemmas*. Sydney: Harcourt Brace.
- Hackman, H. W. (2005). Five Essential Components for Social Justice Education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38(2), 103-109.

- Hackman, H. W. (2008). Broadening the pathway to academic success: The critical intersection of social justice education, critical multicultural education, and universal instructional design.. In J. L. Higbee & E. Goff (Eds.), *Pedagogy and Student Services for Institutional Transformation: Implementing Universal Design in Higher Education* (pp. 25-48). Minneapolis, United States of America: University of Minnesota.
- Hackman, H. W., & Rauscher, L. (2004). A Pathway to Access for All: Exploring the Connections Between Universal Instructional Design and Social Justice Education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 37(2), 114-123.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic : the social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: E. Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). London: Arnold.
- Harris, A. M. (2014a). The Creative Turn in Educational Discourse. In A. M. Harris (Ed.), *The Creative Turn Toward a New Aesthetic Imaginary* (pp. 17-29). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Harris, A. M. (2014b). Our Creative Century. In A. M. Harris (Ed.), *The Creative Turn Toward a New Aesthetic Imaginary* (pp. 171-182). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Haseman, B., & O'Toole, J. (1986). *Dramawise : an introduction to the elements of drama*. Richmond, Vic.: Heinemann.
- Heathcote, D. (2009, August). Mantle of the expert: My current understanding. In Keynote address presented at the International Mantle of the Expert Conference, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Heathcote, D. (1994). Drama and Social Change, Lecture series. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. M. (1995). Drama for learning , Dorothy Heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Heathcote, D., Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1984). *Dorothy Heathcote : collected writings on education and drama*. London: Hutchinson.
- Heathcote, D., Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1991). *Dorothy Heathcote collected writings on education and drama*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- Hodge, R., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control* Routledge & K. Paul.
- hooks, b. (2014). *Teaching To Transgress*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- hooks, b. (1992). *Black looks : race and representation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning : race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hornbrook, D. (1998). *Education and dramatic art, second edition*. London: Routledge.
- Huberman, A. M., Grounauer, M. M., & Marti, J. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. London: Cassell.
- Hughes, J. (1991). Drama in Education: the State of the Art; an Australian Perspective. In J. Hughes (Ed.), *Drama in Education the state of the art* (pp. 1-11). Sydney: Educational Drama Association.
- Jefferson, M., & Anderson, M. (2009). Enter the matrix: The relationship between drama and film. . In M. Anderson, J. Carroll & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Drama education with digital technology* (pp. 184-201). London: Continuum International.
- Johnson, K., & O'Brien, M. L. "School is for me": *Student engagement and the Fair Go Project*. . Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Annual Conference (2002).
- Kelly, D. M., & Brandes, G. M. (2010). "Social Justice Needs to Be Everywhere": Imagining the Future of Anti-Oppression Education in Teacher Preparation. . *Alberta journal of educational research*, 56(4), 388-402.
- Kempe, A. (2012). *Drama, Disability and Education: A critical exploration for students and practitioners*. United Kingdom, Routledge.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Buckingham England , Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- King, P. M., Wood, P. K., & Mines, R. A. (1990). Critical thinking among college and graduate students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 13(2), p.167.
- Kumashiro, K. K., Baber, S. A., Richardson, E., Ricker-Wilson, C., & Wong, P. L. (2004). Preparing Teachers for Anti-oppressive Education: International movements. *Teaching Education*, 15(3), 257-275.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Lammers, J. C., Curwood, J. S., & Magnifico, A. M. (2012). Toward an affinity space methodology: Considerations for literacy research. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 11(2), 44-58.

- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning , legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge England , New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leavy, P. (2015). *Method Meets Art arts-based research practice*. Guilford press, New York, NY (pp. 328).
- Manuel, J. (2003). Have we 'mistaken the symptom for the problem'? Exploring issues of early career teacher retention and attrition. *Curriculum Leadership: an Electronic Journal for Leaders in Education*. <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/> [accessed 26 April 2016].
- Manuel, J., & Brindley, S. (2005). The Call to Teach: Identifying Pre-Service Teachers' Motivations, Expectations and Key Experiences During Initial Teacher Education in Australia and the United Kingdom. *English in Australia*, 144(1), 38-49.
- Manuel, J., & Hughes, J. (2006). 'It has always been my dream': exploring pre-service teachers' motivations for choosing to teach. *Teacher Development*, 10(1), 5-24.
- McCammon, L., Miller, C., & Norris, J. (1998). *Using Personal Narrative and Storytelling To Promote Reflection and the Development of Teacher Voice in Drama Teacher Education*. . Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans (1998).
- McLachlan, A. (2009). Modern languages in the primary curriculum: are we creating conditions for success?. *Language Learning Journal*, 37(2), 183-203.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 136-150.
- Michaels, W., & Educational Drama Association (N.S.W.). (1993). *Drama in education : the state of the art II*. Leichhardt, NSW: Educational Drama Association, New South Wales.
- Miller, C. T. (1984). Self-schemas, gender, and social comparison: A clarification of the related attributes hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(6).
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Montaña Moreno, J., & Vera Rodríguez, E. (2012). Inclusive English classrooms: requirements, implications and limitations:-A qualitative case study. *Folios*, (36), 77-95.
- Mooney, M. (2005). Morphing into new spaces: Transcoding drama. *NJ-Drama Australia Journal*, 29(1), 25-35.
- Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2013). *Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Los Angeles: Sage.

- Munday, C., Anderson, M., Gibson, R., & Martin, A., J. (2015). Drama in schools. In K. Freebody & M. Finneran (Eds.), *Drama and social justice : theory, research and practice in international contexts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). *Constructing critical literacies : teaching and learning textual practice*. St. Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Neelands, J. (2004). Miracles are happening: beyond the rhetoric of transformation in the Western traditions of drama education. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 9(1), 47-56.
- Neelands, J. (2002). The space in our hearts. *Drama: The Journal of National Drama*, 9(2), 4-10.
- Neelands, J., & Goode, T. (1990). *Structuring drama work : a handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neelands, J., & Nelson, B. (2013). Drama, community and achievement: Together I'm someone'. (Anderson & Dunn,) *How Drama Activates Learning: Contemporary Research and Practice*, London and New York: Bloomsbury, 15-29.
- Neelands, J., & O'Connor, P. J. (2010). *Creating democratic citizenship through drama education : the writings of Jonothan Neelands*. Stoke on Trent, UK ; Sterling, VA: Trentham Books.
- Nicholson, H. (2014). *Applied drama, the gift of theatre* (2nd ed.). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire , New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nicholson, H. (2005). On ethics. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(2), p.119-125.
- Nicholson, H. (1999). Aesthetic values, drama education and the politics of difference. *NADIE Journal Australia*, 23(2), 81-90.
- Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity : the sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Norris, J., McCammon, L., & Miller, C. S. (2000). *Learning to teach drama : a case narrative approach*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- NSW Board of Studies. (2000). Drama Stage 6 Syllabus. Retrieved December 20, 2001, from http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au/syllabuses/syllabus_list.html
- O'Connor, P. (2016). Applied theatre and disaster capitalism. *Critical Perspectives on Applied Theatre*, 172.

- O'Connor, P. (2013). Drama as critical pedagogy: Re-imagining terrorism. In M. Anderson & J. Dunn (Eds.) *How Drama Activates Learning* (pp 125-134). London: Bloomsbury
- O'Connor, P. (2009). Unnoticed miracles. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(4), 583-597.
- O'Connor, P. (2007). Reflection and Refraction—The Dimpled Mirror of Process Drama: How Process Drama Assists People to Reflect on Their Attitudes and Behaviors Associated With Mental Illness. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 21(1), 1-11.
- O'Dea, J., & Maloney, D. (2000). Preventing eating and body image problems in children and adolescents using the health promoting schools framework. *The Journal of school health*, 70(1), 18.
- O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds : a framework for process drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- O'Toole, J. (2002). Drama: The productive pedagogy. *Critical Studies in Education*, 43(2), 39-52.
- O'Toole, J. (1998). Playing on the Beach. Consensus Among Drama Teachers – Some Patterns in the Sand. *NADIE Journal Australia*, 22(2), 5-19.
- O'Toole, J. (1992). *The process of drama :negotiating art and meaning*. London; New York: Routledge.
- O'Toole, J., & Dunn, J. (2008). Learning in Dramatic and Virtual Worlds: What Do Students Say About Complementarity and Future Directions? *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 42(4), 89-104.
- O'Toole, J., & O'Mara, J. (2007). Proteus, the Giant at the Door: Drama and Theater in the Curriculum. . In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education*, 203-218. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- O'Toole, J., & Stinson, M. (2013). Drama, speaking and listening: The treasure of oracy. In M. Anderson & J. Dunn (Eds.) *How Drama Activates Learning* (pp 159-177). London: Bloomsbury
- Oser, F. K. (1994). Moral Perspectives on Teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 57-127.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Palmer, P. J. (2010). *The courage to teach : exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.
- Paltridge, B. (2000). *Making sense of discourse analysis*. Gold Coast, Qld: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

- Piazzoli E. C. (2014). Engagement as perception-in-action in process drama for teaching and learning Italian as a second language. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 8(2), 91-116.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1971). *The soft revolution; a student handbook for turning schools around*. New York: Delacorte
- PresRamsey, V. J., & Fitzgibbons, D. E. (2005). Being in the Classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, 29(2), 333-356.
- Robinson, K., Heathcote, D., & Riverside Studios. (1980). *Exploring theatre and education*. London: Heinemann.
- Sardar, Z. (2010). Welcome to postnormal times. *Futures*, 42(5), 435-444.
- Saunders, P. (2005). *The poverty wars: Reconnecting research with reality*. Sydney: UNSW press.
- Saxton, J., & Miller, C. (2013). Drama, creating and imagining: Rendering the world newly. In M. Anderson & J. Dunn (Eds.) *How Drama Activates Learning* (pp 111-124). London: Bloomsbury
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seuss, D. (1990). *Oh, the places you'll go!* New York: Random House Childrens Books.
- Shakespeare, W. (1890). As you like it (Vol. 8). In J. B. Lippincott (Ed.). United Kingdom: Classic book company.
- Silverman, J. C. (2007). Epistemological Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Inclusion in Pre-service Teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 30(1), 42-51.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism*. SUNY Press.
- Smyth, J. (2007). Teacher development against the policy reform grain: An argument for recapturing relationships in teaching and learning. *Teacher development*, 11(2), 221-236.
- Smyth, W. J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice*. New York: Continuum.
- Snyder-Young, D. (2013). *Theatre of good intentions: challenges and hopes for theatre and social change*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stake, R. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). California: Sage.
- Stinson, M., & Freebody, K. (2004). *Modulating the mosaic: drama and oral language*. Paper presented 14th August, 2004 at the 5th

World Congress of the International Drama/Theatre and Education Association, Ottawa, Canada.

- Stinson, M., & Freebody, K. (2006). The Dol Project: The Contributions of Process Drama to Improved Results in English Oral Communication. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 20(1), 27-41.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). California: Sage.
- Strauss, C., & Quinn, N. (1997). *A cognitive theory of cultural meaning* (Vol. 9). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sutherland, L., Howard, S., & Markauskaite, L. (2010). Professional identity creation: Examining the development of beginning preservice teachers' understanding of their work as teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 455-465.
- Sutherland, L., & Markauskaite, L. (2012). Examining the role of authenticity in supporting the development of professional identity: an example from teacher education. *Higher Education*, 64(6), 747-766.
- Swalwell, K. M. (2013). *Educating Activist Allies Social Justice Pedagogy with the Suburban and Urban Elite*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Trent, S. C., & Dixon, D. J. (2004). "My Eyes were Opened": Tracing the Conceptual Change of Pre-Service Teachers in a Special Education/Multicultural Education Course. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 27(2), 119-133.
- Trevor, G., & Densmore, K. M. (2003). *Engaging teachers: Towards a radical democratic agenda for schooling*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England; Philadelphia: PA: Open University Press.
- University of Melbourne. Faculty of Education. (2007). *Journal of artistic and creative education (JACE)*
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(1), 34-41.
- Wales, P. (2009). Positioning the drama teacher: exploring the power of identity in teaching practices. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 261-278.
- Wales, P., & Mohamed, M. (2013). Digital Storytelling and Drama in the English Language Classroom. In L. Y. Tay & C. P. Lim (Eds.), *Creating holistic technology-enhanced learning experiences tales from a future school in Singapore* (pp. 59-73). Rotterdam; Boston: SensePublishers.

- Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive case studies in IS research: nature and method. *European Journal of information systems*, 4(2), 74-81.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research : design and methods* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1987). Preparing reflective teachers: an overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11(5), 565-575.

Appendices

Appendix A: Approval Letter – Human Research Ethics Committee



Research Integrity
Human Research Ethics Committee

Tuesday, 15 October 2013

Dr Kelly Freebody
Fac Ed & Soc Wk - Research; Faculty of Education & Social Work
Email: kelly.freebody@sydney.edu.au

Dear Dr Kelly Freebody,

I am pleased to inform you that the Humanities Low Risk Subcommittee of the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved your project entitled **"Unloosening the chord from the bag of dreams: The new drama teacher, teaching philosophies and social justice practices"**.

Details of the approval are as follows:

Project No.: 2013/819
Approval Date: 15 October 2013
First Annual Report Due: 15 October 2014
Authorised Personnel: Freebody Kelly; O'Grady Alison;
Documents Approved:

Date Uploaded	Type	Document Name
04/10/2013	Participant Consent Form	Consent form v2
04/10/2013	Participant Info Statement	Participant information statement v2
04/10/2013	Recruitment Letter/Email	Email recruitment letter version 2
30/08/2013	Interview Questions	Interview questions/explanation

HREC approval is valid for four (4) years from the approval date stated in this letter and is granted pending the following conditions being met:

Condition/s of Approval

- Continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans.
- Provision of an annual report on this research to the Human Research Ethics Committee from the approval date and at the completion of the study. Failure to submit reports will result in withdrawal of ethics approval for the project.
- All serious and unexpected adverse events should be reported to the HREC within 72 hours.

Research Integrity
Research Portfolio
Level 2, Margaret Telfer
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 Australia

T +61 2 8627 8111
F +61 2 8627 8177
E ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au

ABN 15 211 513 464
CRICOS 00026A



THE UNIVERSITY OF
SYDNEY

- All unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should be reported to the HREC as soon as possible.
- Any changes to the project including changes to research personnel must be approved by the HREC before the research project can proceed.

Chief Investigator / Supervisor's responsibilities:

1. You must retain copies of all signed Consent Forms (if applicable) and provide these to the HREC on request.
2. It is your responsibility to provide a copy of this letter to any internal/external granting agencies if requested.

Please do not hesitate to contact Research Integrity (Human Ethics) should you require further information or clarification.

Yours sincerely

Dr Fiona Gill
Chair
Humanities Low Risk Subcommittee

This HREC is constituted and operates in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council's (NHMRC) National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007), NHMRC and Universities Australia Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) and the CPMP/ICH Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice.

Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet



Faculty of Education and Social Work

ABN 15 211 513 464

Dr. Kelly Freebody
Lecturer

Room 810
Education building A35
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA
Telephone: +61 2 90366038
Facsimile: +61 2 9351 2606
Kelly.freebody@sydney.edu.au
Web: <http://www.sydney.edu.au/>

Unloosening the cord from the bag of dreams: How the practice of new drama teachers is shaped through pedagogy and practice in teaching for social justice.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?

You are invited to participate in a study of how undergraduate teachers in their final semester of their teaching degree envision and articulate their practice through their teaching philosophies. The practices of graduate teachers and how they recruit theories or ideas of social justice practices in their teaching will be examined through interviews and observations. This study expects to provide an insight into the pedagogy and practices of new drama teachers and how outcomes can be improved for marginalized students.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being conducted by Alison O'Grady and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr. Kelly Freebody, Lecturer, Faculty of Education and Social Work.

(3) What does the study involve?

The study is in two phases. You may opt to participate in one or both of these. In phase 1 you will be asked to write a brief (800 word) teaching philosophy that will give articulate the ideals, ambitions, hopes and dreams you have for your teaching practice.

The teaching philosophies will then be analysed and put through a software program to look for common themes and ideas.

Phase 2 involve two interviews in your first 6 months of teaching. These interviews will be recorded and transcribed for accuracy. You will be asked to then review your original teaching philosophies in light of their experiences teaching for the first semester.

(4) How much time will the study take?

It is envisioned that participation in both phases of this project will take approximately four hours over the course of six months.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?

Being in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent and - if you do consent - you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with The University of Sydney.

Page 1 of 2

You may stop an interview at any time if you do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

In phase one, the submission of a completed teaching philosophy is an indication of your consent to participate in the initial study. You can withdraw any time prior to submitting your completed teaching philosophy.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) Will the study benefit me?

Yes. The study offers the participants the opportunity to have a mentor in their final semester of teaching and additional mentoring and professional support during their first semester of teaching.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes this study is not confidential.

(9) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Dr. Kelly Freebody will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Dr. Kelly Freebody, Lecturer, Faculty of Education and Social Work or Mrs. Alison O'Grady, PhD student, Faculty of Education and Social Work.

(10) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep

Appendix C: Participant Consent Form



Faculty of Education and Social Work

ABN 15 211 513 464

Dr. Kelly Freebody
Lecturer

Room 810
Education building A35
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA
Telephone: +61 2 90366038
Facsimile: +61 2 9351 2606
Kelly.freebody@sydney.edu.au
Web: <http://www.sydney.edu.au/>

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ...[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: Unloosening the cord from the bag of dreams - how the practice of new drama teachers is shaped through pedagogy and practice in teaching for social justice

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.
2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.
3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.
4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that any research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me will be used in any way that is identifiable.
5. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) or the University of Sydney now or in the future.
6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

Page 1 of 2

I understand that I can stop my participation in the focus group at any time if I do not wish to continue; however as it is a group discussion it will not be possible to exclude individual data to that point.

7. I consent to:

• Audio-recording YES ☐ NO ☐

• Receiving Feedback YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES to the "Receiving Feedback" question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

Feedback Option

Address: _____

Email: _____

.....
Signature

.....
Please PRINT name

.....
Date

Appendix E: Participant Recruitment Email



Dr Kelly Freebody
Lecturer
Faculty of Education and Social Work

Dear Students of Drama Curriculum

I am writing to you to invite you to be a part of my PhD research project which looks at how pre service drama teachers and then graduate teachers engage with ideas or recruit theories of social justice practices in their teaching.

The project has two phases. The first phase is during the last semester of your degree and would involve you writing a one page teaching philosophy or statement outlining your ideals, hopes maybe dreams for your own teaching practice – the kind of teacher you would like to be in a written document.

The second phase would involve you in your first semester of teaching (next year!) I would interview you and ask you a series of questions about your teaching philosophies and your teaching practice or you can talk to me about issues that are important to you in a semi- structured interview.

The benefit to you, would, I hope be that you would have a mentor in your last semester and in your important first semester of teaching. I would like to be able to provide a reflective sounding board and some experienced guidance to as you navigate your way through that important time.

This is a completely 'opt in' activity. That means you are under no pressure to join and indeed should you withdraw at any time there are no consequences for leaving the project at any time.

If you think you may be interested please contact me on 0408088508 or via email at alison.o'grady@sydney.edu.au or if you would like to see me in my office at room 631 Level 6, A35 Education & Social Work Faculty.

I would be very excited to work with you and I look forward to hearing from some of you for whom this project may pique the interest of!

Kind regards

Alison O'Grady
PhD student
A35 Room 631

Faculty of Education and Social Work
Rm 810, Education Building A35
Sydney University
NSW 2006 Australia

T +61 2 9038 6038
F +61 2 9351 2606
E kelly.freebody@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au

ABN 15 211 513
464
CRICOS 00026A

Appendix F: Participant Interview Questions



Dr Kelly Freebody
Lecturer
Faculty of Education and Social Work

Interview Questions For Participants In this Study:

'Unloosening the cord from the bag of dreams: How the practice of new drama teachers is shaped through pedagogy and practice in teaching for social justice'.

The first phase of this study will involve participants writing a one page teaching philosophy statement that will not be guided. It is anticipated that the philosophies will reveal the teachers aspirations, ambitions, ideals and views on a range of issues relating to their teaching.

During the interviews teachers may refer to their teaching philosophy however due to the unique and individual nature of the philosophies not all questions will be uniform. The interviewer may use some of the philosophies as a starting point for conversation however participants will not be limited to this.

Questions may include asking teachers why they chose a particular activity or text for use in the classroom and if those choices were influenced by ideas of social justice imbedded or inherent in their teaching. They will also have the opportunity to speak about their views on social justice and concerns of the new teacher.

In the second phase of the study teachers will be observed teaching and asked in an interview semi structured questions about why they made particular pedagogical or teaching choices in light of what they had originally espoused in their teaching philosophies. Participants will be asked again at the end of their first semester of teaching to write a teaching philosophy in light of their teaching experiences and will be asked questions about similarities or differences between the two statements. They will have opportunity to discuss this in a semi structured way.

Faculty of Education and Social Work
Rm 810, Education Building A35
Sydney University
NSW 2006 Australia

T +61 2 9036 6038
F +61 2 9351 2606
E kelly.freebody@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au

ABN 15 211 513
484
CRICOS 00028A

Appendix G: Sample Participant Interview Script – Georgia

File Name: Interview 712_0010 Georgia

Duration: 26:40 minutes

1 of 8

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW

Interviewer: It's Tuesday 22nd September and I'm here with Georgia . We've having our second and final interview. She's rereading her teaching philosophy that she wrote for me probably nearly a year ago: 2nd April, so six months ago at least. I'm going to ask her some questions when she's finished rereading it.

Is there anything you would change or add in the light of your experiences given that you're nearly at the end of your graduate year?

Respondent: I haven't really spoken about the role of the student. It's all been very much what I need to do as a teacher but there's nothing to do with student voice in there, and independent learning. I find that interesting because right now I think I'm doing a lot more student-led learning, trying to learn about 21st century pedagogies and within that, the role and the voice of the student.

Interviewer: What do you mean when you say 'the voice of the student'?

Respondent: Can I talk about an experience? I'm not sure if this had happened in our last interview but the principal sent an email saying we need someone to fill this position and I put my hand up for it. The position is for a home room. I knew I wouldn't get it because I was only a graduate, and I said I'm happy to take the home room that the other teacher, whoever takes it, I'll take that one. He actually responded saying, I'd like you to take the home room. It's a social justice home room - 'learn to live', that's what it's called, 'interact, learn to live'.

It's all about the needs of the community and how we're meeting them. I started off saying I have all these great ideas but then I realised that it was my ideas, that's not my role as a facilitator. So I've stepped back and built the student leadership skills so they can enact what's important to them within the school. We've had a really successful term, we've raised to \$4,000 in fund raising activities, and so that has made me go, OK, the kids are coming to me with their ideas, how do I help them achieve that and what's the role of that in the classroom as well?

Now within the curriculum I'm trying as much as possible to draw on the experiences of the kids, which we always learned about in uni but in the first year of teaching you think that's impossible. I guess finding ways now to link what I'm doing in English to history, because I know what the Year 7s are doing, making sure that I'm up to date with what the Year 9s are doing in other subject areas, because it's a cross-curricular approach, always trying to make connections which is what the super six strategy -

- I think having a better understanding of the role of the students in my teaching.
- Interviewer: If you were to rewrite that, that's what you'd write about it?
- Respondent: Yes, the student voice.
- Interviewer: You certainly talk explicitly about the importance of building relationships and inclusive learning environments. Tell me about the philosophy of the dedicated social justice home room, how it came about?
- Respondent: It's only been around for about three years. Technically it's not a social justice club, but that's what I call it because that's how I see it. After our last interview I thought a lot about what is social justice and what are we trying to do, so this is my link to social justice. I've probably used that word because we're in this interview setting.
- Interviewer: That's how you think about it?
- Respondent: That's how I think about it, yes.
- Interviewer: You talk about building relationships and designing inclusive learning environments. An example of how you might do that in other classrooms?
- Respondent: Having researched the school policy, it being a very welfare-driven school, having researched what that policy actually means, using the meta-language of our brave expectations - so at the school we have a BRAVE - each letter stands for something like responsibility, active, learner, all that sort of thing: brave expectations, that's what it called.
- Using that meta-language and ensuring that when I'm using it it's in a positive light, rather than your being disrespectful, instead of saying that it's framing it in a way where the kid is reflecting on it. I think that helps in that sense to be inclusive, but within the actual curriculum, inclusivity I suppose comes more from now that I know more about my students being able to build on their experiences.
- Interviewer: Your lunchtime drama group?
- Respondent: Yes, we're running that.
- Interviewer: How's that going?
- Respondent: Good. I don't remember how big it was last time I spoke to you.
- Interviewer: There was one, and you were about to do a self-devised performance.

- Respondent: Oh yes.
- Interviewer: The students were writing their own scripts.
- Respondent: Yes, yes. I ended up arranging a script for them. They really don't fit improv but not so much at writing the script, which is understandable. I devised a script for them and they performed it at the CAPA night. We had two separate performances and it was all based in the classroom; one in the 70s and one 30 years later at Moorebank, to show that it was all the same and nothing had changed.
- It worked really well; the principal was really happy. I received an email from one of the parents saying 'What have you done with my son? He's changed, he's coming out of his shell, this is fantastic, thank you so much.' That was really nice. Because of that - that was the first run at drama and theme at a CAPA night. Because of that I started up a senior club as well. It's mostly Year 10s, it's all just Year 10s. I haven't managed to get any Year 9s in yet. They're not as keen to do a performance. I'm not going to push it. Every Monday lunchtime they're all there waiting, and they're doing the improv, they're just hanging out.
- Interviewer: You talk about shaping successful citizens academically and socially. Does the drama group have an impact in that sense? What do you think is your part in that? What did you mean when you said that? Is the 'social' still important to you?
- Respondent: Yes, it is.
- Interviewer: Do you see the drama club as being a conduit to that?
- Respondent: I think so because I'm not just getting selective kids now. I'm getting kids from different backgrounds who had different experiences and drama is really good for that. In fact, I've just taught an English unit, 'Hating Alison Ashley', with my Year 8 English class, which is the problem class, everyone dreads teaching this class, and I now have them under my thumb because using drama and all those group exercises it's almost as if they know how to treat each other, which they didn't have in science and other classrooms that I've seen them in.
- Interviewer: Did you teach that explicitly?
- Respondent: Yes, because you can't have a successful performance without the group work and without the group co-operating and working together.
- Interviewer: How did you do that? Did you use particular exercises or draw on a theorist?

- Respondent: No, not particularly, not a theorist, but the Paul's drama game, the chair game, playing that with them where there's one less chair or one more chair and I'm always trying to sit in it and they have to work together. It drove them absolutely nuts and they just couldn't win without working as a team. We would start the lesson every single time with that and we'd go to the dance room and again using the meta-language of BRAVE, what I expected, they knew that if they stuffed up we'd go back to the classroom and do written work as well, so I had to use written work as a bit of a punishment. I hate that but in the end they actually got really good at it and just the way they spoke to each other and then stood up for each other when other kids would snap, it was amazing to see that difference and I've got a kid who comes in Wednesdays - he's at a behaviour school Monday to Friday except for the Wednesday when he has to be in a mainstream classroom - and he used to just disrupt the class completely, he has not had a good upbringing, but now he can be climbing out the window and they have enough respect for me and for each other just to ignore him and they'll now stick up for me and each other when he starts picking on any of them. I think that's come from the drama.
- Interviewer: Did you choose the text?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: Why?
- Respondent: Why 'Hating Alison Ashley?' It was the play version.
- Interviewer: You deliberately chose a play script?
- Respondent: No, sorry, it was always going to be a play but I had the choice of doing Shakespeare or 'Hating Alison Ashley'. Unfortunately, Shakespeare would have bored them and they wouldn't have understood it, so I'm glad I chose 'Hating Alison Ashley'.
- Interviewer: Would you do Shakespeare now, having done 'Alison Ashley' with the same group?
- Respondent: Yes, but I would choose a text with similar themes. 'Hating Alison Ashley' was really good for these kids because having Erica being the character they could relate to being jealous of Alison and her upbringing. In Year 8 it's starting to become clear who are the bottom classes and who are the selective and streamed classes and they've worked that out now. It was really important to them - in the text they were seeing that home life - all the themes that it draws on they could relate to.
- Interviewer: You write about the importance of narrative ... is that still an important aspect in your teaching?

- Respondent: Yes, but not just my narrative now - theirs as well, the students' as well - so making sure they're drawing connections and telling you stories about their life.
- Interviewer: Is that an important layer in social justice teaching?
- Respondent: Yes, because without it the students won't understand the array of experiences. If they only know their narrative and don't share that, then that's never going to be altered, so they need to hear a range of experiences in order to expand their narrative.
- Interviewer: Would you explicitly plan for teaching narrative in a unit of work? Would you identify it or would it be implied?
- Respondent: I think more implied. I don't think I'm at the stage yet where I would - I don't think I have the repertoire yet in my skills to be able to build a unit round that, because I'm still finding my feet, but I think it would come through anyway.
- Interviewer: In the first interview you also talked about finding the balance at school, that you were Year 10 history co-ordinator. Have you still got that position?
- Respondent: No, because we semesterise.
- Interviewer: You were finding the balance difficult between teaching for assessment and about assessment and then the truth of what you wanted to teach in the classroom. How is that playing out for you?
- Respondent: A lot better now. I think looking at the Australian curriculum, it's not as confronting now. The way I approached it before was that it was separate outcomes and I didn't see the connection between them. Now six months later, you teach to assessment but all those skills come through anyway. I'm finding it a lot easier. That Year 10 class that I spoke about last time, they just had me. They're probably now my favourite class. They're great, and I think I've got realistic expectations of what they should be achieving and what I want them to achieve. I still want them to get the best results possible but knowing the kids, knowing where they come from, if they come to breakfast club, I clear myself across the school so they know who I am and I've got that rapport with them so when we go into the classroom the expectations are there and we can get through a lesson and it will be fine.
- Interviewer: You're almost at the end of your first year, you won't be a graduate teach in 10 weeks' time. What are the high points of this year?
- Respondent: Specifically?

- Interviewer: When you walk out the door at the end of Term 4, what will be 'wow'? What will you remember most about this year?
- Respondent: I think the stuff I'm going to remember the most is all the interact stuff, the home room, the impact that's had on the school. For example, we have not a huge Arabic population at our school but there is a substantial amount. We did wear a purple day for Lesbian-Gay-Queer kids.
- Interviewer: LGBTQI?
- Respondent: Yes, thank you. We celebrated that. I went shopping for that and I was a bit worried because of the reactions from these kids but we weren't trying to enforce it on them, they could come to the event if they wanted to, or not, but we ended up having a DJ there and I set up a bit of a rave, and there was this moment where we were in the pit and there were 400 kids all watching, including the kids who had earlier in the day made those comments about gay people or whatever -
- Interviewer: Derogatory comments?
- Respondent: Yes, exactly, their version of what was right and wrong was challenged through a really awesome event and they were going, maybe what is the fuss? It wasn't revolutionary but it was evolutionary. Something clicked in their heads and it's probably not going to change them but perhaps it's going to impact the way they then speak about -
- Interviewer: It sounds like it's going a long way to making them successful global citizens.
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: You're creating that inclusive learning environment, not just the micro environment in the classroom ... did you get any pushback from any community members over having that event?
- Respondent: Not that I'm aware of but we had to frame it in a specific way.
- Interviewer: How did you frame it?
- Respondent: Equality. That was my response when the kids would make comments to me as well. I would say, I believe in equality, I believe in equal rights for everyone, don't you? For a lot of them, being from different races, other than you're white Australian, I thought that was probably the best way to go about it because they would go, Yes, I do believe in equality, so why is it not in every sphere of my life? So it wasn't me trying to challenge the kids but just make them think.

- Interviewer: So that's one thing you're going to take away from this year when you walk out the door?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: What does next year hold?
- Respondent: I don't know because I'm just a temp.
- Interviewer: Any word on that?
- Respondent: No. My principal wants to keep me. I hope so. He'd like to keep me but with national partnerships running now who knows? There is a job that I saw and would be tempted to apply for. It's a fly in-fly out to Manus Island, as a teacher, three weeks on, three weeks off. I think it would be incredible. I wouldn't be able to mention any of the human rights stuff I've done because that would be an automatic no. You're employed by the Government for it.
- Interviewer: You could take your social justice teaching in a really big way.
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: In your first interview we were wrestling with the discourse of what social justice ... you said, it is a bit of a buzz word. Do you still think that?
- Respondent: Sort of, but it's multi-faceted in that what I understand as social justice is not what you understand as social justice. It's personal. That doesn't make it wrong.
- Interviewer: You said that before.
- Respondent: Did I?
- Interviewer: It's a personal interpretation.
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: This is a leading question: if you're prepared to go and teach on Manus Island, your teaching and your philosophy are tied up completely with social justice. Do you agree?
- Respondent: Yes.
- Interviewer: What would you like most about teaching on Manus Island? What's the attraction?
- Respondent: I'm trying to work out my purpose in life, what I'm meant to be doing. I'm not really religious but I feel like everyone's got a greater purpose and I'm not sure of what mine is yet. I know that I can build rapport with people really easily and I try and find ways to relate to people. I feel like that's something that would be good on Manus Island, in that sort

of setting. I think it would also shape me and my teaching in the new Australia, because Australia is changing, for the better or for the worse I don't know, not in terms of having different people, different races, and from all these different countries and experiences, but -

Interviewer: Would you use drama on Manus?

Respondent: I would try. I think it has a place in every classroom. I still believe that. Whether I'd be allowed to - I feel like there's going to be a lot of restrictions. I said it before, that drama is good for the social and the academic, but with the experience of where these people come from perhaps drama isn't the best thing. It is but it isn't. I think of the effect it had on me in Year 12, the way it changed me as a person, shaped me, that's really good but probably my problems are trivial then compared with what people's problems are now in that sort of setting. I'm not quite sure.

Interviewer: It's quite speculative. Anything else you want to tell me or add to your philosophy?

Respondent: Any jobs?

Interviewer: That's a perfect point to stop. Thank you, Georgia.

[END TRANSCRIPT]