MAPPING AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF CHANGE
IN TEACHERS OF ITALIAN (L2) LEARNING PROCESS DRAMA

Erika Piazzoli

Trinity College Dublin, The University of Dublin

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a longitudinal, participatory case study focused on a group of experienced teachers of Italian (L2), learning to integrate process drama pedagogy in their practice. Process drama is an embodied approach for second language teaching and learning, focusing on the process (drama workshop), rather than the product (performance) aiming to engage learners in a felt-experience of the target language and culture. The paper reports the final leg of a wider study, and synthesizes results on teachers' tacit knowledge, transformed into knowing-*in*-action, when using process drama with adult students of Italian (L2).

Key words: process drama; Italian L2; reflection-in-action; knowing-in-action; reflective practice; drama and SLA.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes a research investigation aimed at understanding the genesis and development of 'knowing-*in*-action' (Schön, 1983) of experienced teachers of Italian (L2), learning to integrate process drama strategies into their practice. The overall purpose of the research was to document an 'ethnography of change' in a group of teachers, over a timeframe of seven years (2008-2015). The participants of the project are a group of experienced teachers of Italian (L2) part of *corpo docente* (teaching staff) of the *Societá Dante Alighieri* in Brisbane, Australia. The school, founded in 1962, is an active centre for the teaching and learning of Italian in Australia.

Process drama for second language learning (Kao & O'Neill, 1998; Winson, 2012) is grounded in the assumption that learning a foreign/second language can become meaningful when integrating experiential, embodied activities. In an embodied perspective, learning is not just a rational act; it is also grounded in the learner's body, involving perceptual, affective and social dimensions, situated in context (Varela, Rosch & Thompson, 1991). The focus of an embodied approach is thus on 'experiencing' the target language, and researching this phenomenon through methodologies of embodiment (Perry & Medina, 2016). Several studies have examined the effects on drama in education for Second Language Acquisi-

tion (SLA), with general consensus claiming that process drama can be beneficial to language acquisition (Belliveau & Kim, 2013; Stinson & Winston, 2014). However, fewer studies have focused on L2 teachers' challenges and experiences when learning to integrate drama pedagogy into their practices. Two studies (Araki-Metcalfe, 2008; Stinson, 2009), conducted independently, found that L2 teachers being exposed to process were convinced by its educational potential, but uncommitted to continuing process drama once the researchers, who were trained drama educators, withdrew their professional development support.

The question then arises—if process drama pedagogy is effective to facilitate second language learning, but there is no research on how to create strategies to support L2 teachers to engage with it over time, what is its value? As Schön states, "in our spontaneous, intuitive choices our knowing is tacit, implicit in our pattern of acquisition; our knowing is *in* our action" (1983, p. 49, original italics). The research discussed in this paper offers an insight into a set of instruments developed to investigate this kind of 'knowing *in* action', specifically related to the strategies of a group of experienced teachers of Italian (L2), learning to use process drama.

2. DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

PROCESS DRAMA

Process drama is an embodied approach to language learning, focused on a drama-oriented process, rather than a drama-oriented product. As such, process drama does not aim to prepare L2 students to perform a sketch or theatre performance (product); instead, it takes L2 learners through a series of dramatic episodes, linked together by a narrative thread (process), to afford learning opportunities. The process aims at engaging learners in a shared make belief, where students' creativity is the driving force, and motivation to communicate stems from the students' engagement in the drama.

Process drama is rooted in the Drama in Education tradition, initially developed in the 1970s in England, by Dorothy Heathcote (1973). The term 'process drama' was introduced by O'Neill (1995) in Ireland, developed by O'Toole's work (1992) in Australia, and validated by Taylor in the United States (2000). The pedagogy is grounded in theories of child play in First Language Acquisition (Bateson, 1976; Vygotsky, 1976), and was applied to Second Language Acquisition in the mid-1990s. In the seminal text *Towards a Theory of Drama in Education*,

Bolton (1979) positions Drama in Education within the Vygotskian paradigm of teaching and learning, whereby the use of symbolic play and make belief operate on a dual plane: learners are experiencing a set of emotions related to play context, and a set of emotions related to the real context. The interchange between these two emotional planes, known as 'dual affect' (Vygotsky, 1976), constitutes that kind of productive engagement through which learners experiment new meanings. This is pivotal to allow the learner to grow, moving from object-regulation (for example, L2 learners bound to phrase-books and dictionaries to express meaning), to other-regulation (L2 learners over-relying on the teacher to express meaning), and ultimately self-regulation (L2 learners have internalized a concept and can express meaning independently). Cultivating self-regulation, internalization and agency (Vygotsky, 1978) is at the core of process drama pedagogy.

PROCESS DRAMA AND SOCIOCULTURAL LANGUAGE LEARNING

Situated in this theoretical discourse, process drama can be safely positioned within sociocultural theories of L2 learning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) embodiment and gesture studies in SLA (McCafferty & Stam, 2008). Both process drama and sociocultural theory for language learning resonate with the Vygotskian notion of *perezhivanie*, a Russian term loosely translated as "interpreted, perceived, experienced or lived through by different [individuals] in different ways" (Vygotsky, 1994, p. 354). Through the lens of felt-experience (*perezhivanie)* individuals perceive, feel, interpret, internalize, and re-create meaning through a cognitive, affective and social investment. Mahn and John-Steiner (2002) position *perezhivanie* in an English as a Second Language (ESL) context, as "the affective processes through which interactions […] are individually perceived, appropriated, and represented by the participants" (p. 49). In their study of ESL learners compiling language journals, they argue that Vygotsky's concept of *perezhivanie* plays a central role in understanding the appropriation of L2 social interaction.

The first research study on process drama for SLA dates back to 1995, when Kao conducted an empirical study in the University of Taipei, with 33 undergraduate ESL students. Her findings were published in a seminal text marking the foundations of L2/process drama (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). Since then, several studies have investigated the effectiveness of process drama, focusing on fluency and motivation (Stinson & Freebody, 2006; Stinson, 2008); foreign language anxi-

ety (Piazzoli, 2011); intercultural awareness (Rothwell, 2014); turn-taking (Kao, Carkin, & Hsu, 2011), embodied multimodality (Yaman Ntelioglou, 2016), and engagement (Piazzoli, 2014). In the study discussed in this paper, the research focuses on process drama and L2 teacher education, looking at L2 teachers' development of reflective practice.

REFLECTION-IN-ACTION AND REFLECTION-ON-ACTION

It is through the faculty of reflection-*in*-action that a skilled drama teacher orchestrates students' ideas into a collective story. Reflection-*in*-action is often described as thinking on one's feet (O'Mara, 2006), in terms of facilitating group dynamics to balance the learning objectives and the drama dimension. Reflection-*on*-action, on the other hand, is the reflection occurring in hindsight, after a class has finished. It is a different cognitive operation, involving a distance from the event.

Dunn and Stinson (2011) discuss reflection-*in* and *on*-action in terms of the *macro* and *micro* aspects of planning in process drama. As they explain, *macro* planning refers to those decisions made before a drama class begins, like selecting the stimulus (pre-text) for the drama, and preparing resources. On the other hand, the *micro* level of management refers to "the 'in the moment' artistry needed to make effective decisions in light of the participants' responses" (p. 619).

The challenge in language teacher education is that these vital elements of reflective practice are often tacit. By 'tacit knowledge', Polanyi (1997) refers to that kind of experiential knowledge that is difficult to articulate, or share, and that can be made explicit only by reflecting on it - through face-to-face communication, practice and interaction. While it may be elusive to pinpoint this notion in theory, it is easily anchored in the practice of experienced teachers, who relate to this kind of tacit knowing to inform their everyday classroom choices. Tacit knowledge feeds into teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 2004) that is, knowledge of how to teach a particular subject matter.

3. THE STUDY

The research described in this paper is a longitudinal, participatory case study, underpinned by reflective practice methodology (Schön, 1983). The research questions informing the research are:

- How do experienced teachers of Italian (L2) engage in reflective practice when learning to use process drama?
- What are the challenges experienced by L2 teachers when integrating process drama in their language teaching practice?

To address these research questions, I worked closely with *corpo docente* (teaching staff) of the *Societá Dante Alighieri*, Brisbane (Australia), over a period of seven years, from 2008 to 2015. The choice of this particular school as a research site was multifold: the school management is open to innovation to teaching and learning; it is an active site with several language-oriented events, including the Immersion Day event (focus of the study), a yearly event based on full language immersion through drama. Prior to the study, I had been working as a teacher at *Societá Dante Alighieri*, Brisbane since 2001; I had therefore built a solid rapport with the teaching team, based on mutual trust and professional respect - arguably vital elements in longitudinal, participatory research collaborations.

While the case study spanned from 2008 to 2015, in this paper I concentrate on the final leg of the study (2013-2015), reporting the results of the third leg of the research.[1] For a discussion of previous phases of this project see Piazzoli (2010).

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The third leg of the research, the focus of this paper, consisted of investigating the responses of five teachers of Italian (L2) from *Societá Dante Alighieri*, Brisbane, as they prepared to use process drama to facilitate the Immersion Day event in 2013. Three main stages can be identified in this leg of the research:

A. Teacher development seminars (three in total), in preparation for the Immersion Day;
B. The Immersion Day itself;
C. A follow up period with the teachers, after the Immersion Day.

Research instruments included: three sets of teacher questionnaires, administered after each professional development session; two sets of interviews with each teacher—during the Immersion Day (flash interviews), and shortly afterwards (focus groups); the annotations of teachers' reflections on the lesson plans;

---

[1] The third leg of the study, discussed in this paper, has been granted Ethical Clearance from the Research Committee of Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia.

teachers' email correspondence, to evaluate whether they continued using drama pedagogy in their language practice.

These research instruments were designed to address the research questions (above) and were specifically targeted to capture teachers' reflection-*in*-action, and teachers' reflection-*on*-action. In particular, the 'flash interviews' during the Immersion Day event, and the annotated lesson plans, were constructed to attempt to capture teachers' reflection-*in*-action. Pre-questionnaires, focus groups interviews after the Immersion Day and follow-up correspondence were conducted to capture teachers' reflection-*on*-action.

3.2. THE EVENT: IMMERSION DAY

La Giornata d'Immersione (Immersion Day), hereafter referred to as the *Giornata*, took place at *Societá Dante Alighieri* in October 2013, as part of *la settimana della lingua Italiana nel mondo* (Italian language Week). 45 adult students of Italian (L2), ranging from A2 to C2 level of the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) took part in this full immersion event. Two parallel classes were held (with mixed levels in each), supported by three language teachers per class. The entire event was facilitated using the target language, with the purpose of immersing the Australian students into a linguistic and cultural Italian experience. All teachers were experienced Italian (L2) professionals; at least one teacher per class had previous experience in process drama. In the rest of this section, a description of the *Giornata* activities follows. It is hoped that this description will become useful to anchor the analysis and the discussion of the paper, as well as to enable readers to get a sense of process drama, in action.

The theme of the *Giornata* event was 'Venice' and all things Venetian. Given this theme, the initial challenge in planning was: How can one turn such a theme (a city) into a lived, felt experience? In planning process drama, it is useful to formulate a 'focus question', i.e., a focal point to guide teachers in selecting the most appropriate material. As O'Toole and Dunn point out (2002), an effective focus question "leads straight into dramatic action" (p. 12). The focus question that I formulated with the help of the teaching team was: What does it feel like to be a local in Venice? This was created to enable the students, Australian adults whose experience of Venice was that of being a tourist, to experience Venice not as visitor, but as residents. In other words, the focus question was entrenched in

the educational objective of the drama - that is, triggering intercultural and linguistic awareness of the experience of living in Venice.

The beginning point, or stimulus (pre-text) of the drama workshop was *Venezia è un Pesce*, by Tiziano Scarpa (2000), a highly evocative tour guide of the city. This suggestion was made by one of the teacher-participants, who had already experienced process drama in previous years. To launch the drama, some extracts of this guide were shared with the students, using a variety of activities to evoke the senses, including teachers' theatrical reading of this text:

> *Con meno di un metro di dislivello, molte zone sono già sott'acqua; l'emergenza seria scatta oltre il metro e dieci. Nella tremenda notte del 4 novembre 1966, di ritorno dal suo turno di lavoro, mio padre è tornato a casa nuotando. Le sirene che suonavano l'allarme durante le incursioni aeree della seconda guerra mondiale sono rimaste in cima ai campanili. Ora segnalano le incursioni marine, quando sta per montare l'acqua alta; ti svegliano alle cinque, alle sei di mattina. Gli abitanti insonnoliti fissano agli ingressi parate d'acciaio…* (Scarpa, 2000, p.24)

> With less than a metre difference in altitude, many areas are already under water; a serious emergency arises beyond one metre ten. On the terrible night of November 4th 1966, my father swam home from work. The sirens that sounded the alarm during the air raids of the Second World War have been kept on top of the *campanili*. They now announce sea raids, when the *acqua alta* is about to rise; they wake you at five, six in the morning. The sleepy inhabitants fix steel bulkheads to their front doors… (Scarpa, 2008, p.18)

This extract was chosen as pre-text because of its inherent evocative quality, "driven by a past event and the anticipation of future consequences" (O'Neill, 1995, p.34). Thus, it evoked a dramatic mood that served as the beginning point for the process drama.

After a multi-modal brainstorming, including a visual glossary of key terms and videos of the water sirens, and sharing their own memories of Venice, students were encouraged to imagine what it could *feel* like to be the 'sleepy inhabitants' of the city of bridges, and be woken by the sound of *acqua alta* sirens. A Total Physical Response (TPR) activity followed (Asher, 1969), to guide students in creating their '*acqua alta* evacuation' routine. This evacuation routine was rehearsed and choreographed, becoming a *leit motif* throughout the day. Meanwhile, a group of students worked on a choral reinterpretation of the sirens' alarm, re-arranging it into a harmony of voices. This activity was directed by one of the teaching team, a music teacher and chorus conductor.

The central phase (experiential phase) of the process drama involved the creation of dramatic roles. Students were supplied with role cards, scaffolding a new identity: their Venetian surname and *sestiere* (district) were already provided, while they had to choose their first name, age and personality. Once they had created a new identity, students introduced each other, in role, through role play and group improvisation activities.

Next, they were shown a large map of Venice, hand drawn by one of the teachers, who had a background in architecture. Students were divided into groups, according to what *sestiere* (district) they lived in, and they were invited to choose their street and work place, and mark it on the map. A series of role plays and improvisations followed, to allow participants to get in role, encouraging them to locate on the map their local *bacaro* (eatery) and *chicchetteria* (pub). This sequence of activities marked the first half of the *Giornata* event. The lunch took place in the school itself and consisted in *un chicheto* (aperitif) and typical food from the region. Thus, the lunch break was embedded in the context of the drama, as well as in the learning experience, as the venue was decorated by signifiers of everyday life in Venice.

The second half of the *Giornata* saw the implementation of a cornerstone activity in process drama: teacher-in-role. This pedagogical strategy features the teacher taking on a role within the drama, to provoke students' participation and action (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). In each group, the teachers decided to take on different roles, according to what was brainstormed in the teacher's preparation workshop. For the purpose of this paper, one teacher-in-role will be discussed, that is, the teacher taking on the role as a tourist, new to Venice, seeking guidance from the residents (students in role). A note on the pedagogical value of this strategy is needed: by reversing the power and status of the teacher (tourist) and students (residents), the aim was to allow students to embody a more confident *persona* in the target language, provoking them into action and boosting their confidence to communicate in the L2.

To end the drama, the *acqua alta* siren choir circulated among classrooms, prompting students to re-enact the *acqua alta* evacuation TPR routine. This created particular dramatic tension, especially as the playful confusion of the emergency routine collided with the (teacher-in-role) pregnant wife's water breaking—giving rise to a comical sequence of the teachers heading to the hospital for the labour, while the students were performing the *acqua alta* evacuation.

Throughout these activities, the students used Italian (L2) to communicate, both in and out of role. The drama was structured so that the drama improvisations were short, often pausing to recapitulate and reflect on language structures, to scaffold new vocabulary, and to elicit idiomatic expressions as they emerged from the interactions.

The *Giornata* ended with an intercultural reflection on their emerging understanding of being a resident in Venice—an insightful experience for Australian learners of Italian, who may have been prone to objectify Venice as a tourist destination. Instead, the learners were able to engage, in the Italian language, in a semi-structured reflection of the lived experience, customs, quirks, traditions, and specific language emerging from that lived context.

3.3. DATA ANALYSIS

Five teachers signed an informed consent form to agree to participate in the final leg of the research (2013-2015). These teachers, one male and four female, range from 25 to 65 years of age. The data analysis was conducted using NVIVO 11 qualitative software, used to transcribe, code and cross-reference all data sets (three sets of questionnaires; two sets of interviews; annotated lesson plans; follow up emails). The questionnaires were administered after each professional development seminar. These included a theoretical lecture, a three-hour drama workshop, an active planning session, and co-teaching workshops. All five teachers participating in the research, except for one (Sara) had previous experience in process drama.

In the pre-event questionnaires, the teacher-participants identified positive aspects of process drama pedagogy as:

- "Being engaged in the whole body, with emotions and the voice in a dramatic way" (Massimo);
- "Enabling students to create their own characters while forgetting they are practicing a second language" (Sara);
- "Sharing the experience with the students" (Priscilla);
- "Anchoring movement with vocabulary, to learn" (Dragana)
- "Shifting the focus onto communication, rather than on making mistakes" (Silvana).

Teachers were also asked to anticipate the challenges they may face during the Immersion Day event, and how they could overcome them. Some of the answers were:

- "Switching from in-role to out-of-role; confronting possible disengagement from the students" (Massimo);
- "Creating a smooth progress of activities following process drama main features" (Sara);
- "Controlling the sequence of dynamics of the exercise" (Priscilla);
- "The control of the concept behind process drama" (Silvana).

Clearly, the data suggests that these teachers, despite having some previous experience in process drama, were envisaging issues related to management and control. As Schön (1983), the father of reflection in action, eagerly points out, a key issue in the learning process is related to teachers handing over 'control' in the classroom. This is even more relevant in process drama, where the handover of control is essential for students' spontaneity to flourish.

It is useful to cross-reference the questionnaires with the interviews and focus groups, conducted during and shortly after the Immersion Day. For the purposes of analysis, I focus on one key moment in the *Giornata*, the introduction of the teacher-in-role, facilitated by teachers Massimo and Sara.[2] In this key moment Massimo, in role as a lost tourist in Venice, asked the students, in role as local residents, for directions. While this interaction was happening, Massimo hinted at a 'bizarre event' that he had just witnessed, which had shocked him and caused him to lose track of his bearings. The students were asked to hypothesize what this 'bizarre event' might be and to re-present that, in groups, through visual storytelling, creating freeze frames of their ideas. The teachers' facilitation of this situation, brainstormed during the pre-event workshop, was instrumental in injecting dramatic tension in the story. This constituted a moment of 'unpredictability', as it was not possible to anticipate how the students would have reacted. These are the situations when knowing-*in*-action is required, when tacit knowledge feeds into pedagogical content knowledge.

An extract of Sara and Massimo's focus group follows, discussing this key moment, and marking a difference in the level of fluidity of their facilitation skills:

---

[2] All names are pseudonyms, to protect the identity of participants.

Researcher: E il quadro vivente come è andato?
Sara: Eh...
Massimo: Quello è andato bene! No? Dici che-
Sara: Il vostro gruppo. Il mio gruppo... ma perché io ero un po' confusa, perché...
secondo me non ho dato io le spiegazioni giuste, quindi alla fine sono...
Massimo: Tu piu' che un quadro vivente hai fatto una scenetta!
Sara: Una scenetta – e non dovevo fare la scenetta, e alla fine... ho chiesto a lui:
[Allarmata] Come devo fare, aiutami! E quando gli ho... lui mi ha detto: Devi farli
stoppare in un momento, un quadro vivente...
Massimo: Io molto semplicemente ho utilizzato quello che mi hai insegnato tu, cioè
farli entrare in scena, con un movimento, e farli stoppare
Sara: Stop. Anche noi abbiamo fatto così
Massimo: Poi... mano sulla spalla - una parola... e quello era il tableau vivent!
Sara: E invece io... panico.

Researcher: How did the tableaux vivent go?
Sara: Ehm...
Massimo: That went well, didn't it? Do you think-
Sara: In your group. My group... that's because I was a bit confused,
because... my instructions weren't right, so at the end they...
Massimo: More than a tableaux vivent, you got them to do a skit
Sara: A skit - and I wasn't supposed to do a skit, so at the end... I asked him:
[Alarmed] How do I do this, help! And when I have... he told me: You need
to get them to freeze, in a still image...
Massimo: Quite simply, I applied what you taught me, that is, getting them
in role, through a movement, and freezing them
Sara: Freeze. That's what we've done, too
Massimo: Then... hands on your shoulder – then a word... and that was the
tableau vivent!
Sara: But I... panicked.
(Sara and Massimo, Focus Group 2)

It is essential to reiterate here that, while Massimo had previous experience in process drama (2010 and 2011 Immersion events), this was Sara's first experience in facilitating process drama. From the reconstruction of their dynamics, while Massimo appears to be *self*-regulated in his micro management, Sara appears to be *other*-regulated (by over-relaying on Massimo) as well as *object-regulated* (by relying on the lesson plan)—more specifically, by relying on the format of one activity ("I wasn't supposed to do a skit"). Indeed, in Questionnaire 1, Sara chose

to describe drama as "interesting", "intriguing" but also "threatening". She add-
ed a note to explain why:

**1.5. Would you describe 'process drama' as any of the following (you
can tick more than one):**
<u>Interesting</u>
<u>Fun</u>
<u>Intriguing</u>
Stressful
Confusing
<u>Threatening</u> – *IF not explained and conducted in a proper way*
Other _____
Not sure

(Sara, Q1, 1.5)

For Sara, what was 'threatening' was the possibility of not being able to explain,
or conduct [a process drama activity] in a 'proper' way. By framing it this way, it
appears that Sara had formed a rigid vision of what drama entails, and—should
this not be adhered to, the experience could be 'threatening'. Indeed, in the key
moment described above, this rigidity manifested in action. Interestingly, in her
second questionnaire, Sara saw a possible challenge in the Immersion Day as be-
ing able to create a "*smooth* progress of activities" (Q2, 2.2), and planned to ad-
dress this by practicing the drama sequence on her own.

   Yet, what is compelling about Sara's case is that, while she consciously posi-
tioned her micro management as weak, quite a different picture emerged when
her practice was described by her colleague. Although Sara may have appeared,
on the surface, to be lacking confidence, she tacitly afforded the students with
many creative ways to channel the drama into intercultural engagement. Curi-
ously, this came to light in the focus group, from Massimo's observations of Sara,
rather than from Sara herself. Many examples of Sara's knowing-*in*-action are
mentioned in the focus group. One short example is quoted below:

> Massimo: *Dopo... dopo la fase di presentazione abbiamo... forse perché voi eravate leggermente indietro rispetto a noi, allora Sara ha incominciato a chiedere... eh ancora in teacher-in-role, quindi da turista ai veneziani... consigliare degli itinerari...*
>
> Massimo: After the introductions we… because you were slightly behind, so Sara started to ask… ehm, still in role as a tourist, to the [students in role as] Venetians; to get them to suggest itineraries.
>
> (Massimo and Sara, Focus Group 2)

From here on, Massimo and Sara engaged in a lengthy description of activities, initiated by Sara, in role, successful in provoking students' intercultural, dramatic and communicative engagement. By analyzing their reminiscence of Sara's drama management skills, it appears that she was well able to harness her tacit knowledge of language teaching into the drama structure. This is reinforced by analyzing her annotated lesson plans: she wrote "*confusione*" (confusion), next to the key episode described above (freeze frames); yet, she also annotated "*molto interessante e stimolante*" (very interesting and stimulating) next to the linguistic and intercultural reflection phases. Sara's conscious identity, at that time, was still coming to terms with her confidence to facilitate process drama. Still, in action, she was able to set up a productive collaboration, and harness a newly-found synergy between her expertise as a language teacher, and as a drama teacher. This also aligns with Sara's vision, as indicated in her questionnaire (Question 2.4) that is, to foster a creative partnership with the students, by letting them lead her into the drama:

> **2.3. What do you envisage as your biggest challenge in facilitating the process drama for the immersion day next week?**
>
> Creating a smooth progress of activities following the process drama main features
>
> **2.4 How are you going to address this challenge, in action?**
> I will need to practice the sequence of activities on my own first. Then, I will try to put into practice what I've learnt so far. Also, I think I will let the students lead me. (Sara, Q2, 2.3-2.4)

Indeed, this attitude (a teacher letting students 'lead' her) denotes profound maturity, as it deals with balancing structure and spontaneity (O'Neill, 2006). The difference between Sara and Massimo, I suggest, might be that for Sara, the knowing-*in*-action required for balancing structure and spontaneity was tacit throughout the drama; on the contrary, Massimo's understanding was more explicit. It is significant to note here, that in the pre-event questionnaire, Massimo stated that his favourite parts of the workshop were "the experience and the reflection in action" (Massimo, Q1, 1.3). This understanding was, of course, anchored in his previous experience of having facilitated L2/process drama.

Finally, in terms of the follow-up data analysis, all teachers indicated that they would have liked to incorporate process drama in their future teaching. However, while all stated to be affected by the work, only Sara and Massimo actually incorporated process drama in their practice. Sara indicated that she used some ideas inspired by process drama, but did not specify which ideas, or how they were implemented. Instead, she engaged in a meta-reflection of her practice, adding: "The process drama workshop opened up, for me, a new vision and conception of teaching as a collaborative, interactive action. I started considering every activity as an in-context exercise." (Sara, follow up email, 8.11.15). Massimo, on the other hand, was able to articulate in some detail his process drama practice:

> I have attempted to incorporate some of the element of drama-based pedagogy in the programming I'm currently doing for this semester for level 1 (upper elementary). The program loosely follows *Un giorno in Italia 1* textbook, which goes through a journey on the train along the Italian peninsula. The activity on the book involved a text in which lots of different characters present on the train were described. On the drawing underneath the text the students should have recognized the characters described in the text. I restructured the activity in a role play/ tableaux vivant. Here, each student was impersonating a different character on the train […]
>
> I think the inclusion of process drama has been useful in my teaching practice. It allowed me to break the rigidity of some quite pedantic and abstract activities […] and to structure the lesson with more fluent transitions between one activity/topic and another. It also allowed me to be emotionally more connected with the students and make the lecture more fun.
>
> (Massimo, follow up email, 3.06.2014)

Again, the differences in Sara and Massimo's response suggests that Sara's knowledge of drama remained tacit, while Massimo's was more explicit. The analysis therefore ultimately reinforces the key role of reflective practice, felt-experience and co-teaching in the sustainability of process drama for language teacher education.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As it has been argued, an important component of teaching is embracing the notion of unpredictability. As Shulman holds:

> Teachers learn quickly that the heart of teaching is developing the capacity to respond to the unpredictable. Teaching begins in design, but unfolds through chance. (2004, p. 480)

According to Shulman (2004), teachers learn quickly to respond to the unpredictable. But how? This question was at the core of the present study—an investigation of the reflective strategies through which teachers apprehended process drama pedagogy. The data analysis, informed by a Vygotskian sociocultural framework, indicated that the L2 were at times object-regulated (over-relaying on the lesson plan), other-regulated (over-relying on more experienced peers) as well as self-regulated in their facilitation skills. Two teachers were analyzed closely: Massimo and Sara. In particular, Sara's case was examined with some attention as she appeared, on the surface, to be less confident in her facilitation skills. However, on a deeper analysis, Sara's reflection-in-action revealed that she was able to exercise agency and self-regulate her improvisation, in role, harnessing dramatic tension towards intercultural engagement. She internalized her felt-experience of the drama as knowing-in-action, and transformed it into useful pedagogical content knowledge.

Although this paper has focused solely on the third leg of the study, at this point it is useful to consider the wider scope of the research, mapping the participants' ethnography of change, from 2008 to 2015. In previous Immersion events, the *corpo docente* (teaching staff) of *Societá Dante Alighieri* Brisbane, that participated in the research were not autonomous in their drama facilitation. For example, commenting on the 2008-2009 Immersion dynamics, I noted: "Untrained for engaging in reflection-in-action, the teachers relied on me to reflect on their group's choices, often running out of their classrooms to ask for support" (Piazzoli, 2010, p.7). In the 2008 and 2009 Immersion events, in order to prepare the

teachers for the event, I chose the pre-text, designed the drama structure, and ran through it with the teachers beforehand. On the contrary, in the 2013 Immersion Day event discussed in this paper, the teacher preparation entailed: a lecture on drama theory, an experiential drama workshop, brainstorming the pre-text, co-teaching sessions, and co-planning the event. This resulted in a co-authored drama experience: the theme (Venezia) was collectively chosen by the teaching team; the pre-text (*Venezia è un pesce*), was referred by Massimo; the TPR sequence (*acqua alta* evacuation), created by Sara; the map-making, by Massimo. While I suggested the structure for dramatic roles (tourists/locals), these were developed by the team.

This leads to a key research finding: *only when the teachers' preparation involved a felt-experience on a macro level (planning), were they able to exercise agency on a micro level (facilitating)*. Specifically, affording these teachers a felt-experience of the macro level (planning) involved: introducing them to theories of reflective practice, play, learning through drama, and drama planning; engaging them as participants in a process drama; brainstorming themes, pre-text, roles and situation for the *Giornata*; actively getting them to try out strategies, in preparation for the *Giornata*; co-teaching; encouraging ongoing reflection and debate. Throughout these processes, triggering, recording and analyzing their reflection-*in*-action, and -*on*-action, was instrumental in mapping their ethnography of change.

In closing, a number of limitations of the study need to be outlined. As the research was conducted on a small, local scale, it is not possible to generalize the findings beyond the research context. Moreover, the researcher being part of the *Societá Dante Alighieri* Brisbane teaching team may have influenced the respondents to answer in particular ways. While all measures were taken to inform the participants that their involvement was voluntary, and their unbiased opinions were highly valued, it is reasonable to acknowledge this as a possible limitation of the study. Rather than a firm teacher development model, the present investigation can be taken as a pilot study into the development of a set of research instruments, to capture insights into the reflective processes of L2 teachers learning to use process drama. In future research, it may be useful to apply these instruments to a larger sample of participants, in a quasi-experimental design.

The reflective practitioner is a learning practitioner, Schön (1983) argues. If process drama pedagogy is effective in supporting second language learning, it is important to invest energy into teacher education. More research is needed to

understand what this entails, in practice, for experienced L2 teachers learning new strategies for embodying language in process drama.

REFERENCES

Araki-Metcalfe, N. (2008). Introducing creative language learning in Japan through educational drama. *Drama Australia Journal (NJ),* 31(2), 45- 57.

Asher, J. (*1969*). The Total Physical Response approach to second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 53 (1), 3-17.

Bateson, G. (1976). A theory of play and fantasy. In J. Bruner, A. Jolly & K. Sylva (Eds.), *Play: Its Role in Development and Evolution*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Belliveau, G., & Kim, W. (2013). Drama in L2 learning: A research synthesis. *Scenario: Journal for Drama and Theatre in Foreign and Second language Education, 7*(2), 6.

Bolton, G. (1979). *Towards a theory of drama in education*. England: Longman.

Dunn, J., & Stinson, M. (2011). Not without the art!! The importance of teacher artistry when applying drama as pedagogy for additional language learning. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 16(4), 617-633.

Heathcote, D. (1973). Drama as challenge. In L. Johnson & Cecily O'Neill (Eds.), *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected Writings on Education and Drama*. London: Hutchinson.

Kao, S.M. Carkin, G., & Hsu, L. F. (2011). Questioning techniques for promoting language learning with students of limited L2 oral proficiency in a drama-oriented language classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 16(4), 489-515.

Kao, S.M. & O'Neill, C. (1998). *Words into worlds: Learning a second language through process drama*. London: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2002). The gift of confidence: A Vygotskyan view of emotions. In G. Wells & G. Claxton (Eds.), *Learning for Life in the 21st Century: Sociocultural Perspectives on the Future of Education* (pp.46-58). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

McCafferty, S.G., & Stam, G. (2008). *Gesture: Second Language Acquisition and classroom research*. New York: Routledge.

Neelands, J., & Goode, T. (2000). *Structuring drama work: A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Mara, J. (2006). Capturing the ephemeral: Reflection-in-action as research. *Drama Australia Journal (NJ)*, 30(2), 41-50.

O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

O'Neill, C. (2006). Dialogue and drama. In P. Taylor, P & C. D. Warner (Eds.), *Structure and Spontaneity: The Process Drama of Cecily O'Neill* (pp. 101-118). Sterling, VA: Trentham.

O'Toole, J. (1992). *The Process of Drama: Negotiating Art and Meaning*. London: Routledge.

O'Toole, J., & Dunn, J. (2002). *Pretending to learn: Helping children learn through drama*. Frenchs Forest, N.S.W: Pearson Education.

Perry, M. & Medina, C.L. (eds.)(2016). *Methodologies of embodiment: Inscribing bodies in qualitative research*. Oxon: Routledge.

Piazzoli, E. (2010). Process drama and additional language teaching: Reflections on the Dante Alighieri Immersion Weekends. *Applied Theatre Researcher IDEA Journal*, (11), 1-12.

Piazzoli, E. (2011). Process drama: The use of affective space to reduce language anxiety in the additional language learning classroom, *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* (16)4, 557-574.

Piazzoli, E. (2014). Engagement as perception-in-action in process drama for teaching and learning Italian as a second language. *International Journal for Language Studies*, 8(2), 91-116.

Polanyi, M. (1997). *The tacit dimension*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Rothwell, J. (2014). Let's eat the Captain! Thinking, feeling, doing: Intercultural language learning through process drama. *TESOL in Context, 24*(2), 10-12.

Scarpa, T. (2000). *Venezia è un pesce*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Scarpa, T. (2008). *Venice is a fish* (S. Whiteside, Trans.). Milano: Feltrinelli.

Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.

Shulman, L. S. (2004). *The Wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stinson, M. (2009). Drama is like reversing everything: Intervention research as teacher professional development. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 14(2), 225 - 243.

Stinson, M. & Winston, J. (2011). Drama education and second language learning: A growing field of practice and research. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 16*(4).

Stinson, M. & Winston, J. (2014). *Drama education and second language learning*. London: Routledge.

Stinson, M. (2008). Process drama and teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. In Manuel Jacqueline, Hughes John, & Michael Anderson (Eds.), *Drama and English Teaching: Imagination, Action and Engagement* (pp.193-212). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stinson, M., & Freebody, K. (2006). The DOL project: An investigation into the contribution of process drama to improved results in English oral communication. . *Youth Theatre Journal, 20*, 27- 41.

Taylor, P. (2000). *The Drama Classroom: Action, Reflection and Transformation*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Varela, F. J., Rosch, E., & Thompson, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1976). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. In J. Bruner, A. Jolly, & Sylva K. (Eds.), *Play: Its Role in Development and Evolution* (pp. 537-554). Middlesex: Penguin.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L., & Luria, A. (1994). Tool and symbol in child development. In R. Van Der Veer & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *The Vygotsky Reader* (pp. 99-105). Oxford: Blackwell.

Winston, J. (Ed.). (2012). *Second language learning through drama: Practical techniques and applications*. Padstow, Cornwall: Routledge.

Yaman Ntelioglou, B. (2016). Embodied multimodality framework: Examining language and literacy practices of English language learners in drama classrooms. In Perry, M. & Medina, C.L. (Eds.). *Methodologies of Embodiment: Inscribing Bodies in Qualitative Research* (pp.86-101). Oxon: Routledge.