Writing in Role: A Creative New Process to Engage and Motivate Students in Literacy

Sylvia (known as Sam) Barta

M.Ed., B.Ed. (Special Education)

November 2020

Dissertation submitted to the College of Arts, Society and Education,

James Cook University, North Queensland, as part of the requirement for the Doctor

of Education

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my primary advisor, Dr. Jocene Vallack for the years of support and guidance throughout this thesis journey. Dr. Vallack provided feedback and many resources. I am indebted to her for all the hours dedicated to reviewing my work and assisting my efforts towards this Doctorate.

Professor Helen Boon, my secondary advisor, has also been a source of support and guidance. Professor Boon reviewed and critiqued my work, and like Dr. Vallack, was a source of encouragement. Professor Hilary Whitehouse served as a consultant to Dr. Vallack during my term of study and I thank her for this, as well as the advice and encouragement she offered me. I am so grateful for their contributions towards this thesis.

I would like to thank the Case Study Teacher for the time and access granted to me through the course of this research. A grateful thanks also goes out to the Vancouver School Board for granting approval for this research. Thanks also to the student participants and their parents for granting me access to their written work and survey responses.

James Cook University Graduate Research School must be acknowledged for the support, guidance, and assistance through this Doctoral journey. All efforts afforded to me have been deeply appreciated. The JCU library was a valuable resource.

Thanks also go out to my past students who worked with me in the Radioplay process throughout the years. Their enthusiasm and feedback spurred me on to accomplish this Doctorate.

Family has been an important part of this journey. Thanks to my husband, Raymond Balanzategui, who made this possible through his support. My parents, Wally and Jerry Barta, who through their encouragement, started it all.

Statement of the Contribution of Others

Abstract

This Descriptive Case Study tests a creative, collaborative approach for literacy instruction within the social context of a grade 4/5 classroom. The specific classroom activity involves an original, collaborative, interactive and episodic written role-play process, which I have called 'Radioplay'. It is not only an example of creative teaching, but of teaching *for* creativity.

This Case Study uses Deductive Thematic Analysis to build on and contribute to the already established work in literacy, and the four key theories of Drama in Education, Creativity Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Student Engagement Theory. It is a mixed-method inquiry, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data to serve the deductive thematic approach. The qualitative case study data is comprised of student open-ended survey responses, draft copies of students' written work, teacher observations and interview responses. Quantification and categorization of these responses provide an overview of the data.

The methodology applies the parallel approaches of deductive thematic analysis with content analysis, thereby linking the research findings to constructs contained within salient theories of learning. Evidence of the following pedagogical phenomena is apparent in data provided by the participants: Autonomy, Perceived Competence, Collaboration, and Emotional, Behavioral, and Cognitive Engagement.

Findings from this study show that students were engaged by the process on many levels. Survey responses illustrate engagement through included descriptors such as 'fun', 'collaboration', and 'freedom'. Teacher observations, in addition to student survey responses, confirm the motivation, as well as emotional and behavioural engagement of students- their excitement and enthusiasm displayed towards the process. Additionally, student survey responses indicated that students felt their communication and writing skills grew and improved, indicating cognitive engagement. This perception of students' improved literacy skills was shared by the teacher. Analysis of their written work shows that they

incorporated into their work some of the literary devices that had been learned in class. It was also evident that the creative plot portents, developed by the student teams, continued to develop through each successive chapter.

    'Radioplay' is analyzed and presented here as a creative, collaborative writing-in-role process which informs effective teaching practices for motivating and engaging students in literacy.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction: The Radioplay process

The demands facing classroom teachers are many. The classroom teacher must be equipped with effective teaching strategies, which are empirically tested and proven through research. There are calls for creative teaching and teaching for creativity. Teachers are charged with a curriculum that includes the new literacies of social media. Motivating and engaging students in literacy can be a challenge for the classroom teacher. Some years ago, I developed a program called 'Radioplay' as a process for literacy instruction, and as a tool for contributing to the pedagogical strategies that may meet these challenges. It was a desire to harness and analyze the pedagogical efficacy of this role-play approach to teaching literacy that prompted this formal research. As part one of this doctoral research, I authored a 'Reflection of Past Practice with Radioplay'. This 'substantive piece' sets the context and describes my personal observations when developing Radioplay. It is a 'how to' guide, and it sets out details of how to do this role play pedagogy. This initial paper introducing Radioplay, presents both the Radioplay process and some analysis of past students' comments and written work, and is presented in Appendix 1 of this thesis. An abbreviated and somewhat different version of this reflection of past practice with Radioplay was published as a 'practical strategies pull out guide' in *Literacy Learning: the Middle Years, Volume 26,* Number 3, October 2018 (Australian Literacy Educators' Association). The complete and final version of the 'Reflection of Past Practice with Radioplay", offered as Appendix 1 in this thesis, is followed in Appendix 2 with an 'Author's Note" outlining the differences between it and the more concise published version.

My Radioplay research is centered on applying and analyzing the engagement of students for a specific innovative classroom program for literacy. Radioplay is a collaborative, interactive written role-play process. Students create a character and then write as if they are that character in a sustained episodic adventure. Students work in teams and have autonomy over the plot developments of their group's narrative.

In the first week students create a character, drawing them and naming them. They do "building belief" exercises such as personality profiles and writing about what each character's prize possession might be. Students are placed into teams, usually three per class, ensuring at least one friend for each student. In the second week the student's follow some written prompts to introduce their characters, writing as the voice of their character. Students write out good copies from teacher edited drafts and each team presents to the class by each student reading their chapter out loud. Radioplay takes three lessons a week. The first lesson involves the group planning the chapter and writing the individual draft copies. The second lesson involves writing out the good copies and the third involves presenting their work orally. Teacher prompts are only in place for the first three chapters. In chapter two each team brainstorms and votes for where in the world all their disparate characters will meet and they respond to teacher prompts explaining why their character is making the trip. In chapter three the students brainstorm and vote again as to where they will all come together in one specific place, a place where they can see and describe each other. Once they are all together in one place all plot portents are decided by each team. They create plot skeletons and write to those specific agreed upon events. These plot skeletons may also create spaces for characters to dialogue with each other. Teams not only have autonomy over their plot portents, but also when they choose to end their team's adventure. In ending Radioplay, they may choose to write to an agreed upon plot skeletons or write their own endings, including writing about what happens to the other characters.

My years using the Radioplay process in my teaching inspired this research. I needed to test the efficacy of Radioplay, using a different teacher and a different class of students. I had been too close to the process to analyze it. By repeating a similar process to mimic my original approach, I thus removed myself as a participant so I could view the Radioplay process and effects from the perspective of a researcher. Therefore, the focus of this thesis is on the Case Study research, using the new teacher and her students. This Case Study research sets out an investigation into the pedagogical process of Radioplay as a successful teaching instrument.

I developed this written role drama process for literacy whilst working as a teacher in Canada. It was created to meet the needs of a special education class with extremely low literacy levels in grades 8 and 9. It was successful in meeting the diverse needs of the students and I observed positive engagement and academic improvement. I went on to use the process for over 20 years of my teaching career with both mainstream classes and special needs classes in grades 3 through 12. The observed success of the approach prompted this formal inquiry. I was particularly inspired to turn to existing literature that may account for my perceived success of Radioplay.

1.2 The Literature Review

This thesis examines theories that may explain the phenomenon that is my "Radioplay" process. I am seeking answers as to why the students expressed such positive attitudes and behavior throughout the process. Why did they write more and more as Radioplay unfolded as the process continued? Why did their written expression and technical skills improve so much? In short, what are the variables that explain the success of this written role drama process that I developed, this process I call Radioplay? This thesis presents the results of a new, empirical inquiry research into the Radioplay process, through the lens of four key theories that have emerged and are featured in the literature review.

The literature review features importantly in the methodology and data analysis aspects of this descriptive case study research. I am using the methods of Deductive Thematic Analysis, which means that the literature sets the filters through which the data will be viewed. The four informing theories that are central to this case analysis feature themes, or constructs, which advise my data collection and analytical process throughout this research (Punch, 2009; Saracho, 2017; Wisker, 2015). The four salient theories are:

1. Drama in Education Theory

    I am looking at drama pedagogy, or Drama in Education theory to understand the key themes, or constructs, involved in writing in role and literacy (B. K. Lee, Patali, Cauthon, & Steingut, 2015; Ozbek, 2014). The constructs of autonomy through

choice, and relatedness through collaboration, feature prominently in drama

education processes (Aitken, Fraser, & Price, 2007; Johnson & O'Neill, 1984).

2. Student Engagement Theory

There is consensus in the research community for the Student Engagement Theory

featuring the key constructs of emotional engagement, behavioral engagement, and

cognitive engagement (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004; Hart, Stewart, &

Jimerson, 2011).

3. Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) identifies key constructs needed for

students to be intrinsically motivated. They are autonomy, relatedness, and

perceived competence (Appleton, Christenson, Kim, & Reschly, 2006; Skinner,

Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009).

4. Creativity Theory

Calls for creative teaching and teaching for creativity have become louder, especially

within discussions and policy around "innovations for the 21st century" (Noddings,

2013). The two main constructs of Creativity Theory are autonomy and collaboration,

aligning Creativity Theory with both Drama in Education theory and Self-

Determination Theory (Ahmadi & Besancon, 2017; Amabile, 1997; McWilliam &

Haukka, 2008).

I was beginning to see a pattern, a design. I now agree with Sawyer (2004) who

says that effective teaching is creative teaching that motivates and engages students.

The six key constructs identified in these four salient theories are the factors that

improve learning and motivation. They inform the analysis of the research data. They are:

1. Emotional engagement,

2. Behavioral engagement,

3. Cognitive engagement,

4. A learner's sense of autonomy,

5. A sense of collaboration/relatedness, and

6. A student's perceived sense of competence (Bengtsson, 2016; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014; Yin, 2011).

These are constructs based in theory; well-researched, empirically tested, and have found consensus in the educational and social research community (Fredricks et al., 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This research uses these theories to explain the phenomenon that is Radioplay, through the methods of Deductive Analysis.

1.3 Gaps in the Literature

One of the main benefits of Radioplay is that it provides a meaningful context within which to teach many different aspects of a literacy curriculum. It focuses on a <u>classroom context</u> for a teaching innovation, representing an area of research that seems to be under-represented in the research (Lawson & Lawson, 2013).

There are many studies presenting statistical data on whether students are engaged at school or not. Few of these studies use the words of the students themselves as data. Fewer still are related to a specific innovation carried out in a classroom context. This can also be said for a study that investigates for all three engagement constructs at the same time and for the same activity or context.

Engagement theory and Self-Determination Theory are often both identified within engagement research. It is acknowledged that engagement motivates students and students who are motivated are engaged. This being true, I could find no studies in which all constructs from both theories are investigated at the same time and within the same context. This Radioplay case study specifically looks for indicators of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement, as well as the constructs outlined in Self-Determination Theory. It is classroom and context specific. In this case-study research I examine the survey responses of the students, as well as the observational notes and question responses from the teacher. I also analyze the students' writing in light of the relevant constructs.

Creativity theory is often overlooked in studies focused on student engagement and motivation. Creativity research has featured the constructs important to engaging and

motivating students; the constructs of autonomy and relatedness. These two constructs are also the basis of Drama in Education theory and form two of the three constructs within Self-Determination Theory.

My descriptive case study research on the Radioplay process adds to the existing research on the use of drama, specifically role-play, as a vehicle to empower and engage students in a literacy program. This use of role-drama in the creation of student narrative compositions has been an area that is neglected according to Crumpler (2005, p. 358). My research focuses specifically in this area.

Also, I apply the theory of Drama in Education and trial a pedagogy which uses role-play to motivate students and increase student engagement in a literacy program. In my reflective study (Appendix 1 of this thesis) on the creation and use of Radioplay I noted that it was within the Radioplay process that students produced their best writing for me. I had limited numbers of students' "good" (edited and revised) copies of Radioplay, but no copies of their rough drafts. Therefore, although I observed that the students' written work improved, I felt I could not analyse their work properly in terms of the quality of their output. In this new Case Study research, I had access to students' rough drafts and was able to undertake a qualitative and quantitative analysis of their written work, looking for evidence of improved literacy outcomes. Access to students' rough drafts allowed for a more accurate measure to support my observation that students write more and more words in each successive chapter. Consequently, in order to test this observation, quantitative data in the form of word counts for each and all students' chapters was recorded as an indication of behavioural engagement identified as persistence and effort (Fredricks et al., 2004; Lo & Hyland, 2007). The initial assumption that students write more as the Radioplay process progresses was validated here.

Fredricks et al. (2004) call for new directions in engagement research that I endeavour to address. Unlike some studies on student engagement, my study focuses on all three facets of the engagement construct- behavioural, emotional, and cognitive elements, simultaneously. This is something that has not been done before according to

6

Fredricks et al. (2004, p. 11). In addition, my study incorporates multi-method, observational, and pattern analysis techniques suggested by these same researchers (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 13). Hart et al. (2011) also focus on the three facets of the engagement construct identified (emotional, behavioural and cognitive) stating, "…an obvious challenge remains for researchers of student engagement in parsing out the characteristics of each component" (p. 68). This is both a challenge for my study and a goal. A key feature of my study, which aims to add to existing research, is a focus on the students' perspectives. The students were asked open survey questions where their opinions of working within the Radioplay process were shared. Harcourt and Keen (2012) feel the words of the students themselves are of critical importance to fully understand learner engagement. A unique feature of my study is that I am looking at how a very particular classroom activity (the process of Radioplay) affects student engagement. Burch, Heller, Burch, Freed, and Steed (2015) calls for measures of engagement to be tied to a specific classroom innovation, not school in general. This Radioplay Descriptive Case Study is context specific by design.

1.4 Significance

In 'Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis', I further discuss that my Radioplay case study research is purposefully classroom context rich and tied to a specific innovative process for delivering literacy goals. The data includes the actual words of the students and teacher. Students responded in writing to five survey questions. These responses are analyzed as to how they align with the key constructs identified in the four focus theories. The students' written Radioplay draft chapters are examined for further evidence of engagement and improvement. Observations and reflections from the case study teacher, as well as teacher responses to the researchers' questions are included and analyzed with the same parameters applying to students. Clear and "thick" descriptions of processes and outcomes are provided.

In the concluding remarks, I will argue the significance of this study is that it may inform effective teaching practices that are accessible and applicable to many diverse year level and student program situations. It addresses calls from many educational researchers to examine the variables around engagement, motivation, and creativity within a classroom context that is task specific. The focus here is on literacy, but the applicability of the constructs, featured in theory, cuts across the curriculum and should make educational policy makers aware of its potential to enhance student motivation and engagement in general. Creative teaching is effective teaching. Teachers need the professional freedom to design and "timetable" how they are delivering their programs. Creative teaching does not fit "prescribed day plans" and "prescribed discrete lessons." It requires collaborative experiences with autonomy and support that are sustained over time.

I argue that both practical classroom applications for teaching innovations and providing an understanding of the importance of the constructs identified in the theoretical research is an area of need for both classroom teachers and educational curriculum and policy makers. Making the case for providing meaningful and rich contexts for delivering curriculum goals is another.

1.5 Purpose and Context of Study

I knew from incidental observations that Radioplay seemed to motivate and engage students, but I needed to investigate this phenomenon through formal research. This second investigation into Radioplay was conducted in Canada in 2015/2016. The purpose of this case study was to explore and analyze the experiences of both the teacher and the year four and five students working with a written role drama process for literacy at an elementary classroom in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Through this Descriptive Case Study, I hope to inspire other teachers to try the process in their own classes.

This thesis will now go on to explain and analyze the outcomes of this new Descriptive Case Study investigation into Radioplay as a catalyst for improved motivation

and engagement in literacy. Let us now look at the relevant literature, then the methodology

used and finally, the results of the Vancouver 2015/2016 project.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In keeping with the theoretical framework for this study, this literature review will identify and discuss theory and theoretical perspectives that will inform the research analysis. Four theories salient to this study are analyzed. The data from this case study will be filtered through methods of deductive analysis and content analysis, with specific focus on the theories evident in the relevant literature presented in this chapter. Four theories informing this case study have emerged from the relevant literature and are now analyzed. They are:

1. Drama in Education theory (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984; B. K. Lee et al., 2015), and

2. Creativity Theory (Amabile, 1997) highlight the themes or constructs of collaboration and autonomy.

3. Student Engagement Theory (Fredricks et al., 2004) puts forward the constructs of behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement.

4. Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) is related to engagement theory in that it explains how to stimulate intrinsic motivation, leading to increased engagement. Self-Determination Theory emphasizes relatedness, autonomy, and perceived competence.

In this study I show that these four theories contain within them the six key constructs that become the focus of the Deductive Thematic Analysis methods, explained in the methodology chapter, and used to analyse this study.

These six Key Concepts, drawn from the literature reviewed in this chapter and identified in the Radioplay Case Study data, explain why the Radioplay process increased student motivation and engagement. They are:

1. Emotional engagement

2. Student Collaboration for learning

3. Academic improvement and an increase in the student's perceived comptetence

4. An increased sense of Autonomy in learning

5. Cognitive engagement

6. Behavioral engagement

In this thesis the literature review is important as it serves both the methodology and the analysis. Saracho (2017) tells us that a literature review, "…critically reviews and analyzes research studies and theories in a specific area…presents relationships between them, and how they support the researcher's study" (p. 20). The six key constructs put forward by these four theories do this and are well defined and supported in educational research. The relationship between these theories and their constructs to my study is that the constructs form the basis of my data analysis. The goal of the study is to show the relationship between the Radioplay instructional process, and the six key constructs drawn from the four corresponding theories.

The literature review informs the Radioplay research. Wisker (2015, p. 67) suggests theories will help the researcher to refine the research questions and interpret the data. As recommended by Punch (2009, p. 69) my literature review plays a central role in the planning and question development phase of my research. This study uses "thematic analysis" which involves researching the salient theories that inform data analysis through descriptors of the relevant constructs in the substantial theories. Both research questions and data analysis for the Radioplay study stem from the identified four theories. Wisker (2015) tells us the researcher is, "…situating and articulating new work in a dialogue with established knowledge" (p. 64). My literature review provides the foundation for my data analysis. The research literature, questions, and analysis are all related (Bengtsson, 2016, p. 186). The theories that are examined here in this chapter have been part of established, validated, and peer reviewed dialogues; research imperatives highlighted by Wisker (2015, p. 71). This study closely follows the established theories and their corresponding constructs found in the literature. My own practical and experiential knowledge also features.

The relationship between a methodology using thematic analysis and the literature review is an important one. Nowell, Norris, White, and Moules (2017) explored meeting a "trustworthiness criteria" with thematic analysis. Nowell et al. (2017) cite the researcher Aaronson (1994) telling us, "When the researcher interweaves literature with the findings, the story constructed stands with merit" (p. 11). Nowell et al. (2017) also cite Tuckett (2005), who asserts that researchers may use literature to confirm findings (p. 11). I demonstrate how my research study aligns with constructs within the contexts of the theories reviewed, as well as offering an original contribution to the field.

This literature review is comprised of three papers which together explore the four theories and the six key constructs relevant to the methodology, analysis, and findings of this research. The first paper, *"Drama Pedagogy, Creativity, and Empowerment: Theoretical Perspectives and Frameworks"*, uncovers the basic constructs of student autonomy and the collaboration inherent in Creativity Theory and Drama in Education. The second paper, *"Academic Engagement and Achievement: Research Considerations"*, explores the key constructs included in the Student Engagement Theory. I seek to include engagement constructs that have research validity and consensus. The term "academic engagement" is used extensively in the research I reviewed. For my purposes I needed to know whether it was referencing a process, a product, or both. I needed to know if the construct "academic engagement" had research validity. Three constructs of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement are well defined and have both research validity and acceptance. However, the same cannot be said for "academic engagement" in existing literature. Consequently, instead of "academic engagement", or "academic improvement", I focus on the students' and teacher's perceptions of improvement in abilities.

The focus on theories and constructs continues in the third paper of the Literature Review, *"Role of the Teacher: Architect or Reactor? Agentic Engagement Versus Autonomy in Self-Determination Theory"*. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) (Ryan & Deci, 2000) is tied to student engagement theory in that its three constructs of autonomy, relatedness, and perceived competence feature importantly in creating the intrinsic

motivation that facilitates student engagement. These SDT constructs are defined and described. I take "perceived competence", identified in Self-Determination Theory, as a perception of academic improvement and a "can do" attitude. Some engagement theory researchers put forward the construct of "agentic engagement". I needed to know whether the construct of "agentic engagement" had validity and acceptance in the research community and whether it differed from the autonomy called for in Self-Determination Theory. This third paper of the Literature Review argues that the construct called "agentic engagement" is flawed, and I reject the proposition put forward by Reeve and Tseng (2011) that it is the students who determine or illicit the level of autonomy they experience in their classes. I argue instead for the importance of the teacher's role in delivering autonomy to students.

2.2 Part 1 of the Literature Review: Drama Pedagogy, Creativity, and Empowerment: Exemplars of Effective Teaching Practice

2.2.1 Introduction

This section of the Literature Review examines theoretical formulations for drama pedagogy and creativity in education. There are many features common to both, especially when viewed in the context of empowerment and relationship theories, and effective teaching practices.

"Drama in Education", (DIE), may be an empowering pedagogy, and an effective and creative teaching approach for realizing a broad spectrum of curricular goals. Using drama as a teaching pedagogy has been termed "Drama in Education" when applied to the use of drama techniques to deliver curricular goals in a wide variety of subjects (Ozbek, 2014), and this term will be used throughout the thesis. Simply put, "Drama-based pedagogy describes a collection of drama-based teaching and learning strategies to engage students in learning" (B. K. Lee et al., 2015, p. 1). Pretend or pretence play is closely linked to creativity. Simulations to promote learning are common in many fields, especially in medical training and the military. Kirkham and Kidd (2015) study the links between creativity and pretence

play in primary aged children. The researchers look for correlation between creative thinking and performance on a "pretend action task". Kirkham and Kidd (2017) state that there is,

a significant positive correlation between pretence and creativity in the current

sample, supporting previous research suggesting that these skills are related. (p. 20)

Other researchers call for more multisite studies focusing on pretend play and the whole creativity construct (Russ & Wallace, 2013). Tan (2015) looks at how to make creativity flourish, calling for "contextualizing learning" and "providing for serendipity, imagination, and play" (p. 161). Conklin (2014) looks at the relationship between "joyful learning" and play with learners in the middle grades. The fit between drama pedagogy for education and creativity for education is salient.

This investigation of drama pedagogy, creativity in education, and empowerment seeks to answer these questions:

1. How does the concept of empowerment relate to Drama in Education and creativity in education?

2. How do drama pedagogy and creativity theories inform our knowledge of effective teaching practice?

Theories of empowerment will be examined to uncover the elements or conditions necessary to facilitate it. What is common in these theories is the importance of relationships. Relationships are at the core of Drama in Education techniques for the classroom (Aitken et al., 2007; Prentki & Stinson, 2016). To understand the elements of drama pedagogy that are empowering it is necessary to understand the importance of relationships, between the teacher and the students and the students to each other. It is here where the shift in power begins.

Noddings (2013) states that, "THREE GREAT AIMS for 21st century education appear in policy statements worldwide: cooperation, critical thinking, and creativity" (p. 210). McWilliam and Haukka (2008) argue for the promotion of "creative capital", which they say is most valuable in education. They define it as:

…the human ingenuity and high-level problem-solving skill that leads to fresh

opportunities, ideas, products, and modes of social engagement. (McWilliam &

Haukka, 2008, p. 652)

Promoting these qualities for both students and teachers should be the focus for

education. Ahmadi and Besancon (2017, p. 1) also agree that creativity is a 21st century

skill, listing collaboration, critical thinking, and meta-cognition as variables within the

construct. These researchers state:

Creativity…has become one of the key competencies to be implemented in

classrooms. However, some studies highlight teachers' difficulties to integrate it into

classroom context…introducing creativity in overloaded school curricula may be a

hindrance to developing it. (Ahmadi & Besancon, 2017, p. 1)

Ahmadi and Besancon (2017) point out that, "…creativity is not much integrated in

classroom curriculum" (p. 3). Integrating creativity into the curriculum may be accomplished

through the teaching methodology used to deliver it. Drama in Education teaching

techniques provide a meaningful context within which to deliver curriculum goals from a

variety of subject disciplines. These processes could provide a vehicle for delivering

creativity competencies to learners.

Craft, Jeffrey, and Leibling (2001) look at the current discourse on creativity and

creativity in education. In their book "Creativity in Education", the editors Craft et al. (2001)

tell us they see the discourse on creativity as, "…acting as a possible vehicle for individual

empowerment in institutions and organizations" (Jeffrey & Craft, 2001, p. 1). They review *All

Our Futures: Creativity, Culture, and Education* created by the National Advisory Committee

on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCE) Report (1999) by the British government. The

NACCE report, "distinguishes between teaching creatively and teaching for creativity" (pp.

21, 22). Teaching creatively is different from teaching *for* creativity. Craft et al. (2001)

summarize the report:

Teaching creatively is defined as 'teachers using imaginative approaches to make

learning more interesting, exciting and effective' and teaching for creativity as 'forms

of teaching that are intended to develop young people's own creative thinking or behavior' (NACCE, 1999, p. 89). (pp. 21, 22)

The researchers Apiola, Lattu, and Pasanen (2012) put forward a model for a "creativity-supporting learning environment (CSLE)", identifying components such as cognitive processes that include constructionism, autonomy, and relatedness, among others (pp. 10–11). Craft et al. (2001) feel strongly about the link between creativity, empowerment, and effective teaching, telling us:

> We suggest that where contributors are developing the idea of 'teaching for creativity', the major consequence for teachers and learners is a 'creativity for empowerment'. Where they focus on 'creative teaching' they appear to be suggesting that it is an 'effective pedagogy'. (p. 5)

Creativity, empowerment, and effective teaching are linked together here, just as drama pedagogy, empowerment, and effective teaching are linked. The teaching methodology 'Drama in Education' is an imaginative approach, a form of teaching creatively. Students are engaged and enthusiastic participants. It also fits with many of the elements specified as teaching for creativity, as students are put into imaginary contexts that challenge thinking. This will become evident as we focus explicitly on this teaching methodology.

Heathcote, a leading drama educator, developed her DIE techniques specifically to empower her students. Inspired by the work of Freire, Drama in Education, as Dorothy Heathcote sought to create it, is a critical and transformative pedagogy, looking to solve the problems of the world (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984). Colin Lankshear, known for his work in critical literacies, worked closely with Freire and is a contributor in the book "Paulo Freire on Higher Education, a Dialogue at The National University of Mexico" (Escobar, Fernandez, Guevera-Niebla, & Freire, 1987, 1994). The work of Heathcote anchors this section of the Literature Review. I will be examining the techniques and efficacy of Heathcote's role-drama, teacher-in-role and mantle of the expert through the frame of Lankshear's conceptual model of empowerment (cited in Escobar et al., 1987, 1994).

Cultivating creative skills and capacities is critically important in teacher education programs. Prospective teachers need to know the theoretical perspectives and frameworks, informed by research, that form the foundation of effective teaching. Drama pedagogy, because of its theoretical foundations, is an exemplar of both creative and effective teaching, as well as teaching for creativity in students. DIE is an effective teaching technique for achieving curriculum goals across a wide perspective, and not just within the drama classroom. It is hoped that more teachers will adopt elements of DIE to enhance and enrich their teaching in the classroom.

2.2.2 Empowerment, relationship theory, creativity and drama pedagogy

Seth Kriesberg (1992) explores the concept of empowerment with regards to education in his book "Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education". This definition of empowerment is put forward in the preface of the book, by Sharon Welch (1992) of Harvard University:

Empowerment is the ability to make a difference, to participate in decision making, and to take action for change. Empowerment does not assume control of resisting others but emerges from work with others, who are also deciding, acting, and making a difference. (p. XI)

Empowerment happens in concert with others, and relationships become vital to the phenomenon. The work of Kriesberg (1992, p. 197) explains how the two variables, empowerment and relationship can be linked, and how teachers can facilitate empowerment for both themselves and their students, in a classroom situation. In the light of works by Mary Parker Follet and other feminist scholars, Kriesberg (1992, p. 154) argues that relationships of power-sharing with students is a great challenge. Kriesberg (1992) questions the status quo in teaching, telling us:

What we "know" from our experiences is teacher-dominated teaching: Teachers talk a lot; teachers control students; teachers transmit knowledge. Students have little or no choice or control over their learning. Learning is competitive, lonely. Teachers

17

know everything. Teachers have power. Students do not. Learning can be boring, disconnected, alienating. (p. 199)

Kriesberg (1992) studied teachers that empower students, and became mindful of the importance of relationships. He suggests that teachers who want to empower their students must create "…radically different power relationships" with them (p. 197). He is referring specifically to a supportive atmosphere, which incorporates dialogue and decision making that is shared. He sees this as crucial in creating experiences where empowerment can occur (Kriesberg, 1992, p. 165). Additionally, Kriesberg (1992, p. 191) points out that power is always experienced in the relationships we have with other people.

The inspirational writings of Paulo Freire (1970, 1996) about education for empowerment includes the notion that empowerment is a social act, grounded in relationships, with a potential to result in positive social change. Freire suggests that through empowerment and positive relationships, teachers may direct and educate students. Further stressing of the importance of relationships, of 'power with', comes from Freire's comment about the place for teacher control within the work. Friere states:

I have to be radically democratic and responsible and directive. Not directive of the students, but directive of the process, in which students are with me. As director of the process, the liberating teacher is not doing something to the students but with the students. (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 46)

Freire is talking about a shift in power occurring in the relationship between the teacher and the student. Power is shared.

Three key themes resonate throughout the discourse for both creativity in education and DIE; relationships, collaboration, and empowerment. In the book "Creativity and Education", Harris (2016) acknowledges the importance of these themes:

…the demands of creativity, which are primarily practices that include: risk-taking, decentralizing of power in learning processes and relationships, and collaboration. (p. 36)

18

Harris (2016, p. 16) cites the work of Amabile, a seminal researcher in the field of creativity, who asserts that for creativity to be promoted within the classroom, teachers must let go of some of their power. Amabile and Harris both acknowledge that this idea is frightening for many teachers (Harris, 2016, pp. 16, 36). Craft (2003, p. 113) talks about creative skill as fostering empowerment at the collective and individual level. Craft (2003) cites the work of Maslow (1970), telling us that he was perhaps the first to understand the connection of empowerment to creativity, telling us:

> …that the creative individual is a fulfilled one; and one whose life is characterized by 'agency'-the capacity to take control and make something of it. (p. 114)

Other researchers of creativity share this perspective. Sawyer (2005, p. 45) talks about facilitating creativity through teachers relinquishing control and that students should be allowed to, at least partially, guide the class. Collard and Looney's (2014) paper "Nurturing Creativity in Education" concur, stating:

> Creative classrooms are thus student-centred, and as expressed by the popular maxim, teachers take on the role of 'guide by the side' rather than 'sage on the stage'. (p. 351)

Collard and Looney (2014) stress the importance of "supporting learner autonomy" if we wish to promote creativity (p. 357). Apiola et al. (2012) tell us, "Higher feelings of autonomy or freedom tend to be related to higher levels of intrinsic motivation and creativity" (p. 7). Here Apiola et al. are drawing on the work of Amabile (1985) who focuses on organizational creativity. Amabile (1985, p. 39) asserts that intrinsic motivation promotes the most creativity. Amabile (1985) explains the relationship between a "social environment", intrinsic motivation, and creativity:

> …I have discovered in 20 years of research that a person's social environment can have a significant effect on that person's level of intrinsic motivation at any point in time; the level of intrinsic motivation can, in turn, have a significant effect on that person's creativity. (p. 40)

The social environment Amabile refers to bears directly on the themes of relationship and collaboration. Relationship theory bears directly on the collaboration required to promote creativity. Creativity research directions have a major focus within a "social psychological framework" acknowledging the importance of social structures in promoting the creativity of individuals (Craft, 2003, p. 116; Sawyer, 2005, p. 42). This enabling climate for creativity includes collaborative interactions with teachers and peers and the ability to take initiative (Craft, 2003, p. 120). These collaborative social structures require organization. In his paper "Educating for Innovation", Sawyer (2005) tells us, "In today's knowledge society, creativity always occurs in complex collaborative and organizational settings" (p. 41).

Collaboration and community are fundamental to the realization of relationships. In Drama in Education processes students make decisions collectively, share power with the teacher, and all work collaboratively. Cahill (2002) talks about the special place for drama, through its focus on collaboration, to impact upon students' needs, especially "belonging and purpose" (p. 25). The need to belong is basic to humankind. Cahill, in pointing to the basic need of belonging, confirms the potential for drama pedagogy to enhance this centrality of relationships.

Some scholars believe, as an editorial by Prentki and Stinson (2016) makes the case, that relational pedagogies must provide the frame for formal education and propose that drama should be placed at the "centre of curriculum" (p. 2). Regarding drama, the authors state, "Respectful relationships based on a foundation of trust and the willingness to undertake shared acts of imagination are at the heart of drama" (Prentki & Stinson, 2016, p. 5). Prentki and Stinson (2016) also feel that "Drama develops a sense of personal agency, a revelation that students are able to make/do something rather than having something done to them" (p. 6). Prentki and Stinson (2016) recognize that relational pedagogies are at the heart of Drama in Education methods.

2.2.3 Lankshear's conceptual model of empowerment framing Heathcote's method: Drama in education processes and efficacy evidence

Dorothy Heathcote developed her method of Drama in Education to give empowerment to her students. Anderson (2012) calls Heathcote, "…the most dominant figure on the drama education landscape over the last 30 years" (p. 32). Heathcote's techniques developed from her underlying values and beliefs about what education should be and what it should accomplish, namely social empowerment. Heathcote's goal is for students to participate actively for positive change in society. Inspired by the work of Paulo Freire (1970), the creation of the format for her work is based on a conscious desire to achieve a liberating education for social action (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 192). Heathcote's DIE structures and processes will be introduced and analysed within a conceptual model of empowerment.

Colin Lankshear (as cited in Escobar et al., 1987, 1994) puts forward a conceptual model of empowerment in concert with the writing of Freire. An Adjunct Professor at James Cook University in Queensland, Lankshear's research specialty is literacy, critical literacy, and language (Lankshear, 1987). He is a contributing author in the book "Paulo Freire on Higher Education, a Dialogue at the National University of Mexico" (Escobar et al., 1987, 1994). Lankshear lists four variables to focus pedagogical activity within his conceptual model of empowerment. The first is the subject of empowerment, in this case, the students. The second are the power structures, identified here as knowledge. The third involves the processes by which empowerment occurs. The fourth looks at the outcomes of empowerment, which should lead to social action (as cited in Escobar et al., 1994, pp. 166–182). This model of empowerment was chosen to frame this analysis for several reasons. Heathcote was inspired by the work of Freire and his insights into a "liberating education". Another reason is its fit with the creative endeavours within DIE activities. Lankshear tells us, "It is one thing to advance a conceptual model and assert claims for its potential usefulness in focusing pedagogical activity; it is another, however, to demonstrate its usefulness by means of examples and creative applications" (as cited in Escobar et al.,

1994, p. 166). Heathcote's processes and structures for Drama in Education will be examined through the four variables identified by Lankshear. The focus will be on the fit between the pedagogical methods of DIE, the "examples and creative applications", and how they contribute to empowerment and effective teaching.

2.2.3.1 Subject in the Lankshear Model of Empowerment

In Lankshear's conceptual model of empowerment "subject" applies to "cooperative members generally and collectively" (as cited in Escobar et al., 1994, pp. 179–180). Collaboration is implied here, a relationship existing between "members" working together. Heathcote constructs Drama in Education activities in such a way as to allow children to use their own words and terms (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 56). Heathcote (p. 85) wants to ensure that students can bring themselves into the situation. Heathcote respects the intellect of the students. She is interested in starting from where the students are and accepting their contributions without judgement (Heathcote, p. 90). Role play is an activity where student views are explored. This DIE process resonates with requirements for creative thinking that include, "…a cognitive style favourable to taking new perspectives on problems" (Amabile, 1997, p. 43). In role-drama the students are not pretending to be other characters, only themselves in imagined situations. During the role play the students, working together, "…test their own values, sense the importance of these values, and begin to assert themselves candidly and maturely" (Wagner, 1998, p. 228). Heathcote views the subject of her practice, the students, from the standpoint of empowerment.

The research of Aitken et al. (2007) looks at "Negotiating the Spaces: Relational Pedagogy and Power in Drama Teaching". The researchers' term of "negotiated spaces" applies to those which occur in the real and fictional worlds between the students and the teacher. The researchers discuss the findings from a collaborative research project spanning a two-year period involving elementary teachers and higher education researchers. This combination of ethnography, self-study, case study and action research is called the "Art of the Matter" and its focus is on the drama findings (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 4). The authors tell us that they explore, "Salient issues of trust, power sharing, and metaxis, which

are part of relational pedagogy in the drama classroom" (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 1). They explain that "metaxis" refers to the state of the children being safe and more empowered within the fictional world, allowing them to "…try things out in an authentic way with the safety of the 'no penalty' awareness" (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 10). The focus of the study is on the use of the 'teacher-in-role' drama strategy (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 13). The researchers' interest is in looking closely at how classroom drama practices "manifest" relational pedagogy; how the power relationship between students and the teacher is altered (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 2). An example of this is described with regards to improvisation activities while teaching in role. What is noteworthy is the fact that both teachers and students are taking risks alongside one another, which becomes empowering (Aitken et al., 2007, p. 7). Again, we see the importance of sharing power with the students. Power sharing is central in this study by Aitken et al. (2007), and here the researchers record the teachers' findings with regards to the students. They tell us:

> Their increased agency led to real engagement and, we suggest, real learning…the process gave them license to stand up for what they believed without fear of censure or criticism…The teacher researchers commented on how many of the children grew socially in unanticipated ways. They noted some shy children became braver, quiet children being more assertive, and disruptive children learning to become more focused and engaged. (Aitken et al., 2007, pp. 8, 9)

In conclusion, Aitken et al. (2007) state, "Power is always present in relational pedagogy" (p. 15). Power sharing, the shifting of power from the teacher to the students, is central to Drama in Education pedagogy. Aitken et al. (2007) connect "real learning", relational pedagogy, and DIE processes.

2.2.3.2 Power Structures in the Lankshear Model of Empowerment

The power structures here relate to theories of knowledge. Lankshear tells us that questions regarding the construct of knowledge deal with how powerful knowledge is controlled, how students gain access to it and whether they are given opportunities to remake knowledge, to produce it for themselves (Escobar et al., 1987, pp. 180, 181).

Heathcote believes that knowledge must undergo the scrutiny of critical reflection, that context bears an influence on the perception of the knowledge. In this manner Heathcote seeks to provide opportunities for her students to remake knowledge and make it their own. Heathcote feels this is how power is given to the students, "…power to influence their own construct of the meaning of the event" (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 132). Heathcote wants students to form their own constructions of knowledge.

Dorothy Heathcote developed the role-drama technique called "mantle of the expert". Students are asked to take on the roles of experts to solve problems or come up with solutions within the drama (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 192). The use of this technique has been the focus of research to determine its efficacy as a form of the learning approach called social constructivism. Fraser, Aitken, Price, and Whyte (2012) use three case studies to explore "Inquiry learning, drama and curriculum integration". The researchers tell us:

> Inquiry learning is founded on a social constructivist approach to learning, in that it is based on the assumption that knowledge is built from individual and collaborative endeavour rather than didactic teaching practices. (Fraser et al., 2012, p. 33)

This study focuses on the technique of mantle of the expert. They explain:

> Mantle of the Expert has several features that enhance inquiry learning: a fictional yet authentic content; a repositioning of students as experts; the affective nature of the engagement; and the requirement to engage ethically with issues as they arise. (Fraser et al., 2012, p. 32)

The study finds that the use of mantle of the expert enhances inquiry learning experiences. Inquiry learning, with its roots in social constructivism, is an example of an effective teaching practice. Coates (2010) studies effective teaching practices, finding evidence of the importance of this "…constructionist approach to knowledge and collaboration with peers" (p. 6). The efficacy of DIE for curriculum subjects other than drama, (integrated within the curriculum), will perhaps lead to more teachers considering it for use as a teaching methodology.

2.2.3.3 Processes in the Lankshear Model of Empowerment

In the third variable of his conceptual model of empowerment, Lankshear (as cited in Escobar et al., 1994) tells us it is important to look at the processes "…by which, and qualities through which, cooperative members took on new positions in relation to the discursive production and allocation of power" (p. 181). These "new positions of power" indicate change in the power dynamics between the teacher and student within the DIE activity.

The processes of DIE involve role-drama, with students and, at times the teacher, working in role, and the role-drama technique called "mantle of the expert', introduced in the previous section. In mantle of the expert role dramas, students are cast as experts who must "find out" and make decisions. Again, power is shared as the teacher here acts as a "guide from the side". Further research uncovers its effectiveness at delivering curriculum goals. Adopting a "reflective practitioner approach" (p. 64), Stevenson (2014) explores the outcomes of a project researching the effectiveness of drama for delivering science curriculum goals in a middle school classroom. The research project is conducted by the class teacher, who uses Heathcote's mantle of the expert technique to cast the students as experts within a science lab. Stevenson (2014) concludes:

> …drama pedagogy, when employed in science learning, can have a dynamic effect on the learners. Three major themes were identified; engagement (including fun); …empowerment for students through choice and freedom; and the development of a sense of belonging. (p. 64)

He goes on to cite William Glasser's (1998) Choice Theory that states "…we are all driven to satisfy our five basic needs: survival, love and belonging, power, freedom and fun" (p. 65). In the study's findings Stevenson (2014) concludes that optimal learning involves "…a change in the role of teacher…active and inquiry-based learning" (p. 64). Drama activities are the most popular for engagement (Stevenson, 2014, p. 69). By pointing to 'conditions for optimal learning', Stevenson is highlighting elements of effective practice for teaching.

2.2.3.4 Outcomes in the Lankshear Model of Empowerment

Improved outcomes should be the product of empowerment. Lankshear tells us this fourth variable in his conceptual model of empowerment comes with a varied range of benefits which may include, "enhanced experience of control…higher levels of personal fulfillment" (as cited in Escobar et al., 1994, p. 182). The outcomes of empowerment need not always lead to social action, but may enhance an individual's perception of agency and be more fulfilling, contrary to the intention of Heathcote (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 178), who sees the need for schools to be more oriented to social action and to impact upon society. Heathcote (p. 186) believes that knowledge should be activated by practice focused on the needs and interests of humanity. From the words of Heathcote (as cited in Johnson & O'Neill, 1984), "I seek to use my art of teaching and the art of drama in the service for a process of change" (p. 199). Teachers wanting to enhance the learning experience of their students need not be put off by this exhortation to social action.

Outcomes of Drama in Education processes have also been studied for achievement outcomes. A synthesis of research with a primary focus on empirical studies from 1985-2012 was conducted on "The Effect of Drama-Based Pedagogy on PreK-16 Outcomes" by B. K. Lee et al. (2015). The researchers review 47 quasi-experimental studies, employing both an experimental and nonrandomized control group, to examine the efficacy of Drama-Based Pedagogy (DPB). The researchers acknowledge that not having randomly assigned control groups is a limitation methodologically, in which biased findings can result (16). Allowing for the fact that the studies "…were largely weak for making causal inferences" (B. K. Lee et al., 2015, p. 1) and that, "In all, research findings have largely revealed inconsistent findings across most categories of outcomes" (B. K. Lee et al., 2015, p. 4), the researchers presented these, among other, findings:

> A meta-analysis of this research suggested that DPB has a positive significant impact on achievement outcomes in educational setting. Effects were strongest when the intervention…was integrated into English language arts or science curriculum compared to other domains. (B. K. Lee et al., 2015, p. 1)

DPB should be considered a viable pedagogical method for teachers to raise

achievement outcomes alongside other research-based instructional methods…the

meaningful use of DPB in the classroom not only raises student academic

achievement but also improves students' attitudes toward that academic discipline.

(B. K. Lee et al., 2015, p. 14)

The researchers find that drama pedagogy provides an effective method for

classroom instruction, especially for English language arts and science curriculums. B. K.

Lee et al. (2015) also list a variety of areas that are impacted by this method, with academic

achievement being especially important. Doing drama doesn't just feel good, it gets results.

2.2.4 Drama pedagogy, creativity, and new literacies

Creative teaching and teaching for creativity are inherent to the theoretical

foundations of drama pedagogy. Using drama pedagogy to teach literacy can facilitate and

improve students' participation and performance with the new literacies by giving them

practice collaborating and creating with others. Drama in Education processes afford

autonomy to the students, an important feature for both the teaching of creativity and the

new literacies.

Lankshear and Knobel (2018) explore issues around the new literacies in their article

"Education and 'new literacies' in the middle years". They explain that the new literacies:

…are mediated by digital electronic tools rather than analogue tools like typographic

print, film-based cameras, or gramophone record production machines…now the

'one tool' can be used to generate-in a seamless operation using the same platform-

a multimedia creation". (Lankshear & Knobel, 2018, p. 8)

The new literacies require the technical abilities of the computer and the internet.

Like Drama in Education processes and the requirements for creativity, collaboration is an

important foundation. Lankshear and Knobel (2018) tell us that at a structural level, students

working with the new literacies:

…encounter a profoundly social approach to learning, driven by shared passions,

and steeped in collaboration and companionship. (p. 8)

Lankshear and Knobel (2018) close their discussion of the new literacies by stressing again the structural shifts inherent in their classroom use:

Attending to the structure of new literacies (e.g., participatory culture, social practices, affinity spaces, appreciative systems) necessarily shifts the structure of schooling away from a concern with learning *about* stuff and towards learning to collaborate, contribute, share, understand, resource, empathise etc. as new ways of learning to *be* in the world. (p. 15)

Current research into learning environments supportive of creativity stress the importance of variables such as autonomy, relatedness, and constructionism. These same variables are at the heart of the teaching methodology known as Drama in Education, with its emphasis on freedom through choice, collaboration, and constructionism. Research evidence with a focus on fostering creativity in students highlights collaboration through teamwork (Harris, 2016, p. 44). The point that Harris (2016, p. 67) stresses is the collective nature of creativity. Harris (2016, p. 68) advises teachers striving to design lessons nurturing creativity to ensure autonomy features for both themselves and their students.

The variables of autonomy and collaboration are inherent in the new literacies. Perhaps through illustrating how lessons can facilitate these variables, teachers may be open to experimenting and incorporating these teaching techniques into their repertoire. The nature of the internet and our interactions within it are giving rise to the new literacies. Lankshear and Knobel (2006) put forward the idea that through increased networking there is increased participation and collaboration, making us producers and not just consumers. The authors point to the web practices of sharing and remixing ideas, of commenting and meming and their effect on learning and knowledge building (Merchant, 2007, p. 178).

The processes inherent in drama pedagogy may inform and enhance teaching practices focused on teaching for creativity and teaching for the new literacies.

2.2.5 Conclusion

Cultivating creative skills and capacities is critically important in teacher education programs and professional development for practicing teachers. Teaching practices that

nurture creativity and teaching practices that are creative, both align with effective teaching practices. Drama pedagogy, because of its theoretical foundations, is an exemplar of both creative and effective teaching, as well as teaching for creativity.

New learning environment research focuses on ways that creativity in the classroom can be supported. Variables such as constructionism, relatedness, and learner autonomy have been identified as important. Drama in Education processes promote autonomy through individual and group choice, constructionism, and collaboration. Theories of empowerment examined highlight a common thread of the importance of relationships. Creativity theory and research are relevant to these discussions.

Heathcote's "Drama in Education" techniques such as role-drama, teacher-in-role and mantle of the expert can be framed within a conceptual model of empowerment. Studies focused on the use of these techniques for curricular instruction were reviewed for evidence of academic efficacy. Drama pedagogy is a teaching methodology for use across the curriculum. It offers a myriad of creative approaches for engaging students in learning and nurturing their own creativity.

Teachers can be supported in developing creative teaching techniques and techniques that promote creativity in their students through access and exposure to "theoretical knowledge and practical methods" (Apiola et al., 2012, p. 20). Craft et al. (2001, p. 1) see current discourses in creativity as being useful in focusing efforts to develop effective learning practices, and urge that teachers could lead the way in promoting creative teaching and learning opportunities in the classroom (Craft et al., 2001, p. 32). The New Zealand Curriculum, published by the Ministry of Education in 2007, lists variables of best practice. Fraser et al. (2012) say that, "Evidence tells us that students learn best when teachers:

1. create a supportive learning environment

2. encourage reflective thought and action

3. enhance the relevance of new learning

4. facilitate shared learning

29

5. make connections to prior learning and experience

6. provide sufficient opportunities to learn

7. inquire into the teaching-learning relationship. (p. 35)

These elements of effective teaching practice are processes identified as having a positive impact on student learning and may be realized using practices from Drama in Education pedagogy, a creative teaching methodology.

Creative teaching is effective teaching. Sawyer (2004) tells us creative teaching is being promoted in education because "…it results in deeper understanding among learners" (p. 12). Craft et al. (2001) write about teaching for creativity, reviewing research recently done on learning, telling us, "This work emphasizes that learning is a situated, social process, dependent on interaction and communication" (p. 179). Here, these researchers are talking about collaboration. Researchers writing about "Creativity and Collaboration in the Education Sector" also say creativity is linked to interactions between people, to collaboration (Baguley, Midgley, & Kerby, 2013, p. 53). Collaboration is a "core component of creative school cultures", asserts Harris (2016), creating a situation in which "student engagement with learning is self-motivated" (p. 31). Sawyer (2004) directly links effective classroom practice to collaboration and other key elements; further telling us:

> … many contemporary pedagogical approaches emphasize the importance of the active participation of students-including inquiry-based learning, constructivism, project-based learning, and collaborative learning. (p. 13)

Hallmarks of effective teaching identified here for creativity in education echo those identified as significant to the effectiveness of Drama in Education teaching methods, especially inquiry -based learning and constructivism.

Many educational researchers are now making the case that our teacher education programs should reflect research findings about what constitutes 'best practice'. Sawyer (2005, p. 46) suggests teacher preparation programs need to promote the idea of the teacher sharing power with students in the classroom. Just as student autonomy is important for encouraging their creativity, teachers should be afforded "creative autonomy" to exercise

their "professional judgement" in their own classrooms (Sawyer, 2004, p. 12). If drama pedagogy and creativity in education are effective teaching practices, the implications of this should influence teacher education programs in our universities. Harris and Ammermann (2016) suggest that teacher education programs should enhance teachers' "creative skills and capacities", linking these with critical thinking (p. 110). Sawyer (2004) argues against "scripted instruction" and "teacher-proof curricula", arguing that it does not rely on the creative abilities of the teacher or their knowledge of subject matter (p. 12). Noddings (2013) seems to share Sawyer's assertions against the movement towards standardization in teaching and education. Noddings (2013) tells us, "…after a brief critique of the standards movement, I concentrate here on the potential damage it does to creativity" (p. 210).

Noddings (2013, p. 210) would have us encourage teachers to adopt creative teaching methods; seeing a link between that and promoting creativity in students. If we want teachers to adopt creative teaching processes such as drama in education methods, we need to address factors that influence their level of intrinsic, or self-motivation. Intrinsic motivation is not governed by external rewards. LaChapelle (1985), in his review of "The Social Psychology of Creativity" by Amabile (1985), tells us that increases and decreases in the level of one's intrinsic motivation level is dependent upon "one's perceived autonomy and one's perceived competence" (p. 48). Teachers need the freedom and autonomy to design instructional contexts in concert with knowledge of effective teaching practices.

Let's give teachers the skills and resources needed for them to adopt creative teaching practices that nurture creativity in their students. Then let's give them the professional freedom to do it.

2.3 Literature Review Part 2: Academic Engagement and Achievement in Learning

2.3.1 Introduction

Student engagement is a meta-construct consisting of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement variables. Research on student engagement is important because it

may enhance learning. The link between student engagement and improved achievement outcomes is well established in the literature. Recently, Reschly and Christenson (2012) have added the new variable of "academic engagement" to the construct of student engagement. However, there is a lack of consensus amongst researchers regarding the terminology, definitions, and indicators of academic engagement. This part of the Literature Review investigates the assertions and evidence of researchers using the term "academic engagement". Terminology in this area of research can be problematic.

Some evidence shows researchers are defining academic engagement as both a process and product variable. Other researchers assert that it is purely a process variable. Some researchers use the term "academic challenge", also asserting it is a process variable. Still others use the term "academic engagement", but never define it, or use it interchangeably with "student engagement". In addition, there are researchers who do not acknowledge the variable of academic engagement within the meta-construct of student engagement. While the above outlined areas lack consensus in the research community, all researchers in the field of student engagement acknowledge the connection between positive student engagement and academic achievement. If researchers use the term "academic engagement", they must be explicit regarding how they are defining it, whether it is a process or product variable or both. One should be clear about the facilitators and indicators of academic engagement, and how they will be measured. This review seeks to examine the choices available.

2.3.2 Academic engagement: Definitions, indicators, measures

Researchers wanting to incorporate the construct of academic engagement into their research design must be explicit regarding its definition, form, and indicators because how this construct is defined will determine how it is measured. The measurement of academic engagement in research depends on many factors. How is the term defined? Is it considered a process variable or a product variable, or both? Are there reliable measurement scales available? What form will the observations take? Is the data quantifiable or qualifiable, or both? These questions are now explored through the literature.

2.3.2.1 As both process and product variable

Researchers have defined academic engagement and described it as both a process and product variable, providing indicators that inform their data collection and measurement. Reschly and Christenson (2012, p. 9) feature an engagement theory with four variables or constructs; including academic engagement in addition to emotional, behavioral and cognitive engagement.

Academic engagement, as defined by these researchers, comprises elements of accuracy, performance, and skill demonstration (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 10). Reschly and Christenson (2012) point out that within the construct of student engagement unresolved issues as to theory, definitions, and measurement persist. Reschly and Christenson (2012) ask, "How can engagement be both a mediator and an outcome?" (p. 11). This points to the debate as to whether engagement is a process the student experiences or an outcome in the form of achievement. Reschly and Christenson (2012) see engagement as a multidimensional theory, involving both process and product, with academic engagement more of an outcome of engagement. These researchers assert that students' emotional and cognitive engagement will need to happen prior to any changes in either behavioural or academic engagement (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 9).

In the *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement (2012),* Reschly and Christenson's (2012) chapter is titled "Jingle, Jangle, and Conceptual Haziness: Evolution and Future Directions of the Engagement Construct". In discussing problems within the meta-construct of engagement they explain, "…the same term is used to refer to different things (jingle) and different terms are used for the same construct (jangle)" (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 11). This observation has many implications. Researchers should strive to be clear and explicit about the engagement construct they are investigating and the variables within it. The measurement of each variable needs to be explicit and justified. Speaking of addressing problems of engagement research, Reschly and Christenson (2012, p. 16) stress that researchers should be clear about their purposes for measuring engagement; whether it is to test a theory or link engagement to a specific intervention.

From the point of view of intervention, they state, "…we posited that it is important to assess both indicators and facilitators of this construct" (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 13). Reschly and Christenson (2012) explain that facilitators, "…direct attention to contexts that are logical foci of intervention efforts" (p. 13). Facilitators are indicative of the process and indicators of the product. With regards to academic engagement, the researchers explain:

Indicators

1. Academic

2. Time on task

3. Credit hours toward graduation (high school)

4. Class grades

Outcomes

1. Academic

2. Grades (GPA)

3. Performance on standardized tests

4. Passing Basic Skills Tests (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 10).

Note the similarity of indicators and outcomes. Both the indicator and outcome variables appear to be quantifiable. However, there is room for qualitative evidence in assessing engagement. Reschly and Christenson (2012) believe that students are accurate reporters of their own engagement and environments "…and that these in turn should influence interventions" (p. 9). They acknowledge that attempts at student engagement measurement are only in "the earliest stages" (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 15). Reschly and Christenson (2012) call for "improved measurement methodology" that will enable researchers to show the relationship between interventions and assessments (p. 16).

The engagement taxonomy developed by Reschly and Christenson (2012) originated in earlier work (Reschly & Christenson, 2006a, 2006b) that is endorsed and reviewed by Appleton, Christenson, and Furlong (2008). This taxonomy includes academic engagement along with three other "subtypes" listed as behavioral, cognitive, and psychological (p. 372). Appleton et al. (2008) also list the indicators of academic engagement as "…variables such

as time on task, credits earned toward graduation, and homework completion" (p. 372).

Similarly, these researchers describe both process and product indicators of academic

engagement here. In the article "Student Engagement With School: Critical Conceptual And

Methodological Issues Of The Construct", Appleton et al. (2008, p. 369) identify three main

areas of concern to researchers of student engagement. They call for consensus in the

variables that make up the multidimensional construct of student engagement, or "taxonomy"

(which is their term) (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 369). The say that the different dimensions or

variables of the student engagement construct need to be reliably measured (Appleton et al.,

2008, p. 369). Finally, Appleton et al. (2008) are concerned with ensuring the future of

research and interventions on student engagement through "construct validation studies" (p.

369). The article critically examines how researchers have used the engagement construct,

seeking to put forward a way that the different perspectives used in research can be

integrated (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 369). Appleton et al. (2008) justify the four-variable

engagement taxonomy reviewed in Reschly and Christenson (2012) as follows:

> This taxonomy integrated the theoretical work of Finn (1989), Connell (Connell, 1990;
>
> Connell & Wellborn, 1991), and McPartland (1994) and the implementation of the
>
> Check & Connect intervention model (http://ici.umn.edu/checkandconnect/) over 13
>
> years; it purports to provide understanding of student levels of engagement and to
>
> recognize the goodness of fit between the student, the learning environment, and the
>
> factors that influence their fit (Reschly & Christenson, 2006a, 2006b). (p. 370)

This taxonomy has been influenced by theory and implemented in a long-term

engagement intervention that has produced some promising research findings underlining

the facilitating connection between the context of the "learning environment" and student

engagement (p. 380). Aligning with their perspective that academic engagement comprises

both a process and a product, Appleton et al. (2008) report increases in learning through the

intervention study they refer to are substantial and attributed to "the *combination* of

academic press and social support for learning" (p. 381). "Academic press" is the term the

researchers use to describe both the teachers' and the students' perceptions of challenging

academics (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 381). Social support for learning comes from teachers, peers, parents, and the school, and Appleton et al. (2008, p. 381) stress that both academic press and social support are necessary for learning. This engagement taxonomy has much to offer prospective researchers because intervention designs can benefit from the integrative nature of the model (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 381). Appleton et al. (2008, p. 369) acknowledge the relationship of motivational theories to student engagement with such factors as participation, motivation, and relatedness that also are influencing student engagement (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 381). Student perspectives, along with their experiences profoundly influence social and academic outcomes (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 369). This understanding influences researchers to use the voices of the students themselves. Appleton et al. (2008) feel that the "multidimensionality" of the student engagement meta-construct is important with respect to the subtypes' relationship to important outcomes (p. 381). Herein also lies the problem. Appleton et al. (2008) tell us:

> The number and configuration of engagement subtypes provide another source of
> inconsistency and conceptual haziness. (p. 382)

Favouring a conceptualization of student engagement that is comprehensive, the researchers conclude by reminding us of the importance of "…constancy of the construct across researchers- in conceptualization and measurement" (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 383). There are many issues regarding measurement of student engagement and few measurement instruments that "equate with expected outcomes" (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 383). Precise definitions and indicators are called for; to be understood in relation to each distinct research finding (Appleton et al., 2008, p. 383). Reschly and Christenson (2012) agree that these are the challenges facing researchers of the student engagement construct.

Furrer and Skinner's (2003) study "Sense of Relatedness as a Factor in Children's Academic Engagement and Performance" explores the relationship between relatedness, motivation and academic engagement. The term "academic engagement" is used only in the title of the paper. Furrer and Skinner (2003) avoid addressing the multivariable construct of engagement, offering instead a general definition of engagement:

Engagement refers to active, goal-directed, flexible, constructive, persistent, focused

interactions with the social and physical environments. (p. 149)

This definition clearly illustrates that "engagement" is a process-oriented variable.

Perhaps the researchers are specifying "academic engagement" as the *product* of

engagement. Furrer and Skinner's (2003) research is looking at how the motivational

variable of "relatedness" factors into students' performance. They explain the relationship

between relatedness and academic engagement this way, with the dual focus of process

and product:

Feelings of relatedness…have been linked to important academic outcomes,

including self-efficacy, success expectations, achievement values, positive affect,

effort, engagement, interest in school, task goal orientation, and school marks.

(Furrer & Skinner, 2003, p. 149)

A range of both qualitative and quantitative indicators are being offered here,

addressing both the process of student engagement and the outcomes. As in the paper by

Appleton et al. (2008, p. 148), the researchers acknowledge the broad spectrum of research

that illustrates how central social factors are to children's motivation. Furrer and Skinner

(2003) tell us:

A sense of relatedness may function as a motivational resource…children who

experience trusted others as "backing them up" respond with more vigor, flexibility,

and constructive actions. (p. 148)

These "trusted others" the researchers are speaking about include parents, teachers,

and peers. The researchers find that emotional engagement is especially impacted by

relatedness (Furrer & Skinner, 2003, p. 148). Furrer and Skinner (2003) assert that

children's feelings of relatedness are especially important from grades three through six in

terms of "their academic motivation" (p. 148). Furrer and Skinner (2003) also offer advice to

researchers regarding what data can prove valuable. In their conclusion, Furrer and Skinner

(2003) say the results of the study suggest, "…children's own accounts of their behaviour

and emotion in the classroom add vital information about children's motivation" (p. 160). For

researchers of engagement, using the words of the students themselves can provide valuable data. Academic engagement outcomes may not only be limited to achievement scores and grades. In speaking about the processes that engage students, Furrer and Skinner (2003) describe:

> …active, goal directed, flexible, constructive, persistent, focused interactions with the social and physical environments. (p. 149)

Researchers will want to look closely at the intervening variables responsible for improved academic engagement; the processes that contribute to these improvements.

The group of researchers endorsing academic engagement as both a process and product variable is small. Process facilitators listed, such as academic challenge, social support, and active learning are indicative of effective teaching practices. Outcome indicators of academic engagement are largely measurable as quantifiable data in the form of grades, credits, and standardized testing. In addition, these researchers feel, in assessing academic engagement, that it is important to use the voices of the students themselves.

2.3.2.2 As process variable only

Several researchers define and describe academic engagement as a process variable alone. Finn and Zimmer (2012); Skinner et al. (2009); and Greenwood, Horton, and Utley (2002) are similar in their definitions of academic engagement as having to do with academic participation in the classroom. Finn and Zimmer (2012) and Greenwood et al. (2002) both focus their measurements of academic engagement on observable classroom behaviors. Skinner et al. (2009) include teacher and student comments along with observations.

Finn and Zimmer (2012, p. 1) put forward a construct for engagement containing both psychological and behavioral components. The researchers posit that the behavioral component- academic engagement- provides the strongest contribution to positive high school graduation statistics (Finn & Zimmer, 2012, p. 23). Finn and Zimmer (2012) define academic engagement as a process variable, listing observable academic engagement

behaviors "…such as paying attention, completing homework and coming to class prepared, and participation in academic curricular activities" (p. 8). Resulting higher academic achievement is the predicted outcome of such behaviours, in part from the likely increase in positive feedback from teachers (Finn & Zimmer, 2012, p. 23). Finn and Zimmer (2012) argue that their use of the term academic engagement is "conceptually distinct" from other engagement variables and fits with other "multiple definitions" of engagement (p. 24). Finn and Zimmer (2012, p. 8) measure academic engagement via quantifiable, observable behaviors.

Research that uses a "motivational conceptualization" in its exploration of engagement and its opposite- disaffection-is presented by Skinner et al. (2009, p. 493). The article by Skinner et al. (2009) lists "academic engagement" in its keywords, describing it as "children's behavioural and emotional participation in Academic Activities in the classroom" (p. 494), or, as they say, "the social contextual process" (p. 493). Here the definition focuses on process, with no mention of product. For them, academic engagement is evident through the participation of the students, how they are involved in the activities of the classroom, the social context of the experience. This leads to its own set of assessment problems which the Skinner et al. (2009) point out:

> …current assessments do not contain all the components that are included as indicators of classroom participation and involvement. (p. 518)

Academic engagement is the participation of the students, how they are involved in the activities of the classroom, the social context of the experience and all that entails. Issues of what to measure and how to measure it exist. There are so many views of engagement. The researchers point to the "…profusion of conceptual and operational definitions" (Skinner et al., 2009, p. 494) when it comes to engagement. Skinner et al. (2009) offer this definition of engagement in general:

> At the core of many conceptualizations is a construct that captures the quality of students' participation with learning activities in the classroom, ranging from

energized, enthusiastic, focused, emotionally positive interactions with academic

tasks to apathetic withdrawl. (p. 494)

The challenge then, for the researcher, is to determine the operational definitions that will guide their research. In terms of data validation, Skinner et al. (2009, p. 493) suggest teacher comments correlating positively with student reports achieve some validity in the data. As in earlier studies and articles involving Skinner, this study also points out that student self-reports are valuable sources of data (Skinner et al., 2009, p. 496). A type of triangulation occurs when student and teacher comments are correlated with classroom observations. This helps the researcher to assume validity in the data findings. Skinner et al. (2009) remind us that research in student engagement is important, that engagement "… represents a potentially malleable proximal influence shaping children's academic retention, achievement, and resilience" (p. 494). The process of academic engagement impacts on students staying in school, their levels of achievement, and other variables. Educators need to be informed as to the social contextual supports needed to favourably impact student engagement.

Called the "*engagement in academic responding construct"* by Greenwood et al. (2002, p. 329), the researchers sought to understand the influence of teaching on student behaviors and how these behaviors in turn are related to academic achievement. They define academic engagement as:

…a composite of specific classroom behaviors: writing, participating in tasks, reading aloud, reading silently, talking about academics, and asking and answering questions. (Greenwood et al., 1984; Greenwood et al., 2002, p. 329)

To Greenwood et al. (2002), this view of academic engagement consists of processes only, telling us, "Classroom behaviors that enable academic learning are the focus of this article" (p. 328). The classroom behaviours are open to change and are dependent upon instructional opportunities in the classroom that are created by the teacher, focussing on giving students opportunities to respond (Greenwood et al., 2002, p. 329). The goal of the researchers is to close the gap between research and practice, improving

instruction in elementary schools. Standardized tests were used to measure student

achievement (Greenwood et al., 2002, p. 328). The tasks under observation for the research

of Greenwood et al. (2002, pp. 344, 345) include worksheets, paper and pencil tasks,

discussion, and readers. Most situations were either whole class or independent

(Greenwood et al., 2002, pp. 344, 345). The researchers were not investigating

engagement interventions, but the effect of existing practice on student engagement, with a

hope to inform future changes of practice that could improve student engagement and

ultimately, achievement. In analysing the quantitative observational data, the researchers

state:

> The best instructional tasks for promoting academic engagement were worksheets,
> paper/pencil, other media (computer), workbooks, and readers. The best
> instructional grouping arrangements were independent and one-on-one situations.
> Small groups were moderately effective, and entire class instruction was the least
> promoting of academic engagement. (Greenwood et al., 2002, p. 343)

The findings of this study are limited and problematic. Greenwood et al. (2002, p.

343) caution that due to the nature of the sampling and analysis, the results cannot be

generalized beyond this research project. The research was focused on existing practice in

the classroom and not interventions to impact student engagement. The classroom activities

identified as being "best for engagement" are not inspiring or instructive. However,

researchers of student engagement should, as these researchers have, consider

observations of classroom behaviors and be mindful of instructional strategies that may have

a positive impact.

The term "academic challenge" equates to the term "academic engagement" and is

put forward by several researchers, also asserting it is a process variable (Carina, Kuh, &

Klein, 2006; Coates, 2010; Lester, Leonard, & Mathias, 2013). These researchers stress the

importance of effective teaching practices to impact upon student engagement and student

achievement outcomes.

Looking to inform universities about "effective educational practices" to facilitate student engagement, Coates (2010) describes the development of the "Australasian Survey of Student Engagement", (AUSSE), telling us it is to inform universities about "effective educational practices" that will facilitate student engagement (p. 1). The student engagement instrument 'AUSSE' is built on is carefully defined:

> First, it is concerned with "students' involvement with activities and conditions likely to generate learning" (Coates, 2006, p. 4). Second, it looks at "the policies and practices that institutions use to induce students to take part in these activities" (Kuh, 2003). (Coates, 2010, p. 3)

Student engagement is seen here as a process, where students are involved in activities within contexts or conditions. Engagement is influenced by educational practices. Descriptions of the process of "academic challenge" has some similarity to previous discussions of academic engagement as a process variable. The process variable measured is "Academic Challenge", entailing creativity and challenge in learning tasks (p. 5). Coates (2010) tells us:

> Engaging students in active learning lies at the heart of effective education. The AUSSE's Active Learning scale examines students' participation in experiences that involve constructing new knowledge and skill...whether students participate in class discussions and presentations, collaborate with and teach other students, and extend their learning beyond formal classroom contexts. (p. 6)

The focus on effective teaching practice within the AUSSE instrument is useful and informative, pointing to a constructionist approach to knowledge and collaboration with peers. The importance of the context of instruction is stressed. Coates (2010, p. 13) includes many practical applications, advice, and examples within the scope of this study, concerned that the insights into effective teaching practices be translated into action; that they produce change. Coates (2010) calls for, "…evidence-based planning, practice and quality enhancement" (p. 15) to inform effective teaching practices. Coates' (2010) use of the AUSSE's Active Learning Scale illustrates that these classroom participation variables

are observable and measurable. The AUSSE instrument includes "Outcome Measures" which include outcomes for learning, grades, and satisfaction (Coates, 2010, p. 4). In designing interventions to impact academic engagement one would be mindful to consider the effective teaching practices put forward.

Carina et al. (2006) look at the relationship of student engagement to achievement outcomes and learning. The researchers do not use the term academic engagement, but the term "academic challenge" features in their measures of engagement (Carina et al., 2006, p. 6). To measure the processes of student engagement the researchers use the NSSE: "National Survey of Student Engagement" (Carina et al., 2006, pp. 2, 3, 6). The areas of assessment are instructive to prospective researchers in the field. The NSSE survey terms these engagement measures as exemplars of "effective educational practice", listing them:

> The five clusters are: level of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment (Carina et al., 2006, p. 6; Kuh, 2001).

Note that in identifying "academic challenge" as part of student engagement it becomes part of the process, an effective teaching practice. The researchers make the case that effective teaching practices are linked directly to pedagogies and activities that engage students. The researchers assert that student engagement influences the product, namely academic performance. The researchers focus their research on student engagement that affects academic outcomes for students (p. 2). This study is valuable for its descriptors, exemplars, and measures of student engagement detailed in tables and appendixes. Measures of academic performance are included and utilized, providing a clear perspective on both the process and outcome features of the research. The focus of the study is threefold:

> …(1) the extent to which engagement is associated with experimental and traditional measures of academic performance, (2) whether the relationship between engagement and academic performance are conditional, and whether institutions

differ in terms of their ability to convert student engagement into academic

performance. (Carina et al., 2006, p. 1)

The study gathers its data from 14 institutions of higher learning, integrating multiple

measures (p. 24). Academic outcomes are assessed using SAT scores, GPA (Grade Point

Average), GRE (Graduate Record Examination), and self-reported gains among other

performance measures. The research attempts to identify the forms of engagement that

have the most impact on student performance (Carina et al., 2006, p. 2). Their research

also shows that student self-reports can be a valid source of data (Carina et al., 2006, p. 1).

Carina et al. (2006) sum up the findings of this study:

The results suggest that the lowest ability students benefit more from engagement

than classmates…many measures of student engagement were linked positively with

such desirable learning outcomes as critical thinking and grades, although most

relationships were weak in strength. (p. 1)

The linkages between student engagement and student learning as put forward in

the study outcomes may show only a weak relationship, however the study has value in

illuminating effective teaching practices that influence engagement. Engagement is

important, especially for our lowest ability students. Academic performance is tied to

engagement, as an outcome related to the process.

The term "academic challenge" also appears in a study by Lester et al. (2013) and is

effective in highlighting the process components of academic engagement. The researchers

look at post-secondary transfer students' perceptions of their academic and social

engagement. These definitions of academic and social engagement are put forward:

Kuh et al. (2005) offered a measure of student engagement that emphasizes

academic participation. Student engagement includes academic challenge, student-

faculty interaction, and active and collaborative learning. Social engagement with

peers is embedded in the collaborative learning construct, but the context for this

connection is academic. (Lester et al., 2013, p. 203)

The view of academic engagement here is as process. A further implication is that this process depends upon social connections and interactions. The researchers imply in the title of their study, the "Blurring of Social and Academic Engagement", that the two forms of engagement merge together, one influencing the other (Lester et al., 2013, p. 202). The researchers question whether these two engagement variables are indeed separate (Lester et al., 2013, p. 220). In concluding the researchers note what the post- secondary students value, "…educationally meaningful assignments, interesting class discussion, and connections with peers and faculty members" (Lester et al., 2013, p. 219). Effective teaching practices are featured with regards to their impact on student engagement. Lester et al. (2013) do not focus on student outcomes, however the researchers do point out the sound research that "…supports the idea that student engagement is a critical part of student success" (p. 203). Here is the notion that engagement contributes to student achievement, that the process of academic engagement contributes to the improved student outcomes.

Some researchers use the term "academic engagement", indicating it as a process variable, but fail to define it or provide insight regarding its indicators. Such is the case with the research of Dolezal, Welsh, Pressley, and Vincent (2003) and Gasiewski, Eagan, Garcia, Hurtado, and Chang (2012). The focus of both groups of researchers is on effective teaching practices that may impact on achievement outcomes.

The relationship of motivation to academic engagement is the focus of research by Dolezal et al. (2003) who studied the classroom practices of 9 third grade teachers across 8 schools, for one year. In the study the term "academic engagement" (Dolezal et al., 2003, p. 256) is used along with "academic motivation" (Dolezal et al., 2003, p. 240). What is striking here is that academic engagement is never defined, rather alluded to in terms of the behaviour of students and their reactions to the classroom work required of them. This study asserts that academic engagement can be facilitated through effective teaching practices. Dolezal et al. (2003) state, "The primary data were field notes from classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student work samples" (p. 242). Though "student work samples" are

included with the other data, there is no presentation of findings or analysis of this work. This lack of focus on a measure of achievement may be indicative of a focus more on process than of product. This is further supported by the statement of the researchers regarding their goal for teachers to:

…become more engaging teachers by learning about the many approaches to increasing student engagement, as well as approaches that can undermine academic engagement. (Dolezal et al., 2003, p. 256)

The quest of the researchers Dolezal et al. (2003) is to inform teachers of engaging motivational practices for the classroom. The researchers posit that academic engagement is found in both the students' behaviors during classroom activities and their reactions to it. This perspective on academic engagement focuses on processes. Their study offers an extensive repertoire of effective teaching practices in its lengthy appendix. What follows is a mere sampling of headings:

- (p. 259)-Cooperation Encouraged
    - -Cooperative Learning
    - -Drama
- (p. 260)-Engaging Content.
- (p. 261)-Positive Atmosphere
    - -Self-Regulation
- (p. 262)-Stimulates Creative Thought
    - -Student Choice
    - -Student Engagement / Participation (Dolezal et al., 2003).

Engaging students takes more than one technique related to one goal, but rather a "repertoire of positive motivational approaches" (Dolezal et al., 2003, p. 255). This study and its findings also illustrate how engagement research and literature are explicitly related to that of motivational constructs. Both engagement constructs and motivational constructs directly contribute to effective classroom instruction, and ultimately student achievement. Implications for the researcher involve a focus on the nature of the classroom activities and student reactions.

A study that highlights this effectively, while being unclear about the term "academic engagement", is titled "From Gatekeeping to Engagement: A Multicontextual, Mixed Method Study of Student Academic Engagement in Introductory STEM Courses" (Gasiewski et al., 2012). In this study the term "academic engagement" is used interchangeably with "student engagement". Gasiewski et al. (2012) state, "Fredricks et al. (2004) note that academic engagement represents a multifaceted construct that includes three dimensions: behavioural, emotional, and cognitive" (p. 231). For Gasiewski et al. (2012) the whole construct of student engagement is referred to as academic engagement; it is not a distinct variable, meaning the study is not helpful regarding the definition and measurement of academic engagement. Another point of interest is the researchers' conceptualization of engagement in terms of whether it is a process or a product, or both. Gasiewski et al. (2012) state:

> In conceptualizing this study, we define engagement as mainly behavioural…we also draw from theories of motivation and learning to offer insight into the psychological traits that foster greater behavioural academic engagement among students. (p. 231)

By looking at academic engagement as "mainly behavioral", the researchers are signalling they are adopting a more process-oriented approach. They also point to "the theories of motivation and learning" that inform their study and contribute to their inventory of effective practices to promote engagement and learning. Gasiewski et al. (2012) focus this study on teaching strategies based on "active learning"; techniques they tell us have a positive effect on student engagement for learning (p. 232). For example, in terms of implications for practice, these researchers highlight a need for student collaboration promoted through group projects (Gasiewski et al., 2012, p. 252). In In this mixed-method study, quantitative survey data coming from colleges and universities are discussed along with qualitative data coming from focus groups of students, examining "…the learning strategies and pedagogical practices that best relate to students' self-reported academic engagement" (Gasiewski et al., 2012, p. 230). What is particularly valuable in the study by Gasiewski et al. (2012) is what it tells us about interventions, about effective teaching

practices that promote student engagement and achievement. In their findings Gasiewski et al. (2012, p. 229) look at students "more likely to be engaged" and list what the students reported:

1. feeling comfortable asking questions in class

2. seeking out tutoring

3. attending supplemental instruction sessions

4. collaborating with other students.

There is no focus in this study on achievement outcomes such as marks. However, for researchers of student engagement and the learning process, this study provides valuable insight to pedagogical practices for teachers that make up effective teaching strategies. These in turn may influence engagement outcomes.

2.3.3 Student engagement and academic achievement

Research into student engagement is important since the relationship between student engagement and academic achievement is widely acknowledged. While the researchers here do not use the term "academic engagement", they all acknowledge the strong relationship between improved student engagement and corresponding improvement in achievement outcomes.

Skinner and research associates have contributed a body of research into student engagement over the last three decades. The focus of much of the research is on variables of motivation and their impact on student engagement. In the study by Skinner, Wellborn, and Connell (1990) the term academic engagement is not used and achievement considered an outcome of engagement. This study looked at the relationship of perceived control, student engagement, and achievement. The researchers state in their conclusion:

> …children's perceived control (self-report) influences academic performance (grades and achievement test scores) by promoting or undermining active *engagement* in learning activities (as reported by teachers) and that teachers positively influence children's perceived control by provision of *contingency* and *involvement* (as reported by students). (Skinner et al., 1990, p. 22)

There are several elements of value here to researchers of engagement. There are pathways to influence and enhance student engagement. Student achievement can be improved through this enhanced engagement. Student self-report is a viable method for gathering data, along with teacher reports. The study is limited in that it is not "task specific" and only the variable of perceived control is assessed. The researchers feel that engagement cannot be explained when "only one variable" is studied (Skinner et al., 1990, p. 22).

Skinner's interest in how to impact children's engagement through motivation continues. Skinner and Belmont (1993) study teacher behavior and its reciprocal effects on student engagement. They feel that "...when the social surround provides for children's basic psychological needs, motivation will flourish" (Skinner & Belmont, 1993, p. 572). They look at student's emotional and behavioral engagement across a school year (Skinner & Belmont, 1993, p. 571). In this study the researchers clearly link improved engagement with specific interventions, or changes in teacher behaviour. Skinner and Belmont (1993) tell us "…teacher provision for both autonomy support and optimal structure predicted children's motivation across the school year" (p. 571). The term academic engagement is not used. However, clearly academic achievement is viewed as a product of heightened engagement in this statement:

> According to our model, children who are engaged…should not only feel pride and satisfaction in their accomplishments, but should also increase in their competencies. (Skinner & Belmont, 1993, p. 572)

Skinner and Belmont (1993) conclude by exhorting the need to change teacher behaviors, regarding teacher-student interactions, to promote student engagement.

Student engagement is widely viewed as an important ingredient towards academic achievement. What kind of engagement is a question that Reyes, Brackett, Rivers, White, and Salovey (2012) try to answer in their study "Classroom Emotional Climate, Student Engagement, and Academic Achievement'. These researchers focus on the importance of the "Classroom Emotional Climate" or CEC, stating:

…accumulating evidence suggests that when teachers create a sense of community, respond to students' needs, and foster positive relationships-all of which are indicative of classrooms with high CEC-academic success likely ensues, perhaps because students are more engaged and enthusiastic about learning. (Reyes et al., 2012, p. 2)

Since the research is focusing on the dynamics within the classroom that may lead to achievement; clearly Reyes et al. (2012) view student engagement as a process. The study examines and measures the contexts and the "quality of interactions" of the classroom, culminating in a look at achievement outcomes (p. 2). The researchers use the "Engagement vs. Disaffection Scale" (Furrer & Skinner, 2003), "…to examine whether student ratings of engagement mediate the relationship between CEC and year-end grades in a core content area" (Reyes et al., 2012, p. 3). Using a "multilevel mediation analyses", the researchers find the relationship between CEC and grades to be both positive and "mediated by engagement" (p. 1). While this study has limitations such as bias in the selection of classes and teachers, as well as the use of grades rather than standardized test scores, it is illuminating in its nod to effective teaching practices that foster academic achievement (p. 11).

J.-S. Lee's (2014) study is entitled "The Relationship Between Student Engagement and Academic Performance: Is it a Myth or Reality?". Lee seeks to determine whether a causal link exists between the process of student engagement and the product of academic performance. J.-S. Lee (2014) utilizes data from "U.S. data of the Program for International Student Assessment 2000", with a large sample size of 3, 268 students of the age of 15, drawing from 121 U.S. schools (p. 177). Through multilevel analysis the study shows a significant relationship for engagement predicting reading performance (J.-S. Lee, 2014, p. 177). J.-S. Lee (2014) states:

The present study showed that student engagement was a process variable that had effects on academic performance. This finding is consistent with other studies that

reported significant relationships between student engagement and various student outcomes (e.g., Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012; Reyes et al., 2012, p. 183).

This study uses non-experimental data and J.-S. Lee (2014, p. 183) acknowledges that this limits any causal claims. Lee's study provides support for the use of student self-report in measuring and assessing student engagement. While acknowledging that self-report is a limitation of the study due to "social desirability bias" (J.-S. Lee, 2014, p. 183), J.-S. Lee (2014) tells us:

> …self-report measures are appropriate to capture an individual's feelings, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs. Emotional engagement is largely linked to the psychological aspects and self-reporting seems to be appropriate to capture this. Given the fact that effort and perseverance require an individual's will and determination to continue in the face of difficulties, self-reporting also deems to be appropriate for behavioural engagement. (p. 184)

J.-S. Lee (2014, p. 184) feels that this study gives verification for the ability of student engagement to predict academic performance. Emotional and behavioral engagement are clarified, and the case is made that student self-report is an appropriate method for collecting data. Improved academic outcomes are the product of enhanced student engagement.

2.3.4 Conclusion

The variable of academic engagement may be defined and presented as either a process variable, a product variable, or both. Different researchers and theorists have put forward different facilitators and indicators of academic engagement, and different ways to measure it. Prospective researchers of student engagement, wanting to include the variable of academic engagement, along with others in the engagement meta-construct, must be clear and explicit about which perspective they have adopted. Consensus exist in the research community regarding the strong relationship between enhanced student engagement and improved academic outcomes. Considering "academic engagement" as a product of student engagement, in the form of achievement outcomes, is the least controversial. There is much to choose from, and in closing, a summary table is offered.

Table 2.1

Academic Engagement Summary Table

"Academic Engagement" term used and defined	Academic Engagement as both process and product	Academic Engagement as process variable only	Measuring Academic Engagement	Assert Student Engagement is related to Academic Outcomes
*Reschly and Christenson (2012)	*Reschly and Christenson (2012)		*Reschly and Christenson (2012)	*Reschly and Christenson (2012)
*Appleton et al. (2008)	*Appleton et al. (2008)		*Appleton et al. (2008)	*Appleton et al. (2008)
*Furrer and Skinner (2003)	*Furrer and Skinner (2003)		*Furrer and Skinner (2003)	*Furrer and Skinner (2003)
*Finn and Zimmer (2012)		*Finn and Zimmer (2012)	*Finn and Zimmer (2012)	*Finn and Zimmer (2012)
*Skinner et al. (2009)		*Skinner et al. (2009)	*Skinner et al. (2009)	*Skinner et al. (2009)
*Greenwood et al. (2002)		*Greenwood et al. (2002)	*Greenwood et al. (2002)	*Greenwood et al. (2002)
"Academic Challenge" term used: *Coates (2010)		*Coates (2010)	*Coates (2010)	*Coates (2010)
*Carina et al. (2006)		*Carina et al. (2006)	*Carina et al. (2006)	*Carina et al. (2006)
*Lester et al. (2013)		*Lester et al. (2013)		*Lester et al. (2013)

"Academic Engagement" term used and defined	Academic Engagement as both process and product	Academic Engagement as process variable only	Measuring Academic Engagement	Assert Student Engagement is related to Academic Outcomes
Term used but not defined:				
*Dolezal et al. (2003)				
		*Dolezal et al. (2003)		*Dolezal et al. (2003)
*Gasiewski et al. (2012)				
		*Gasiewski et al. (2012)		*Gasiewski et al. (2012)
Term not used:				*Skinner et al. (1990)
*Skinner et al. (1990)				*Skinner and Belmont (1993)
*Skinner and Belmont (1993)				*Reyes et al. (2012)
*Reyes et al. (2012)				*J.-S. Lee (2014)
*J.-S. Lee (2014)				

2.4 Literature Review Part 3: Role of the Teacher: Architect Or Reactor? Agentic Engagement Versus Autonomy in Self-Determination Theory

2.4.1 Introduction

In this section of the Literature Review, the main arguments that deal with the issue of agentic engagement versus autonomy in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) will be discussed. In distinguishing between these two constructs, the purpose now is to highlight the problems inherent in the agentic engagement construct by pointing to the casting of teachers as reactors rather than architects in terms of their teaching in the classroom. Besides providing a map of the new construct of agentic engagement, this third part of the Literature Review assesses the extent to which these ideas have been validated by research.

The examination is structured in sections. After giving an overview of the scope of the role of autonomy within SDT, research evidence will be reviewed that highlights the connection between student autonomy and effective teaching. Next, a summary of the new concept of agentic engagement is provided, along with related studies of validation. Finally, in the last section, several implications derived from agentic engagements' supposition that students' behavior directly effects autonomy support in the classroom will be considered. This part of the Literature Review argues that teachers are the architects of learning in the classroom. It is the teacher's design and actions that promote student autonomy in the classroom. Autonomy support for students, as put forward by SDT, is an important element contributing to effective teaching practice.

2.4.2 Autonomy in self-determination theory

Ryan and Deci (2000) put forward a macro-theory of human motivation called "Self-Determination Theory" (SDT), identifying three innate psychological needs that, when satisfied, may cause motivation to flourish. The three basic needs identified in SDT are relatedness, autonomy, and perceived competence. To realize these needs, it is important that the needs are met within social contexts. Relatedness speaks to not only opportunities

to collaborate with peers, but of a more democratic relationship with the teacher in which power is shared. Perceived competence on the part of the students is important as students need to feel that they are being effective learners; that they are able.

SDT is important for explaining the relationships between constructs of motivation and student engagement, characterizing and clarifying the functioning of the student engagement construct. Ryan and Deci (2000) look at the nature and effects of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic. The difference between these two types of motivation have important implications for educational and developmental practices (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54). In reviewing studies supporting intrinsic motivation in students, Ryan and Deci (2000) find in common "…the innate needs to feel connected, effective, and agentic" (p. 65) as the "social contextual conditions" required. The researchers feel that intrinsic motivation facilitates higher level performance, effort and commitment (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 76). If intrinsic motivation is to be achieved within these "social contextual conditions", autonomy must feature prominently (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 70).

While all three basic needs identified are important in facilitating intrinsic motivation, of particular interest is the need for autonomy within this "empirically based theory" (Deci & Ryan, 2008, p. 182). These researchers state:

> …we have been particularly interested in the concept of *vitality,* which is the energy that is available to the self -that is, the energy that is exhilarating and empowering, that allows people to act more autonomously and persist more at important activities. (Ryan & Deci, 2008, p. 184)

In the classroom, autonomy supporting activities incorporate student choice resulting from the teacher's lesson design.

Self-Determination Theory is widely accepted and referenced in educational research. The table that follows includes a sampling of how widely it has been used by scholars.

Table 2.2

Sample of Studies Dealing With SDT, or Aspects of SDT

Relatedness	Competence	Autonomy	SDT
-Jarvela, Volet, and Jarvenojci (2010)	-Walker, Greene, and Monsell (2006)	-Greene, Milky, Crowson, Duke, and Akey (2004)	-Appleton et al. (2006)
-Blumenfeld, Kempler, and Krajcik (eng hand)	-Blumenfeld, Kempler, and Krajcik (2006)	-Martin (2004)	-Skinner and Belmont (1993)
-Furrer and Skinner (2003)		-Shim (2008)	-Skinner et al. (2009)
-Eccles and Wang (2012)		-Stevenson (2014)	-Wentzel (eng hand) and (99, 05, 09)
-Corina, Kuh, and Klein (2006)		-Oldfather and Dahl (1994)	-Kaplan and Assor (2012)
-Shim (2008)		-Fredricks et al. (2004)	-Guay, Ratelle, and Chanal (2008)
-Stevenson (2014)		-Stefanou, Parencevich, DiCintio, and Turner (2004)	-Young (2005)
-Oldfather and Dahl (1994)		-Dolezal et al. (2003)	-Shen, McCaughtry, Martin, and Fahlman (2009)
-Bartholo, Tanes, and Tacca (2010)		-Skinner et al. (1990)	-Rientes, Giesbers, Tempelaar, Segers, and Gijselaers (2012)
-Barron (2003)		-Reeve (2006)	-Nunez, Fernandez, Leon, and Grijalvo (2015)
-Reeve (2006)		-Reeve and Jang (2006)	-Kasser, Ryan, Zax, and Sameroff (1995)
-Reeve and Jang (2006)		-Blumenfeld, Kempler, and Krajcik (eng hand)	-Reeve (2011)
		-Lo and Hyland (2007)	-Reeve and Tseng (2011)
		-Assor, Kaplan, and Roth (2002)	-Reeve and Lee (2014)
		-Grolnick and Ryan (1987)	-Pass and Neu (2014)

2.4.3 Autonomy and effective teaching

There are many studies that establish the connection between autonomy support in the classroom and effective teaching. Earlier work looked at this relationship. Grolnick and Ryan (1987), in a control group study, found that:

> …both the nondirected and the noncontrolling directed learning sets resulted in greater interest and conceptual learning compared to the controlling set, presumably because they were more conducive to autonomy. (p. 890)

Ryan and Connell (1989) look at how students understand and describe their reasons for acting, relating them to a "continuum of autonomy" (p. 750). Ryan, Huta, and Deci (2008) describe a person who acts autonomously as embracing "an activity as his or her own, endorsing it at the highest order of reflection" (p. 157). In this article autonomy is put forward as a "motivational concept" (Ryan et al., 2008, p. 139). This research endorses SDT in explaining the motivational power of autonomy, as well as illustrating the effectiveness of autonomy in higher order learning.

Guay et al. (2008) conduct a literature review focused on "Optimal Learning in Optimal Contexts" concluding that the types of motivation proposed by SDT are important for understanding student success at school. They acknowledge the contribution the context of the learning makes in facilitating motivation, which in turn facilitates learning. Guay et al. (2008, p. 237) conclude that higher grades result from forms of motivation that are autonomous. They go on to make the case that increased autonomy produces gains in "affective, cognitive and behavioural domains" (Guay et al., 2008, p. 238). The domains of engagement listed by Guay et al. (2008); affective, cognitive, and behavioural engagement, are positively influenced by autonomy support which facilitates intrinsic motivation.

It is important to note that teachers who provide autonomy support are also providing structures that support learning. Rientes et al. (2012, p. 894) looked at the effects of scaffolding by the teacher and computer supported collaborative learning. These researchers incorporated the SDT concept of motivation put forward by Deci and Ryan

(1985, p. 895). Scaffolding support and guidance from the teacher positively influences student engagement, a finding also reported by Jang, Reeve, and Deci (2010).

Other researchers have used the SDT framework to analyse their findings. Nunez et al. (2015) look at the effects of the social context on student behaviour and feelings. They state:

> This study suggests that if teachers promote choice, minimize pressure to perform tasks in a certain way, and encourage initiative, in contrast to a controlling environment, characterized by deadlines, external rewards, or potential punishments, they will provide students with interesting experiences that are full of excitement and positive energy. (Nunez et al., 2015, p. 191)

Besides "positive energy", enhanced learning is reflected in the findings of a study by Shen et al. (2009, p. 44) who look at the relationship between the satisfaction of student needs, student perceptions of autonomy support, and achievement in learning. This empirical study uses statistics to show that, "…providing more support for students' autonomy and active involvement hold promise for enhancing their learning" (Shen et al., 2009, pp. 51, 52). Note that autonomy support structures are dependent upon teacher planning, the implication being that teachers can incorporate degrees of autonomy support into their lessons.

Similarly, Skinner and Belmont (1993, p. 571) study the effects of teacher behavior on student engagement, finding a positive relationship between teacher's autonomy supportive behaviours and children's motivation. With regards to future research, Skinner and Belmont (1993) state:

> Most important is empirical inquiry into the source of differences among teachers in their provision of involvement, structure, and autonomy support. (p. 580)

Clearly these researchers believe that the teacher is the provider of the social context of the lesson; that teachers create the structures and provisions for involvement and choice. Skinner and Belmont (1993) are not endorsing a reactive manner of teaching dependent on the actions of the students.

An earlier study involving Skinner looks at the effects of students' perceived control on motivation levels and academic achievement. Skinner et al. (1990, p. 22) find that by involving children and giving them choice, you can enhance their motivation in school, resulting in improved academic performance.

The benefits of autonomy support in the classroom are well researched. Dolezal et al. (2003) find that autonomy through choice increases academic engagement. Kasser et al. (1995) find a positive effect on student values, and Pass and Neu (2014) an improvement in student effort. Assor et al. (2002) assert a positive relationship between autonomy support from teachers and improved student engagement. These researchers feel that choice within the classroom should be promoted.

Stefanou et al. (2004) look at research evidence stemming from studies of autonomy support. These researchers assert that there are three different forms of autonomy support that in turn may have differing student behavioral outcomes (Stefanou et al., 2004, p. 97). Stefanou et al. (2004) outline these different forms of autonomy support:

> …*organizational* autonomy support (e.g., allowing students some decision-making role in terms of classroom management issues), *procedural* autonomy support (e.g., offering students choices about the use of different media to present ideas), and *cognitive* autonomy support (e.g., affording opportunities for students to evaluate work from a self-referent standard)…cognitive autonomy support may foster a more enduring psychological investment in deep-level thinking. (p. 97)

Autonomy support increases student motivation and engagement, resulting in improved achievement. Stefanou et al. (2004) offer a more detailed analysis of forms of autonomy support that may be offered by the teacher within the context of the classroom. These researchers are clear that these autonomy supports are provided by the teacher, implying purposeful planning and design. They believe that cognitive autonomy support results in higher order learning, a deeper level of reflection. It is this form of autonomy support that should be used if motivation and engagement are to be "maximized" (Stefanou et al., 2004, p. 109).

2.4.4 Agentic engagement and validation studies

Educators see the importance of positive student engagement in their quest to raise student achievement levels and keep students in school. Consensus among researchers of student engagement see it as being made up of three main constructs, namely behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004). Skinner et al. (2009, p. 521) identify descriptors of emotional engagement as student enjoyment, happiness, interest, and having fun. Fredricks et al. (2004, p. 4) list descriptors such as effort, participation and persistence for behavioral engagement and thoughtfulness for cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 1). Fredricks et al. (2004, p. 3) also tell us that students that are cognitively engaged perceive that they are mastering skills and increasing their knowledge and achievement.

An engagement construct featuring four variables of engagement is put forward by Reschly and Christenson (2012). These researchers acknowledge that engagement is a necessary element if we wish to improve student outcomes (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 15). Reschly and Christenson (2012, p. 9) add academic engagement to their multidimensional theory of engagement. These researchers see academic engagement as not only an outcome, but as a product affected by the cognitive and emotional engagement of the students (Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 9). Reschly and Christenson (2012, p. 10) tell us that academic engagement is comprised of the skill and accuracy displayed by students, by their overall performance.

Clearly there are many different conceptions of the variables that make up the engagement construct. In exploring the variables of student engagement, context is a very important factor. Connell (1990) and Connell and Wellborn (1991) make the case that the relationship between the student and the context is mediated by SDT. They call for "more specific measures" to examine links with the different types of engagement, outcomes, and contexts. Fredricks et al. (2004) are critical of school wide contexts, telling us:

> …researchers tend to examine aspects of context separately rather than considering
>
> how the pattern of contextual variables working together influences

engagement…want to focus on context of the classroom: teacher, peers, classroom

structure, autonomy support, task characteristics. (p. 10)

Fredricks et al. (2004) call for qualitative research approaches that focus on the

classroom context, rich in description, looking at how and why different approaches work (p.

13). The researchers feel that these types of findings will help us to "design more

specifically targeted and nuanced interventions" (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 2). Appleton et al.

(2006) acknowledge the place for SDT as well as context in explorations of the

"multidimensional engagement construct", calling for:

…attendance to the inclusion of important underlying variables such as sense of

autonomy, belonging, competence and the extent to which the context provides the

nutriments for the fulfillment of these needs. (p. 441)

There is a lack of consensus among researchers regarding the engagement

construct. Engagement is a multidimensional theory and there are problems with the

numbers, types and definitions of engagement, as well as distinguishing between the

facilitators of engagement versus the indicators (Reschly & Christenson, 2012). These

researchers ask the question, "How can engagement be both a mediator and an outcome?"

(Reschly & Christenson, 2012, p. 11). This question will become especially salient when

discussing the agentic engagement variable.

There are more combinations of engagement variables put forward in the student

engagement construct. Table 2.3 shows a sampling of combinations endorsed by

researchers. Table 2.4 lists the words and descriptors of the engagement variables.

Table 2.3

Sample of Studies and Papers that Focus on the Student Engagement Construct

Behavioral Emotional / Affective	Behavioral Emotional / Affective Cognitive
Finn (1989) Skinner et al. (1990) Newmann, Wehlage, and Lamborn (1992) Skinner and Belmont (1993) Marks (2000) Willms (2003)	Connell and Wellborn (1991) Christenson and Anderson (2002) Jimerson et al. (2003) Jimerson, Campos, and Grief (2003) Furlong et al. (2003) Chapman (2003) Fredricks et al. (2004) Klem and Connell (2004) Russell, Ainley, and Frydenberg (2005) Guay and Ratelle (2008) Hart et al. (2011) Goldspink and Foster (2013) Lamote et al. (2013) (could not assess cognitive) Parsons, Nuland, and Parsons (2014) O'Toole and Due (2015)
Behavioral Emotional / Affective Cognitive Academic	Behavioral Emotional / Affective Cognitive Academic Agentic
Christenson and Thurlow (2004) Reschly and Christenson (2006a, 2006b) Yazzie-Mintz (2007)	Reeve and Tseng (2011)
4 Variables / Not Academic	Other Combinations of Engagement
Eren (2013) Reeve (2013) Reeve and Lee (2014)	-Mitchell and Carbone (2011): behavioral, emotional, cognitive, metacognition -Harris (2011): behavioral, academic, cognitive, psychological -Appleton et al. (2006): academic, behavioral, cognitive, psychological -Lawson and Lawson (2013): agentic, behavioral, emotional, cognitive -Burch et al. (2015): emotional, physical, cognitive in class and cognitive out of class -Finn and Zimmer (2012): academic, social, cognitive, and affective

Table 2.4

Words and Descriptors Associated with Student Engagement

Behavioral Engagement	Emotional Engagement	Cognitive Engagement
*attention	*affective reactions: interest, boredom, happy, sad, anxiety	*investment
*concentration		*thoughtfulness
*persistence	*emotions such as interest and value	*willingness to exert effort
*effort		*motivational goals
*enthusiasm	*liking/disliking the work	*self-regulated learning
*to involve oneself	*positive reactions	*psychological investment in learning
*become occupied	*willingness to work	
*actively committed	*related to student attitudes, interest, values	*effort
*on-task behaviour		*strategy use
*positive conduct	*attract or involve	*mastering the knowledge, skills, crafts
*absence of disruptive behaviours		*their feeling of achievement
*contributing to class discussions		*use metacognitive strategies to plan, monitor, and evaluate their cognition accomplishing tasks
*autonomy participation		
*self-directed academic behaviour		
*doing work		
*following rules		
*evidence of metacognition		
*psychological investment		
*socially appropriate behaviour		
Academic Engagement		Agentic Engagement
-accuracy		-autonomy
-performance		-freedom
-skill demonstration		-choice
-time on task		-self-efficacy
-homework completion		-tell teacher what I like and dislike
-class grades		-let teacher know what I'm interested in
-participating in tasks		-express preferences and opinions
		-give suggestions on how to make the class better

Agentic engagement has been identified by Reeve and Tseng (2011) as a fourth variable to the engagement construct in addition to emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement. They define agentic engagement as "…students' constructive contribution to the flow of instruction they receive" (Reeve and Tseng, 2011, p. 257). Reeve and Tseng

(2011, p. 260) claim their research shows agentic engagement to be a distinct construct of student engagement that correlates in a significant and positive manner to the other three engagement constructs.

How the students engage in their learning is of interest to the researchers. Reeve and Tseng (2011) developed a student self-report scale they call the "Agentic Engagement Scale (AES)". Reeve and Tseng (2011, p. 259) claim these statements within the scale are indicative of students' agency:

1. I ask questions

2. tell teacher what I like and don't like

3. let teacher know what I'm interested in

4. I express my preferences and opinions

5. offer suggestions on how to make the class better.

Within Reeve and Tseng's (2011) construct of agentic engagement students are proactive in that they can ask questions, express their interests and put forward their opinions. Teachers that allow students to do this are called "autonomy supportive", which means they are open and responsive to these actions by the students (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 264). The five statements making up the "agency scale" in the questionnaire seem oversimplified and inadequate to represent the construct. The consequences stemming from these actions by the students have not been established. Within this study one wonders if the teacher is responding to the students and changing a specific lesson, or all their lessons, to suit them? On this basis one can question whether construct validity has been established. A further question would be on how this construct informs the teacher, leading the teacher to be more autonomy supportive. There are no studies showing a causal relationship between students performing the actions on the scale and resulting actions on the part of the teacher. In addition, Reeve and Tseng's (2011) research is not task specific. The five statements are just in general to the classroom and not a specific course or lesson. We do not know the specific social context or lesson within which these statements apply. Reeve and Tseng's (2011) research is not context specific, so one can

question any achievement outcome claims. Implied in the statements of the Agentic

Engagement Scale (AES) is the assumption that students can influence the teacher in terms

of what and how to teach. This is not practical. The teacher knows/sees the "big picture".

They are informed about best practice and effective teaching for engagement and

achievement. They are responding to Australian curriculum demands, prescribed lesson

plans, constraints of time and school calendar, scheduling, etc. How this construct of

agentic engagement will inform the teacher is the question that must be asked.

Drawing on this earlier work by Reeve and Tseng (2011), Reeve (2013) conducted

three studies, presented in the paper "How Students Create Motivationally Supportive

Learning Environments for Themselves: The Concept of Agentic Engagement". Reeve

(2013) states:

> Overall, these studies show how agentic engagement functions as a proactive,
>
> intentional, collaborative, and constructive student-initiated pathway to greater
>
> achievement (study 2) and motivational support (study 3). (p. 579)

These three studies seek to "expand and validate the Agentic Engagement Scale

(AES)" (Reeve, 2013, p. 591), consisting of the five student statements listed previously.

Study 1 claims to develop a strong psychometric engagement scale. Study 2 claims to

provide validity for both "construct and predictive validity" (Reeve, 2013, p. 579). Reeve

(2013, p. 591) claims that specific course achievement can be predicted through agentic

engagement acts, though evidence presented is correlational and not task specific.   Study 3

focuses on both the students and teachers, as Reeve (2013) explains that the study:

> …showed how agentically engaged students create motivationally supportive
>
> learning environments for themselves. Measures of agentic engagement and
>
> teacher provided autonomy support were collected from 302 middle school students
>
> in a 3-wave longitudinal research design. (p. 570)

Reeve (2013) stresses that the agentic engagement acts such as asking questions

and voicing opinions are distinct in qualitative ways from the emotional, behavioural, and

cognitive engagement variables "…in that they are intentional, proactive, and teacher-

collaborative ways of engaging in learning activities" (p. 580). Reeve (2013) asserts that the

agentic engagement is a "student-initiated pathway" leading to a learning environment that

provides for greater motivational support (p. 581) and that agentic engagement is also "an

antecedent of autonomy support" (p. 592). Reeve (2013) concludes that agentic

engagement contributes in a unique way to "course-specific achievement" and could predict

long term changes in how teachers motivate their students in the classroom (p. 593). Reeve

(2013) claims the effect of increased motivational support in the form of autonomy are

longitudinal, impacting on the "teachers' classroom motivating style", and ultimately resulting

in improved achievement that is "course-specific" (p. 593). This is an interesting claim,

especially as the study points out it is not context specific in terms of a specific classroom or

subject.

Reeve and Tseng (2011) do not believe their conceptualization of agentic

engagement is outside of the realm of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) or other theories of

motivation. They are interested as to what extent it mediates the "motivation-to-achievement

relationship" (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 263). They believe that agentic engagement is

associated with students' "constructive motivation" (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 257), students'

constructive contribution towards their learning. They further claim:

Agentic engagement is important not only to a Self-Determination Theory

conceptualization of student motivation but perhaps all major theories of student

motivation. (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 264)

This claim is problematic. In the previous section of this paper the SDT concept of

autonomy analysis did not reflect the idea that it is the students that influence the teacher's

provisions for autonomy support.

Reeve and Tseng's (2011) study asserts that it incorporates Self-Determination

Theory (SDT) into its analysis. They put forward a model in which engagement mediates

between motivation and achievement, maintaining the "psychological need satisfaction" put

forward in SDT influences the engagement variables, which in turn influence academic

achievement (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 264). Reeve and Tseng (2011) explain the

relationship of motivation to academic outcomes:

> To the extent to which students act agentically, they initiate a process in which they
>
> generate for themselves a wider array of options that expand their freedom of action
>
> and increase their chances of experiencing both strong motivation (e.g. autonomy,
>
> self-efficacy) and meaningful learning (e.g., internalization, conceptual
>
> understanding). (p. 258)

Reeve and Lee (2014) also believe that there is a reciprocal relationship between

engagement and motivation; that the elements of SDT are nurtured by agentic engagement.

This "reciprocal" order is not an element of SDT. The basic requirements of autonomy,

relationship, and perceived competence need to be fulfilled for motivation to flourish, and in

turn student engagement. Agreement with Ryan and Deci's (2000) Self-Determination

Theory comes from Lo and Hyland (2007), who tell us, "Motivation is also influenced by

learners' sense of agency and feelings of mastery and control over the learning activity and

their interest in it" (p. 220). Lo and Hyland (2007) do not assert that the students' agency

precedes autonomy support by the teacher.

Researchers of student engagement identify the importance of their work in relation

to student achievement and staying in school. Reeve and Tseng (2011, p. 263) argue that

including agentic engagement in conceptualizations of student engagement is important to

better explain student achievement. Indeed, these researchers posit that agentic

engagement is unique in how it contributes to achievement, explaining:

> …it is through intentional, proactive, and constructive acts that students find ways to
>
> improve their opportunity to learn by enriching the learning experience and by
>
> enhancing the conditions under which they learn. (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p. 263)

One can question where the role of the teacher fits within this construct of agentic

engagement. From this statement one may think that the quality of the students' education

is completely of their making. Can a teacher be autonomy supportive by design, or only by

reaction? This investigation argues that the teacher is autonomy supportive by design.

The construct of autonomy, well formulated and researched within SDT, has a wealth of positive effects on student motivation, engagement, and learning. Reeve and Tseng (2011) have not shown empirical, causal evidence of the same for their construct of agentic engagement. Autonomy within SDT is mediated through social contexts that require teacher planning. Reeve and Tseng's (2011) construct of agentic engagement creates autonomy supportive contexts in the classroom as a reaction to the behaviour of the students. In earlier work, Reeve (2006) states:

> …teachers most engage students when they offer high levels of both autonomy
> support and structure. (p. 225)

This statement supports the notion that autonomy support structures are "offered" by the teacher. The implication is that they are planned for. To assert that the actions of the students are antecedent to autonomy support reflects a change of stance.

2.4.5 Agentic engagement implications

Reeve and Tseng (2011) see the concept of agentic engagement in terms of a very specific context; "classroom or learning activity-specific" and this has implications for any assessments of agentic engagement (p. 265). They admit this is not how data was acquired for this study and offer this advice:

> Future research, therefore, would be best served by obtaining students' engagement
> and indices of achievement (grades, performance, learning, skill development,
> academic progress) at the class (or learning activity) level. (Reeve & Tseng, 2011, p.
> 266)

These agentic engagement theorists make the case that the research in this area should be "context specific", but use a general, school-wide context in their own research, where the tasks in question are vague. They discount up front autonomy support from the teacher. They favour the view that it is the "transactional antecedent" on the part of the students, in which the proactive behaviours of the students influence the actions of the teacher.

Perhaps the strongest argument against this conceptualization of agentic engagement comes from the work of Lawson and Lawson (2013). Lawson and Lawson (2013, p. 433) review issues surrounding engagement theories and research, pointing out the presumption that there is a linear order to the processes that nurture engagement, stressing the importance of context and motivation that precedes engagement. This linear order, contrary to that within Reeve and Tseng's notion of agentic engagement, is endorsed by these researchers who explain the importance of these ideas to quantitative research:

> …much quantitative engagement research reflects the view that key aspects of the engagement process, namely, the indicators and facilitators for engagement, should be evaluated with respect to predetermined, linear, and temporal order (Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Green et al., 2012; Skinner, Furrer, Marchand, & Kindermann, 2008). In this linear-temporal research frame, students' motivations and school attachments are typically operationalized as antecedents to, and facilitators of, engagement…These linear relationships are typically depicted in a context> motivation> engagement> outcome temporal sequence (e.g., Connell & Wellborn, 1991; Green et al., 2012; Sinner et al., 2008)". (Lawson & Lawson, 2013, p. 433)

Lawson and Lawson (2013) feel that the role of context preceding engagement bears more strongly on engagement outcomes, noting that this "causal logic" is not typically represented in the findings of quantitative researchers of engagement (pp. 444, 434). It is in this area of antecedents that the work of Reeve and Tseng (2011) falls short. In their conception of agentic engagement, students must create the context that facilitates their engagement, and must be motivated to create that context. The causal logic of Reeve and Tseng's work can be questioned. The research presented has too many limitations. None of the research is task specific. Their Agentic Engagement Scale was used generally, for total classroom activities instead of specific lessons. The current definition of agentic engagement is inadequate to describe "autonomy supportive classrooms" (if sticking to the notion that student behaviour is antecedent to autonomy support). Most teachers believe that they are the architects of the teaching that occurs in their classroom. They have control

over context, process, materials, tone, structures; so many variables. Teachers, through *their actions* can be autonomy supportive. There is a large body of research investigating autonomy supportive actions of teachers that create feelings of autonomy in their students. Reeve (2013), Reeve and Tseng (2011) and Reeve and Lee (2014) suggest a contrary notion in their definition of agentic engagement that implies teacher manipulation and reactive teaching.

2.4.6 Conclusion

This part three of the Literature Review investigates the construct of agentic engagement alongside that of autonomy within Self-Determination Theory. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is a macro-theory of human motivation developed by Ryan and Deci (2000) that says motivation will flourish when the basic psychological needs of competence, relatedness and autonomy are met. SDT is important in explaining the constructs of motivation in relation to student engagement, especially intrinsic motivation.

Agentic engagement is a relatively new construct to be included in the wider meta-construct of student engagement. Reeve and Tseng (2011) assert that it is the students' actions that influence the amount of student autonomy granted by the teacher, associating it with motivation they call 'constructive'. These researchers suggest that the students' questions, opinions, preferences, interests, and suggestions influence the actions of the teacher, resulting in a more 'autonomy supportive' approach to teaching. The validity of this five-variable approach to agency can be questioned, including how the researchers assert this construct informs the teacher, leading the teacher to be more autonomy supportive. These proponents of agentic engagement suggest it is the actions of the students that determine their resulting level of autonomy, and not teacher initiatives or purposeful planning.

Effective teaching research and literature focuses on the proactive rather than the reactive actions of the teacher. Research evidence asserts that effective teachers are autonomy supportive by design. They are proactive and not manipulated by their students.

2.5 Literature Review Summary

Radioplay study data is analyzed through the lens of the key themes or constructs stemming from the four key theories identified. The key theories represented in this literature review are Drama in Education, Creativity Theory, Student Engagement Theory, and Self-Determination Theory. The six key constructs identified in these theories are autonomy, collaboration / relationships, perceived competence/ academic improvement, and emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement. Creswell (2014) asserts:

> These themes are ones that appear as major findings in qualitative studies and are often used as headings in the findings section….of studies. They should display multiple perspectives from individuals and be supported by diverse quotations and specific evidence. (pp. 199–200)

In line with much of the relevant literature, I have chosen to use the term "construct" rather than "theme" in my findings and analysis. My findings then fit the textual, survey and observational data from both students and teacher into the "predetermined codes" stemming from the theoretical constructs examined in the literature review (Creswell, 2014, p. 199). Methodologically, this is a deductive approach. Deductive approaches tend to let the constructs lead to the definition of the relevant data to be collected for analysis. The following three tables of descriptors of the student engagement constructs have been gleaned from the literature review to frame this study's findings and analysis.

Table 2.5

What Research Says are Sample Indicators of Emotional / Affective Engagement: What to

Look for in the Data

Research	Affective / Emotional Engagement
Bowman and Standiford (2014)	-active engagement -enhanced awareness of other perspectives -improving emotional investment -self-awareness -increased empathy -raising social consciousness -social skills development (eg. cooperation, debate, negotiation)
Hart et al. (2011)	-liking for learning and school -seems interested in school -gets along with peers -seems to care about grades -learning is interesting, like, enjoy -school: like, proud, happy, look forward to going
Skinner et al. (2009)	-in class, I feel good -interested, fun -enjoy learning new things -get involved -student is enthusiastic -happy, enjoys it, fun -new, interested
Reeve and Tseng (2011)	-enjoyment, interest, curiosity, and fun -energized emotional states -enjoy learning new things, fun -interested, curious
Reschly and Christenson (2012)	--student perception of belonging, id with school, school connectedness
Fredricks et al. (2004)	-interest, satisfaction in school -attract or involve -positive reactions -willingness to work -related to student attitudes, interest, values -affective reactions: interest, happy -liking the work

Table 2.6

What Research Says are Sample Indicators of Behavioral Engagement: What to Look for in the Data

Research	Behavioral Engagement
Bowman and Standiford (2014)	-active engagement
Hart et al. (2011)	-effort and persistence -participates in class discussions/ activities -try hard, work hard
Skinner et al. (2009)	-I try hard to do well, work hard -participate, pay attention, listen -involved, does more than is required
Reeve and Tseng (2011)	-listen carefully in class, try very hard -listen, pay attention
Reschly and Christenson (2012)	-participation, less behavioural incidents
Fredricks et al. (2004)	- persistence, effort, attention -showing enthusiasm, participation -positive conduct, work involvement -actively committed -on-task behaviour, concentration -autonomy participation -evidence of meta-cognition/ psychological investment -following rules -socially appropriate behaviour

Table 2.7

What Research Says are Sample Indicators of Cognitive Engagement: What to Look for in

the Data

Research	Cognitive Engagement
Bowman and Standiford (2014)	-active engagement -critical ethical reasoning -exercising creativity, spontaneity, imagination -improved problem-solving skills -learning multiple skills and knowledge base simultaneously -self-efficacy, perceived competence
Hart et al. (2011)	-persists on more challenging tasks -demonstrates appropriate effort for the tasks -is self-motivated -"when I study I relate to what I know, combine in new ways, how might be useful in real world, own words, connect to own experience" -"learning for school…how fits with what already know, associate to learnings in other classes"
Skinner et al. (2009)	-(265) "future improvements are needed… for the assessment of cognitive engagement"
Reeve and Tseng (2011)	--active, self-regulation -use of strategic and sophisticated learning strategies -relate new learning to what I already know -connect to own experiences -make different ideas fit together/ make sense -make up my own examples -if difficult/ change the way I learn material
Reschly and Christenson (2012)	-self-regulation -relevance of school to future aspirations -value of learning (goal setting)
Fredricks et al. (2004)	- investment, thoughtfulness -willingness to exert effort -self-regulated learning -feelings of achievement -use metacognitive strategies to plan, monitor and evaluate their cognition and accomplishing tasks -strategy use -problem with agreement in definition and how to measure -look at motivational lit./ indicators of psychological investment

2.5.1 The relationship between the literature and methods in this research

Miles et al. (2014) assert, "It is perfectly legitimate, and sometimes necessary, to work from the top down—from a conceptual framework or theory to the collection of information testing its validity" (p. 293). This is a deductive approach and Bengtsson (2016) tells us that a list of constructs generated deductively, rather than inductively, has a higher reliability. This assertion endorses the Radioplay research approach which uses Deductive Thematic Analysis to inform the Descriptive Case Study Methodology.

In terms of analytic generalizations: my conceptual claim shows how my study's findings are able to inform the set of theoretical constructs I set out: emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement, autonomy, relatedness (collaboration), and perceived competence. Defining a certain set of theoretical constructs is key to this process, highlighting the importance of this literature review. I connect my findings to these constructs. I show how the empirical results of my research are supported by, and support, the relevant theories of Drama in Education, Creativity Theory, Student Engagement Theory, and Self-Determination Theory.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This research uses the methodology of Descriptive Case Study, and it is informed by the methods of Deductive Thematic Analysis, consistent with this approach. The literature review, with its focus on theories and constructs, informs the data analysis. The criteria for analysis is predetermined, founded on themes evident in the relevant literature, and used to analyze the findings of this research. Braun and Clarke (2006) state, "…a theoretical approach requires engagement with the literature prior to analysis" (p. 86). This research follows a process laid out by Punch (2009, p. 75) involving collecting data, linking that data to concepts, and then to identified indicators. In my research the identified indicators reflect the constructs derived from substantial theories, explored in the literature review chapter, informing my data analysis and interpretation. The literature review focused on four key theories and their identified themes or constructs deemed important for engaging and motivating students. I will show how my study's findings align with the set of theoretical constructs defined and described in the literature review. They are key to this Radioplay instructional process. I will connect my findings to the identified constructs, and I will show how the results of my research are supported by the conceptual findings in the relevant theories.

3.1.1 Research questions

1. What indicators of the constructs of engagement (emotional, behavioral, and cognitive) are reported by students and/or observed by the teacher working with Radioplay?

2. What indicators of the constructs of autonomy, collaboration, and perceived competence (indicators of academic improvement) are reported by students and/or observed by the teacher working with Radioplay?

3. Will the quantitative data corroborate the qualitative data? This research will seek connections, and triangulation of findings through analysis of both qualitative and

quantitative data. In this way the validity of inferences in the research findings are strengthened (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2003).

The six constructs within my questions have been identified in the four main theories featured in my Literature Review. These theories are Drama Pedagogy, Student Engagement Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Creativity Theory. Wisker (2015, p. 64) asserts that in Deductive Thematic Analysis the Literature Review engages with theory and theoretical perspectives that are the foundation of the research and the research should evolve from it and it should inform and provide the framework for the research. My questions evolve from my literature review and my data analysis is grounded in it. According to Punch (2009), "…research questions then operationalize the conceptual framework, pointing ahead to the data" (p. 65). The questions focus and delimit the study. Research questions and methods should be as close as possible and methods should follow questions (Punch, 2009, pp. 64–65). Punch (2009) tells us there must be conceptual clarity matching questions to methods. My questions are linked to the theoretical perspectives of the four salient theories (above) that ground the inception and analysis of my study.

3.1.2 Supplementary questions

As this research progressed, incidental question and observations arose, which were also addressed through the data and findings:

1. What else may become apparent?
2. What are the experiences of students when participating in Radioplay?
3. What is the experience of the teacher when working with the Radioplay process?
4. How might the Radioplay process be improved as a resource for teachers?

3.1.3 Assumptions and hypotheses

To be transparent, my past experiences in the development of Radioplay had convinced me that there were pedagogical advantages in the approach. When I embarked on this formal investigation, I brought to it certain assumptions and hypotheses, which needed to be tested:

Assumptions:

1. Radioplay, through the autonomy and collaboration afforded through the process, engages and motivates students in literacy.

2. Radioplay is a creative way of teaching literacy that promotes creativity in students. This creativity will be reflected in the content of the stories that the students' Radioplay teams produce.

Hypotheses:

1. If Radioplay engages students behaviorally, the students will write more than they usually do for writing assignments. They will want to participate in the process and spend more time doing it.

2. If the Radioplay process is an exemplar of creative teaching, which I claim it is, the students' writing produced through the process will be novel and interesting and the story plot developments will continue to improve through student team collaborations.

3.2 Research Design

3.2.1 Summary of theoretical framework

The epistemology is Constructivism, which is distinct from Objectivism (used in Scientific Method) and Subjectivism (used in Autoethnography). Methodology scholar, Crotty (1998) explains that constructionism is:

> …the view that all knowledge and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context. (p. 42)

It follows logically then, that the Theoretical Perspective is Interpretivism, which fits well with the chosen methodology of Descriptive Case Study. This case study methodology seeks to reveal themes in relation to the predetermined, key theoretical constructs. The Radioplay inquiry process fits under Constructionism. This is the epistemology commonly used in social and educational inquiries. My methodology is Deductive Thematic Analysis,

using a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, aligning with content analysis to assess the magnitudes of responses.

The research, that is, this new trial with the new teacher, is a single case study in the "interpretive" tradition. The narrow focus lends itself well to an in-depth analysis.

3.2.1.1 Descriptive case study

There are many advantages to choosing the descriptive case study design to frame my research. Lune and Berg (2017) assert, "As a research methodology (Descriptive Case Study), it provides more context, history, and meaning than just about any other approach…only case studies focus on the uniqueness of each case" (p. 180). I want practicing teachers and pre-service teachers to discover that the Radioplay process is relevant to them in their own classrooms, with their own students. Punch (2009) argues that case studies are particularly valuable for studies in education explaining:

> Only an in-depth case study can provide understanding of the important aspects of a new or persistently problematic research area…Discovering the important features, developing an understanding…conceptualizing them for further study…the case study can make an important contribution in combination with other research approaches. (p. 123)

The case study design delineates and binds the context of my research to an identified group of students and their teacher. I seek to describe and better understand and explain the data for this specific educational context. Miles et al. (2014) call this a "within - case analysis", telling us it does not lend itself to generalizability (p. 102). I am focusing on the uniqueness of the case. I am not developing an inferential model to be applied to other cases. This research into Radioplay provides evidence to support the theories to which I refer in the Literature Review.

With regards to case studies, Lune and Berg (2017) state, "Most are designed around testable propositions derived from theory and existing research literature" (p. 176). O'Leary (2010) asserts that case studies can "provide supportive evidence" for theories (p. 175). Yin (2011, p. 95) also endorses a theory-before-research model; that these theories

provide us with the concepts that are key in the data collection and analysis process. I use theories to help explain my data.

I imposed analytical categories or concepts (constructs) in the data after the data was collected. This study features the actual words of the participants, both students and teacher. Pre-structuring the data does not permit people to provide information using their own terms, meanings, and understandings.

3.2.1.2 Deductive thematic analysis

Deductive thematic analysis, as a research method, has relevance and can be accepted as a method in "in its own right" (Nowell et al., 2017, p. 2). Nowell et al. (2017) provide a guide to using this method of analysis, stressing the key elements as, "…identifying, analysing, organizing, describing and reporting themes found within a data set (Braun & Clarke, 2006)" (p. 2). I have identified, analysed, organized, described, and reported themes found in the data set. In this work "themes" equal "constructs"- those variables found in the major theories I identified and analysed in the Literature Review chapter. In this way my Literature Review informs my analysis and provides merit and confirmation (Aaronson, 1994; Tuckett, 2005). Consequently, this research uses an appropriate process of deductively generating themes from theory before analysing data (Boyatzis, 1998).

I am using what Creswell (2014) would call a pragmatic approach. The methods I choose fit the research questions I want to answer; what I want to find out. I am working deductively, using theories about the substantive phenomena of engagement, motivation, and creativity. A theory is a set of propositions that describe and explain a phenomenon. The role of substantive theories in this study are to inform and structure the analysis of the data. They will contribute to the explanation, accounting for what happened, and finding reasons for "how" and "why". Explanation is the central focus of a substantive theory. A substantive theory is about content.

Serving the Descriptive Case Study methodology, in this thesis, the method of Deductive Thematic Analysis moves the research from the general to the specific and

concrete. Through the deduction, research proceeds downwards in abstraction from general concepts to indicators (Punch, 2009). Lune and Berg (2017) state that deductive reasoning is, "…considered to be a form of theory testing, in which one's conceptual framework guides the researcher to seek out and test anticipated patterns and relationships" (p. 194).   The relationships and patterns from my Radioplay research findings show an alignment with the salient theories I have identified and explored in my Literature Review.

My hypothesis is that the Radioplay instructional process, because of its design that includes autonomy and collaboration, elicits motivation and engagement in students. Additionally, students are expected to develop and demonstrate a "can do" perspective that aligns with the construct "perceived competence". These are the constructs identified by Drama Pedagogy, Engagement, Creativity, and Self-Determination Theories. I am testing theory in that I am asserting that the Radioplay process is an exemplar of these theories at work. I seek to explain how and why this applies. Graneheim, Lindgren, and Lundman (2017) explain that while using a deductive approach, "…researchers test the implications of existing theories or explanatory models about the phenomenon under study against the collected data" (p. 30). They further note that any coding frame developed by the researcher should be based on definitions of these constructs and must be explicit (Graneheim et al., 2017, p. 31). This is what I have aimed to do. The key constructs from the four theories are the categories I used to analyse the content of all my qualitative data. In line with the recommendations (Punch, 2009, p. 88) these systematic comparisons are standardized and used for all respondents. Together, the theories and their corresponding constructs will inform findings regarding the efficacy of the Radioplay process.

My deductive coding uses the actual words of the students and teacher, both spoken and written. I restricted myself to using verbatim data and avoided trying to interpret their words. The actual text, without interpretation, is called the "manifest content" (Bengtsson, 2016, p. 10). Bengtsson (2016), citing Burnard (1991), suggests, "…the researcher works this way gradually through each identified category…often uses the informants' words…in

81

this way, it is possible to stay closer to the original meanings and contexts" (p. 12).

However, he goes on to add this caution:

> The words used by the informants may not correspond to the researcher's view of
> their meaning. Other misrepresentations may arise due to the informants not telling
> the whole truth, or their being unable to express themselves, or their being affected
> by what they think the researcher wants to hear. (Burnard, 1995, as cited in
> Bengtsson, 2016, p. 11)

These are all possible problems, and they are typical of the many in any qualitative
research approach. In this research, because the project uses children's responses, it is
likely that some will be "unable to express themselves". The student subjects in this study
were young, at year four and five grade levels. Many of them had English as a second
language. Several had severe learning disabilities. All the collected students' words are
presented in the data analysis tables, along with this researcher's indicators of the
constructs expressed through them. This transparency enables scrutiny. These same
findings were shared with the case study teacher for corroboration, to modify and clarify the
analysis.

Braun and Clarke (2006) recommend the use of tables to organize the data, which I
have done. In the first stage of analysis each student response to each of the five questions
posed in the survey was analysed for indications of each and any of these six key
constructs. Braun and Clarke (2006) state:

> …remember that you can code individual extracts of data in as many different
> 'themes' as they fit into-so an extract may be uncoded, coded once, or coded as
> many times as relevant". (p. 89)

Responses in the first table analysis are clearly marked to show which constructs are
applicable. For example, one student response was as follows (uncorrected):

> "That Raido play is one of the best group writing excirses ever. I highly suggest
> Raido Play to your student/child to do this activity / excirses."

The constructs identified with this student response include positive emotional engagement, collaboration, and cognitive engagement.

As recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 89), I have collated all data extracts within the identified constructs. A second set of tables show relevant responses grouped together for each construct. Both sets of tables contribute to the analysis of response magnitude, discussed in detail in the "Content Analysis" section of this chapter. Tables were also used for each of the teacher observations or responses to questions and analysed in the same manner. The credibility of the findings will depend on how well the data is covered by the categories in the analysis and whether relevant or irrelevant data was either excluded or included (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004, p. 110). In my analysis both students' and teachers' words were categorized into the relevant constructs identified in the salient theories. All tables of analysis are presented in this study and are reviewed in the "Findings and Analysis" section.

Bengtsson (2016) tells us that a list of constructs generated deductively, rather than inductively, has a higher reliability. This assertion can only strengthen the findings this research has shown. Braun and Clarke (2006) advise that in the final analysis, each theme, or construct, should be used to create an overall story about the topic, in this case motivating and engaging students in literacy My final analysis shows how the Radioplay process taps into the constructs or themes from the four theories identified. My research findings show that students using the Radioplay process are motivated and engaged creatively.

3.2.1.3 Content analysis

Content analysis is a method that contributes in that it provides a means to *quantify* the qualitative data (Bengtsson, 2016, p. 13). I decided to quantify the written student survey responses and the verbal or written teacher textual data that I received. My analysis aligns with the work of Chi (2009) in her paper "Quantifying Qualitative Analyses of Verbal Data: A Practical Guide". Chi (2009, p. 273) explains the quantification of the qualitative data makes the data less subjective. O'Leary (2010) calls this "linguistic quantification"; the use of words and text as units of analysis to be tallied (p. 270). What O'Leary calls 'tallying',

Chi calls the 'magnitude of responses'. Simply put, this counting of relevant responses around construct indicators will provide a sense of which constructs resonated more with the case study subjects. These frequency counts of relevant data can be expressed as percentages. For example, if 7 out of 14 students indicated positive emotional engagement, you could display the magnitude of the response as 50%. Assessing the magnitudes of the constructs presented highlights the levels of focus the participants, both teacher and students, have indicated.

I used percentages to indicate the magnitude of student survey responses, as well as frequency counts. Teacher observations and responses were also analysed using frequency counts. While magnitudes cannot be viewed as findings, they can be useful in illustrating the importance of some findings in the complete analysis (Lune & Berg, 2017, p. 187). Yin (2011, p. 194) provides a detailed description of the use of matrices to analyse data and assess the magnitude of responses. The first student analysis uses matrices; two dimensional arrays of rows and columns, to display and categorize the qualitative data in the form of open-ended student survey responses. These responses are conceptually ordered; a set of categories (constructs) arrayed against another set (survey responses). As recommended by Yin (2011, p. 194), I used cells to indicate whether a category is represented by each survey response. Following this first analysis of student responses, separate tables show relevant student and teacher comments for each of the six constructs, providing a frequency tally. In this way the number of comments for each construct may be viewed and compared, using both the percentage magnitudes and frequency counts for student comments, and the frequency of teacher comments.

To be transparent, there are some drawbacks to using content analysis. Lune and Berg (2017, p. 182) point out that it is not causal. It shows us *what* is present; but does not address *why* (Lune & Berg, 2017, p. 200). My findings show that student engagement, in all its forms, are present. The qualitative findings show that students were motivated, had perceived competence for the tasks, and enjoyed the collaboration with their peers. With

regards to "Directed Content Analysis", Lune and Berg (2017), cite the work of Hsieh and Shannon (2005), telling us it:

> "…involves the use of more analytic codes and categories derived from existing theories and explanations relevant to the research focus…code categories reflect the meanings and expectations inherent in the theoretical framework that the researcher has adopted in order to view the study". (pp. 183, 184)

I show that the Radioplay process fulfils the "expectations" for student affects that are "inherent" in the four theories and six key constructs used to provide the framework for my analysis. By examining patterns in the categorised responses, causality is suggested (Lune & Berg, 2017, p. 200).

3.2.1.4 Ethics

Applications for ethics approval were made to both the James Cook University Human Research Ethics Committee in Townsville, Australia, and the Vancouver Board of Education in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. The research protocol was approved by both ethics' committees. Vancouver Board of Education approval was granted November. 9th, 2015. James Cook University Human Research Ethics Committee granted approval for research on teaching involving human subjects from the period of the end of November 2015 through to November 30th, 2016.

Informed consent was obtained from the school case study teacher and participants (both students and parents). This was achieved by providing them with an information sheet clearly explaining the aims and procedures of the study. The case study teacher, students, and parents were all required to sign informed consent documents. These consent documents indicated their willingness to participate in the study, as well as the knowledge that they were free to withdraw their consent at any time without question. Samples of participant letters and consent forms can be seen in Appendices and include:

1. Informed Consent Form (teacher)
2. Information Sheet (parents and students)
3. Informed Consent Form (parents)

4.   Informed Consent Form (students)

Confidentiality was assured to all participants. Identifying information such as the names of participants, contact details, or school site name were not provided.

Upon completion of the research, a report of the case study results was provided to the Vancouver Board of Education that included the abstract for this thesis.

3.3 Setting, Context and Participants' Characteristics

The Radioplay research took place in a split year four/five classroom in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada in 2015/2016. Prior to this formal research, I had begun developing the Radioplay process while working as a teacher in a High School Special Education class for the Vancouver School Board. After that I used the Radioplay process consistently and it became an important part of my self-devised literacy program. During a period of twelve years, I had the good fortune to work with an exceptional aide who assisted me in delivering the Radioplay instructional process with my special education classes. This aide has since become a teacher and she expressed an interest in using Radioplay in her own, regular education classes. Consequently, for this research, the teacher agreed to using Radioplay during the 2015/2016 school year (in Canada terms run from September through June) to support this research project. After the collection and sharing of data, with ethical approvals in place, she provided the data for this study.

In this new and experimental trial of the Radioplay instructional process, the teacher was working in a "split" class situation, having both grade 4 students and grade 5. There were 30 students in total. Of the 20 grade 4 students, 12 were female and 8 were male. Of the 10 grade 5 students, 6 were male and 4 were female. I provided the teacher with a complete write up of the Radioplay process and support materials that gave specific instructions for each part of the Radioplay process. The teacher's previous experience of working with me doing Radioplay was an advantage to this study in terms of replicating my way of working with Radioplay. It was also an advantage that the new data would be coming from a classroom situation that was a close match to that used in my reflective study of past

practice, being a Canadian classroom with students at a grade 4/5 level. In these ways, the experimental trial of Radioplay in a new setting retained a certain consistency in delivery and pedagogical context.

3.3.1 Data collection procedures

      Three types of qualitative data were collected consisting of:

1.   teacher reflections, observations, and responses to questions from the researcher,

2.   student survey responses, and

3.   rough drafts of Radioplay chapters from all students.

      The data from my coresearcher in Canada was delivered to me, the researcher, in Australia via the post and emails.

      Teacher Reflections / Observations / Question Responses: The teacher/coresearcher recorded thoughts and observations throughout the process, however most observations were written. They consisted of diary-like entries and responses to questions. Recordings and written material were forwarded to me through the post and through emails. I transcribed and analysed the recordings along with any written work. All communications from the teacher are presented in table analyses and additionally, in the appendices.

      Student Survey Responses: The data appears to support my assertion that students' feelings of autonomy, competence and engagement are enhanced by the Radioplay process. These open-ended student survey questions were designed to seek relevant data to confirm these assertions:

1.   What do you think about Radioplay?

2.   Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or Why not?

3.   How did you feel when using Radioplay?

4.   What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?

5.   How can you make Radioplay better?

Students wrote their responses to these survey questions. The original surveys were forwarded to me as part of the data collection process. All student responses are presented uncorrected and verbatim in all table analyses.

Student Radioplay Chapters: All original copies of students' draft copies of Radioplay chapters were forwarded to me for analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data in the two key areas of academic improvement and behavioral engagement.

Academic Improvement: A textual/content analysis was done for the students' work to determine if academic outcomes had improved. A broad range of variables was examined. Student writing was examined for the quality of the narrative and the extent that literary devices were used to increase the quality of the writing, such as the use of adjectives, adverbs, similes, and metaphors. Usage of these literary devices was quantified on a chapter by chapter basis for each student.

Behavioral Engagement: I counted and recorded the number of words used in each of the students' chapters, as this is seen as one of the indicators of behavioral engagement. Word count has previously been used as quantitative evidence of behavioral engagement in a study by Lo and Hyland (2007), who investigated word count as a means to show persistence and effort in students' written passages (Fredricks et al., 2004). Note also that the number of chapters students wrote is important data for this study.

To summarize, this research uses a Descriptive Case Study methodology to seek evidence that Radioplay served to motivate students to engage with creative writing. The evidence, which is presented and analysed in the next chapter, shows that through deductive thematic analysis of the case study evidence, the data for this research can be seen to comply with six pre-identified hallmarks of engagement with creative writing; that is, the key constructs for this analysis:

1. emotional engagement,
2. behavioral engagement,
3. cognitive engagement, along with
4. student autonomy,

5. student collaboration and

6. a perceived sense of competence as a learner.

These constructs are indicators of improved student motivation, and they are identified within these four theories, which along with the constructs, inform the deductive analysis:

1. Drama Pedagogy

2. Student Engagement Theory

3. Self-Determination Theory

4. Creativity Theory

Let us now examine the Radioplay data in view of these theories and in the context of the methodological framework outlined in this chapter.

Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

The data collected for analysis consists of student survey responses, completed drafts of Radioplay Teams' written chapters, and teacher observations, reflections, and question responses. These findings are analyzed in seven parts:

1. Table analyses of student survey responses (indicating which constructs applicable)

2. Table analyses of student survey responses (sorted for each construct)

3. Table analyses of teacher observations and responses (sorted for each construct)

4. Analysis of students' written work

5. Student recommendations on how to make Radioplay better

6. Corroboration from the case study teacher

7. Summary of findings.

Part One and Part Two of this findings and analysis chapter both consist of sets of table analyses for student responses to the five questions in the survey:

1. What do you think about Radioplay?

2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?

3. How do you feel when using Radioplay?

4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?

5. How can you make Radioplay better?

The sets of tables differ in their focus, but both are linked to the key constructs identified in this case study. This is also true for the table analyses of teacher observations and responses. The key constructs, drawn from the literature, and which inform this research analysis are:

1. Positive and / or negative emotional engagement

2. Collaboration indicated

3. Academic improvement indicated (perceived competence)

4. Autonomy indicated

5. Cognitive engagement indicated

6. Behavioral engagement indicated.

All student and teacher comments are analyzed for indications of each and any of these constructs.

4.1.1 Part One

The first set of tables shows all student responses to each of the five survey questions. There are two tables of responses for each question, one for each gender. These tables are equal in number as in the class of 28 students, 14 are females and 14 are males. This study prominently features the voices of the students themselves, as each response is displayed verbatim. In this first stage of analysis each comment is analyzed for indicators of any or each of the six key constructs included in the focus of this study. Where a certain construct is indicated in a student's response, a corresponding 'box' is highlighted. For example, if a student says, "I love it", a box for positive emotional engagement is highlighted. These highlighted squares or boxes are then tabulated to show a frequency of response for each construct, both for male and female tables of responses. These tabulations are also expressed as percentages. For example, if 7 out of 14 males indicated a positive emotional engagement indicator, the 'magnitude' of the response would be displayed as 50%.

4.1.2 Part Two

The second set of tables assembles and displays all student comments applicable to each of the identified constructs, with male and female responses mixed. Within these tables, student comments, both positive and negative, are also grouped under the corresponding stimulus questions. The student survey responses, assembled into each of the constituent key constructs, are then presented in order, from those constructs with the most frequently occurring indicators, to the least often occurring. Therefore, the table displays for the six key constructs are presented in this order:

1. Emotional Engagement

2. Cognitive Engagement

3.   Collaboration / Relationship Exemplars

4.   Behavioral Engagement

5.   Academic Improvement / Perceived Competence

6.   Autonomy Exemplars

A discussion of the findings for each key construct follows each table presentation. These discussions begin with displays showing the percentage of responses applicable to each construct and for each question. These percentages are from the first set of tables in part one of this analysis, showing all student comments for each question. Consistent with part one, they are divided by gender, with male and female responses displayed separately.

4.1.3 Part Three

Part Three consists of table analyses of teacher comments, followed by a summary. The teacher recorded reflections and responded to questions from the researcher in email communications. These comments are analyzed with reference to the six key constructs that are the focus of this case study. Like those for the students, all teacher comments are assembled in tables with the corresponding key construct indicated. A discussion follows each table presentation and concluding comments are offered.

4.1.4 Part Four

Part Four begins with a summary analysis of the students' written work. Students organized themselves into teams that produced the Radioplay narratives. This summary precedes the table analysis of each Radioplay team's narrative. These narratives are examined for the quality of their plots, the use of literary devices, and quantity of writing produced. These in-depth table analyses identify gender, year level and special designations of the students. The tables show the numbers and types of literary devices used as well as the number of chapters written and corresponding word counts. Plot details for each chapter are outlined. Items "of note" are recorded as well as student work samples. The summary focuses the analysis on four areas:

1.   Radioplay narratives

2.   Behavioral engagement

3.   Gender differences in word usage

4.   Use of literary devices.

4.1.5 Part Five

Part Five looks in depth at the student responses to question five regarding how to make Radioplay better. These are displayed in two tables. One table shows all female responses, and the other table shows comments from the males. Students may have thought no improvement was needed, or that they did not know how Radioplay could be made better. Students may have had ideas on how to improve the Radioplay process, or the experience of working with Radioplay for themselves. These three areas illustrate the students' suggestions:

1.   Technical skills

2.   Plot setting

3.   Computer use

Student comments applicable to each of these areas are discussed.

4.1.6 Part Six

Part Six turns again to feedback from the teacher. Findings from the study were forwarded for comment. In this form of "member checking", the case study teacher's corroboration of findings is valuable in providing reliability and verification.

4.1.7 Part Seven

Part Seven provides an overall summary of the findings, comparing those of the students and those of the teacher.

4.2 Part One: Student Survey Findings and Analysis

4.2.1 Introduction

The case study students were asked five survey questions to ascertain their experiences working with the Radioplay process. The participants were year four/five students who were able to write their own responses to the survey questions. The student survey responses were analyzed for evidence of the six key constructs identified in the major

theories informing this study. These student responses are recorded exactly as they were written, complete with errors.

In the class of twenty-eight students there were nineteen grade four students and nine grade five students. Eleven females were in grade four and three in grade five. Nine male students were in grade four and six in grade five. The male / female split was even at fourteen for each. The numbers identify the students from the class list provided by the teacher. The students are identified by their class list number, their gender, and their grade. For example, "3/M/4" signifies the student is number three on the class list, is male and in grade four. These same identifiers are used in Part Three, the "Student Work" section of this "Findings and Analysis" chapter.

In this part one of the analysis of student comments, each table shows either fourteen female responses to a question, or fourteen male responses to a question in this case study class of 28 students. Boxes for each of the six Key Constructs follow each response, to be highlighted if the construct is indicated. These highlighted boxes are tabulated. The tabulations are also presented as percentages by dividing the total of responses by fourteen. In this way the magnitude of response for each question and for each key construct is shown, for females and for males. No student responses were left out of the table analyses, both the part one and part two series of tables, presented in this chapter.

For each of the five questions in the student survey, student responses were analyzed for indicators of the six key constructs. Some student responses were indicative of more than one of the key constructs and this is recorded. For example, here is a female grade four response to the question, "What do you think about Radioplay?":

"I think Radioplay is perfect for someone who likes to write…It is a fun way to improve your writing by creating a story based on reality. It is AWSOME! Radioplay !ROCKS!"

This student response was deemed to be indicative of positive emotional engagement, perceived competence or academic improvement, and cognitive engagement.

94

Female responses and male responses have been presented in separate tables for each survey question. The tables are presented in landscape format. Following each of these tables, an examination of the magnitude or amount of responses for females and males, and both combined, is offered for the five questions. By looking at the magnitude of responses we can see which of the six key constructs feature more prominently with the students.

Table 4.1

Frequencies of Female Answers to Question One, By Grade (N=14)

		Question: What do you think about Radioplay?						
Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim female student responses [1]	1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
2/F/4	I think Radioplay is awesome and fun to do.	▒						
4/F/4	I Love Radio-Play because I love collaborating with my friends to write a story. I like it because some parts are really ecxiting and dramatic.	▒		▒				
6/F/4	I like radio Play it is fun!	▒						
9/F/4	I think it is fun and makes imagination more intersting. It's like a life story but you can make it more intersting.	▒						
10/F/4	What I think about Radioplay is that it's a new opretunity to use your imagineation and brain in different ways. It is also a great way to think about what words to use and not too use. I think Radioplay is very fun. I am happy that our teacher lets us write freely. It is also very injoyd that we can write at our own pase. It is also another way to make new friends and socialize. It is an exersize too improve writing. I LOVE it!	▒		▒	▒	▒	▒	▒
12/F/4	I think it is very fun and lots of the people in my class like doing it a lot. I hope I get to do radio play again in my life!	▒						
15/F/4	I think radio play is amazing. It is such a fun way to write. It inspiers me to write more in	▒					▒	

96

ID	Response							
	the summer. It takes writing (witch I don't like) into a whole different universe. I love raidoplay.	▓					▓	
19/F/4	I think it is super fun. It's a time were you hang out and right a <u>storie</u> about your character and do what ever you want in the <u>storie.</u>	▓				▓		
21/F/4	I think that Radioplay is a great way to write, but talk and have fun at the same time! I think that it is fun to join groups together and write an awesome story! Radioplay takes fun writing to the next level! I think that working on Radioplay will definitely help you develop your writing skills. You can make a simple fictional character turn into a great adventurer!	▓		▓	▓		▓	▓
22/F/4	I think Radioplay is perfect for someone who likes to write. For me it is loads of fun but not my favoritie activity. It is a fun way to improve your writing by creating a story based on reality. It is AWSOME! Radioplay !ROCKS!	▓		▓	▓		▓	
27/F/4	It is awesomer than awesom can be! It tottaly rocks!	▓						
1/F/5	I think it's awesome!!!	▓						
24/F/5	I think it's an amazing way to get your Imagination going. I think it's fun creative and a great way for people to learn. It can also help you know other people better. I think Radio play is cool because the stories connect to each other when the characters talk.	▓		▓			▓	
28/F/5	I think that Radioplay was so fun. It always made me happy when we got to do it because I can talk with my friends as well as doing work of corse!!! (smiley face)	▓		▓				▓
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	14	0	5	4	2	9	3
	PERCENTAGE %	100	0	36	29	14	64	21

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade.

Table 4.2

Frequencies of Male Answers to Question One, By Grade (N=14)

	Question: What do you think about Radioplay?							
Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim male student responses [1]	1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4.. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
3/M/4	Meh, a bit boring, I would rather make a norm book.		▓				▓	
8/M/4	I think Radioplay is a good idea. It is really good until people start leaveing and arguing. What I mean by that is One of are group members left and then the other joined another group. (crying emoji)	▓	▓	▓			▓	▓
11/M/4	I think that Radioplay is amazing! It makes writing so much more Fun!	▓						
13/M/4	I think Radioplay is awesome! It really helps you think of what adventures and helps people out. It is also a fun activity for groups!	▓		▓	▓		▓	
17/M/4	I think Radioplay is very fun and awesome.	▓						
20/M//4	I really like it it is so fun !!!!!!!	▓						
23/M/4	I like Radioplay because it's a fun excersise to do radioplay involves a lot of writing which can make your writing grow and grow so radioplay is good.	▓			▓		▓	
25/M/4	The radio play was really fun. It was a pleasant experience.	▓						

ID	Comment							
5/M/5	I think Radioplay is great! You get to work with others and make stories which is amazing. I love how you can write anything you think of. You can just go on and on with all the writing. It is just a fun way of writing.	▓		▓	▓		▓	▓
7/M/5	I think it is a really great activity to use your imaginations also this is awesome for people that are not really good writiers (like me).	▓			▓		▓	▓
14/M/5	I think that Radioplay is a great thing for us to do, because it helps us with our writing and communication.	▓			▓		▓	
16/M/5	it is very fun for me and I think I'll Keep on going	▓						▓
18/M/5	I like Radioplay but there are some days I hate it	▓	▓					
26/M/5	I think that Radioplay is awesome.	▓						
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	13	3	3	4	1	7	4
	PERCENTAGE %	93	21	21	29	7	50	29

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade.

Question One: What do you think about Radioplay?

Both females and males showed the strongest indications for positive emotional engagement, followed by cognitive engagement. Females indicated perceived academic improvement as the third most frequent. Males indicated behavioral engagement as the third most frequent.

Table 4.3

Frequencies of Female Answers to Question Two, By Grade (N=14)

Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim female student responses [1]	Question: Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?						
		1.Positive emotion indicators	1.Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
2/F/4	Yes becaues it nice and fun!	�						
4/F/4	I would like to do it again because I could maybe do a part 2 of my first one.	▓					▓	
6/F/4	I would totally use radio play again,	▓						
9/F/4	I would because it's like writing a book and I like writing books.	▓					▓	
10/F/4	I would like to use Radioplay again someday so I can use my imagination. I also really like it. Radioplay improved my writing so much. I would like to improve my writing much more over the year.	▓			▓		▓	
12/F/4	I would like to do radio play again becase we can be creative and rest our minds.	▓					▓	
15/F/4	I would love to use raidoplay. It just is so fun to make	▓			▓		▓	

	charecters and write. It's a great learning method too.							
19/F/4	Yes. Because I think it's a great bonding time for you and your friend's.							
21/F/4	I would absolutely LOVE to use Radioplay again some time because each time you create a character, you write madly with great detail as you go. Only good things can happen after writing a Radioplay							
22/F/4	Radioply YES! Is awesome It is the best thing I will ever experience in my LIFE!!							
27/F/4	YES!!! Its so much fun! I get to hang out with my friends and stuff like that…							
1/F/5	Yes I would because is It lets us use are creativie tow right!							
24/F/5	I would love to do radio play again. I enjoyed using my imagination, and working with friends. I love writing and hope I can do it again some day. I also enjoyed chooseing my character and storie.							
28/F/5	I would LOVE to do Radioplay again because I think it's a good time to get together with your friends and write. But the thing is that it makes it so							

	much more fun when you write with friends.							
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	14	0	4	3	1	8	5
	PERCENTAGE %	100	0	29	21	7	57	36

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade.

Table 4.4

Frequencies of Male Answers to Question Two, By Grade (N=14)

	Question: Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?							
Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim male student responses [1]	Positive emotion indicators	Negative emotion indicators	1. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	2. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	3. Autonomy indicated	4. Cognitive engagement indicated	5. Behavioral engagement indicated
3/M/4	I wouldn't, typing on a computer is way faster. It takes too much time to decide what to do with your group.		X				X	X
8/M/4	I would not wan't to use Radioplay again because I have no one in my group. (sad/ crying face)		X	X				
11/M/4	Yes I would because I have so much intrest in it. It makes me very happy	X					X	
13/M/4	Yes I would like to because it is soooo much fun when you are doing it	X						
17/M/4	yes I would like to use Radioplay again because it was fun.	X						
20/M/4	I would love to use Radioplay again it is really fun!!!	X						
23/M/4	Maybe if I want to improve my writing and improve how I work in groups radio play is a fun non realistic Story radio play is just a fun writing activity to do so I might use radioplay again but not every year because il get tired of it.l	X		X	X		X	
25/M/4	I would love to do the radio play again because it taughjt me how to write really well.	X			X		X	

103

ID	Response							
5/M/5	I would like to do RadioPlay again because the more I write, the more better I get at writing. And it would be nice to do Radioplay with a new group.	X		X	X		X	
7/M/5	I would like to do this again because it was really fun to discuss and write with a group.	X		X				X
14/M/5	I would like to use Radioplay again because it is Fun and helpful.	X			X		X	
16/M/5	yes I do	X						
18/M/5	Maybe	X						
26/M/5	I would like to use Radioplay again because it is fun.	X						
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	12	2	4	4	0	6	2
	PERCENTAGE %	86	14	29	29	0	43	14

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number, their sex and grade.

Question Two: Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?

The most frequent indicators for both female and male students were for positive emotional engagement, followed by cognitive engagement. Females indicated for behavioral engagement as the third most frequent, while males tied in their frequency of indicators for collaboration and perceived academic improvement.

Table 4.5

Frequencies of Female Answers to Question Three, By Grade (N=14)

Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim female student responses[1]	Question: How do you feel when using Radioplay?						
		1. Positive emotional indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
2/F/4	I feel like I want to Play I also feel like I am in a advensher	▓					▓	
4/F/4	I feel ecxited to write a new chapter.	▓						
6/F/4	I feel relaxed, free I also have a lot of fun.	▓						
9/F/4	I enjoy it and I can imagine the scene.	▓					▓	
10/F/4	I felt happy because my group would joke around about our characters and we would get to know each other better and eventually became really good friends.	▓		▓				▓
12/F/4	I feel exited and I like working with other people. We can plan it.	▓		▓		▓		▓
15/F/4	I felt great when I was talking to my friends writing and joking around. I was super exicted when I heard what raidoplay was.	▓		▓				
19/F/4	Sometimes I felt mad because we did not agree on some thing's. But mostly I was happy and proud of my whriting	▓	▓	▓	▓		▓	

105

ID	Response							
21/F/4	I felt great, but my hand hurts after writing so much! I always put my best effort when writing my Radioplay Radioplay is great!	▨			▨		▨	▨
22/F/4	I felt AMAZING! LUCKHY. AWSOME, COOL, PRIVLAGED, HAPPY AND PROUD!	▨			▨			
27/F/4	awesome!!	▨						
1/F/5	I feel com and Relaxed	▨						
24/F/5	I feel excited on every page. A new Idea, a new paragraph, a new page to write. I feel ancious to get everyh one of my ideas down. Especially the exiting parts.	▨					▨	
28/F/5	I felt very exited, happy, and it was fun. I'm not a huge fan of writing stories but Radioplay just made it so much more fun to write.	▨						
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	14	1	4	3	1	5	3
	PERCENTAGE %	100	7	29	21	7	36	21

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade**.**

Table 4.6

Frequencies of Male Answers to Question Three, By Grade (N=14)

Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim male student responses [1]	Question: How do you feel when using Radioplay?						
		1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
3/M/4	Bored		▓					
8/M/4	I felt amazed at the beginning but at the end I felt Mad, fustirated, uncared, and Angry! (angry face drawn)	▓	▓					
11/M/4	I feel very focused, happy and relaxed it makes me calm down and have fun	▓					▓	
13/M/4	I feel creative and imaginative when I am doing radioplay.	▓					▓	
17/M/4	I felt happy and excited.	▓						
20/M/4	I felt great because you can write anything!	▓			▓			
23/M/4	I felt honoured and good for seeing how much writing I did in the past months, weeks, etc it really feels an honor and I was happy to work with a group on a unrealistic story I felt happy and kind of disappointed.	▓	▓	▓				
25/M/4	I felt great and excited, it was a fun experience	▓						
5/M/5	I feel very happy when I write. I've made some new friends so it made it more injoyible, sometimes I feel upset because I have to wait for my friends,	▓	▓	▓			▓	▓

	but I've learned not to be that impacent.							
7/M/5	I feel happy because I really like to write down all of the chapters for my Raido play story							
14/M/5	I felt exitment when I was using the Radioplay.							
16/M/5	I feel good wen I write							
18/M/5	Bored, Radioplay isn't fun when you have to write two copies of everything							
26/M/5	I felt a little bit stressed.							
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	11	6	2	0	1	4	2
	PERCENTAGE %	79	43	14	0	7	29	14

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade**.**

Question Three: How do you feel when using Radioplay?

The trend continues with both females and males indicating positive emotional engagement most frequently. Females indicated cognitive engagement as the second most frequent. The males indicated a second highest frequency of negative emotional engagement. The reasons for the high frequency of negative comments from males will be explored in detail in upcoming analyses. Females indicated perceived academic improvement as the third most frequent. The males indicated cognitive engagement as their third most frequent.

Table 4.7

Frequencies of Female Answers to Question Four, By Grade (N=14)

Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim female student responses [1]	Question: What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?						
		1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
2/F/4	Radioplay is fun and Joyfull and also awesome and advenshres and Paly full and you all soudle try it.	X						
4/F/4	I would tell them that is was really fun because it was really cool to write a chapter book with friends.	X		X				
6/F/4	I would tell them radio play is fun. I have a lot of fun when I am writing	X						
9/F/4	It calms you down and takes over your imagination to bring an inspiration.	X					X	
10/F/4	I would tell teachers and parents that Radioplay is a great way to teach kids to work with a group. This teaches kids to focus and write a little more than usual.	X		X	X		X	X
12/F/4	I would tell them that it is amazing that you can write that much just as you think. At the begin you think you will never be able to finish but you do!!!!!!	X					X	
15/F/4	I would tell them to use this procces and give there kids and students a lot of time not to rush them.	X						

109

ID	Response							
19/F/4	I would say "hey you should do radioplay with your class". "It's really fun (and smiley face)							
21/F/4	I would tell people that Radioplay is super fun to write and that you can create a real book out of it. You can literally bend the story however you want to! It's awesome.							
22/F/4	I would tell parents and teachers that you have to try Radioplay because it is the BEST!							
27/F/4	It's so much fun!							
1/F/5	I would tell them "I rote Pages and Pages of writing and I still don't feel (?don…done enough?)							
24/F/5	I would tell them how exciting it is and how creative it is. I'd tell them that it's exciting and that you have to use your imagination a lot							
28/F/5	I would tell my teachers and parents that I love Radioplay and that anything is possible when you put your mind to it. I would also tell them that it made writing more fun for me!							
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	14	0	2	1	1	6	2
	PERCENTAGE %	100	0	14	7	7	43	14

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade.

Table 4.8

Frequencies of Male Answers to Question Four, By Grade (N=14)

		Question: What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?						
Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim male student responses [1]	1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
3/M/4	It's good for L.a.	▓			▓			
8/M/4	I would tell the teachers that please don't ever do this again because it just made me lose friends. I would tell parents it is a writing exersize but it is boring and frustirating.		▓	▓			▓	▓
11/M/4	I would tell them it makes me happy and I get a lot of intrest in it and wanht to be a writer and write about my Radio play	▓					▓	
13/M/4	That I have had soo much fun doin it, tell whats happened so far and what chapter I am on	▓						
17/M/4	I would tell them to do it with their kids and students.	▓						
20/M/4	I would tell them that it is fun and I would tell them that they should do it!	▓						
23/M/4	I would tell them look at how much writing I wrote do you see how I improved my writing I would say stuff like how I improved my writing how long my writing is how much hardspelled words im putting in how much new words I am putting in grammar and words that are hard to understand I would also say it's a fun group activity creating stories from your brain that's what I would tell.			▓	▓		▓	▓

ID	Response							
25/M/4	That I recommended the radioplay to teachers and for parents to say that I enjoyed it.	▓						
5/M/5	Yes, I would tell my parents and teachers about what a wonderful experience I had doing Radioplay. I would also ask my teacher to do Radioplay. I would also write and read to my parents. **I LOVE RADIOPLAY!**	▓					▓	
7/M/5	That Raido play is one of the best group writing excrises ever. I highly sugest Raido Play to your student/child to do this activity/ excirses.	▓		▓			▓	
14/M/5	I would tell them what we do in Radioplay, and why I like it.	▓						
16/M/5	lot's of things	▓						
18/M/5	You might like it, try it out.	▓						
26/M/5	I would say radioplay is awesome and it is alot of fun.	▓						
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	13	1	3	2	0	5	2
	PERCENTAGE %	93	7	21	14	0	36	14

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade**.**

Question Four: What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?

Both females and males had the highest frequency of indicators for positive emotional engagement, followed by cognitive engagement.

Females were tied in third place with collaboration indicated and behavioral engagement. The third most frequent indicator for males was for

collaboration.

Table 4.9

Frequencies of Female Answers to Question Five, By Grade (N=14)

Student I.D.[2]	Verbatim female student responses[1]	Question: How can you make Radioplay better?						
		1. Positive emotion indicators	1. Negative emotion indicators	2. Collaboration indicated (relationships)	3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence)	4. Autonomy indicated	5. Cognitive engagement indicated	6. Behavioral engagement indicated
2/F/4	I like it the way it is.	X						
4/F/4	I feel that it is fine the way it is.	X						
6/F/4	I don't need to make radioplay better							
9/F/4	By making the stories more adventurous.						X	
10/F/4	I wouln't change anything because it's great how it is! (smiley face/ LOL)	X						
12/F/4	It is fine the way it is right now	X						
15/F/4	I think raido play would be better if not everybody is your class would go to the same place but if different groups went to other places.						X	
19/F/4	Maybe we should do the good copy's on the computer and print it out.						X	
21/F/4	Well, you can make Radioplay better by keeping it as-is. There is nothing that I don't like about Radioplay. Radioplay is the best way to write	X					X	
22/F/4	I do not know to make Radioplay better.							

ID	Comment							
27/F/4	Be quicker						▓	
1/F/5	I can't it is already great!!! (hearts instead of dots)	▓						
24/F/5	I for One think that radio play is the amazing experience it is. But I think it would be more exciting if every once in a while you act an exciting chapter out with your friends.	▓		▓			▓	
28/F/5	For me Radioplay cant be any better than it already is!!! (and in big balloon letters: I heart Radioplay!!)	▓						
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	8	0	1	0	0	6	0
	PERCENTAGE %	57	0	7	0	0	43	0

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on a class list of 28, their sex and grade.

Table 4.10

Frequencies of Male Answers to Question Five, By Grade (N=14)

| | Question: How can you make Radioplay better? | | | | | | | |
| | Verbatim male student responses [1] | 1. Positive emotion indicators | 1. Negative emotion indicators | 2. Collaboration indicated (relationships) | 3. Academic improvement perceived by student (perceived competence) | 4. Autonomy indicated | 5. Cognitive engagement indicated | 6. Behavioral engagement indicated |
Student I.D.[2]								
3/M/4	I don't know							
8/M/4	I would make radioplay better by not putting people into groups. Or there are separate groups and we act out a scene.			▓			▓	
11/M/4	To make it better I would add more chapters and info. But I am fine how it is	▓					▓	
13/M/4	I do not know how to make radioplay better because it is already better	▓						
17/M/4	you can make it better by giving us more time to do it						▓	
20/M/4	By writing more chapters and knowing good grammar						▓	
23/M/4	By telling people to focus include new people to radioplay teaching kids how to spell certain words basically teaching people how to be better spellers and be creative and a good thinker basically meke them be good at writing and radioplay.			▓			▓	
25/M/4	I don't think I can make the radioplay any better.							

5/M/5	I can make radioplay better by asking what words I can use and not use the same sentences or words.						▒	
7/M/5	I think that Raidoplay cannot improve. I say that Raidoplay is already really good.	▒						
14/M/5	I think if we could write Radioplay in book form it would be better.						▒	
16/M/5	Make pichers of the Story.						▒	
18/M/5	Don't know.							
26/M/5	I can make radioplay better by adding pictures.						▒	
	TOTALS (frequencies) / 14	3	0	2	0	0	9	0
	PERCENTAGE %	21	0	14	0	0	64	0

Notes: 1. Each shaded cell represents one response. 2. The ID represents the student number on the class list of 28, their sex and grade**.**

Question Five: How can you make Radioplay better?

Females had the highest frequency of indicators for positive emotional engagement. Males had the highest frequency of indicators for cognitive engagement, which came in second place for the females. The second most frequent indicators from the males were for positive emotional engagement. Collaboration indicators came in third place for both females and males.

4.3 Part Two: Table Analyses of Student Survey Responses (Sorted for Each Construct)

4.3.1 Introduction

In part two all student comments are displayed in separate tables representing each of the six key constructs. The female and male student responses combined are recorded exactly as they were written, complete with errors. Where there are repetitions of words or phrases, frequency counts are offered. Both positive and negative comments are included in this part two table analyses. The responses are presented with the corresponding stimulus questions. These part two table findings are presented in the order of their strength of response. Notably, the construct tables of emotional engagement, cognitive engagement, and collaboration exemplar tables are presented first because it was aspects of these constructs that appeared most frequently in the student responses. The construct of behavioral engagement follows, and finally tables showing responses indicative of the constructs of perceived competence or academic improvement, and autonomy. Before moving on to an examination of another key construct, a discussion of the applicable findings is offered.

Percentage magnitudes were tabulated in the part one set of tables from the previous section of this chapter. Following each table presentation, the percentage magnitudes of positive indicators for each key construct, and for each student survey question, will be presented. The exception to this is for the key construct of emotional engagement where several negative indicators occurred. There were other constructs that showed negative comments from students, but these were few. Students' negative comments for any of the key constructs are shown here in the part two table displays.

The amount of comments displayed in each 'key construct' table provide a visual indication of the impact of the Radioplay process with the students. Providing the percentage magnitudes arrived at in part one of this chapter links each set of tables with the other.

The following table summarizes evidence of Key Construct 1: Emotional Engagement, in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.11

Analysis of Emotional Engagement Using Student Survey Responses (Student Comments Analysis: Positive and Negative

Frequency Counts)

Survey Questions	Descriptors Plus Superlatives / Frequency	Phrases and Sentences
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	*positive* -fun (12), very fun (2), so fun (2), super fun, loads of fun, really fun -awesome (9), like (6), love (4), amazing (2), happy (2), great, really great, pleasant, perfect, cool, totally rocks, exciting *negative* -bit boring	*positive* -good idea -It is also very injoyed that we can write at our own pase. -lots of people in my class like doing it
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	*positive* -like (2), really like -absolutely love -fun (7), so fun, so much fun, sooo much fun -awesome, best	*positive* -love to use (4) -great learning method -only good things can happen after writing Radioplay -It makes me very happy -Radioplay YES! Is the best thing I will ever experience in my LIFE!!

3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	*positive*	*positive*
	-excited (7), happy (9), great (3), awesome (2)	-I enjoy it
	-fun (4), really fun (2) so much fun (2), super fun, more fun, a lot of fun	-I was super exicted when I heard what Radioplay was.
	-free, amazing, lucky, cool, privileged, proud, calm, relaxed	-PROUD!
		-I felt honoured and good…and kind of disappointed
		-I felt amazed at the beginning
	negative	
	-mad, anxious, bored (2), little bit stressed	*negative*
		- but at the end I felt Mad, fustirated, uncared, and Angry! (angry face drawn)
		-isn't fun when you have to write two copies of everything
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	***positive***	***positive***
	-fun (4), really fun (2), so much fun (2) super fun, more fun, a lot of fun	-it calms you down
	-awesome (3)	-it is the BEST!
	-exciting, joyful, cool	-I love Radioplay, I LOVE RADIOPLAY!
		-about what a wonderful experience I had doing Radioplay
		-It makes me happy
	negative	
	-boring, frustrating	***negative*** -please don't do this again because it just made me lose friends
5. How can you make Radioplay better?		***positive***
		-I can't it is already great!!! (hearts instead of dots)
		- (in big balloon letters): I heart Radioplay!!
		-I wouldn't change anything because its great how it is! (smiley face/ LOL)

4.3.2 Key Construct 1: Emotional engagement indicated

Positive Emotional Engagement

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	100	93
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	100	86
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	100	79
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	100	93
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	57	21

Negative Emotional Engagement

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay	0	21
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	0	14
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	7	43
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	0	7
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	0	0

Both girls and boys had a positive emotional experience with Radioplay. The strongest indications from all students were for positive emotional engagement. This is consistent with both sexes through all five of the student survey's questions. The questions about how the students think and feel about Radioplay elicited the most comments indicative of positive emotional engagement. The magnitude of negative emotional responses was low and came mainly from the boys, all members from one Radioplay "team" that broke up. This is discussed in more depth in part three of this chapter where we focus on teacher's comments and observations.

The next table presents evidence of Key Construct 5: Cognitive Engagement, in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.12

Analysis of Cognitive Engagement Using Student Survey Responses

Survey Questions	Phrases and Sentences
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -some parts are dramatic -makes imagination more interesting. It's like a life story but you can make it more interesting. -new opretunity to use your imagineation and brain in different ways. It is also a great wasy to think about what words to use and not too use. It is an exersize too improve writing. -inspiers me to write more in the summer. It takes writing (witch I don't like) into a whole different universe. -takes fun writing to the next level...will definitely help you develop your writing skills. You can make a simple fictional character turn into a great adventurer! -amazing way to get your imagination going…creative and a great way for people to learn. It can also help you know other people better…the stories connect to each other when the characters talk. -really helps you think of what adventures and helps people out -can make your writing grow and grow -you can write anything you think of -great activity to use your imaginations…awesome for people that are not really good writers (like me). -helps us with our writing and communication -I love how you can write anything you can think of. *Negative:* -I would rather make a norm book. -It is really good until people start leaveing and arguing.

Table 4.12

Analysis of Cognitive Engagement Using Student Survey Responses continued

2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	***Positive:*** -it's like writing a book -I can use my imagination -improved my writing so much -we can be creative and rest our minds -so fun to make chaecters and write. It's a great learning method too. -each time you create a character, you write madly with great detail as you go -lets us use are creativie tow right! -enjoyed using my imagination…chooseing my character and storie -I have so much interest in it…maybe if I want to improve my writing and improve how I work in groups -taughjt me how to write really well -the more I write, the more better I get at writing ***Negative:*** -typing on a computer is way faster. It takes too much time to decide what to do with your group.
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	***Positive:*** -I feel like I want to play I also feel like I am in a advensher -I can imagine the scene -proud of my writing -always put my best effort -a new idea, a new paragraph, a new page to write. I feel ancious to get everyh one of my ideas down. -I feel focused…relaxed it makes me calm down -you can write anything! -I feel creative and imaginative -I've learned not to be that impacent ***Negative:*** -you have to write two copies of everything

Table 4.12

Analysis of Cognitive Engagement Using Student Survey Responses continued

Survey Questions	Cognitive Engagement
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	*Positive* -It calms you down and takes over your imagination to bring an inspiration -Radioplay is a great way to teach kids to work with a group. This teaches kids to focus and write a little more than usual. -it is amazing that you can write that much just as you think. At the begin you think you will never be able to finish but you do! -you can create a real book out of it. You can literally bend the story however you want to! -I would tell them how exciting it is and how creative it is. I'd tell them that it's exciting and that you have to use your imagination a lot. -anything is possible if you put your mind to it. -I get a lot of interest in it and wanht to be a writer and write about my Radioplay -I would say stuff like how I improved my writing how long my writing is how much hardspelled words im putting in how much new words I am putting in grammar and words that are hard to understand…creating stories from your brain that's what I would tell. -I would also write and read to my parents. -That Raido play is one of the best group writing excirses ever. *Negative*
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	*Note: One female comment. Eight comments from males.* 9F4: By making the stories more adventurous. 11M4: …I would add more chapters and info. 17M4: …giving us more time to do it. 20M4: By writing more chapters and knowing good grammar. 23M4: By letting people to focus…teaching kids how to spell certain words…be creative and a good thinker basically make them be good at writing and radioplay 5M5: I can make radioplay better by asking what words I can use and not use the same sentences or words. 14M5: I think if we could write Radioplay in book form it would be better. 16M5: Make pichers of the story 26M5: …adding pictures

4.3.3 Key Construct 5: Positive cognitive engagement indicated

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	64	50
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	57	43
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	36	29
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	43	36
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	43	64

Besides positive emotional responses, the highest percentage of responses for both boys and girls involved cognitive engagement. The male students had especially strong cognitive responses to question five at 64%. Their suggestions for "How to Make Radioplay Better" are reviewed in part five of this chapter, and account for some of the negative comments in this Table 4.12. The strong cognitive engagement indicators from both genders is quite amazing in comparison to the other theme responses and warrants further investigation. This finding is especially surprising given the young ages of the students. Of the twenty-eight students, nineteen were in grade four and nine were in grade five.

The students in this Radioplay case study talked about wanting to use their imagination to make their stories more creative and adventurous. They were mindful of their shortcoming as writers and expressed the desire to improve.

The following table summarizes evidence of Key Construct 2: Collaboration, in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.13

Analysis of Collaboration / Relationship Exemplars Using Student Survey Responses

Survey Questions	Collaboration / Relationships
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -I love collaborating with my friends to write a story -another way to make new friends and socialize -talk and have fun at the same time -can also help you know other people better -I can talk with my friends as well as doing work of corse! -a fun activity for groups! -you get to work with others and make stories *Negative:* -It is really good until one of are group members left and the other joined another group (crying emoji)
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	*Positive:* -it's a great bonding time for you and your friends. -I get to hang out with my friends -enjoyed using my imagination and working with friends -good time to get together with your friends and write -I want to improve…how I work in groups -it would be nice to do Radioplay with a new group -really fun to discuss and write with a group *Negative:* -I have no one in my group. (sad/crying face) -It takes too much time to decide what to do with your group.
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	*Positive:* -my group would joke around about our characters and we would get to know each other better and eventually become really good friends. -I like working with other people. We can plan it -I felt great when I was talking to my friends writing and joking around. -I was happy to work with a group. -I've made some new friends *Negative:* -Sometimes I felt mad because we did not agree on some thing's.

Table 4.13

Analysis of Collaboration / Relationship Exemplars Using Student Survey Responses continued

Survey Questions	Collaboration / Relationships
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -really cool to write a chapter book with friends -a great way to teach kids to work with a group -it's a fun group activity creating stories -one of the best group writing excirses ever *Negative:* -please don't ever do this again because it just made me lose friends.
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	*Positive:* -would be more exciting if every once in a while you act an exciting chapter out with your friends -include new people *Negative:* -not putting people into groups. Or there are separate groups and we act out a scene.

4.3.4 Key Construct 2: Positive collaboration indicated

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	36	21
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	29	29
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	29	14
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	14	21
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	7	14

There was an almost similar distribution of indicators for collaboration between the girls and the boys. When it came to questions about "thinking and feeling" about Radioplay, the positive female responses for collaboration were almost double those of the males. There were some negative comments, not reflected in the above display. Again, most of the negative comments came from the one group of boys whose team broke up. Roughly one fifth of the class responded with a comment about collaboration. This is a good result given that students were not asked directly about their experiences working together. Students seemed to enjoy the group work.

The following table summarizes evidence of Key Construct 6: Behavioral

Engagement, in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.14

Analysis of Behavioral Engagement Using Student Survey Responses

Survey Questions	Phrases and Sentences
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -write freely…own pase , -you can just go on and on with all the writing, -involves a lot of writing, -get to work with others, -I think I'll keep on going, -great way to write, but talk and have fun at the same time!, -I can talk with my friends as well as doing work, -another way to make friends and socialize *Negative:* -It is really good until people start leaveing and arguing…one of our group members left and then the other joined another group
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	*Positive:* -great bonding time for you and your friends, -I get to hang out with my friends, -working with friends, -get together with friends and write, -you write madly with great detail and you go, -really fun to discuss and write with group *Negative:* -takes too much time to decide what to do with your group
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	*Positive:* -my group would joke around about our characters, -eventually became really good friends, -like working with other people, -I've made some new friends, -my hand hurts after writing so much! -I always put my best effort *Negative:* -I have to wait for my friends -you have to write two copies of everything
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -look at how much writing I wrote…how long my writing is -I rote Pages and Pages of writing and I still don't feel (don?...done enough?) *Negative* -just made me lose friends
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	(no responses applicable to behavioral engagement)

4.3.5 Key Construct 6: Positive behavioral engagement indicated

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	21	29
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	36	14
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	21	14
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	14	14
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	0	0

The magnitude of responses for positive behavioral engagement were, for the most part, evenly distributed between the girls and the boys. Another measure of behavioral engagement is to look at the volume of the work the students have completed. This will be examined in depth in the "student work" section (Part Four) of this "Findings" chapter. Considering both pieces of evidence together indicates that the behavioral engagement of the students working in Radioplay may be equal to that of cognitive engagement, or even emotional engagement.

More than one third of the class kept writing Radioplay chapters after the process was ended at chapter seven. Five boys and four girls wrote from nine to thirteen chapters. By these actions, rather than just the comments, we can see that these students were behaviorally engaged.

The next table presents evidence of Key Construct 3: Academic improvement or

perceived competence, as indicated in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.15

Analysis of Exemplars of Students' Perceived Academic Improvement

Survey Questions	Phrases and Sentences
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	-Its an exercise too improve writing
	-I think that working on Radioplay will definitely help you develop your writing skills
	-way to improve your writing
	-It really helps you think of what adventures and helps people out.
	-radioplay involves a lot of writing which can make your writing grow and grow so radioplay is good
	-awesome for people that are not really good writers (like me)
	-because it helps us with our writing and communication
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	-Radioplay improved my writing so much.
	-It's a great learning method too
	-write madly with great detail
	-because it helps us with our writing and communication
	-Maybe if I want to improve my writing and improve how I work in groups
	-I would like to do RadioPlay again because the more I write, the more better I get at writing.
	-helpful
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	-I was happy and proud of my whriting
	-I always put my best effort when writing my Radioplay
	-PROUD
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	-great way to teach kids to work with a group. This teaches kids to focus
	-It's good for L.a.
	-do you see how I improved my writing. I would say stuff like how I improved my writing how long my writing is how much hardspelled words im putting in how much new words I am putting in grammar and words that are hard to understand
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	No comments applicable

4.3.6 Key Construct 3: Positive academic improvement indicated (perceived competence)

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	29	29
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	21	29
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	21	0
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	7	14
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	0	0

Students were never asked directly if they felt they had improved in their written language skills. The table analysis shows that some students perceived that they improved their writing skills through the Radioplay process. Looking at responses to the first question, about one third of the class, both female and male, indicated some improvement in their writing ability. The timeframe for the Radioplay study was relatively short at only seven chapters over a three-month period. Students were restricted as to only working on Radioplay in specified class times.

The next table presents evidence of Key Construct 4: a student's sense of autonomy

and empowerment in learning, as indicated in the responses of 28 surveyed students.

Table 4.16

Analysis of Autonomy Exemplars Using Student Survey Responses

Survey Questions	Autonomy
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -I'm happy that the teacher lets us write freely…we can write at our own pase -do what ever you want in the storie -I love how you can write anything you think of. You can just go on and on with all the writing *Negative:* No negative comments applicable to autonomy
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	*Positive:* -I also enjoyed chooseing my character and storie *Negative:* No negative comments applicable to autonomy
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	*Positive:* -We can plan it -I felt great because you can write anything! *Negative:* No negative comments applicable to autonomy
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	*Positive:* -you can write that much just as you think -You can literally bend the story however you want to! *Negative:* No negative comments applicable to autonomy
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	*No positive or negative comments applicable to autonomy

4.3.7 Key Construct 4: Autonomy indicated (positive comments)

Question Number:	Female % (N=14)	Male % (N=14)
1. What do you think about Radioplay?	14	7
2. Would you like to use Radioplay again? Why or why not?	7	0
3. How do you feel using Radioplay?	7	7
4. What would you tell teachers and parents about Radioplay?	7	0
5. How can you make Radioplay better?	0	0

Autonomy over the characters and plot setting is a key feature of the Radioplay process. The students in this case study were not asked about autonomy directly, as this would have been seen to be leading the students. Another factor which may have influenced the low indicator score were the young ages of the students.

4.3.8 Part Two Summary

Positive emotional engagement was the most frequently indicated of the identified key constructs. This was true for both female and male students. Students liked and loved it. The term 'fun' was mentioned often. Positive cognitive engagement also showed strong indicators. The amount and thoughtfulness of the responses from students came as a surprise, given the young ages of the students. Suggestions for new directions for the Radioplay process are dealt with more closely in part five of this Findings and Analysis chapter.

Favourable comments on collaboration were the third more frequent from the student responders. It was clear that most students enjoyed working together. Negative collaboration comments came from the group that broke up and will be discussed further in part three of this analysis where we look at comments from the teacher. They will also be addressed in part four where we analyze students' written work.

Students provided fewer responses indicative of positive behavioral engagement. However, combined with the actions of the students, as we will see in parts three and four of this chapter, positive behavioral engagement is strongly evident.

The smallest totals of responses coming from the students were for indications 0f perceived competence and exemplars of autonomy. There were comments about improving writing ability and that Radioplay was good for language arts. Students talked about the freedom to choose both characters and story plots.

4.4 Part Three: Summary and Analysis of Teacher's Comments

Teacher comments were obtained in a variety of ways. The case study teacher was provided with a recording device and comments recorded were transcribed. The teacher also responded to questions by this researcher via email communications. These questions and answers were also compiled for analysis. All communications from the teacher are contained in the appendices section of this thesis:

Appendix 3: Teacher Comments on the Radioplay Process (Audio Transcript)

Appendix 4: Teacher Comments from Email Communications

Appendix 5: Case Study Teacher Responds to Questions

Appendix 6: Case Study Teacher Responds to Questions About Ending Radioplay

Appendix 7: Teacher's Use of Radioplay in the Classroom: The Process

1. On Character Development

2. The Classroom, Routines, and Scheduling

3. On Plot Skeletons

4. And Finally

5. Radioplay as a Meaningful Context to Practice Literary Devices

Questions posed to the case study teacher centered on Radioplay team formation and assisting teams to create the plot skeletons for their Radioplay chapters. The questions included:

1. Was there just one team, or more than one?

2. How did you pick the teams?

3. Did you keep some friends together?

4. Did you vary the ability levels?

5. Sex?

6. How did you help them create their plot skeletons?

   The case study teacher was also asked several questions about ending Radioplay:

7. Wondering if you are giving students the freedom to end their adventure however they want?

8. Were they able to write about the other characters however they want?

   As in the student response tables in the previous section, all the teacher's comments and answers to questions have been examined for indications of the six Key Constructs. The tables containing the teacher's comments are presented in order from the most comments to the least. The tables and the tabulation of responses are as follows:

   Key Construct 6: Behavioral Engagement Indicated=17

   Key Construct 1: Emotional Engagement Indicated=15

   Key Construct 2: Collaboration Indicated=7

   Key Construct 5: Cognitive Engagement Indicated=5

   Key Construct 4: Autonomy Indicated=5

   Key Construct 3: Academic Improvement Perceived / Academic Considerations=2

   The teacher was most struck by the behavioral and emotional engagement effects of the Radioplay process on the students. Especially overwhelming for the teacher was the amount of writing being submitted. Comments such as "I can't keep up" and "I only allowed them to work on the Radioplay in class" are indicative of this. As for emotional engagement, enthusiasm, eagerness, and excitement displayed by the students were mentioned.

   The third most frequent comments were regarding collaboration. The case study teacher gave the students complete autonomy to form their own teams. This experimental class formed themselves into eight teams. Allowing for small groups of handpicked friends led to some problems. Learning to cooperate and collaborate with others in plot setting takes some time and perhaps training. These students were young and inexperienced. The large number of teams led to the teacher letting the students have autonomy in drafting their stories. There were problems with dominant personalities and a lack of "democracy" in the

plot setting processes. Students with different work ethics had trouble dealing with each other.

There were five teacher comments indicative of cognitive engagement. Most comments centered on the learning curve facing students in terms of plot setting. The teacher also felt that the students' writing became more fluent and expressive.

The case study teacher afforded much autonomy to all the students. They chose their own groups, both large and small. They had complete freedom in plot setting from chapter four onwards when all characters were together in the same place. Eight Radioplay teams meant the teacher felt there was not enough time to help all groups planning their stories or following up on their plot skeletons. Though the teacher did not sit with each group to supervise their plot setting procedures, there were many ways in which the subject of plot setting was addressed with the class. The teacher gave examples of well-crafted plots. Radioplay chapters were sometimes read aloud by the teacher, who would draw the students' attention to the plot. They were asked why certain parts were more interesting. Discussions of plots in drama games played by the class stressed that good story plots had a beginning, middle, and end. They would discuss movies with regards to why some were better than others.

The teacher's indicators of autonomy were less frequent than some of the other thematic constructs analyzed.

The case study teacher marked the students' Radioplay as a body of work, as opposed to single pieces. This research did not have access to the teachers' marks. The teacher perceived academic improvement from chapter one through to the end.

The next table, which summarizes data collected from the Case Study teacher, presents evidence of Key Construct 6: Behavioral Engagement

Table 4.17

Teacher's Recorded and Written Observations, Question Responses: Analysed for

Evidence of Students' Behavioral Engagement

Behavioral Engagementt	Teacher's Observations and Responses
	-They are writing a lot!!!
	-they were writing so enthusiastically…I couldn't stop them after awhile…
	-in fact I talked to several parents who came in the next day and said, "My goodness, what is this Radioplay thing? The kids can't stop talking about it.
	-they've been coming up and showing me what they've been working on and in fact they've been eager to do it for homework.
	-Today the students have half day where they can play. The whole school can play for half the day. In my classroom, I tell them they can play. The question they ask me, "Can we work on our Radioplay?" Priceless (happy face and heart emojis)
	-The kids are writing a lot! I can't keep up! I am stopping at chapter 7…Many of them just want to keep going!
	-They are choosing to end on chapter 7. That being said, many of them
	are choosing to continue on…
	-The kids wrote so much…I just could not keep up. I didn't want to stop them. All they wanted to do the whole day at school was to write the Radioplay!
	-But very seriously…they wrote so much even my boys who hated writing
	wrote lots!!!
	-the students will spend a lot of time talking…They must talk and talk.
	-All they want to do is write. Months ago it was difficult to get them to write a couple lines!
	-I only allowed them to work on the play in class, however; a few students were very keen and continued to write at home.
	-they were focused
	-they were writing so enthusiastically…Even though I gave them specific parameters about the amount to write I couldn't stop them after a while…
	-there's a buzz in the room whenever they're doing it, particularly again
	that first character development or picture
	-they had a really good time joining other groups and interacting with other characters.
	- (one year later) I saw one of my students from last year there…He said "M. ****, I'm still writing Radioplay…I do it at home."

The case study teacher was impressed by the behavioral engagement of the students working on Radioplay. Not only were they writing enthusiastically, but with volume. The volume of writing made it difficult for the case study teacher to keep on top of all the editing required.

Students' emotional engagement was the second construct that was most notable for the teacher. Excitement over the Radioplay process was often mentioned. Consequently, the next table presents evidence of Key Construct 1: Emotional Engagement.

Table 4.18

Teacher's Recorded and Written Observations, Question Responses: Analysed for Evidence of Students' Emotional Engagement

Emotional Engagement	Teacher's Observations and Responses
	1.-students are just so very engaged in it.
	-they are very excited
	-They look forward to it.
	-They are always excited to work on the RP.
	-I've given them some art associated with that so they're additionally excited…
	–they were very excited
	-the kids are very excited again
	-students are just so very engaged in it
	-They did not enjoy writing and RPP they were very excited. They continued to be through the whole project.
	-students were very excited too.
	-They're very excited, they're really engaged
	-They're always excited to work on the RP.
	-With regards to the boys and their boredom…I was there and saw them engaged and happy and excited. I don't know why they said that in writing (*referring to a few student survey responses*)
	-The students are engaged, happy and very proud of themselves!
	-Yes, the students were very excited to take over the story and take it in a
Frequency= 15	multitude of directions…

The next table shows the teacher's data relating to Key Construct 2: Student

Collaboration.

Table 4.19

Teacher's Recorded and Written Observations, Question Responses: Analysed for

Evidence of Students' Collaboration / Relationships

Collaboration	Teacher's Observations and Responses
	1. -So I'm clearing a bulletin board in my classroom for the next day and on it we will post all the characters and I will have a gallery where the kids can walk around and have a look at the pictures and talk about them and so on.
	2. -the students will spend a lot of time talking…They must talk and talk.
	3, -Yes, they had a really good time joining other groups and interacting with other characters.
	4. -They picked their own groups. Some worked out well…Some not so much and I was pleasantly surprised by a couple of others!
	5. -Many friends were together and many of them learned that friendship is complicated. I think one of the most important things they learned through this process was this idea of cooperation during the collaborative process. A little bit of give and take…they are not always going to agree. The idea that you might not like your friend's idea. They might not like your idea! It is a great age to recognize that you want to be with people who share your work ethic!
	6. -Another thing that perhaps is to be considered is the functioning of the groups. Some groups were able to collaborate in a positive way.
	7.-I feel one of the most important piece is the fact that they are able to collaborate and imagine together.

There were consequences to these autonomously created groups. One of the boys'

Radioplay teams broke up, causing hard feelings. Again, this will be looked at more closely

in the "Student Work Analysis", part three of this Findings and Analysis chapter.

The following table shows data segments from the Case Study teacher, pointing to

Key Construct 5: Cognitive Engagement, and Key Construct 4: Autonomy.

Table 4.20

Teacher's Recorded and Written Observations, Question Responses: Analysed for

Evidence of Students' Cognitive Engagement and Autonomy)

Cognitive Engagement	Teacher's Observations and Responses
Autonomy	-I am also looking at their improvement from the first chapter to where they are now. Their writing fluency has improved significantly. They have become more expressive. Their writing has become easier to read and has a flow and smoothness when it is read out loud.
	-They also came to recognize how effective a good plan for writing is when they listen to their friends and read their own Radioplays. The ones they found most interesting and fun were the ones that has a very good story plot…
	-They were to plot out their stories before they proceeded…They did do that…But I think many of them just went their own way after a while… it was a tricky group.
	-The ability in the groups were varied…they learned the truth about their friends. Some discovered that their friends did not like (to) write…Did not take their work seriously…Had learning disabilities, were unable to stay focused!
	-I feel one of the most important pieces is the fact that they are able to collaborate and imagine together. You should hear some of the conversations they have! Chapter 4 they are in groups and they can go where they want
	-They picked their own groups
	-Most groups were divided into male and female…there were a couple of groups that were both sexes. All their choice…
	-Yes, the students were very excited to take over the story and take it in a multitude of directions… (*On individuals being given the freedom to end the story however they wanted.*)
	5. -Yes, they had a really good time joining other groups and interacting with other characters. (*on being able to write about other characters from other groups however they wanted to…Again, after group writing ended.*)

The next table shows data segments from the Case Study teacher, which points to Key Construct 3: Academic Improvement or Perceived Competence.

Table 4.21

Teacher's Recorded and Written Observations, Question Responses: Analysed for Evidence of Teacher's Perception of Students' Academic Improvement)

Perceived Competence / Academic Improvement	Teacher's Observations and Responses
	1. -I am also looking at their improvement from the first chapter to where they are now. Their writing fluency has improved significantly. They have become more expressive. Their writing has become easier to read and has a flow and smoothness when it is read out loud. (comment also above in Cognitive section)
	2. -I marked it as a body of work as opposed to a single piece. (*Researcher's note: I did not have access to the students' marks.*)

4.4.1 Summary

The case study teacher's comments aligned with those of the students in terms of the strong indications of emotional and behavioral engagement. The student indicators for cognitive engagement were many. Corroboration from the case study teacher confirms these findings in the upcoming "member checking" section of this chapter. More information regarding perceived competence / academic improvement is also forthcoming.

4.5 Part Four: Summary and Analysis for the Radioplay Teams' Written Work

4.5.1 Introduction

Students divided themselves into eight Radioplay "teams". There were three all girl teams, the largest having six girls and a team with one girl who chose to write alone. There was one mixed team, having five girls and one boy. There were four boys' teams with three to four boys each. This part three of the "Findings and Analysis" chapter begins with summary analyses of students' written work grouped around each team's efforts. The quality of their written narratives is examined. Indicators of behavioral engagement are highlighted. The analysis revealed that there were gender differences in word usage;

notably with adverbs, and this interesting finding is explored. An overview of students' use of other literary devices is included. A summary of team observations follows with comments about each teams' narratives and items of note. This precedes the table analysis for each of the Radioplay teams that examines in detail the number of written chapters, word usage, and word counts. A final summary of the Radioplay teams' written work concludes part three of this chapter.

4.5.2 Radioplay narratives

In examining the teams' narratives several factors became evident. The characters created by the students were varied and the students were creative in their presentations. In the beginning the narratives read like diaries containing lists of items and detailing elaborate meals. It is in chapters one and two that the students may write independently of their team's plot outlines. In chapter two all students had to explain why and how they were travelling to Cozumel. In chapter three the disparate characters are brought together and the action starts. Team plot setting is activated from chapter three through to the end. The teams' narratives were read aloud to the rest of the class and this clearly had an impact on the plot narratives, especially from chapters four through seven. The groups were trying to create exciting and varied plotlines to entertain their peers. The case study teacher gave several lessons on narrative plot setting early in the Radioplay process. The teams had complete autonomy in their plot setting, and it was interesting to see the effect that had on their writing. A key finding here was that the plots for the Radioplay narratives improved from the beginning chapters to those at the end. This finding was also corroborated by the case study teacher who found that the students' writing became "more fluent and expressive" through the Radioplay process, with evidence of "academic improvement".

I believe that in presenting their work to their peers the students worked to make their chapters more interesting and exciting. Audience response, in this case by their peers, motivated the students to thrill and entertain. In this case study, left on their own and with the oral presentation of each chapter to their peers, it is gratifying to note that there was

improvement in the Radioplay plot setting as the process continued, as well as in writing skills.

4.5.3 Behavioral engagement

The Radioplay process in the class ended with chapter seven. More than one third of the class wrote beyond chapter seven, with one male student, who left one group to join another, writing thirteen chapters. Clearly, these students persisted and continued in their efforts. Other behavioural evidence came from the teacher's observations and actions outlined in part two of this Findings and Analysis chapter. Observations included comments about enthusiasm and excitement for Radioplay. The teacher was overwhelmed with the amount of writing produced by the students, (that she would then edit), and restricted them to working on Radioplay only within the prescribed class minutes. They were not allowed to take Radioplay for homework.

4.5.4 Gender differences in word usage

The most interesting data to emerge from this analysis centres on the difference between the girls' versus the boys' use of adjectives and adverbs in their writing. There were the same number of girls as there were boys, but beyond this there is no consideration of sample size here, only word counts for completed chapters. With no deviation, girls used more adverbs than adjectives in their writing, while boys used more adjectives than adverbs. Intrigued, I set out to find out why.

Robin Lakoff (1973) found that adverbs in the form of intensifiers are typical of women. These are words such as so, very, really, etc. It is the overuse of intensifiers in the girls' Radioplay narratives that skews the results for the total use of adverbs. Hanafiyeh and Afghari (2014) conducted a study that confirmed Lakoff's assertions of gender-bound language for "the use of hedges, tag question, intensifiers, and empty adjectives, but not in the use of adverbs" (p. 1168). Tagliamonte and Roberts (2005) agree, stating that women are using these words more often to, "boost or maximize meaning" (p. 280). If the use of intensifiers was factored out of the Radioplay adverb analysis, perhaps we would find a more even distribution of adverb usage across the genders.

4.5.5 Use of literary devices

The teacher in this case study also taught students about literary devices; encouraging, but not requiring the students to incorporate them into their work. Few students did, and I think this makes sense in terms of the fact that students do not naturally incorporate similes and metaphors into their natural speech. Interestingly, one boys' team had the most instances of use for similes and metaphors of all the teams. I think this might be explained in terms of the boys influencing each other to produce good writing.

4.5.5.1 Summary of Team Observations

Girls' Team 1

1. all girls used more adverbs than adjectives

2. two girls wrote more chapters than the seven required. These girls were both in grade 4 and both wrote the most words, almost double that of the others in their own group

3. Narrative: At the beginning the chapters seemed like random, episodic diary entrees. They developed into more exciting and eventful chapters. This group improved in their narrative plot setting through the Radioplay process.

Mixed Team 2

1. the girls followed the general trend of using more adverbs than adjectives in their writing

2. the one male in the group wrote substantially more adjectives than adverbs (a trend born out by the other male students)

3. two grade 4 girls wrote two to three more chapters than required

4. Narrative: The chapters 5 through to the end are focused on action and excitement. They seem focused on entertaining an audience and improved their plot setting for the narrative.

Girls' Team 3

1. all girls used more adverbs than adjectives

2. one grade 4 girl wrote an extra chapter

3. one grade 5 girl wrote more words than anyone, at the chapter seven level and beyond

4. two of the girls in this group used more similes and metaphors than any other group

5. all girls had among the highest word counts, especially noting they are at the chapter seven level only, and not beyond

6. Narrative: This group improved their narrative skills through the Radioplay experience. The plot became more exciting, detailed and action oriented as they went along.

Girls' Team 4

1. this girl, in a team of her own, also used more adverbs than adjectives

2. Narrative: This student ramped up the plot action at the end of the process. It was evident that she was writing for an audience.

Boys' Team 1

1. all boys used more adjectives than adverbs

2. a grade 4 boy had the highest word count at seven chapters, also used the most similes and metaphors amongst all boys and girls. Overall, this team used the most similes and metaphors. It seems that they had a positive influence on each other in using more literary devices in their writing.

3. Narrative: This did not hold true for their joint narrative, however. After chapter 3 the narratives veer off in different directions. It was hard to tell if they were trying to please an audience, or only themselves.

Boys' Team 3

1. the boys used almost twice as many adjectives than adverbs

2. two boys wrote three more chapters than required

3. Narrative: Strong personalities within this group made coming together in a joint narrative difficult. Exciting plot events, not explained, become tiresome after a while.

Boys' Team 4

1. again, these boys followed the trend of using more adjectives than adverbs, and again almost twice as many

2. one boy wrote six more chapters than the seven required (after leaving this group)

3. Narrative: This boys' team also offered little explanation for their bombings and terrorist attacks. This small group of friends ran into disagreements, with one student leaving the group to join another. Bad feelings resulted.

Boys' Team 5

1. again, the boys wrote more adjectives than adverbs

2. seems one boy wrote more chapters than required

3. Narrative: This group of "English Language Learners" created a fairly interesting plotline throughout the Radioplay process. Their narrative skills were stronger than the other boys' teams. Maturity may have also been a factor, as they were all in grade 5.

4.5.6 Student teams' work: Table analysis

Table Analysis: The following pages show the word and chapter counts for each character, grouped into teams. Each student was designated a number, a gender, and a grade level. For example, 3F4 was student number 3, female, and in grade 4. Some students had special education status codes. These are included as follows:

- ELL= New immigrant

- ELL*= Recently taken off the ELL list

- R= Mental illness, moderate behavior support

- H= Serious mental illness, intensive behavior intervention. (*This designation was supplied by the case study teacher; representing a designation sanctioned by the Vancouver School Board.*)

Note: The names shown in the following tables are the character names chosen by the students.

4.5.6.1 Girls' teams and plot lines

There were a diverse variety of skill levels among the female students. The most notable ability areas of variation were for spelling and paragraph skills. Student teams had complete autonomy on plot setting from chapters three on. Only seven chapters were supervised by the teacher in terms of edits. The teacher was overwhelmed by the volume of writing to deal with and restricted the class from taking work home. Even so, the teacher acknowledged the work was not edited fully. Observations of writing quality were made by

the researcher, not the case study teacher, and refer only to the development of each group's plot setting.

Girls' Team 1/ (6-8 Chapters): Promise, Ellena, Bella, Maya, Poppy

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
1F5	Promise	R	6	34	65	1	0	1195
2F4	Ellena	ELL	7	34	50	0	0	1033
9F4	Bella		8	113	124	0	0	2015
12F4	Maya		8	60	120	0	1	1912
19F4	Poppy	H	7	76	135	1	0	1329

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why the character is going to Cozumel. Describing the trip.

Chapter 3: All characters in the same hotel and on the same floor. They can see and describe others. Some meetings occur.

Chapter 4: They are all in a restaurant when a bomb explodes. They escape death in this terrorist related event.

Chapter 5: They go to a mall in Cozumel to shop for party clothes. They attend an evening party.

Chapter 6: The next day they go surfing. The group is attacked by sharks. They survive.

Chapter 7: They go to a restaurant. A robber enters the restaurant and shots are fired. Poppy dies of gunshot wounds.

Chapter 8: The final chapter sees the survivors attend a party on an island. The characters draft various endings, such as eaten by sharks when snorkelling and Poppy making it to heaven.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of note: In the beginning the chapters seemed random and episodic; reading more like diary entries. The last three chapters were the most exciting and eventful. The students improved in their plot setting as a group.

Maya: I went out to the bellcony and felt the whisper of wind blew on my hair

Promise: a nick of time

4.5.6.2 Mixed team

Team 2/ (6-13 Chapters): Skylar, Ophelia, Login, Leah, Amanda, Angelina

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
5M5	Skylar		6	120	85	1	1	1624
21F4	Ophelia		7	153	206	0	0	2335
6F4	Login	ELL*	7	78	79	0	0	1191
28F5	Leah		7	92	185	0	0	2006
15F4	Amanda		9	120	149	0	0	2102
4F4	Angelina		10	92	154	1	0	2225

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing their journey.

Chapter 3: Characters are all invited to an evening dinner party at a grand beach house.

The characters see each other and meet.

Chapter 4: The group gets together and decide to take a trip to Madagascar.

Chapter 5: On route they are shipwrecked and make it to a deserted island.

Chapter 6: They build shelter and forage for food. They find mangoes and "piggies". They

are attacked by monkeys. Skylar's work ends here.

Chapter 7: Login, Leah, and Ophelia end things here. The characters swim back to

Cozumel and attend a party in a hotel penthouse. Ophelia exchanges contact information

with the others before departing. Login Jumps to her death with no explanation as to why.

Leah has the whole group travel to Seattle. There, in a Starbucks, Amanda is shot in the

head. Leah journeys home and learns that Amanda has survived.

Chapters 8, 9, 10: The characters Amanda and Angelina continue their stories individually.

Amanda incorporates a character from another team into her narrative (Russell Gator), who

turns out to be the shooter in the Starbucks. Amanda plots to kill Russell for revenge. She

ends her narrative in a cliff hanger where she is just about to shoot Russell. Angelina also

incorporates the character of Russell into her narrative, as well as a "friend" of Russell's

named Jeff. There is a fight between characters and Amanda is shot in the chest. Angelina

returns to her home.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: Chapters 5 and up are focused on action and excitement. Plot elements

seek to keep an audience entertained.

Skylar: I woke up to the sound of a crow cawing it's life away. –"Thank you for

saving my sister" Westin said thankfully.

Amanda: My hair looked like a tornato.

Ophelia: My eyes are chestnut brown with a special touch that can only be seen

face to face, a drop of green. Let's turn the subject back to me. -The boat is literally

just a pile of ashes.

Leah: So I got my luggage and hit the road.

Girls' Team 3/ (7 Chapters): Emily, Veronica G., Isabel

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
10F4	Emily		8	114	199	5	3	2593
22F4	Veronica G.		7	131	232	0	0	2939
24F5	Isabel		7	188	245	2	3	3221

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing their journey.

Chapter 3: The three characters come together in the evening at a Grand Beach House

party.

Chapter 4: The characters decide to journey to Madagascar by boat.

Chapter 5: The boat sinks and the shipwrecked characters make it onto a mysterious island.

Chapter 6: They forage for food and try to build a shelter. They are attacked by monkeys.

Chapter 7: They find water and pigs. Emily takes a piglet for a pet. Isabel is bitten by a "little black dot" that was crawling on the piglet. It turns out to be a poisonous spider and she becomes ill. Isabel is put on raft out to open sea and dies. Veronica and Emily stay on the island which is now experiencing earthquakes.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: The plot gets more exciting, detailed and action oriented as they go.

Emily: It looked like a beach spilled on it, or they found it at the bottom of the ocean. -It sparkled like dimons!

Isabel: I can feel the cold wind tickle my cheeks, and guiding me where to go. -The view was a pretty as a picture! Everyone starts to scream! So much for remaining calm. A stampied of people raced for the door. I feel the cold of the water pinching my skin -and we sour off to dreams

Veronica G.: Ding an memory struck me right away!

Girls' Team 4: Veronica F.

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
27F4	Veronica F.	H	7	74	112	1	0	1445

Note:

This student has a special education designation (SpeD) of "H". This indicates a serious mental illness and a need for intensive behavior intervention.

The character creation does their own thing…does not follow the plot lines of any team, nor does the character write about other characters the class has created. Her character is mentioned by the others in team 3 of the girls, though is not included in a meaningful way.

Veronica F.'s writing was unfinished…she seems not to have worked much with the others and her writing does not seem to account for the others.

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing the trip.

Chapter 3: On arriving Veronica obtains a pet bird and pet dog.

Chapter 4: She decides she wants to be a mother and gets a girl named "Ellenor" from an orphanage.

Chapter 5: Veronica takes her pet and child home.

Chapter 6: The young daughter decides she wants a father. Veronica phones an old boyfriend named Carlos, who agrees to become a father to the girl.

Chapter 7: The family is on a boat that ends up sinking. Veronica dies trying to free Carlos, whose foot is stuck. The family perishes underwater.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: This student indicated that the Radioplay experience was "awesome". She said it was fun and that she got to hang out with her friends. Note how action is "ramped up"

at the end. It seems the student does want the interest of others for her story; evidence that she is writing for an audience.

> **Veronica F**.: -Now when I say big, I mean <u>really</u> big. "Duuh…Seriously?" I muttered as I strugled to get up. Now I had a bird and a dog to take care of!
>
> -I shouted inside my head.
>
> -She had long, wavy, flaming red hair and briliantly green eyes.
>
> -I smelled the familiar smell of home, the green trees and bushes
>
> -Then it happened; our lips crushed together. It was a wonderful feeling, until my eyes closed, and there was darkness. (She ends with a picture of her tombstone.)

4.5.6.3 Boys' teams and plot lines

There are a diverse variety of skill levels among the male students. The most notable ability areas for variability are spelling and paragraph skills. Student teams had complete autonomy on plot setting from chapters three on. Only seven chapters were supervised by the teacher in terms of edits. As mentioned earlier, the teacher found the amount of writing by the students too great to deal with in terms of the required editing needed. The teacher acknowledged the work was not edited fully. Observations of writing quality refer only to the development of each group's plot setting.

Boys' Team 1/ (5-7 Chapters):   Kirito, Harper, Austin

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
3M4	Kirito		5	83	37	1	2	1071
26M5	Harper	ELL*	7	63	65	2	0	1129
25M4	Austin		7	174	71	4	1	2602

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing the trip.

Chapter 3: The characters meet in an arcade in Cozumel, but from there the accounts vary.

4. -Harper tries to shoot Kirito…is hit with a hammer, falls out a window, uses a parachute for a safe landing…steals a jet to fly to Mexico…has fight with spitfire…goes to NYC for a gaming competition…gets to the Empire State Building…(seems incomplete)

5. -Austin meets characters at the arcade. After Harper's escape he investigates cheating in preparation for the gaming competition in NYC…what follows are descriptions of game battles with assorted opponents…after he wins he flies home

6. -Kirito doesn't talk about Cozumel…and doesn't involve the others in his narrative, though he does reference playing video games. His story mainly involves characters he has made up. The ending seems incomplete.

Writing Samples (Uncorrected)

Of Note: This group was not very successful in melding their combined narratives. They did refer to each other, but the story lines were vastly different. It was hard to tell if they were trying to please an audience, or only themselves.

Kirito: -"Who's there?" someone grunts in a deep New York accent. He opens the door. He has the smell of beer on his breath. There are multiple blackened teeth on his unloving frown. -The name fits him well. -As big as a planet!!! -After an ETERNITY, I arrived at the 13th floor. -This is the end of the line.

Austin: -Soon were arriving in Cozumel and I'm as tired as a running cheetah. –I thought I was just hearing things but 2 minutes later, I heard what sounded like a door being pulled down by a sledgehammer. –As I wave to Harper and Kirito, I step on to the plane exiting the path of a wonderous, spectacular, and amazing adventure.

Boys' Team 3/ (7 to 10 Chapters): Master Booklock, Alex, Huston, Anderson

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
7M5	Master Booklock		7	110	44	2	2	1636
13M4	Alex		10	106	75	0	0	1967
11M4	Houston		10	128	64	0	0	
23M4	Anderson	ELL*	7	114	26	0	0	

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing the trip.

Chapter 3: The characters meet at a party in Cozumel. They decide to fly somewhere, but the plane explodes before they can board. They go back to their hotel.

Chapter 4: The characters go to an amusement park… back to Alex's for a birthday party…on to NYC for a wedding between Alex and a girl named Heather. While in New York they go to a zoo where they help to capture an escaped lion. After that they purchase weapons in preparation for a hunting trip that doesn't happen.

Chapter 5: This Radioplay group seems to split at this point. The character of Master Booklock chooses to fly to Serbia to see an athletic museum. The other characters fly back to Cozumel where a hostage situation develops in the hotel involving Master Booklock's family.

Chapter 6: Master Booklock returns to Cozumel to deal with the hostage situation. There is a knife fight involving all the characters against an evil hotel manager.

Chapter 7: The characters go back to NYC. Alex ends up marrying a girl named Heather. Here the characters part ways.

Chapters 8-10: Various adventures remain for Alex and Houston who seem to coordinate their adventures. These include a random shooting at a beach volleyball game. In Alex's version, Houston is shot dead. In Houston's version he dreams of going to heaven before waking up and surviving. Their joint finale is a trip to the Empire State Building.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: This team had a lot of exciting plot portents, many of which were not explained. This made the writing feel random and lacking focus. There seemed to be strong personalities jostling to control the narrative. That being said, note that two of them kept writing, even when the teacher called an end after chapter 7. Total words could not be completed for two students as work was missing or unreadable.

Master Booklock: -My life's goal was to make people smarter and educated by reading books. -When I arrived It was raining Cats and Dogs, luckily I had an umbrella. -They were working as hard as a bee. -It was so annoying that my mind blew up.

Houston: -I have lots of friends because I am Alert, good athlete, good friend, organized and thinks before acting.

Boys' Team 4/ (Chapters 7 to 13): Chris, Russell, Jeff

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
8M4	Chris		7	89	49	0	1	
20M4	Russell		13	130	56	2	0	2199
17M4	Jeff		7	77	40	0	0	1122

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing the trip.

Chapter 3: The characters meet skydiving in Cozumel. They land in the ocean and are then chased by sharks who turn out to be pets of the boat owner who finally picks them up.

Chapter 4: They decide to fly somewhere, but there is a terrorist attack…bombing and shooting.

Chapter 5: They decide to fly to Seattle. The ferry terminal is bombed.

Chapter 6: Another airport is bombed.

Chapter 7: The ending seems incomplete for Chris and Jeff.

Chapters 8-13 for Russel: The character of Russell Gator then moved to the mixed boy and girl team to continue on. He includes the characters Angelina and Amanda in his ongoing narrative (that coincides with the mixed team).

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: This team offered lots of action in their narrative, with little explanation. Consequently it all becomes somewhat boring. This group experienced problems. There was a lot of arguing and finally the character known as Russell (20M4) left the group to join another. This caused hard feelings for the character of Chris (8M4), and he had negative comments regarding his Radioplay experience. The other boy involved in the group expressed positive feelings towards the Radioplay experience.

Chris: I got dressed and I hit the road.

Russell: The other guy had so many scars and cuts its like he has a pet tiger or something.

Boys' Team 5/ (Chapters 6-8): MacMurphy, Larry, Mia

ID#	Character Name	SpeD	Chapter Numbers	Adj.	Adv.	Simile	Metaphor	Total Words
14M5	MacMurphy	ELL*	8	68	30	0	0	
16M5	Larry	ELL*	6	78	34	1	0	973
18M5	Mia		6	44	18	0	0	

Plot Portents

Chapter 1: Introducing the character.

Chapter 2: Explaining why they are going to Cozumel and describing the trip.

Chapter 3: The characters meet in a 5-star restaurant in Cozumel which blows up as they leave.

Chapter 4: They go for drinks the next day and decide to fly to Bulgaria. On route the plane fails and they parachute out, landing near a boat in the water. They proceed by boat.

Chapter 5: There is an attempted shooting of Mia by Larry. It turns out Mia is a spy who was ordered to kill Larry.

Chapter 6: The narratives of Mia and Larry are incomplete, ending at chapter 6.

Chapters 7-8: MacMurphy goes on to tell us Larry is shot for creating "Doomsday", and that Mia ends up marrying his brother.

Observations and Writing Samples (uncorrected)

Of Note: This grade 5 group managed to create a fairly interesting plotline, especially considering that two are recent "English Language Learners". Of interest is the fact that one of the boys wrote as the female character "Mia". The quality of the writing samples in terms of legibility was faint and so it was not possible to determine the total number of words written. It is unclear as to why two of the characters stopped the narrative at chapter 6. Perhaps there were absences.

Larry: I was stinky as a skank

4.5.7 Summary of students' written work

The analysis of students' written work provides evidence that students' plot setting improved through the Radioplay process as the intervention unfolded. These were year level four students for the most part who had complete autonomy over their plot setting for each chapter. Chapter one introduced the students' character creation. Chapter two had the characters explain why and how they were travelling to a specific destination. These chapters were, for the most part, amusing and interesting. The chapters directly following were, in the beginning disappointing in their random and episodic nature. These chapters, chapters three and beyond, were based on plot outlines created by the students. Students read their chapters aloud for the class, and I believe that this "need to please, amuse, and entertain" provided the pressure for students to tighten the plot lines of their chapters. The improvement in chapter plots was notable from chapter three to the last chapters.

Students incorporated literary devices in their writing. An interesting difference emerged between adjective and adverb use in females versus the males. The females used twice as many intensifier adverbs in their written work, a finding echoed in other research as discussed earlier. Boys used more adjectives than adverbs. The teacher did introduce the students to many literary devices they could incorporate into their writing but did not require or enforce usage. The less frequent usage of the more sophisticated literary devices such as simile and metaphor may be explained by the young year levels of the students.

Behavioral engagement was evident in that around a third of the class kept writing Radioplay chapters, even when the teacher had stopped the program. This meant that the teams were meeting in their own time, in or out of class. They also would have completed the extra chapters in or out of class. Their actions, with respect to behavioral engagement, spoke as loudly as their words.

4.6 Part Five: Student Recommendations on How to Make Radioplay Better

Student survey responses to question five were analyzed to determine if student suggestions for improving Radioplay had to do with the process itself, or for the student experience. Students might also have indicated that they thought Radioplay could not be made better, or that they did not know how Radioplay could be made better. Appendix 4.22 shows the female responses and Appendix 4.23 shows the responses for the males with the analysis categories highlighted and tabulated. The frequency of responses corresponding to the four categories are given percentages to illustrate the strength or magnitude of responses for each category.

Table 4.22

Analysis of Female Answers to Question Five on How to Improve Radioplay, By Grade

(N=14)

Student I.D.	5. How can you make Radioplay better?	For Students	For Process	No Improvement Needed	Don't Know
2/F/4	I like it the way it is.			▓	
4/F/4	I feel that it is fine the way it is.			▓	
6/F/4	I don't need to make radioplay better			▓	
9/F/4	By making the stories more adventurous.		▓		
10/F/4	I wouln't change anything because it's great how it is! (smiley face/ LOL)			▓	
12/F/4	It is fine the way it is right now			▓	
15/F/4	I think raido play would be better if not everybody is your class would go to the same place but if different groups went to other places.	▓	▓		
19/F/4	Maybe we should do the good copy's on the computer and print it out.		▓		
21/F/4	Well, you can make Radioplay better by keeping it as-is. There is nothing that I don't like about Radioplay. Radioplay is the best way to write.			▓	
22/F/4	I do not know to make Radioplay better.				▓
27/F/4	Be quicker		▓		
1/F/5	I can't it is already great!!! (hearts instead of dots)			▓	
24/F/5	I for One think that radio play is the amazing experience it is. But I think it would be more exciting if every once in a while you act an exciting chapter out with your friends.	▓	▓		
28/F/5	For me Radioplay cant be any better than it already is!!! (and in big balloon letters: I heart Radioplay!!)			▓	
	TOTALS / 14	2	5	8	1
	PERCENTAGE %	14	36	57	7

Table 4.23

Analysis of Male Answers to Question Five on How to Improve Radioplay, By Grade (N=14)

I.D.	5. How can you make Radioplay better?	For Students	For Process	No Improvement Needed	Don't Know
3/M/4	I don't know				■
8/M/4	I would make radioplay better by not putting people into groups. Or there are separate groups and we act out a scene.	■	■		
11/M/4	To make it better I would add more chapters and info. But I am fine how it is		■	■	
13/M/4	I do not know how to make radioplay better because it is already better			■	■
17/M/4	you can make it better by giving us more time to do it		■		
20/M/4	By writing more chapters and knowing good grammar	■	■		
23/M/4	By telling people to focus include new people to radioplay teaching kids how to spell certain words basically teaching people how to be better spellers and be creative and a good thinker basically meke them be good at writing and radioplay.	■	■		
25/M/4	I don't think I can make the radioplay any better.			■	
5/M/5	I can make radioplay better by asking what words I can use and not use the same sentences or words.	■	■		
7/M/5	I think that Raidoplay cannot improve. I say that Raidoplay is already really good.			■	
14/M/5	I think if we could write Radioplay in book form it would be better.		■		
16/M/5	Make pichers of the Story.		■		
18/M/5	Don't know.				■
26/M/5	I can make radioplay better by adding pictures.		■		
	TOTALS / 14	4	9	4	3
	PERCENTAGE %	29	64	29	21

The findings from these two tables have been tabulated and are presented below.

How can you make Radioplay better?	Female (N=14)	Male (N=14)
-for students	14%	29%
-for process	36%	64%
-no improvement needed	57%	29%
-don't know	7%	21%

The students were asked to respond to the question of improving the Radioplay experience with regards to the students' experience, and for the process. There were significant differences between the female and male responses.

Almost twice as many males as opposed to females had ideas on how to improve the Radioplay process for students. There were calls for more time, more chapters, more information, and incorporating pictures. Several male students wanted to improve their writing by using different kinds of sentences and a larger variety of words. Teaching for improved spelling and grammar skills was mentioned by several students. One female seemed to indicate frustration with her group's plot setting, calling for more adventurous stories. Several boys suggested compiling the Radioplay chapters in book form and adding pictures. One girl suggested writing the good copies on computer and printing them out. Another girl thought it would be good if the different groups could pick their own part of the world to meet up in. The teacher in this case study had all the characters meet each other and come together in groups in Cozumel. Both a girl and a boy suggested acting out scenes from the Radioplay chapters would improve the process. More thoughts from the boys included having more time for the Radioplay process. It seems evident from the comments here that at least one student was frustrated by the plot setting efforts of their group. There were calls for better thinking and creativity.

Despite of the "room for improvement" ideas already put forward it is interesting to note that the second largest combined percentage of students thought that no improvements to the Radioplay process were needed. Almost twice as many females than males thought

that the process needed no improvement. A more detailed analysis of student suggestions

for improving the Radioplay process is warranted.

4.6.1 Ideas for improving Radioplay

The students were asked to respond to this question with regards to improving the

experience for students, as well as the Radioplay process. Only 29% of the boys thought no

improvement was needed. This explains why there were many more explicit suggestions for

improvement coming from the boys. Suggestions for Radioplay improvement can be divided

into the three main categories of technical skills, plot setting, and computer use. Both male

and female applicable comments are included.

4.6.1.1 Technical skills

The technical ideas for improving Radioplay for both the process and the students

are reflective of the cognitive engagement of the students. They became aware of their own

skill levels and expressed a need to improve. They wanted "better spelling and grammar"

and "better writing". They wanted to use different kinds of sentences and a "larger variety of

words". The students called for more time for the Radioplay process and the freedom to

have more chapters. What stands out in these student comments is the fact that the

students themselves are asking for more instruction in literacy related areas. They are

asking for "appropriate support" to improve their writing skills.

Parsons et al. (2015) look at instructional tasks that foster engagement in literacy

tasks. These researchers reference Self-Determination Theory in their findings. They assert

that tasks should be open ended, involve collaboration, and students should receive

appropriate support (Parsons et al., 2015, p. 227). Parsons et al. (2015) assert that students

should perceive that they are competent to perform the task with some support. The sense

of relatedness in SDT is accounted for in the collaboration that should be in the task.

Autonomy from SDT is achieved through the open-ended nature of the task.

4.6.1.2 Plot setting

One student was frustrated by the plot setting efforts of their group. There were calls

for better thinking and creativity, and more adventurous stories. Here again we see

evidence of cognitive engagement. The teacher in this case study did spend time with the class focusing on the creation of plot skeletons; but did not supervise the separate groups through the process. These young year four and five students were advocating for more support in the plot setting process, a finding echoed by the case study conducted by Parsons et al. (2015). The students' recognized their narrative plots were lacking and in need of improvement. Some improvement was noted in the narratives as the process neared the end, brought about through audience feedback in the oral presentations.

4.6.1.3 Computer use

Many of the students' suggestions for improving Radioplay (both for process and students), are centered on the use of computers. The students' ideas reflect their cognitive engagement. The students wanted to do their good copies on computer and print them out. They wanted to put Radioplay in book format. Using computers could enable them to incorporate pictures, scout locations, attractions, and generally acquire information to apply in their Radioplay writing. Given that Radioplay began when technology was in its early stages in schools, this is now an obvious way forward.

4.7 Part Six: Teacher Corroboration (Member Checking, Reliability, Verification)

The case study teacher was given access to all the findings and analysis and asked to provide feedback. Referring to the Radioplay trial, the teacher felt that, "All in all it was a tremendous success." I have grouped other comments within the six Key Constructs for the research. Teacher feedback did not include comments regarding Key Construct 4: Autonomy.

Key Construct 1: Emotional engagement

1. The students were "highly engaged and excited by the activity".
2. "Students often asked first thing when they walked in in the morning, 'Are we going to do the Radioplay today?'" They would express disappointment if this was not so.

Key Construct 6: Behavioral engagement

1. "I could not keep up with the amount of writing…I insisted on only 2 paragraphs, however many of them came up with much more."

2. "I found that the writing was slower in chapter 1 and chapter 2 and then it accelerated exponentially as we went through the process."

Key Construct 5: Cognitive engagement

1. "I found that they were so involved…they thought a lot about where they were going with their characters."

2. "Students heard excitingly discussing plot and activities their characters were engaged in."

3. The teacher was receiving emails from students on weekends and in the late evening. Students often wondered if they could do a "variety" of things. "It was clear that they were working on their accounts at home." (Note that the case teacher restricted Radioplay to in class time only.)

Key Construct 3: Perceived competence/ academic improvement

1. (With regards to students with learning difficulties and students who were new English language learners.) "Specifically, those with learning difficulties expressed their enjoyment of the process and found it entertaining and were engaged in the writing. Their fluency increased substantially…in all areas."

2. "They became more skilful with the use of conventions."

3. (The case teacher used peer editing.) "I observed it made a huge difference. Once students got into the habit of checking their work and their friend's work, their work improved substantially, additionally, the piece about 'reading aloud' proved to be a huge benefit."

4. The case teacher reported that the students used figurative and evocative language in their Radioplay writing.

Key Construct 2: Collaboration / relatedness

1. "Their ability to collaborate with each other improved considerably over the course of the Radioplay time, and in all subject areas."

2. "LD and English language learners were supported by stronger students…new relationships (were formed) that might not have happened…(these same students)…praised for their accomplishments by their peers."

Procedural considerations: The case study teacher also offered comments on the Radioplay process

1. "Each class would begin with a reminder of objectives for the particular timeframe. There was some difficulty with students who were faster writers, however; I had a list of tasks that they could complete while they waited for their peers to catch up. I also insisted that they support students who were slower writers. It was an opportunity for 1 to 1 support."

2. "There was not always time for each student to read (aloud)"…sometimes the teacher would read, emphasizing expression.

4.7.1 Summary

The data from the case study teacher verified the success of the Radioplay process for motivating and engaging students. The students' own perceptions regarding improvements in their writing ability is corroborated by the observations and perceptions of the teacher.

4.8 Part Seven: Summary of Findings and Analysis

In this chapter it has been shown that a key component of this descriptive case study research is to feature the words of the participants themselves, both students and teacher. Student survey responses and teacher observations and reflections have been displayed in tables representing each of the six key constructs being examined. Students organized themselves into "teams" of characters that interacted in the shared narratives the students created. Parts one and two of this chapter focused on the responses of the students to the

five survey questions. Part three presented the observations, reflections, and question responses of the case study teacher, analyzed for indicators of the six key constructs identified by the four main theories this research was drawn from, in the same manner as the student responses. Part four presented summaries of the Radioplay teams' written chapters. Students' draft copies were analyzed for evidence of behavioral engagement, academic improvement, word counts and word usage, and the quality of the narratives. Part five of this chapter focused on student ideas for improving the Radioplay process. Cognitive engagement featured prominently in student comments, especially in the boys' responses to question five, "How can you make Radioplay better?" These suggestions from the students were represented under the three main headings of technical skills, plot setting, and computer use. Part six featured teacher corroboration of the findings and analysis. This part seven summary reviews the indicators of the six key constructs represented in the theories that ground this study.

4.8.1 Emotional engagement

Students used the adjectives "fun, awesome, excited, happy" many times to describe their feelings about the Radioplay process. This was mostly true for both males and females. Females had three times as many positive emotional engagement responses as males for the question about how they felt when using Radioplay. The case study teacher had fifteen positive comments to indicate that she observed the students' emotional engagement with Radioplay. The teacher observed that, "They are always excited to work on the RP", and "They look forward to it". In the teacher corroboration of the findings the fact that the students were highly engaged and excited through the Radioplay process was stressed.

There were student comments indicating negative emotional engagement. Some of these negative descriptors included comments such as "boring, anxious, stressed, frustrating". Here are several other negative comments:

"isn't fun when you have to write two copies of everything."

"please don't ever do this again because it just made me lose friends."

Most of the negative comments came from members of the boys' group that broke up, including the comment about losing friends. Students' lengthy writing became burdensome when called upon to write a "corrected" copy. As several of the students themselves noted, the Radioplay process would be much better with the use of computers.

4.8.2 Cognitive engagement

These young year four and five level students were strongly engaged cognitively. There was a mainly even distribution of comments from both male and female students. The exception came from the responses to the question about how to improve the Radioplay process. 64% of the males had comments showing cognitive engagement, with only 28% of the females. Most females indicated they did not know how Radioplay could be made better. Here are a sample of responses:

"amazing way to get your imagination going…creative and a great way for people to learn…the stories connect to each other when the characters talk."

"I can imagine the scene."

Negative comments indicative of cognitive engagement and collaboration highlight group dynamics. Here are some examples:

"It is really good until people start leaving and arguing"

"It takes too much time to decide what to do with your group."

Note again the source of one of these comments came from a boy whose group broke up. This was an unexpected outcome, which may seem to have more impact on the results due to the small cohort of participants.

The teacher had five observations showing indications of cognitive engagement among students. Here is a sample:

"I feel one of the most important pieces is the fact that they are able to collaborate and imagine together. You should hear some of the conversations they have. Incredible!"

The teacher did not comment about the findings for cognitive engagement directly in her corroboration of the findings, focusing instead on the academic improvements noted during the Radioplay experiment.

4.8.3 Behavioral engagement

The second highest number of case study teacher comments were those focused on the behavioral engagement of students. Students' actions during the Radioplay experiment corroborated the strength of the teacher's comments as well as their own comments. The students were writing so much that the teacher had to restrict their writing to in class only. No homework was allowed. The teacher found it difficult to keep up with all the editing of their written drafts. Students commented on their writing, one talking about writing madly and another that their "hand hurts after writing so much". The teacher talked about how the students were working "so enthusiastically" that it was difficult to get them to stop. The students also indicated their behavioral engagement in how they talked about working with the Radioplay process. A quote from the teacher illustrates this:

> "…in fact I talked to several parents who came in the next day and said, "My goodness, what is this Radioplay thing? The kids can't stop talking about it."

The teacher corroborated the findings of this study, adding these observations:

> "I insisted on only 2 paragraphs, however many of them came up with much more."

> "Writing…accelerated exponentially as we went through the process."

Student comments indicative of positive behavioral engagement also included many comments about working with others. These comments are explored in more detail in the next heading of "Collaboration".

4.8.4 Collaboration indicated

Females typically made more comments than males that positively indicated collaboration, ranging from twice as many for survey question three, and almost twice as many to question one. Comments were both positive and negative. Female students expressed that they liked working with other people, making friends and socializing. These sentiments were echoed by several males as well. Negative comments were mainly from the

male students where the original Radioplay team broke up. Hard feelings ensued. Another male expressed anger when there was a lack of agreement in the team regarding plot setting. The case study teacher noted the difficulties some groups had, but mainly reflected that they had a "good time" working with others and learned to cooperate. After reviewing the findings of this study, the case teacher added that the students improved in their collaborative abilities through the course of the Radioplay experiment and that this was evident, incidentally, in other subject areas as well. More academically capable students supported those with special needs, and students praised each other's work. So, it appears that the collaboration nurtured through the Radioplay process may have wider implications for improving a shared learning environment. This possibility would need to be pursued through further research, however, as it is beyond the scope of this case study.

4.8.5 The learner's perceived competence and academic improvement

When asked what they would tell teachers and parents about Radioplay, twice as many males as females responded with indicators of perceived competence or academic improvement. One student commented that the Radioplay process was a "way to improve your writing". Another commented that it was a great learning method. The teacher commented that the students' writing became more expressive with improved fluency. After reviewing the findings for this study, the case study teacher commented that the students' work improved substantially.

4.8.6 Autonomy indicated

The construct of learner autonomy was the least mentioned by both students and teacher. Females consistently commented about their autonomy more than males for each question. Students talked about their happiness at being able to write freely. They liked having the freedom to design their plots and creating their own characters. The autonomy of the learner seemed to work harmoniously with the collaborative environment, as Radioplay allows for both the individual character development alongside that of the group storyline.

4.8.7 Student ideas for improving Radioplay

Question five asked the students how Radioplay could be improved. Almost three times as many females commented that no improvement was necessary with regards to the process. The opposite is true with regards to how to improve Radioplay for students. Most suggestions for improving the Radioplay experience for students came from the boys. The suggestions examined in this chapter were represented in the headings: technical skills, plot setting, and computer use.

The Radioplay process produced strong positive emotional, behavioral, and cognitive student engagement affects. Students indicated that they enjoyed collaborating to create their Radioplay chapters. There were some students who indicated that they felt they had improved their writing ability. All these findings have been corroborated by the case study teacher and are evident in the student responses, teacher comments, and the work of the students themselves.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This research into the Radioplay process for literacy instruction references four theories, which help to explain both its approach and effects. The Radioplay instruction process is both collaborative and interactive. It affords choice and autonomy to students. It is an inclusive process, open to students of different ability levels, enabling them to gain competence. In this way the Radioplay process fulfills the requirements for facilitating intrinsic motivation in students as put forward in the literature that informs the research. Besides perceived competence, this research supports the idea that improved student collaboration or relatedness, and a greater sense of student autonomy were also present throughout the Radioplay pedagogy. These are the factors identified in the literature on Drama in Education theory, Creativity theory, and Student Engagement Theory.

It therefore appears that this research endorses the Radioplay approach as a means to improve literacy and motivation in learners. This Descriptive Case Study uses my original approach in a new, empirical inquiry, with new co-researchers-both students and class teacher-to successfully teach literacy. The outcomes of the research align with the expectations gleaned from much of the existing literature and can be explained through the established theories therein. Here, in the conclusion, I will draw together the theory and the research outcomes to recap how Radioplay is a means to the teaching of literacy via the successful application of recognized, pedagogical theories on student engagement, creativity, and motivation. These theories explain why Radioplay works.

The motivation of the students working within the Radioplay process is evident by their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement, as reported by the students themselves, and by the case study teacher. It is also evident by the increasing quality of their accumulated written product.

It was apparent from the data that doing Radioplay improved emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement of students. To a lesser degree, constructs of collaboration, academic improvement or perceived competence, and autonomy were also indicated

through the student survey responses. In this concluding chapter these constructs will be discussed in order of the most frequently occurring responses evident in the findings; they will be prioritized according to the data.

These concluding observations focus on the importance of a meaningful context for literacy instruction. Radioplay engages the learner with the motivation to write for communication. We shall consider thoughts on effective teaching strategies for literacy and speculate on the new literacies that may provide future directions for the evolution of the Radioplay process.

5.1 Emotional Engagement

It appears that Radioplay engaged students emotionally. The large volume for positive emotional engagement indicators coming from the student survey responses speaks for the power of the Radioplay process to engage students. The case study teacher had many comments about the students' emotional engagement, second only to the number of comments for behavioral engagement. She pointed out that prior to embarking on the Radioplay project the students did not enjoy writing. However, once they were motivated by the Radioplay guidelines the teacher observed that the students were "engaged, happy and excited" during the Radioplay process. She was especially surprised that the boys, who expressed negative emotional reactions in their early survey responses, were showing stronger signs of engagement with literacy. In her corroboration of the Radioplay findings she relayed that the students asked every morning if they were doing Radioplay that day and would be disappointed if they were not.

The positive adjectives most used in the students' survey response comments included "fun, love, exciting, awesome". Positive emotional female responses were 100% for the first four of the survey questions and 57% for the fifth. The boys' responses were less consistent. Positive emotional male responses ranged in frequency from 21% to 93%. Negative comments came from the boys whose group broke up, leaving this small group of boys frustrated and anxious. In a small sample size like this, such an incident may impact or

even skew the results, unless viewed in context and analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. This being said, it is obvious looking at all the data that the Radioplay process was a "wonderful experience" for most of the students.

5.2 Cognitive Engagement

After emotional engagement, the second strongest engagement construct indicated by the students is cognitive engagement. This is important and especially surprising given the young age level of the students. Students talk about being given the opportunity to "use your imagination and brain in different ways". Other comments include:

- helps us with our writing and communication

- a great learning method

- taught me how to write really well

- I can imagine the scene

- I feel anxious to get every one of my ideas down.

Question five of the student survey asks the students how the Radioplay process can be improved. It required a cognitive response. The males provided more cognitive engagement indicators in response to this question, with a magnitude of 64% as compared with the females at 43%. The females mostly expressed that the process needed no improvement. Comments from the males included calls for more time, more chapters, and being able to incorporate pictures. Several male students wanted to improve their writing by using different kinds of sentences and a larger variety of words.

The teacher made a total of five comments indicative of cognitive engagement through her communications. The students' ability to collaborate and imagine together was mentioned. The teacher felt that students "came to recognize how effective a good plan for writing is" through listening to the chapters of their peers and through reading their own Radioplay chapters.

The students' suggestions for improving the Radioplay process center on the main areas of technical skills, plot setting, and computer use. The students were aware of their

own skill levels and called for more instruction in literacy related areas. There were calls for better thinking and creativity, and for more adventurous stories. The students wanted to use computers to print out their chapters, make editing easier, and publish their adventures in book format.

The teacher provided additional corroborating comments indicative of cognitive engagement after reviewing the research findings. She wrote that the students were "so involved" and "thought a lot about where they were going with their characters". The students were heard excitingly discussing plot and activities their characters were engaged in. The teacher received emails on weekends and late evenings with students asking questions regarding what their character could do. It was clear to the teacher that the students were subversively working on their accounts at home, even though she had restricted them from working on Radioplay as homework.

Mages (2006, p. 329) research entitled, "Drama and imagination: a cognitive theory of dramatic effect on narrative comprehension and narrative production", puts forward a cognitive theory that asserts that drama has a positive influence on both aural and oral language skills. Mages further asserts that the effects of drama can be linked to scholastic success and literacy acquisition. Central to these positive language development effects is the role of imagination. Mages (2006), "…explicitly posits the role of imagination in drama('s) potential to enhance the development of both narrative comprehension and narrative production" (p. 329).

As a drama-based teaching strategy, Radioplay is an especially effective process for eliciting cognitive engagement in students.

5.3 Behavioral Engagement

Students chose to participate positively in Radioplay. Indicators of positive behavioral engagement are evident in both teacher and student comments, as well as in the quality and quantity of the students' written work. The teacher commented that she was overwhelmed with the amount of writing produced by the students. She stopped them from

taking Radioplay as homework, restricting them to in class prescribed minutes only.

Because the writing became so copius, the Radioplay process was brought to a stop by the

teacher after chapter seven. Nevertheless, the students' behavioral engagement was so

apparent that one third of the class wrote beyond chapter seven. The teacher wrote that

they were writing so enthusiastically that she could not stop them after a while. Parents

reported that the "kids can't stop talking about it". A year later a student told the teacher they

were still doing Radioplay at home.

Student responses included "you write madly with great detail". A student

commented that they always put forward their best effort. Another talked about writing

pages and pages and still not feeling like it was enough.

After reviewing the research findings, the case study teacher commented that the

students' writing "accelerated exponentially as we went through the process".

Salmi and Thuneberg (2019) put forward the idea that behavioral engagement is

caused by both emotional engagement and cognitive engagement. These researchers

assert, "…the cause of behaviour is interest in the activity itself, curiosity, or pure

enjoyment." (Salmi & Thuneberg, 2019, p. 46). The results of this Radioplay case study

corroborate this idea.

Clearly, Radioplay engages students behaviorally. Moreover, the student writing and

comments support the teacher's perceptions, rendering any criticism of cognitive bias that

might be leveled at the teacher remarks as unfounded.

5.4 Collaboration

A key feature of the Radioplay process is that it requires collaboration and interaction

between students. Additionally, when I used Radioplay with students, I would create a

character and join in the narratives of student teams; not to dominate, but to share. Dorothy

Heathcote, a proponent of Drama in Education theory, would always take a small, teacher-

in-role character in her 'process dramas', created *with* students. Radioplay has the potential

to include this pedagogical strategy.

The third category of most frequent comments from students were those regarding the benefits of collaboration at roughly a fifth of the class. These comments expressed enjoyment at working with friends. One student felt it was a great way to teach kids to work with a group. Another wanted to improve group work skills.

After reviewing the research findings, the case study teacher had additional comments regarding student collaboration. She felt that not only did they improve in their ability to collaborate during the Radioplay process, but this translated to all subject areas. She talked about the students supporting each other, mentorships and new relationships forming. She spoke of peers praising each other's work.

This link between collaboration and learning is represented in research. Barron (2003), interested in classroom practices, calls for more empirical studies to investigate the quality of collaboration for learning. Barron (2003) looks at the quality of collaboration:

> …learning outcomes as well as concurrent joint problem solving outcomes are influenced by qualities of interaction. These findings point to the need for a better theoretical understanding of joint learning that integrates cognitive, relational and social practice aspects of learning (Lave, 1998). (p. 382)

In the study, Barron (2003, p. 353) measures responsivity and connectedness, looking at how students' participation in learning effects outcomes. Here Barron (2003) links relational and social practices with cognitive outcomes.

In this Radioplay case study indications of collaboration and cognitive engagement are both strong, along with the students' self-reported perceptions of academic improvement.

5.5 Academic Improvement / and Perceived Competence

Almost one third of the class, both males and females, indicated that they felt some improvement or competence in their writing when responding to Question One, "What do you think about Radioplay?". There were no comments indicative of academic improvement

and/or perceived competence for question five that asked how the Radioplay process could be made better.

The case study teacher observed academic improvement from the start to the finish of the process, especially in terms of "fluency and expression". In reviewing the research findings, she added that they "became more skillful in the use of conventions".

In studying the students' written work, chapter by chapter, it became clear to this researcher that the students were gaining skills and showing improvement in their plot setting.

As in this case study, Dalby and Burton (2013) look at the effects of writing in role on year 4 children. In their findings they describe the feelings of the students. All felt their writing improved as well as their language development. The students felt that the writing process was easier in role (Dalby & Burton, 2013, p. 86). Dalby and Burton (2013) conclude, "The analysis of the results show that 'writing in role' technique both supported and developed certain areas of children's writing and imagination, whilst increasing their motivation to write" (p. 87). This observation aligns with the results of this research.

5.6 Autonomy

The opportunity for students to develop an empowering sense of autonomy is built into the Radioplay process. This case study cohort were given the freedom to choose their own groups and set the plots for each chapter. Evidence of the consequences come largely from the teacher's observational data. Student responses reflective of autonomy are low because they were not directly asked about autonomy. One student talked about the teacher letting them write "freely". Another said they enjoyed choosing their character and story.

A classroom context that features autonomy inspires the students' motivation to learn. Salmi and Thuneberg (2019) tell us, "What Dewey and modern science centre pedagogy share is the emphasis on motivation, free will and the learner's own activity which is stimulated by the context and is not forced" (p. 45). In discussing the role of Self-

Determination Theory on learning and motivation, these researchers argue that autonomy and personal agency are central. Turner and Paris (1995) also talk about creating contexts for motivating students in literacy tasks. These researchers assert that open tasks are best. They advocate that students should control both the process and the product. In Radioplay the students control both the process and the product.

5.7 Summary

This research shows strong indications of the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural engagement constructs listed and described by Student Engagement Theory. The quantitative data in terms of the number of relevant comments for each construct (qualitative evidence) offers a measure of the magnitude of the responses. The quantitative data around the number of chapters the students wrote corroborates the strength of the qualitative data for behavioural engagement. The constructs of relationships/collaboration, autonomy, and perceived competence, listed and described in Self-Determination Theory, are also represented in the findings to varying degrees. The case study teacher has corroborated the findings in this research. The experiences of the students and teacher working with the Radioplay process were, with few exceptions, positive and described at length.

It became apparent that the number of Radioplay teams and how they were put together created some problems. This case study teacher allowed students to form their own teams and so there were many small groups of friends. This made it difficult for the teacher to monitor the plot setting processes of these young students. This became apparent in the analysis of their written chapters which were found wanting. As the process went on plots improved and I have suggested that this was due to feedback from the class as an audience to their oral presentations. Students wanted to entertain and amuse their peers. There was also the problem of friends having disagreements and groups breaking up. This can be avoided if it is the teacher who makes up the Radioplay teams, something I have always done. As I outlined earlier, in my own practice of Radioplay I never had more than three

teams, making sure each student had at least one friend on the team. This made it possible for me to sit in on their plot setting processes, offering guidance.

5.8 Study Limitations

This descriptive case study research would have more objectivity if the case study teacher had not been such a close colleague of myself, the researcher. Since the analysis focuses on this specific case, generalizability is problematic and limited. The methods of deductive thematic and content analyses are not causal and therefore this study is limited in its ability to assume causality. What was found is presented in detail and while the causes are suggested, they are not proven.

5.9 Discussion

5.9.1 Drama processes, teacher autonomy, the importance of a meaningful context, technology, and the new literacies

Radioplay uses the drama process that is widely referred to as 'writing in role'. Research looking at the effects of writing in role has shown positive results, as well as pointing to the importance of contexts for learning. Anderson (2012) looks at the effects of process drama on the written language of students. The study finds:

> Significant increases in students' written language productivity and specificity were observed in contextualized dramatic arts activities, as compared to decontextualized language arts activities. (Anderson, 2012, p. 959)

In Radioplay the students' written output increased as the process continued. This is another effect of providing them with the stimulation of a meaningful learning context. Radioplay, with its emphasis on collaboration, facilitates interaction, and this helps students to develop "…linguistic specificity and productivity" (Anderson, 2012, p. 966). Anderson (2012) asserts:

The evidence generated by this study supports process drama as a contextualized literacy activity to address linguistic specificity, motivation, and engagement among students with diverse learning needs. (p. 975)

The findings of the Anderson study endorse the importance of process drama in creating contexts for literacy activities. Radioplay is a written process drama that provides a context within which many aspects of a literacy program may find focus.

Process drama can do more than just motivate and engage students in literacy. Process drama can have more positive effects, as Mages (2006) asserts, it "…explicitly posits the role of imagination in drama's potential to enhance the development of both narrative comprehension, and narrative production" (p. 329).

This Radioplay study found that the student narratives improved through the process. The   methodology of Deductive Analysis aligns this Case Study's results with the theories of other researchers. Informed by an extensive literature review, this methodology provides a lens of knowledge, through which to analyse and appreciate the merits of drama-based, roleplay approaches to literacy teaching. Wells and Sandretto (2017) also focus on using process drama pedagogy for literacy instruction. Besides observing greater student engagement, the researchers point to quality effects such as, "…more detailed writing and an enhanced depth of thinking" (Wells & Sandretto, 2017, p. 180). Citing the work of Schneider and Jackson (2000), Wells and Sandretto (2017) further explain:

Process drama also creates a fictional context to prompt authentic purposes for student writing (Schneider & Jackson, 2000). For the students in Schneider and Jackson's study, writing in role was genuine writing that encouraged them to use their imagination and consider multiple perspectives. (p. 183)

Similarly, Cremin, Goouch, Blakemore, Goff, and Macdonald (2006) conducted a study seeking to understand how drama supported students in literacy learning and to identify writing features evident in "drama-related writing" (p. 273). The researchers assert that drama contributes positively to students' written compositions. They point to a

recognised relationship between Drama in Education and language development. Cremin et al. (2006) state:

> … the potential of this relationship has not been fully realised. It could be argued that the dominant culture of accountability and prescription recently evidenced has marginalised the contribution of drama and the arts in primary education. (p. 273)

The accountability and prescription highlighted here are the main roadblocks to innovative processes that do not fit into prescribed "timetabled" curriculums. I sought to conduct my Radioplay study in Australia and approached a teacher. This teacher told me that the Radioplay process could not be used because the prescribed curriculum was full, and the teachers' time was tightly scheduled. I argue now that Radioplay should not be viewed as an optional "extra" to the curriculum. It is too valuable as a teaching process. It is a process or way, to seamlessly and meaningfully, integrate many aspects of a literacy curriculum.

As the Australian Curriculum finds its way into schools, teachers struggle to incorporate and enormous amount of content. Cremin et al. (2006), referring to the prescribed curriculum, also assert, "It has also compromised practitioners' pedagogical knowledge and is likely to have limited their artistic involvement in teaching and learning" (p. 273).

I learned about drama pedagogy as part of my teacher training. I went on to complete a Master of Education degree in Drama in Education. As a Canadian teacher I had the freedom to design my own teaching timetable and decide how I would deliver the curriculum. It used to be like that in Australia and internationally too. But fashions in pedagogies swing like a pendulum. If teachers are to incorporate innovative and effective learning processes, proven in research, they must have the freedom and flexibility to do so.

Teachers need access to research-based learning contexts for effective teaching. Hamalainen and Vahasantanen (2011) state, "A common feature of orchestrating learning is that it draws systematically on research-based productive collaborative learning situations in the design and real-time implementation of teaching" (p. 170). The classroom specific

context of this Radioplay pedagogy enables teachers to determine the applicability to their own teaching situations.

I am interested in how the notion of "meaningful context" features in discussions of effective teaching. A meaningful context may provide for integrating discrete, disparate lessons in literacy-creating the space to incorporate new learning…to practice…to apply. For example, in my own practice of Radioplay I would require students to incorporate literary devices such as simile and metaphor within their chapter adventures. This was more meaningful to students than composing random sentences on a worksheet.

Looking ahead it is possible that the Radioplay instruction process may be greatly enhanced through the incorporation of technology and the new literacies. This would be a topic for future research. The students in the Radioplay case study pointed out that the process could be improved through computer use, both for editing and publishing in book format. Technology would enhance presentation, aid in the inclusion of pictures, and help them to research location details. The realm of blogging and podcasts could enrich Radioplay presentations and include a wider distribution of students through online teaching and distance education.

Chun, Kern, and Smith (2016) look at the "…ways that technological media influence contexts and forms of expression and communication" (p. 64). In determining how to incorporate technology into their lessons, these researchers advise teachers should "…focus on the *process* of meaning making and learning with the technology" (Chun et al., 2016, p. 77). Radioplay, in addition to literacy learning, could provide a meaningful context to enable learning technology and the application of new literacies.

Hashemi and Cederlund (2017) advocate for "…infused approaches making use of digital technology in multimodal, functional and learner centred literacy practices" (p. 221). The researchers are concerned with the contexts influencing teachers' choices (Hashemi & Cederlund, 2017, p. 246). Hashemi and Cederlund (2017) state:

Consequently, the question of literacy education in a digital classroom concerns not

only teachers' knowledge and choices, but the framework enabling or constraining

185

their work. School leaders, stakeholders and policymakers hold an important position in this matter. (p. 247)

Radioplay provides a framework, a process for literacy learning. It also could provide the meaningful context within which to teach technology skills, new literacies, and Media Arts. Stakeholders and education policymakers need to enable teachers to incorporate research based, innovative new programs into their teaching toolbox.

Through collaboratively doing Radioplay, students become empowered to tell stories. Katie Duffy (2019) finds storytelling in the classroom to be a powerful method of learning. Here she speaks of digital storytelling:

> Digital storytelling is a multi-faceted pedagogy that can bring the curriculum to life and develops literacy skills in writing, editing, symbolism and oral reading…The stakes for students are much higher due to the visibility and personal nature of the task, thus providing them with both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. (Duffy, 2019, p. 22)

Radioplay involves students reading their stories aloud to the class. Oral reading as the voice of the students' character creations is a key feature of the Radioplay process. As students realize the responses their work elicits, they work ever harder to entertain their peers. Their chapter plots become more interesting, amusing, and exciting. The Radioplay process can be successfully realized in a low technology or no technology environment, but digital storytelling can enhance the process on so many levels.

Henriksen, Mishra, and Fisser (2016) promote the idea of combining creativity and technology. To accomplish this there are three levels to be employed systematically, "…the levels of teacher education, assessment and educational policy" (Henriksen et al., 2016, p. 27). These researchers call for embedding creativity and technology in subjects throughout the curriculum, and more emphasis on research "to identify models and practices" (Henriksen et al., 2016, p. 35). The Radioplay process is a way to integrate creativity and technology.

5.9.2 Self-determination theory, student engagement, and effective teaching

Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) informs effective teaching practices by detailing the necessary constructs that increase intrinsic motivation in students and their engagement in learning tasks and underpins Radioplay. Salmi and Thuneberg (2019) look at the role of Self-Determination Theory for effective teaching. The goal in referencing the constructs important in facilitating intrinsic motivation is to, "…help in planning even more effective and interesting informal learning environments" (p. 44). These researchers talk about the challenge of conducting research in education within the context of a "traditional" classroom. By employing autonomy and collaboration in lesson planning; constructs that form the foundation of Self-Determination Theory, you are challenging traditional teaching methods. For many teachers sharing power with students is a threatening concept. The work of Salmi and Thuneberg (2019) is important in that it clearly links a specific type of classroom context with effective teaching. Autonomy and collaboration are implicit in the Radioplay process.

Parsons et al. (2014) look at instructional tasks that foster engagement, acknowledging the importance of Self-Determination Theory. For teaching to be effective, students must be engaged. Parsons et al. (2014) list the elements that contribute to an engaging context in the classroom:

Activities (that) are authentic, collaborative, challenging, student-directed, and sustained…have been identified in the literature as essential to enhancing engagement. (p. 225)

Radoplay fulfills these descriptors of a learning context that facilitates engagement. An important feature of the Radioplay process is that it is sustained over time and produces an "artifact"-the chaptered stories of the students.

McGlashan (2018) talks about the link between effective teaching and creativity and the lack of guidance to "inform actual classroom practice" (p. 377). Creativity theory stresses the constructs of autonomy and collaboration. Using these same constructs, Radioplay seeks to provide the creative and effective strategies that teachers can implement

in their classes, for their students. Radioplay is a creative classroom activity that allows for the teaching of many aspects of a literacy program.

Creely (2020) looks at writing in the middle school years, recommending it "…be centred on agency and identity and creating a presence through writing" (p. 7). The idea of agency is gaining traction in discussions of effective teaching for literacy. Creely (2020) explains:

Competent and enthusiastic writers thus emerge in the middle school, and it is here that their agency as writers should be promoted in teaching and learning and emphasized in literacy programs…also embody the personal sense of power and personal growth that comes with creating, producing and sharing writing. (p. 11)

Agency should play a central role in students' writing. Creely (2020) also promotes the practice of co-writing in teams and sharing writing with an audience. Another element of effective teaching pointed out by Creely (2020) is "teacher modelling of writing for students" (p. 14). Creely (2020) advocates that "…teachers be co-writers with students, sharing writing and becoming fellow constructors of creative and personal writing" (p. 14). This is reminiscent of the teacher-in-role approach of Heathcote's Process Drama, although Heathcote's work produces oral, not written, storytelling. Wright (2020, p. 20) responds to Creely's work, also advocating for agency in the development of students' writing identity, saying that the teacher's role as model is of central importance. Wright (2020) asserts:

Choice of topic and choice of genre. Only when these beliefs drive the writing practice in our middle schools, will it begin to approximate authenticity. (p. 21)

In my own practice of using Radioplay in the classroom I would do exactly that. I would join Radioplay teams as a character within their co-constructed narratives, sharing decision making powers with them. It gave me an opening to model and discuss my own writing choices with them. Theoretically, Radioplay as a pedagogy combines the Process Drama of Heathcote with the writing enhancement constructs evident in contemporary literature to produce an environment conducive to motivating and empowering children to

write. In this thesis, I argue for the power of the strategy and offer it to readers as a template for their own teaching.

5.9.3 New understandings regarding literacy learning

Our understanding of effective literacy learning practices in evolving. Belifiore and Lash (2018) outline the "21st Century Skills" that will be required by students:

> …4C-related skills (critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity) will become even more important over the next three to five years. (p. 43)

Rebecca Urban (2018) reports on the "Evidence for Learning" Australian initiative in a 2018 article in the "Weekend Australian". The article talks about addressing teacher education to prepare teachers on how to teach these skills, as well as measuring student progress. The chief executive officer, Matthew Deeble (2018) states,

> Our research shows that there's a strong desire from teachers to be able to access a better evidence base to inform their practice. The problem now is that a lot of evidence is informed by academic research…which often doesn't tell teachers how they can use it in the classroom. (p. 47)

Ewing (2019) suggests that teachers do not feel that they have the power to incorporate "imaginative and creative teaching and learning" (p. 52). Here Ewing references the prescribed curriculum, which includes a specified timetable for teachers in some districts in Australia. To incorporate teaching for 21st Century skills we must change how we are delivering the curriculum and give teachers more power to create instructional formats and timetables. This Radioplay study contains a reflection of past practice (Appendix 1), incorporating detailed instruction; a "how to" guide on how to use Radioplay as a pedagogy for the classroom. The results of this new empirical inquiry into the efficacy of the Radioplay process show that it is a good learning tool that addresses these 21st Century needs, along with other recommendations evident in contemporary literature pertaining to teaching literacy, which has been discussed throughout this thesis.

Robyn Henderson (2019) talks about the progression in our understanding of literacy learning:

…-around the 1990s- we saw a shift away from the previous psychological

approaches towards more sociological understandings which identified literacy as a

social practice. (p. 44)

Barron (2003) promotes the idea of "generative collaboration" with regards to literacy

instruction. Walker, Tabone, and Weltsek (2011) tell us, "Literacy is understood then, as a

social event negotiated among participants" (p. 365). On learning more broadly, Craft et al.

(2001) assert, "learning is a situated social process, dependent on interaction and

communication" (p. 179).

If literacy is a social practice it follows that literacy learning should be collaborative

and interactive. These are the foundation of the Radioplay instruction process. Radioplay is

a creative new and research-informed way to engage and motivate students in literacy.

5.9.4 Recommendations for future research

Expanding this case study research on the instructional process of Radioplay to

different teaching situations would offer more depth and validity to the findings presented

here. It would be interesting to see how the process tests out with grade levels lower than

4/5, as well as higher. Computer access for all students would impact on draft editing which

is laborious for the class teacher, another area for investigation.

References

Aaronson, J. (1994). A pragmatic view of thematic analysis. *The Qualitative Report, 2*, 1–3.

    http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/aaronson.html

Ahmadi, N., & Besancon, M. (2017). Creativity as a stepping stone towards developing other

    competencies in classrooms. *Education Research International, 2017*, 1–9.

    https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/1357456

Aitken, V., Fraser, D., & Price, G. (2007). Negotiating the spaces: Relational pedagogy and

    power in drama teaching. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 8*(14), 1–18.

    http://www.ijea.org/v8n14/

Amabile, T. M. (1985). The social psychology of creativity. *Studies in Art Education, 27*(1),

    47–48. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1320390

Amabile, T. M. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and

    loving what you do. *California Management Review, 40*(1), 39–58.

Anderson, M. (2012). *Master class in drama in education: Transforming teaching and*

    learning. India: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Apiola, M., Lattu, M., & Pasanen, T. A. (2012). Creativity-supporting learning environment—

    CSLE. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education,12*(11), 3.

    doi:10.1145/2275597.2275600

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school:

    Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in*

    Schools, 45(5), 369–386. doi:10.1002/pits.2303

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and

    psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument.

    Journal of School Psychology, 44, 427–445. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.002

Assor, A., Kaplan, H., & Roth, G. (2002). Choice is good, but relevance is excellent:

    Autonomy-enhancing and suppressing teacher behaviours predicting students'

    engagement in schoolwork. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 261–278.

Baguley, M., Midgley, W., & Kerby, M. (2013). Epilogue-creativity and collaboration in the education sector. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 8*(1), 53–54.

Barron, B. (2003). When smart groups fail. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12*(3), 307–359. doi:10.1207/s15327809JLS1203_7

Barta, S. (2018). Writing in role: A new process to engage and empower literacy students. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 26*(3), i–xvi.

Belifiore, G., & Lash, D. (2018). Creative know how: Competencies for student success in a world of change. *EduCAUSE Review March/April 2018*. http://www.educause.edu/

Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *Nursing Plus Open, 2*, 8–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001

Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77–101.

Burch, G. F., Heller, N. A., Burch, J. J., Freed, R., & Steed, S. A. (2015). Student engagement: Developing a conceptual framework and survey instrument. *Journal of Education for Business, 90*(4), 224–229. doi:10.1080/08832323.2015.1019821

Burnard, P. (1995). Interpreting text: An alternative to some current forms of textual analysis in qualitative research. *Social Sciences in Health, 1*, 236–245.

Cahill, H. (2002). Teaching for community: Empowerment through drama. *Melbourne Studies in Education, 43*(2), 12–25. doi:10.1080/17508480209556399

Carina, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Research Higher Education, 47*(1), 1–32. http://wwwjstor.org/stable/40185882

Chi, M. T. H. (2009). Quantifying qualitative analyses of verbal data: A practical guide. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 6*(30), 271–315. doi:10.1207/sl5327809jls0603_1

Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (Eds.) (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement (2012).* Springer Science and Business Media, LLC. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_23

Chun, D., Kern, R., & Smith, B. (2016). Technology in language use, language teaching and language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 100* (supplement 2016). doi:10.111/modl.12302

Coates, H. (2010). Development of Australasian survey of student engagement (AUSSE). *Higher Educ*ation*, 60*(1), 1–17. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40784042

Collard, P., & Looney, J. (2014). Nurturing creativity in education. *European Journal of Education, 49*(3), 348–364. doi:10.111/ejed.12090

Conklin, H. G. (2014). Toward more joyful learning: Integrating play into frameworks of middle grades teaching. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(6), 1227–1255. doi:10.3102/00283121459451

Connell, J. P. (1990). Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system processes across the life-span. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *The self in transition: Infancy to childhood* (pp. 61–97). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-esteem processes. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Self-processes and development: The Minnesota symposium on child development* (Vol. 23, pp. 43–77). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Craft, A. (2003). The limits to creativity in education: Dilemmas for the educator. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 51*(2), 113–127. doi:10.111/1467-8527.101-1-00229

Craft, A., Jeffrey, B., & Leibling, M. (2001). (Eds.). *Creativity in education*. London and New York: Continuum.

Creely, E. (2020). Students as writers-strengthening the agency of students as creative writers in the middle school. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 28*(2), 7–18.

Cremin, T., Goouch, K., Blakemore, L., Goff, E., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Connecting drama and writing: Seizing the moment to write. *Research in Drama Education, 11*(3), 273–291. doi:10.1080/13569780600900636

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioural research* (pp. 209–240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Australia: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd.

Crumpler, T. P. (2005). The role of educational drama in the composing processes of young writers. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 10*(3), 357–363. doi:10.1080/13569780500276103

Dalby, M., & Burton, N. (2013). What is the impact on six underachieving year 4 children's choice of language and development of character when 'writing in role'?, *Education3-13, 41*(1), 82–89. doi:10.1080/03004279.2012.710103

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour.* New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3),182–185.

Dolezal, S. E., Welsh, L. M., Pressley, M., & Vincent, M. M. (2003). How nine third-grade teachers motivate student academic engagement. *The Elementary School Journal, 103*(3), 239–267. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1002271

Duffy, K. (2019). A practically based response to Ewing's key article. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 27*(2), 22–25.

Escobar, M., Fernandez, A., Guevera-Niebla, G., & Freire, P. (1987). *Paulo Freire on higher education: A dialogue at the National University of Mexico.* New York: State University of New York.

Escobar, M., Fernandez, A., Guevera-Niebla, G., & Freire, P. (1994). *Paulo Freire on higher education: A dialogue at the National University of Mexico*. New York: State University of New York.

Ewing, R. (2019). Embedding arts-rich English and literacy pedagogies in the classroom. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 27*(2), 7–17.

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on student engagement*. Springer Science & Business Media, LLC. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_5/fulltex

Fraser, D., Aitken, V., Price, G., & Whyte, B. (2012). *Inquiry learning, drama and curriculum integration: Teaching and learning set 3 (32–40)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative, NZCER.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109. http://www.proquest.com

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: The Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (1996). *Letters to Cristina: Reflections on my life and work*. New York: Routledge.

Furrer, C., & Skinner, E. (2003). Sense of relatedness as a factor in children's academic engagement and performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 148–162. doi:10.10037/0022-0663.95.1.148

Gasiewski, J. A., Eagan, M. K., Garcia, G. A., Hurtado, S., & Chang, M. J. (2012). From gatekeeping to engagement: A multicontextual, mixed method study of student academic engagement in introductory STEM courses. *Research Higher Education, 53*, 229–261. doi:10.1007/s11162-011-9247-y

Graneheim, U. H., Lindgren, B., & Lundman, B. (2017). Methodological challenges in qualitative analysis: A discussion paper. *Nurse Education, Today 56*, 29–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2017.06.002.

Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nursing Education Today, 24*, 105–112. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001

Greenwood, C. R., Horton, B. T., & Utley, C. A. (2002). Academic engagement: Current perspectives on research and practice. *School Psychology Review, 31*(3), 328–349.

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(5), 890–898.

Guay, F., Ratelle, C. F., & Chanal, J. (2008). Optimal learning in optimal contexts: The role of self-determination in education. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3), 233–240. doi:10.10.1037/a0012758

Hamalainen, R., & Vahasantanen, K. (2011). Theoretical and pedagogical perspectives on orchestrating creativity and collaborative learning. *Education Research Review, 6*, 169–184. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2011.08.001

Hanafiyeh, M., & Afghari, A. (2014). Gender differences in the use of hedges, tag questions, intensifiers, empty adjectives, and adverbs: A comparative study in the speech of men and women. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences,* 2231–6345.

Harcourt, D., & Keen, D. (2012). Learner engagement: Has the child been lost in translation? *Australian Journal of Early Childhood Volume, 37*(3).

Harris, A. (2016). *Creative ecologies: Fostering creativity in secondary schools.* Retrieved from http://creativeresearchhub.com

Harris, A., & Ammermann, M. (2016). The changing face of Australian education. *Teaching Education, 27*(1), 103–113. doi:10.1080/10476210.2015.1077379

Hart, S. R., Stewart, K., & Jimerson, S. R. (2011). The student engagement in schools
    questionnaire (SESQ) and the teacher engagement report form-new (TERF-N):
    Examining the preliminary evidence. *Contemporary School Psychology, 15*, 67–79.

Hashemi, S. S., & Cederlund, K. (2017). Making room for the transformation of literacy
    instruction in the digital classroom. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 17*(2), 221–
    253. doi:10.1177/1468798416630779

Henderson, R. (2019). Looking back and moving forward: Building on Sam (Sandra) Power's
    legacy. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 27*(2), 41–51.

Henriksen, D., Mishra, P., & Fisser, P. (2016). Infusing creativity and technology in 21st
    century education: A systemic view for change. *Educational Technology & Society,
    19*(3), 27–37.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approached to qualitative content analysis.
    *Qualitative Health Research, 15(*9), 1277–1288.

Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It is not
    autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of
    Educational Psychology, 102*(3), 588–600. doi:10.1037/a0019682

Jeffrey, B., & Craft, A. (2001). Introduction: The universalization of creativity 1-12. In Craft,
    Jeffrey, & Leibling (Eds.), *Creativity in education.* London and New York: Continuum.

Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (Eds.). (1984). *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education
    and drama.* London, England: Hutchinson.

Kasser, T., Ryan, R. M., Zax, M., & Sameroff, A. J. (1995). The relations of maternal and
    social environments to late adolescents' materialistic and prosocial values.
    Developmental Psychology, 31(6), 907–914.

Kirkham, J. A., & Kidd, E. (2015). The effect of Steiner, Montessori, and National Curriculum
    Education upon children's pretence and creativity. *The Journal of Creative
    Behaviour, 51*(1), 20–34. doi:10.1002/jocb.83

Kriesberg, S. (1992). *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education*.
    Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

LaChapelle, J. R. (1985). Review: The social psychology of creativity by T. M. Amabile. *Studies in Art Education, 27*(1), 47–48. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1320390

Lakoff, R. (1973). *Language and woman's place.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lankshear, C. (1987). *Literacy, schooling, and revolution.* London, England: Falmer Press.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices and classroom learning* (2nd ed.)*.* Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2018). Education and 'new literacies' in the middle years. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years*, *26*(2).

Lawson, M. A., & Lawson, H. A. (2013). New conceptual frameworks for student engagement research, policy, and practice. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), 432–479. doi:103102/003465431380891

Lee, B. K., Patali, E. A., Cauthon, S. W., & Steingut, R. R. (2015). The effect of drama-based pedagogy on preK-16 outcomes: A meta-analysis of research from 1985 to 2012. *Review of Education Research, 85*(1), 2–49. doi:10.3102/0034654314540477

Lee, J.-S. (2014). The relationship between student engagement and academic performance: Is it a myth or reality? *The Journal of Educational Research, 107*(3), 177–185. doi:10.1080/oo220671.2013.807491

Lester, J., Leonard, J., & Mathias, D. (2013). Transfer student engagement: Blurring of social and academic engagement. *Community College Review, 41*(3), 202–222.

Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagement and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 219–237. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.002

Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (9th ed.). England: Pearson Education.

Mages, W. K. (2006). Drama and imagination: A cognitive theory of drama's effect on narrative comprehension and narrative production. *Research in Drama Education, 11*(3), 329–340. doi:10.1080/13569780600900750

McGlashan, A. (2018). A pedagogic approach to enhance creative ideation in classroom

practice. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 28*, 377–393.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s. 10798-017-9404-5

McWilliam, E., & Haukka, S. (2008). Educating the creative workforce: New directions for

twenty-first century schooling. *British Educational Research Journal, 34*(5), 651–666.

Merchant, G. (2007). Review. *Literacy, 42*(3), 177–178.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods

sourcebook* (3rd ed.). United States: SAGE Publication.

Noddings, N. (2013). Standardized curriculum and loss of creativity. *Theory into Practice*, *52*,

210–215, 203. doi:10.1080/00405841.2013.804315

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving

to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*,

1–13. doi:10.1177/1609406917733847

Nunez, J. L., Fernandez, C., Leon, J., & Grijalvo, F. (2015). The relationship between

teacher's autonomy support and students' autonomy and vitality. *Teachers and

Teaching: Theory and practice, 21*(2), 191–202. doi:10.1080/13540602.2014.928127

O'Leary, Z. (2010). *The essential guide to doing your research project*. SAGE Publications.

Ozbek, G. (2014). Drama in education: Key conceptual features. *Journal of Contemporary

Educational Studies, 1*, 46–61.

Parsons, S. A., Malloy, J. A., Parsons, A. W., & Burrowbridge, S. C. (2015). Students'

engagement in literacy tasks. *The Reading Teacher, 69*(2), 223–231.

doi:10.1002/trtr.1378

Pass, M. W., & Neu, W. A. (2014). Student effort: The influence of relatedness, competence,

and autonomy. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 18*(2), 1–11.

Prentki, T., & Stinson, M. (2016). Relational pedagogy and the drama curriculum—Research

in drama education. *The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 21*(1), 1–12.

doi:10.1080/13569783.2015.1127153

Punch, K. F. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. London, England: SAGE Publications.

Reeve, J. (2006). Teachers as facilitators: What autonomy-supportive teachers do and why their students benefit. *The Elementary School Journal, 106*(3), 225–236. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/5014-84

Reeve, J. (2013). How students create motivationally supportive learning environments for themselves: The concept of agentic engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(3), 579–595. doi:10.1037/a0032690

Reeve, J., & Lee, W. (2014). Students' classroom engagement produces longitudinal changes in classroom motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(2), 527–540. doi:101037/a0034934

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*, 257–267. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002

Reschly, A., & Christenson, S. L. (2006a). Prediction of dropout among students with mild disabilities: A case for the inclusion of student engagement variables. *Remedial and Special Education, 27*, 276–292.

Reschly, A., & Christenson, S. L. (2006b). Promoting school completion. In G. Bear & K. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs 111: Understanding and addressing the developmental needs of children*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S.L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement.* SpringerLink.

Reyes, M. R., Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., White, M., & Salovey, P. (2012). Classroom emotional climate: Student engagement, and academic achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1–13. Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/a0027268

Rientes, B., Giesbers, B., Tempelaar, D., Lygo-Baker, S., Segers, M., & Gijselaers, W. (2012). The role of scaffolding and motivation in CSCL. *Computers & Education, 59*, 893–906. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2012.04.010

Russ, W. S., & Wallace, C. E. (2013). Pretend play and creative process. *American Journal of Play, 6*, 138–148.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(5), 749–761.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on Eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*, 139–170. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9023-4

Salmi, H., & Thuneberg, H. (2019). The role of self-determination in informal and formal science learning contexts. *Learning Environments Research, 22*, 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-018-9266-0

Saracho, O. N. (2017). Writing and publishing qualitative studies in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 45*, 15–26. doi:10.1007/sl0643-016-0794-X

Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined improvisation. *Educational Researcher, 33*(2), 12–20. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699971

Sawyer, R. K. (2005). Educating for innovation. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 1*, 41–48. doi:10.1016/j.tsc.2005.08.001

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). Analysing collaborative discourse. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of learning sciences.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, J. J., & Jackson, S. A. W. (2000). Process drama: A special space and place for writing. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(1), 38–51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20204876

Shen, B., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., & Fahlman, M. (2009). Effects of teacher autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 80*(1), 44–53.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education.* Boston, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behaviour and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(4), 571–581.

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection, conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioural and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*(3), 493–525. doi:10.1177/0013164408323233

Skinner, E. A., Wellborn, J. G., & Connell, J. P. (1990). What it takes to do well in school and whether I've got it: A process model of perceived control and children's engagement and achievement in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 22–32.

Stefanou, C. R., Perencevich, K. C., DiCintio, M., & Turner, J. C. (2004). Supporting autonomy in the classroom: Ways teachers encourage student decision making and ownership. *Educational Psychologist*, *39*(2), 97–110. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep3902_2

Stevenson, L. (2014). Lab coats, test tubes and animated expressions: Drama in a middle school science classroom. *NJ (The Drama Australia Journal)*, *38*, 64–73.

Tagliamonte, S., & Roberts, C. (2005). So weird; so cool; so innovative: The use of intensifiers in the television series *Friends*. *American Speech*, *80*(3).

Tan, O. S. (2015). Flourishing creativity: Education in an age of wonder. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 16*(2), 161–166.

TLRI. (2007a). *The art of the matter: The development and extension of ways of knowing in the arts* (Project report). Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tiri.org.nz/tiri-research-completed/school-sector/art-matter-development-and extension-ways-knowing.

TLRI. (2007b). *Connecting curriculum connecting learning: Negotiation and the arts* (Project report). Wellington, New Zealand: Teaching and Learning Research Initiative. Retrieved from http://www.tiri.org.nz/tiri-research-completed/school-sector/connecting curriculum-connecting-learning-negotiation.

Tuckett, A. (2005). Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse, 19*, 75–87.

Turner, J., & Paris, S. G. (1995). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. *The Reading Teacher, 48*(8), 662–673. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20201530

Urban, R. (2018, July 7–8). Evidence points to best learning: New studies seek to determine what works in our classrooms. *The Weekend Australian*, p. 47.

Wagner, B. J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts: What research shows.* United States: Heinemann.

Walker, E., Tabone, C., & Weltsek, G. (2011). When achievement data meet drama and arts integration—Research directions. *Language Arts, 88*(5), 365–372.

Welch, S. (1992). In S. Kriesberg. *Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wells, T., & Sandretto, S. (2017). 'I'm on a journey I never thought I'd be on': Using process drama pedagogy for the literacy programme. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 12*(2), 180–195. doi:10.1080/1554480X.2016.1245147

Wisker, G. (2015). Developing doctoral authors: Engaging with theoretical perspectives through the literature review. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 52*(1), 64–74. doi:10.1080/14703297.2014.981841

Wright, A. (2020). The critical role of agency in the development of a writing identity. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 28*(2).

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Appendix 1: Substantive Piece: Introduction to Radioplay,

Reflections of Past Practice

Writing in Role: A Creative New Process to Engage and Motivate Students in Literacy

Sylvia (known as Sam) Barta

Master of Education

Doctor of Education

Part One

Substantial Piece: Reflection of Past Practice

Introduction to "Radioplay"

Faculty of Arts and Society

James Cook University

2020

Writing in Role: A Creative New Process to Engage and Motivate Students in Literacy

Abstract

This paper introduces a drama role-based process for teaching literacy, "Radioplay", created by the author. It is based on collaborative and interactive storytelling, students writing in role as the voice of their character, and then together creating the plot portents. These processes provide a meaningful context in which to practice and further develop many skills required of competent literacy users. This paper will report on the Radioplay process created by the author. It will also compare observations of this classroom practice, student survey responses and one student reflection with six key elements that have been identified in relevant drama in education, engagement, motivation, and creativity theories. The key elements include emotional, cognitive, and behavioral engagement, as well as relatedness or collaboration, autonomy, and perceived competence. Each element will be discussed in relation to its potential alignment with the Radioplay process. This paper constitutes the foundation of what will be an ongoing investigation into the use of role-play to engage and motivate students in literacy.

Introduction

The pedagogy of drama in education, specifically role-drama, is based on the premise that students should construct knowledge within a social context and be provided with a meaningful context for learning. Using these tenets, I developed a written role-drama process that provides a meaningful context within which to integrate many aspects of literacy instruction such as grammar, punctuation, oral reading with expression, and literary devices such as similes, metaphors. Radioplay is not a curriculum but provides students the opportunity to apply lessons learned. In this way it is adaptable to any curriculum and year level.

Drama in education is recognized as a powerful tool for writing development (Crumpler, 2005). Schneider and Jackson's (2000) research reported on the work of a teacher using drama as a stimulant to inspire students' writing. The researchers noted that role-drama allows teachers to provide instruction for both specific content and writing skills. Their conclusions are supported by the work of Liu, Liu, Wang, Cheng, and Su (2012), who used 'tangible story avatars' (TSAs) to have students assume a role and work collaboratively on stories, fulfilling a constructionist approach to learning. This approach is a key component of the role-drama process. The authors point to the work of Wood and O'Malley (1996), who found that literacy

development, interpersonal skills, and story writing skills could all benefit from collaboratively working with peers. They suggest that this type of instruction should be both facilitated and encouraged. This role-play process draws on these strengths and facilitates collaborative storytelling by working with peers. It compliments any curriculum for literacy instruction.

Radioplay aims to engage and motivate students in literacy over a sustained period of time. I found that when motivated by the Radioplay process, not only did students produce their best writing, but over time it was evident that they were writing much more. Incidentally, I also found that that students' oral and expressive skills improved. In this paper, I am looking back and reflecting on my experience of Radioplay as an effective, exciting, and enjoyable way to enhance students' engagement with literacy.

Radioplay

Radioplay provides an opportunity for students to apply their literacy learning within an engaging and collaborative process. The focus for different areas will depend on the year level and its corresponding curriculum. What is appropriate for a Year 3 class will be different to that of a Year 6 or 7 class, as well as a special needs class. Appendix Five shows writing samples from the last split Year 3 and 4 class I taught. You can see the students were using similes and metaphors in their writing. Students were applying what they had learned outside of the Radioplay process. Prior to writing the Radioplay chapters, teachers might remind students about the range of figurative language they can incorporate, perhaps making the use of some specific forms a requirement.

The Radioplay Process

Overview

"Radioplay" is a written role-drama process that was developed while I was teaching literacy. No radios or recordings are involved in any way. I named the process "Radioplay" because it brought to mind the idea of listening to stories through the voices of the characters, with no acting required.

Students are asked to take on the voice of their own fictitious character creation, writing as if they are that character in the course of a sustained episodic adventure. In Radioplay the teacher may also assume a character, and so take part in the role-drama. In this way the teacher can share all the characters' adventures as well as model writing for students. Importantly, it is a way to share power as the whole process of setting the plot parameters for each chapter is democratic. It is a great deal of fun interacting with the students' characters

within the story. During the process students are encouraged to incorporate literary devices learned in class within the meaningful context of the role-drama.

Students are grouped into teams and interact and share dialogues with other students' character creations, collaborating with each other, and having the power to influence the plot of this shared narrative structure. In the classroom, each chapter of Radioplay takes a week to a week and a half to create, with three scheduled sessions of about one hour each. Students meet to collaboratively plan the plot developments, building a scaffold or writing guide. They then write about these plot developments from the point of view of their characters. Draft copies are edited by the group or by the teacher and then students write out a final copy of the chapter in the second session. This final copy will be incorporated into a type of book format, and along with illustrations will provide the artefact of the students' creative endeavour. In the final session of the week, Radioplay chapters are presented orally to the class. Teams take turns, with each student reading the version of events from their character's point of view. Most Radioplays are seven or more chapters long, spanning a timeframe of three to five months. The longest Radioplay from any of the classes I taught was fourteen chapters, created by special class students in Years 8 through 12.

Learning Context for the Creation of Radioplay

I taught special education classes for over twenty years which involved working with students who found writing difficult. While teaching at a secondary school in Vancouver, B.C., Canada, the students placed in my program were severely learning disabled in the area of language. Typically, these students were five years or more behind their peers in all academic areas. Most students were at a beginning level of literacy, that is, about grade one reading and spelling ability. The highest reading levels, in these students in grades eight through twelve, were about grade four level. I also had one student who, according to the educational psychologist, was incapable of any level of literacy. The majority of students placed in my "Language Assistance Program" class, in addition to having a severe learning disability, had English as a second language (ESL) or were of First Nations (aboriginal) extraction.

You can imagine the problems facing a teacher of such a class. You have students who, apart from their academic functioning, are typical developmentally and intellectually. Prior to being placed in my program, all students were tested by educational psychologists and shown to be of average to above average intelligence with a severe learning disability in the area of speech and language. The available educational materials suited to their functioning level of literacy are inappropriate in their presentation and do not address the interest level of older students. Teachers have very little resources at hand, yet they are charged with delivering a full

educational program. These students are used to failure and are disengaged, especially from reading and writing tasks where they have experienced little success.

I devised a written role-drama structure as a pedagogy to address a very real need for both myself as a teacher, and my students as learners. I believed that by motivating my students through role-drama I could engage them in a literacy program. It seemed to work. The students became wholly engaged with the role-play and wrote creatively and copiously about their characters.

The Radioplay process became the foundation for my teaching of literacy throughout my teaching career. I have used it with both special classes at the high school level and mainstream classes from grades three through seven.

Table 1: The Process of Radioplay in the Classroom… (Summary / Overview Map)

Process Steps	Session 1.	Session 2.	Session 3
Beginning: **Building belief**	Introduction: -Character building activities -Character Poster	-Continued, activities looking at personality traits (adjectives), etc.	-Prize Possession building belief activity -File Folders for drafts to feature art, artefacts related to the students' character
Chapter 1: **Characters introduced**	-Students write a draft copy, responding to teacher prompts or guidelines	-Students have been formed into teams by the teacher and character posters are displayed at the front of the class -Students write their revised copies of Chapter One, incorporating edits -Continue illustrating their file folders	-Presentations: -Teams take turns coming to the front of the class -Teams introduce their characters by reading aloud as the voice of their character
Chapter 2: **World destination**	-Students vote for choice of world destination -Students write their draft copy, responding to teacher prompts or guidelines	-Students write their revised copies of Chapter Two, incorporating edits -Continue illustrating their file folders	-Oral Presentations: Teams take turns coming to the front of the class and reading their characters' versions of Chapter Two

Process Steps	Session 1.	Session 2.	Session 3
Chapter 3: **One specific location decided** (the characters can see each other for the first time)	-Students vote for choice of specific location (some research may be required) -Students write a draft copy, responding to teacher prompts or guidelines	-Students write their revised copies of Chapter Three, incorporating edits -Extra time used for creating illustrations for their "book" or their teams' display area	-Oral Presentations (as above) -If time remains this is a good time for the teacher to discuss genre, plot devices for various genre, and associated vocabulary and adjectives (ie. Sci Fi, Horror, Fantasy, Adventure, etc.) -This may be a continuing activity outside of the Radioplay sessions
Chapters' 4 and beyond: **Students create and respond to plot skeletons**	-Teacher supervision required for team plot setting sessions -Opportunities for conversations with pairs of characters incorporated -draft copies written	-Students write their revised copies of Chapter Four, responding to edits -As above for illustrations	-Oral Presentations (as above) -Team Meetings for plot setting or time to work on illustrations
Ending Radioplay: **Student choice of ending through vote…** **Various options**	OPTIONS: -Complete autonomy to end the adventure how they wish, including the outcomes for others on team -Plot setting as usual with teacher supervision, may include conversations	-Students write their revised copies as above -Students might include an "epilogue" for their character -If time permits, students may work on their final illustration	-Oral Presentations (as above) -May wish to review each team's adventures

Getting started: Character Creation Activities, Building Belief and Team Formation

Students will be creating Radioplays of their own. To inspire them and open their minds to the possibilities ahead it is a good idea to listen to recordings of actual radio dramas. Discussions of characterisation and use of the expressive voice may inspire students for the tasks ahead. Most radio dramas are made up of chapters and it may be useful to point out to the students the strategies used to keep listeners interested, for example, through the use of cliff hangers.

Character Creation Activities

1. Brainstorm. Prior to beginning the activities around building the students' characters, it may be useful to brainstorm and discuss with students some well-known characters from fiction, movies, plays, and real life. This can help the students understand the importance of drives, special talents, fears, and flaws in their characters. Each class of students will offer up known characters.

2. Sample questions for students to address when designing their characters.

How would you describe their personality?
What positive and negative traits do they possess?
What special talents or skills do they have?
What are they afraid of?
What motive seems to drive the character? What does the character seem to want more than anything? Is it fame, power, love, money, or just to be happy?
How do they like to spend their time?
How do they speak? Do they use certain words or phrases repeatedly?
Where do they live? What is their home or apartment like?
Do they have a family?
Do they work or go to school? Describe their job or what they are studying.

3. Vocabulary building for personality traits. Look at adjectives that describe both positive and negative personality traits. Students will use this type of vocabulary list to make up their character profiles. You might read a few existing character descriptions that demonstrate their use of adjectives and strong verbs.

4. Share the teacher's character profile and poster. Include why you have chosen the character. There should be some personal interest to be explored. One character I created was an Aboriginal Australian man named Roland. Roland was an expert at survival in the bush. I had been interested the whole idea of surviving off the land. My picture of Roland had an outdoor landscape and a backpack with supplies on the ground beside him. I wanted to explore what it might be like to be an expert at bush survival. Other character creations of mine included a young computer expert/hacker, and an old homeless woman. I shared the poster and my written character profile of Roland with the students before they began working on their own character creations.

5. Students build their character profile. They should address the same questions from the beginning activity of looking at fictional characters, (#1.). The character must be reality based

and unknown. They may be young or old. Students are encouraged to choose an adult character as this will provide the most freedom for travel and access to different venues within the written story lines. They are also not restricted as to gender. Stress that the students must create a realistic character, entirely human. They can explore being different ages and cultures. It is important that the students create a character that is fully rounded, with strengths, weaknesses and foibles. It is important that they can commit to this character over a sustained period.

6. Students draw their character and name them. I ask them to pay attention to how the character dresses, how they wear their hair, what accessories they carry with them.

The level of character analysis and scope of activities will depend on the age and nature of the students, and the demands of the curriculum. I have used the Radioplay process with a split Year 3 and 4 class, made up of mainly of students with English as an additional language. Basic vocabulary and adjective lists were appropriate. This also applies to the special classes I taught at the secondary school level. I have also used Radioplay with regular classes from Years 5 through 7. When students were more able, a more sophisticated character analysis was called for. I collected an assortment of support materials and reproducible activities for classroom use. The most important and helpful resources I used were *The Reading Teacher's Book of Lists*, *Fourth Edition* (Fry, Kress, & Fountoukidis, 2000) and *The Writing Teacher's Book of Lists*, *Second Edition* (Muschla, 2004). These resources provided word lists for adjectives, adverbs, verbs, literary devices such as simile, metaphor, lessons on editing for students, and much more.

Building Belief

1. Prize possession activity. One technique I have used for building belief is to have them write about their character's prize possession. I have done this after the students have identified their own, real life prize possession in a paragraph writing exercise. Students respond to question prompts in building the paragraph:

<div align="center">

My Prize Possession

</div>

- What is your prize possession?
- Describe it. What does it look like?
- How did you get it?
- Where do you keep it?
- Why is it so important to you?

The students reveal more about the character's personality in this exercise. Sometimes I would display these paragraphs with the illustration of the prize possession on the Radioplay team's bulletin board space.

2. File Folder Designing. File folders are distributed for students to keep their writing and illustrations in. I encourage them to illustrate these folders with aspects of their character's lives, another way of building belief. Some students have drawn a series of pictures showing the life of their character. Some draw their houses, favourite clothes, music, food, or games. Some draw newspaper headlines and stories about their characters. Usually students would work on the art when they finished writing their revised copies.

3. Storyboard illustrations. I also had a sheet that was divided into four spaces with caption boxes so students could draw cartoon illustrations of plot events within an episode. These would be added to their revised copies, which would typically be contained in folders that keep the loose pages together.

Team Formation

Team formation happens when students have completed the first draft of Chapter 1 and before the first presentation. If the class is small, around twelve students, one team is ideal. When I had a class of thirty-three students I put them into three teams. Providing some teacher supervision of team plot setting is easier if there are no more than three teams.

How these collaborative teams are chosen is important. I always tried to ensure that each student had at least two good friends on their team. I also tried to ensure that there was a mix of gender and abilities as writers. I have had single gender teams as well, and they were successful. I think it is a mistake to group teams in terms of behaviour control. I have found that student behaviour is excellent during the Radioplay activity. At this point it is evident the sort of characters or personalities the students have devised. I would try to create teams that had a balance of good and evil characters, as well as a balance of ages.

Before the first presentation, all character posters are on display above the dedicated bulletin board spaces for each team. Names are on the top of each A4 size poster board, with the characters beneath. The dedicated space for each team is important for sustaining the ongoing process of Radioplay. Students like to post pictures of events from each of their chapters as the adventure continues. The pictures and names of characters become a reference point for future episodes.

Editing and Radioplay

When I initially started using the Radioplay process I was teaching special needs students. These students were not able to participate in the editing of their work. I would do all the editing, training the students to recognise my cues to capitalise, start a new paragraph, etc. Even though these students would write more and more as the process continued, the amount of editing was manageable because of the smaller class size. You would think that students would not be willing to copy out their lengthy revised copies. I did not find this to be true. I think this speaks to the fact that they were creating an artefact, a book written by them. Here I reference situations when computer use was not an option. Where students have access to computers, word processing is ideal and preferred.

It was quite a revelation moving into a standard class environment with classes of over thirty students in Years 5 through 7. Again, the students would write more and more as the process continued. I realise this could be a burden for the teacher if solely responsible for editing. Some ideas I have had are to put more responsibility on the students, including teaching them to begin the editing process by reading their work aloud. This individual proofreading could be followed by peer and team editing. Students could sit with a partner to proofread and edit each other's work. Teams could pass work around several times, with more than one other person proofreading. These are important skills for students to acquire.

One teacher using Radioplay in the classroom with a Year 7 class asserts that teachers must spend some time before the Radioplay process making sure lessons are taught in grammar, punctuation, simple and complex sentences, and figurative language. This teacher feels that this makes it easier to help them in the editing process as they would some idea of what you were talking about. This is all true for the purposes of editing, however I disagree that teachers should hold back in using Radioplay until basic competencies are learned. Teachers should not underestimate the importance of giving students a meaningful context for their learning. Of course, teachers must provide specific lessons to meet the requirement of the curriculum. Yet, I assert that the Radioplay process provides a sound format for practising what has been learned in lessons.

The Computer, New Literacies, and Radioplay

Radioplay adapts well to a full technology environment if all students have access to computers at the same time. Editing time by both the teacher and the student is halved. It is easier to format appealing revised copies for publishing. Students may research destinations they have chosen for Radioplay. The computer can be used to create their character posters

and provide other illustrations. Radioplay chapters can be compilations of character blogs, easily assembled for publishing. Sound effects and animation can be added. Projectors and Smart Boards can be used during the presentation process. If teams have access to projectors and Smart Boards they could all work together reviewing and editing each other's work, prior to writing their revised copies.

Most of my time working with Radioplay was without access to computers. I see now that this speaks to the decades in which I was teaching, as well as a lack of school resources. Radioplay can be successful in a low technology environment. It provides a context to teach literacy for teachers that have few other resources to work with. When opportunities existed to use computers regularly throughout the process, they were incorporated. I feel that Radioplay also provides a meaningful context to teach computer skills. Word processing, blogging, formatting, and publishing can be the focus of instruction during the Radioplay process.

The nature of the internet and our interactions within it are giving rise to *New Literacies*. Lankshear and Knobel (2006) put forward the idea that through increased networking there is increased participation and collaboration, making us producers and not just consumers. These authors point to the web practices of sharing and remixing ideas, of commenting and meming and their effect on learning and knowledge building (Merchant, 2007). The Radioplay process benefits greatly from the use of computers and is even more relevant now considering the New Literacies. The variables of autonomy and collaboration are inherent in both the New Literacies and Radioplay.

The Radioplay Chapters

Chapter 1

Students begin writing their first chapter in Radioplay by responding to questions or prompts provided by the teacher (Appendix 1). This scaffolding enables the students to write a short descriptive paragraph or paragraphs about the character. Students who have minimal literacy skills would not be excluded from this creative writing activity. They would dictate their stories to the teacher who would write it out for them. The students would then transcribe their work. Through coaching and practise they would be able to read their chapters aloud. As the words were their own to begin with, they become familiar and memorable. It is extremely important that all of the character's words are written in first person singular. Use of *I* helps the student to fully identify with his or her own character creation. In each episode the characters tell the story from their own point of view. The Appendix 1 prompts are especially appropriate for

special needs and primary students. Teachers may choose to adapt this format to suit their particular class.

During the presentation session each team comes to the front of the class where seats are arranged for them. Characters stand when it is their turn to read. Each character is introduced by the students reading aloud, their pictures with character names being displayed prominently at the front of the classroom. Where there is more than one team, each team is given a specific section at the front of the class where the pictures will remain throughout the course of the whole Radioplay process.

See Appendix 1: Chapter 1 Prompts

Chapter 2

For the second chapter the group must decide in which part of the world they will all come together. Brainstorming generates ideas and a team vote determines the target destination. Each character must then determine the reason they must travel there. Some reasons chosen by students include holiday, family, business, or more interestingly, misadventure. The second chapter or episode ends when the character "arrives". Again, the drafts are put through an editing process. In the second Radioplay session, the students make a revised copy. Those who finish early in the time allotted use the time to work on their storyboard illustrations for either their books or team bulletin board, or illustrations on their file folder. These activities contribute to building belief in their characters and commitment to their team's narrative adventure.

When revisions are complete, each team presents their story, with the students reading as the voice of their own character. I have the whole team at the front of the class and they either stand as they read aloud, or I have them sitting on a table where they are easily visible. Revised copies are then added to their "book".

See Appendix 2: Chapter 2 Prompts

Chapter 3

The third chapter is concerned with getting these disparate characters to one very specific place. The teams' brainstorm possibilities and vote for their favourite. Again, it is up to each character to come up with a reason for his/her actions. Once all the characters are together in one place many strange things tend to happen. But what must happen is that they all come together, even if that means being separated from other loved ones. In past Radioplays we have all ended up in the same gondola, UFO, lifeboat, bomb shelter, party, plane, camel tour,

nightclub, and restaurant. Note that in this chapter each of the characters can see one another. I encourage them to comment on several characters, based upon their appearance in the character posters. Students enjoy hearing others comment on their own characters. Once again, drafts go through an editing process. Students write out their revised copies during the second session. In the third session of Radioplay, students present orally to the group before adding their revised copies to their final copy books.

See Appendix 3: Chapter 3 Prompts

A Good Time to Review Fictional Genres

The students will no longer be responding to plot skeletons provided by the teacher. They will be free to take their adventure in any direction they wish. It is a good idea to refresh their memories of the different fictional genres for them to choose from. This also provides an opportunity to examine the plot devices and vocabulary associated with them. Here are some examples of different genres I have enjoyed exploring with my students:

Adventure: shipwrecks, landslides, volcanos, lost in the jungle, survival on deserted islands
Science Fiction: alien abduction, time travel, mad scientists
Supernatural: vampires, attacking mummies, ghosts, haunted houses, monsters, witches
Fantasy: dragons, elves and fairies, lost worlds

Chapters 4 and Beyond: Creating Plot Skeletons

Now that all the characters have come together in one place it is up to the students to create the plot skeletons they will adhere to for each of the episodes they will now go on to write as new chapters. With one person acting as a recorder, students brainstorm the event that will happen next. Everyone has a chance to contribute an idea. Then each team member chooses their two favourite ideas, again recorded. The top two ideas are identified and then subjected to a team vote. Once the main idea is identified we set about creating the writing scaffold that students will be responding to.

If a new character is introduced, they must all agree on the description of the character. Each student could contribute a feature to describe the new character. There may also be room for individual freedom within the plot skeleton. For example, students may have to take on some sort of monster in an individual battle. They would have the freedom to both describe the monster and the details of their personal battle. Students like having this option and students enjoy hearing what their team-mates have come up with. In one Radioplay adventure, students in a team each "discovered" a dragon that they tamed and trained. They had the freedom to describe their personal dragons and the training regime they devised.

217

It is vitally important for the teacher to supervise the democratic plot setting sessions, especially in the beginning of Radioplay. As students grow in their skills, and become more familiar with the process, the teacher may withdraw. In my experience, the students need a type of 'devil's advocate' on the sidelines who poses questions and offers advice. Ideally, discussion and lessons around what constitutes a good plot will have occurred prior to this stage of Radioplay. I always stressed having a beginning, middle and end to each chapter. I would point out questions the reader would want answered. For example, if the students voted to have an explosion at an airport, they must at least eventually answer who and why.

The place for conversations within chapters needs to be identified, and students paired up. Students were required to have conversations with different characters on their team during the adventure, as discussed earlier. In some chapters it is possible for the characters to have an individual adventure and the place for this needs to be identified.

What follows are some examples of plot skeletons or writing scaffolds created by students in a split Year 3 and 4 class. The first two writing scaffolds were supervised by me and I do not suggest that this is the only way to outline them.

Ghost Attack

Paragraph 1- You are in the spooky dungeon. You wonder about the prisoners who were imprisoned, tortured, and died there… kings, queens, beggars, thieves, women accused of witchcraft, etc.

Paragraph 2- Suddenly you encounter a ghost! (Each student may create their own) What does it look like? What does it say? Sounds? What does it do? You will help them pass on to the next life…they will disappear, go through a door, or?

Paragraph 3- How do you feel about what just happened to you?

Rolling Off!

Paragraph 1- The London Eye Ferris Wheel speeds up, getting faster and faster. It is hard to stand up, hang on. It is scary. Suddenly there is a BOOM/CRASH. The wheel falls to the street, and as it rolls down the street it crushes cars and people.

Paragraph 2- The wheel falls into the River Thames, stays upright, and keeps rolling. It is airtight. You cannot see anything because the water is dirty. It keeps rolling in the direction of the ocean.

Paragraph 3- End by wondering what will become of you. Do you think you will die? If so, what are your last thoughts or concerns?

Students' "Independent" Example of Plot Setting (spelling corrected)

Paragraph 1- (Talk about the alien) The alien is…Big, Green Purple, Quick, 7 eyed and fat.

The alien goes in the UFO and fixes it. We repay him by throwing the puzzle piece at him. Then he gives us the keys to the U.F.O. so we can fly it to other cities in the evil world.

Paragraph 2- We grab resources in a different city then we set out in the UFO. The UFO runs out of fuel and we all crash in a deep part of a forest far away from the city. Then we found another shadow in the forest. Think about what that mysterious shadow is.

Conversation- Dialogue between characters is usually in pairs, to be written in play format. A place for the dialogue within the action is identified. I usually check the plot skeletons for each new chapter or episode, and then photocopy them for each member of the team. Again, students then proceed to write their draft copies. Drafts go through an editing process and students write their final copies.

Generally, I would assign bulletin board space to each team where they could storyboard their adventures through pictures. This adds to the enjoyment and understanding during the presentation process.

I continue to encourage the students to write about the other characters in their team. I notice that they particularly enjoy hearing others' perceptions and reactions to their characters. Throughout the Radioplay process, students are not allowed to make up actions and dialogue for other characters, only to react to what the characters have done or said.

See Appendix 4: Conversation Guide

Ending Radioplay

The students decide when they are ready to end their Radioplay adventure by consensus. In the final episode there is more freedom for the characters. I have given students several options once the decision has been made. One option is to proceed as usual with a plot skeleton they all agree to. Once the episode is ended they are encouraged to write a type of post script. It may be a news article about the character, a eulogy, a TV news report or interview, etc. An example of this is an adventure that ended with characters being eaten by man eating plants. Each character could describe their death in detail, mine included, who

happened to be an old lady with an extensive Elvis collection. My character prised her collection and never wanted it to be sold. I ended my story with an ad detailing the sale of the extensive collection by her sons. By the teacher participating in the process in this way, I was demonstrating a humorous and creative postscript. Students were encouraged to think of something that fit their character in some way.

Another option is to not confer with the other students and have the freedom to end the drama any way they choose, including the "endings" for the other characters (this seems to be the favourite). Everyone looks forward to hearing about what happens to their character after.

Radioplay Presentations

Radioplay allows students to play at becoming voice-over actors, as they read aloud as their character at the end of each chapter. They read from their written chapter, from the front of the classroom where the pictures of their characters are displayed. We focus on expression, fluency and volume in oral reading. When pairs of students have dialogues each student will read the narrative that precedes the conversation. They will then perform the conversation before each reading the narrative that follows.

Students are motivated to participate as group players. In the cases where I was teaching a Year five, six or seven class, often 30 students or more, there would be three Radioplay teams, and the entire team would be at the front of the class for the presentation of their chapter. In this way, the voices and stories are enjoyed by all and each student is part of a team.

Audiences for the Radioplay presentations can vary. Students may wish to present their work for another class or have an evening presentation where parents are invited. Both ideas contribute to the pride of accomplishment in the students. Projections of the character portraits, individual storyboard illustrations, and team storyboard illustrations would provide extra performance value.

At the completion of the entire Radioplay I take one character at a time and read the whole story through that character's voice. Students take great pride in the length of their writing, realising they have written whole stories. Students would retain their individual stories and sometimes I would also photocopy each student's chapters for all to retain.

I truly believe that many of our Radioplays have been worthy of publication. They could be enjoyed as literature, as well as theatre and dramatic plays. Many times the students have expressed the desire to submit their work to a publisher. They have been justifiably proud of their interesting, exciting and often humorous finished work.

It is the students' engagement with the activity that motivates them to succeed as more fluent writers.

Personal Observations and Experiences

I have many fond memories of working with Radioplay over the years. I shared in the fun and excitement of all of the stories and presentations. Students were always motivated to do their best and be entertaining for their peers. The classes always loved hearing the latest adventures and they would be listening closely to see if their characters were mentioned by others. At times I would feel like a victim of my own success in that some students wrote pages and pages of text, that I would then edit. I witnessed great improvement in the students' ability to write, especially for those with limited literacy. One memory stands out. A young man came to my special education class in grade 8. The student was unable to write a complete sentence and had limited sight word knowledge. He would dictate his passages to me and I would rehearse with him so he could read them aloud, being quick to prompt. Towards the end of the year the student chose to write on his own and would comment on how much he had improved and how proud he was that he was able to write so much on his own. This is the kind of success that a teacher lives for.

Preliminary Research on the Effectiveness of the Radioplay Process

Quantitative Data: Behavioural Engagement

Data Collection / Sample Size

I analysed nine good copies of Radioplays from the last class I taught in Canada. The students were in a regular split grade 4/5 class, mainly ESL in composition. The good copies I retained were from a variety of skill levels and teams. Students all had the same amount of class time to work on their chapters, however some students would elect to write more, and take Radioplay as homework. My idea was to look at the word count from one chapter to another. I was interested to know if students would write more as they progress through the chapters. It may indicate their level of engagement to the task. Word count has previously been used as quantitative evidence of behavioural engagement in a study by Lo and Hyland (2007), showing persistence and effort in students' written passages (Fredricks et al., 2004; Skinner, Kindermann, Connell, & Wellborn, 2009). Where conversations between characters occurred in Radioplay, I only counted the words of the character in question. The students decided to end their adventure in episode nine, choosing to each have the freedom to decide how they

and the other characters would "end up". Some students also created dialogues for characters other than their own in the final chapter.

Quantitative Data Display

Table 2: Showing Increased Words Written Throughout the Radioplay Process

Character Name / Chapter Number	Cody G-Gifted ESL	Tom B-ESL	Franny Clue B-ESL	Jessie G-ESL	Gma Cindy G-ESL	Daddy McFlurry B-Low ESL	Brock B-Low ESL	Jenny G-ESL	Bobby Bob G-ESL	Total
1. prompts	229	115	133	115	160	97	56	139	154	1198
2. prompts	249	82	166	106	98	127	90	149	200	1267
3. prompts	360	109	210	153	98	117	132	174	197	1550
4. plot skeleton	255	103	173	130	112	171	87	161	165	1357
5. plot skeleton	377	245	295	152	292	155	96	262	187	2061
6. plot skeleton	303	161	220	186	126	82	190	154	162	1584
7. plot skeleton	252	205	203	115	274	147	90	169	162	1617
8. plot skeleton	226	132	242	144	124	162	102	198	245	1575
9. free choice for ending	420	298	608	316	303	140	130	305	242	2762
Total Words	2671	1450	2250	1417	1587	1198	973	1711	1714	14971
% more between Chapter 1. and Chapter 9.	183%	259%	457%	274%	189%	144%	232%	219%	157%	231%

"G" signifies a girl and "B" signifies a boy.

"ESL" signifies that the student has English as a second language.

"Gifted" and "Low" signifies the functioning level of the student as determined by psychometric testing by educational psychologists. These students receive special programming outside of class.

Data Analysis

Every student increased in the amount of words for their written passages between the first and last chapter.

The smallest percentage of increased word count between the first chapter and the last was 144%. The largest percentage of increase was 457%.

The student identified as gifted/ESL had the largest overall word count. They did not have the highest percentage for overall increase between the first and last chapter, instead showing good consistent effort overall.

One of the students identified as low/ESL (receiving special education support) had the lowest percentage of increased word count, though still at a significant 144%. The other student identified similarly scored 232%, one of the higher percentage levels of increase.

The two students receiving special education support both showed a sizable increase in the lengths of their written passages from chapter one and the final chapter. Similar results were found in Lo and Hyland's (2007) study. The authors state, "Giving the students more autonomy in what they wrote…had the effect of increasing students' motivation and engagement and had a particularly noticeable impact on the underachieving students, resulting in noticeably longer pieces of writing and better content" (Lo & Hyland, 2007, p. 231). Here autonomy is directly related to increased motivation and engagement. I also believe that the Radioplay students improved in the content of their writing.

Qualitative Data: Student Reflection and Student Survey Responses

Looking back over my years of working with Radioplay I feel it is important to include the voices of the students who experienced the process. I have copies of interviews I did with my special class students, but was missing feedback from any mainstream classes I taught. I reached out to a former student and asked her to write about her experience with Radioplay. Now an adult, she submitted her reflections of the process.

Student Reflection

----It's been ten years since I was writing radio plays in Ms. Barta's grade 5 class, and yet I still have strong memories of the stories we came up with and of how much fun they were to create. I think this speaks to the value of the radioplay project in its capacity to get kids excited about writing and being creative. We each designed our own individual character but would meet with our group each week to read aloud what we had written and collectively decide what was going to happen next in the

story. I remember having the most fun making up relationships with the characters of my other friends in the group, and incorporating my impressions of everyone else's characters into my own writing. This element made it exciting for us to share what we had written and to hear what others had come up with as well. For people less comfortable with creative writing, having the group collectively come up with the next part of the story provided a comfortable framework in which to explore writing without that extra pressure. Deciding the plot on a week by week basis also added to the excitement of the project, as you never knew what was going to happen next. I kept copies of the drawings and writing I did throughout the radio play project and still enjoy taking them out to look at and reread from time to time. I think the radio play format has a lot to offer as it helps develop writing skills, creativity, team work, and public speaking, yet in such a fun and accessible way that only in looking back do I realize the practical skills I gained from it.

Student Survey Responses

These student survey responses are from a special class for students with learning disabilities. The students were in Years eight through twelve and were mainly ESL or First Nations in background. I was presenting the Radioplay process for a teachers' professional development workshop. The students consented to provide their responses. Four questions were asked and responses indicate whether the student was male or female.

How has Radioplay helped you?

F: Travel…helps me learn about places.

M: …Learn new words…become more brave in talking, have the confidence to talk to people in the classroom…writing improved…faster…paragraph form…dialogue…write longer, not short like I used to…reading…more fluency…express personality…emotion.

M: Reading more and my grammar is a lot better…I'm proud that I can write a lot and I could read it out loud and not be embarrassed.

F: Made me speak more fluently and not be shy to talk in front of people.

F: Think more imaginatively and make more sense of…express myself in different ways.

M: Help me learn more English…learn more words…drama…I'm not so nervous…improved my reading.

What do you like about Radioplay?

F: People's ideas…when they go together it's pretty exciting…what ends up happening to the characters. I enjoy different characters' attitudes.

M: Make up and write about a character…so called travel and explore…fun, get to be that character for a while.

M: Helps me write more and write faster. Like that we get to pick characters, different people.

F: Get to experience a little bit of acting and you could be whoever you want to be.

F: Like how you could make up your own person and make them do whatever you want them to do.

M: Fun to talk about…make me not nervous to speak up.

Why is democracy so important in Radioplay?

F: Some places people don't want their character in…might not be interested in.

M: Student makes the decision…NOT the teacher…that's the most important thing of all…students can't complain…because we make the choice.

M: They know they have some power over the teacher to decide what they want and what they feel like having.

F: Helps with decision making…votes…politics.

F: All get a chance to do something that we think we would want to write about.

M: Easier to think…easier to write.

What is important for teachers to know about Radioplay?

F: Helps people with their English, grammar, and stuff…helps them cooperate with each other…we got partners…spoke with each other…reflects what people are interested in.

M: Improve students in many ways for both reading and writing…helps kids who are nervous to be brave in speaking…mostly you are able to explore new things, become new characters, be something you're not…"WHEN DO YOU GET TO BE A GIRL IN A PLAY??!!"

M: It's a great thing to have and it teaches children to write lots of different things about different people. It gives you ideas to change your personality (for both on paper and in real life).

F: Helps with reading and writing and helps with speech…and makes people not embarrassed to talk who are shy.

F: Helps your editing and paragraph skills and talking as character (dialogue).

M: Fun to read.

Qualitative Data Analysis

My quest to understand the effectiveness of the Radioplay process is informed by four key theories grounded in research. The four theories and their associated constructs include:

1. Drama in Education Theory: empowerment (autonomy) and collaboration (relationships)
2. Engagement Theory: emotional, cognitive, and behavioural engagement
3. Self-Determination Theory: perceived competence (academic improvement perceived by the student), autonomy, and relatedness (collaboration)
4. Creativity Theory: collaboration, and autonomy

I will look at all statements from the students and group them according to the six constructs put forward by these key theories. Engagement Theory includes the constructs of emotional, cognitive and behavioural engagement. Self-Determination Theory, Drama in Education and Creativity theories stress perceived competence, autonomy, and relatedness.

"Drama in Education" or "Role-Drama" was a popular movement in Education in the 1970s and 1980s. Names associated with this movement include Heathcote (as cited in Johnson & O'Neill, 1984) and Bolton (1984) who specifically wrote about techniques and processes for structuring role-dramas, usually posing problems for students to solve. Students in Heathcote's role-dramas are addressed as if they have the expertise to solve these problems. Heathcote uses drama as a tool to empower students. Heathcote describes the power exchange that occurs between the teacher and their students while working through the drama

(Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 21). Students exercise their power in their ability to influence the action (p. 153). Heathcote's approach to Drama in Education is closely aligned with the work of Freire (1970, p. 35) who also spoke about students sharing power with the teacher. In Radioplay students are afforded autonomy in being able to create and control the ongoing narrative involving their characters, through peer collaboration.

The concept of student engagement continues to be important as educators seek to improve achievement levels of students and prevent students from dropping out. Researchers see engagement as a multifaceted construct, and engagement levels in students open to change. Fredricks et al. (2004) tell us that there is consensus among researchers that the engagement "construct" includes three main components of behavioural, cognitive, and emotional engagement. Emotional engagement looks at whether the students enjoy the experience, are happy, having fun, and are interested (Skinner et al., 2009, p. 521). Thoughtfulness is a hallmark of cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 1). Here is a sample of statements indicating cognitive engagement taken from the "Student Engagement in Schools Questionnaire", (SESQ):

"When I study, I try to understand material better by relating to things I already know. When I study, I figure out how the information might be useful in the real world. When I study, I try to connect what I am learning to my own experiences" (Hart et al., 2011, p. 73).

Cognitive engagement is tied to the students' feelings of achievement in skill mastery and increased knowledge (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 3).

In their "Self-Determination Theory" (SDT), Ryan and Deci (2000) identify perceived competence, relatedness, and autonomy as psychological needs innate to the individual. Social contexts are important for the realization of these needs. The researchers look at the nature of motivation and its effects. They tell us that to achieve intrinsic motivation there must be "…immediate contextual supports for autonomy" (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 70). This is what Radioplay offers to its participants. Autonomy and empowerment are linked concepts in that, "Autonomy refers to perception of a sense of agency, which occurs when students have the opportunity for choices and for playing a significant role in directing their own activity" (Blumenfeld et al., 2006, p. 477). I designed the structure of the Radioplay process to incorporate student choices and collaborative planning. The element of collaborative planning is also very important, working with others, working in teams. "Collaboration with peers encourages motivation and cognitive engagement" (Blumenfeld et al., 2006, p. 482).

New research into learning environments that support creativity in the classroom highlight the importance of autonomy, relatedness, and constructionism, among other variables. The processes of drama pedagogy, as a teaching methodology, are salient in tapping into variables related to creativity such as freedom, choice, collaboration and constructionism. Harris (2016) looks at the research evidence with regards to nurturing creativity. Findings show that all the major studies indicate the importance of collaboration and teamwork (Harris, 2016, p. 44). Harris (2016, p. 67) highlights the fact that creativity is a collective endeavour. To enable teachers to design lessons incorporating these creative skills and capacities, Harris (2016, p. 68) states that both teachers and students must have a level of autonomy in how they go about their work.

Drama pedagogy, because of its theoretical foundations, is an exemplar of creative teaching and teaching for creativity.

Table 3: Student Comment Analysis (some comments in multiple sections)

Emotional Engagement Indicated	- express personality, emotion -I'm proud that I can write a lot and I could read it out loud and not be embarrassed -not be shy to talk in front of people -I'm not so nervous -fun to talk about -helps kids who are nervous to be brave in speaking -makes people not embarrassed to talk who are shy -fun to read -yet I still have strong memories of the stories we came up with and of how much fun they were to create.
Cognitive Engagement Indicated	- I think this speaks to the value of the Radioplay project in its capacity to get kids excited about writing and being creative. - made me speak more fluently -my grammar is a lot better - helps people with their English, grammar, and stuff - It gives you ideas to change your personality (for both on paper and real life) - mostly you are able to explore new things, become new characters, be something you're not…"When do you get to be a girl in a play?!!" - easier to think…easier to write - get to experience a little bit of acting -people's ideas…when they go together it's pretty exciting…what ends up happening to the characters. I enjoy different characters attitudes. - think more imaginatively and make more sense of…express myself in different ways - become more brave in talking…have the confidence to talk to people in the classroom - travel-helps one learn about places - not be shy to talk in front of people
Behavioural Engagement Indicated	- faster, write longer, not short like I used to -reading more - helps me write more and faster

Table 4: Student Comment Analysis (Some comments in multiple sections)

Autonomy Indicated	- We each designed out own individual character but would meet with our group each week to read aloud what we had written and collectively decide what was going to happen next in the story.
	- all get a chance to do something that we think we would want to write about
	- student makes the decision…NOT the teacher…that's the most important thing of all…students can't complain…because we make the choice
	- they know they have some power over the teacher to decide what they want and what they feel like having
	- some places people don't want their character in… might not be interested
	- reflects what people are interested in
	- like how you could make up your own person and make them do whatever you want them to do
	- you could be whoever you want to be
Collaboration/ Relatedness	- would meet with our group each week to read aloud what we had written and collectively decide what was going to happen next in the story.
	-For people less comfortable with creative writing, having the group collectively come up with the next part of the story provided a comfortable framework in which to explore writing without that extra pressure
	- helps them cooperate with each other… we got partners… spoke with each other
	- people's ideas…when they go together it's pretty exciting…what ends up happening to the characters. I enjoy different characters attitudes
Perceived Competence/ Academic Improvement	-I think the Radioplay format has a lot to offer as it helps develop writing skills, creativity, teamwork, and public speaking, yet in such a fun and accessible way that only in looking back do I realize the practical skills I gained from it.
	- learn new words
	- writing improved
	- reading, more fluency
	- my grammar is a lot better
	- helps me learn more English…learn more words …drama
	- improved my reading
	- improve students in many ways for both reading and writing
	- paragraph form

Discussion

I created Radioplay to provide a meaningful context within which to apply literacy lessons learned that would empower and engage students over a sustained period of time. I refined and improved the process over a period of thirty years, teaching a variety of classes and ages of students. In reflecting back, I see that Radioplay delivered so much more than I ever imagined it would. The range of areas identified by the students as relevant to Radioplay is vast. Some powerful themes have emerged, not just in the areas of reading, writing and speaking. Students talked about confidence, to express themselves and talk to others. Students took pride in their accomplishments. Students talked about the importance of being able to influence the action, about teamwork, cooperation, power, choice, and politics. Radioplay is exciting and fun for students to participate in.

Students enjoy interacting with others and forming relationships. The main focus of Radioplay is on peer collaboration. Sawyer (2006) tells us, 'In emphasizing peer collaboration, the learning sciences is drawing on over twenty years of educational research that has consistently demonstrated that collaboration helps students learn' (p. 187). Relatedness is an important component of peer collaboration. Tied to a feeling of belonging, these students' needs are met in the positive interactions with their teachers and peers (Blumenfeld et al., 2006). Students' comments identified that working together with their peers was important, fun, and exciting.

Students were behaviourally engaged as well as cognitively occupied by Radioplay. My evidence is through my own observations and what the students themselves have told me. Through my experiences of Radioplay I have always avowed that students did their best writing for me within this process. Motivation, cognitive engagement, and achievement are seen as related variables by Blumenfeld et al. (2006). They explain;

> Motivation sets the stage for cognitive development. Motivation leads to achievement by increasing the quality of cognitive engagement…interest may lead to deeper engagement with the material, which results in increased skills and knowledge…Similarly, success in creating an artefact or mastering an idea or skill can lead to greater feelings of competence and greater perceived value of the endeavour and result in higher levels of engagement. (Blumenfeld et al., 2006, p. 476)

Blumenfeld et al. (2006) assert that motivation and cognitive engagement increase when students are given the opportunity to collaborate with their peers. Producing the "artefact", (in

this case the Radioplay narrative), can add to the sense of value for the project and give students feelings of higher levels of competence. In a discussion of Lifewriting,, Butler & Bentley (1987) argue that, 'Ownership' of the writing is essential for students' commitment to producing writing for communication to a variety of audiences" (p. 22). Energy and interest are provided by this ownership and needed if the student is to sustain interest in the project throughout the revision processes. Radioplay ensures this energy and interest.

Student responses indicated that some students became braver and less shy when speaking with others and reading aloud. This confidence seemed to stem from their increased competence levels from working with Radioplay but may also be a result of the less explicit style of pedagogy. The student reflection speaks of "its capacity to get kids excited about writing and being creative". When you are excited about something you are more motivated to engage with it. Both the student reflection and student survey responses speak to the competencies gained through the Radioplay process, and the value of Radioplay as a learning tool.

Conclusions

In this paper I have set out the steps needed to use the Radioplay process in the classroom. I have suggested that it is a creative pedagogy of co-operative role-play and as such, engages and motivates students.

From my observations and reflections, I see Radioplay as a pedagogy for literacy learning which may sustain the following advantages:

It intrinsically motivates students
It positively impacts on the students' perceived competence for the task
It engages them cognitively, emotionally, and behaviourally
Students learn the skills of collaboration working in their teams.
The autonomy inherent in the process affords creative ownership to students, which fosters creative responsibility.

Learner engagement is being overlooked in Australia's drive to reform curriculum frameworks. What to teach and how to assess seems to be the priority (Harcourt & Keen, 2012). Research suggests a close relationship between achievement and student engagement (Parsons et al., 2014). Wentzel (2012) talks about the importance of understanding how and why active engagement can be facilitated through "social and contextual supports". The Radioplay process is highly social and collaborative. Students work in teams and their characters interact within the world of their co-created fictional narratives.

233

I find Radioplay to be a process that engages and motivates students through its emphasis on autonomy and collaboration. Students' responses show enthusiasm and interest, talking about how much fun it is working within the Radioplay process. Students demonstrate their engagement by writing more and more as the process continues. Students reflect on their increased levels of achievement through working with Radioplay. Radioplay could transform the way we teach discreet units of the language arts curriculum, placing them within the process of this written and read aloud role-drama.

Implications for Future Research

I plan to pursue future research on Radioplay, examining data from the classroom of another teacher using this process. A larger sample size of students and removing the influence of the teacher as researcher would have the advantage of testing the Radioplay process in a different context. Student survey questions that are "open ended" would be applied. It will be interesting to see if another class with another teacher find Radioplay an engaging and motivating process for literacy.

References

Blumenfeld, P. C., Kempler, T. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as education.* London, England: Longman.

Butler, S., & Bentley, R. (1987, May 1–3). *Lifewriting: Self-exploration through writing.* [Paper presentation]. NCTE Northwest Regional Conference, Hotel Vancouver.

Crumpler, T. P. (2005). The role of educational drama in the composing processes of young writers. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 10*(3), 357–363. doi:10.1080/13569780500276103

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109. http://www.proquest.com

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: The Seabury Press.

Fry, E. B., Kress, J. E., & Fountoukidis, D. L. (2000). *The reading teacher's book of lists* (4th ed.). United States: Jossey-Bass.

Harcourt, D., & Keen, D. (2012). Learner engagement: has the child been lost in translation? *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 37*(3), 71–78.

Harris, A. (2016). *Creative ecologies: Fostering creativity in secondary schools*. Retrieved from http://creativeresearchhub.com

Hart, S. R., Stewart, K., & Jimerson, S. R. (2011). The student engagement in schools questionnaire (SESQ) and the teacher engagement report form-new (TERF-N): Examining the preliminary evidence. *Contemporary School Psychology, 15,* 67–79.

Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (Eds.). (1984). *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama.* London, England: Hutchinson.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices and classroom learning* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Liu, C., Liu, K., Wang, P., Cheng, G., & Su, M. (2012). Applying tangible story avatars to enhance children's collaborative storytelling. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 43*(1), 39–51. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01146.x

Merchant, G. (2007). Review. *Literacy, 42*(3), 177–178.

Muschla, G. R. (2004). *The writing teacher's book of lists* (2nd ed.). United States: Jossey-Bass.

Parsons, S. A., Nuland, L. R., & Parsons, A. W. (2014). The ABCs of student engagement. *Kappan,* 23–27. Retrieved from V95N8Kappanmagazine.org

Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36*, 257–267. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2011.05.002

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012), Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S. L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement.* SpringerLink.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.68

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). Analysing collaborative discourse. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of learning sciences.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, J. J., & Jackson, S. A. W. (2000). Process drama: A special space and place for writing. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(1), 38–51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20204876

Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (Eds.). (2009). Engagement and disaffection as organizational constructs in the dynamics of motivational development. In K. R. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 223–246). New York: Taylor and Francis.

Wentzel, K. (2012). Commentary: Socio-cultural contexts, social competence, and engagement at school. In S. L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement.*

Wood, D., & O'Malley, C. (1996). Collaborative learning between peers: An overview. *Educational Psychology in Practice: Theory, Research and Practice in Educational Psychology, 11*(4), 4–9. doi:10.1080/0266736960110402

Appendices

Appendix One: Chapter One Prompts

RADIOPLAY CHAPTER ONE

present day

anywhere on earth

human being, not someone who already exists

any profession

Directions:

1. Draw a full body picture…include background details. Make your picture interesting by paying attention to your character's style and accessories.
2. Written paragraph(s)…minimum of 10 sentences. Your work should cover all aspects suggested below. You may wish to have the first paragraph deal with basic information, and the second paragraph with more personality details.
3. "Talk" to us like you ARE the person. What phrases or words does your character like to use or repeat? Are they casual, or very formal?

Things to include in your writing:

name, age, sex

job or school status

family details

where you live… describe it

Perhaps first paragraph

what you like to do for fun

personality type: what kind of person you are

special skills or talents you may have

secret fears or hopes

"People always say I……"

"My favourite saying is…."

To include in second paragraph

Appendix Two: Chapter Two Prompts

GETTING TO ONE PLACE ON EARTH

Paragraph One

1. Where are you going?
2. Why are you going there?
   Some ideas: job, holiday, family event such as wedding, reunion, or funeral, contest prize, misadventure or accident.
3. How do you feel about going? What are you looking forward to or dreading?
4. How will you get there?
5. What will the trip be like?

Paragraph Two: Arrival and Accomodation

1. Where are you staying?
2. What is it like?
3. How do you feel after the trip?

Appendix Three: Chapter Three Prompts

GETTING TO ONE PLACE ALTOGETHER

Paragraph One

1. Where are you going?
2. Why are you going there?
3. What are you hoping to see?
4. What are you hoping to do?

Paragraph Two

*YOU ARE THERE. YOU CAN SEE THE OTHER CHARACTERS.

Look around. Describe what you see. You may also describe the other characters that are there. Do not say they are doing things. Only describe how they look (based on their pictures displayed). You might also add your opinion of them.

Example:

I am at/in/on _____. It is _____. There are ____ other people here too. One is _____. Another is _____. There is also _____

Appendix Four: Conversations

Conversations are important in any story. Writing good and interesting conversations is difficult. Conversations have **3 GOALS:**

1. Tell more about the character: personality, mood, history, intent
2. Tell more about the action: What is going on around the characters? They become our eyes and ears.
3. Further the plot: keep the story going to the next scene

Some rules:

-no using the Lord's name in vain… (God / Jesus)
-no swearing…use characters or bleep
-no inappropriate remarks: racist, sexist, etc.

Sample Conversation:

> Tom: Heh.
>
> Jackie: Well, hello there stranger! I don't think I've met YOU before. Are you a friend of Kim?
>
> Tom: What's up?
>
> Jackie: Well, don't you know? It's Kim's birthday. She's turning 40 the poor thing. Well, there's no stopping time.
>
> Tom: Guess you know a lot of people here.
>
> Jackie: Well of course I do. Kim and I are best friends, even though she is much older than I am. Are you sure you are in the right place? You don't seem to know anybody and you didn't even know this was a birthday party.
>
> (Explosion suddenly blows out the windows. Glass is flying everywhere.)
>
> Tom: AAagh! My eye! I've been hit! What the *%@! (BLEEP) (I look out the window) A plane just flew into the building next to us!
>
> Jackie: WHAT? Oh my, did you feel that?

Tom: Yeah, the building's shaking! Let's get out of here.

Jackie: What, Why? Do you think we are in danger? I'm too young to die!

Tom: Get to the elevators!

(We run, knocking people out of our way.)

Jackie: They're down! We've got to use the stairs…I'm in heels!

Tom: Forget your shoes! Quick, before they come…

Appendix Five: Radioplay Teams' Plot Synopses and Writing Samples

These examples of students' work were drawn from a split Year 3/4 class, the majority of which were English as a Second Language students.

Team 1: Tom

Characters came together in the underwater aquarium tunnel in Barcelona, Spain. The glass shattered, and somehow they managed to get to safety in an underwater cave. From there they entered a portal into a U.F.O. where they were transported to a land of dragons. Each student had their own fighting dragon to train before their own idea of how to end the adventure for everyone.

Tom's Writing

I feel so excited to meet the soccer team of Barcelona. I am so excited I could burst!
Okay, Ellis. Let's go and scavenge that rusty U.F.O., but remember, maybe there are traps inside the U.F.O. Let's go.
Now he is as tall as a mountain.

Team 2: Gma Cindy, Cody, Bobby Bob

Characters came together in a pod on the London Eye ferris wheel. The ferris wheel broke off, rolled into the Thames, and out into the ocean. They ended up in Hades after crossing the River Styx. The characters were kicked out of Hades into a dark forest where they battled Medusa. Each student then had complete freedom to end the adventure for themselves, also talking about how the other characters ended up.

Cody's Writing

My brother who lives with me is a punk drummer. He is so annoying…My brother's place is like 4 wrestlers were fighting there.
…we are trapped in this stupid pod thingy. Wait! How are we still breathing? Oh, there is a sign that says, "Airtight". I was hoping to have a fun time, but this is turning out to be a disaster. What the heck? Zeus and Aphrodite are here! Can you BELIEVE this?! All of the myths I learned were true. This is so awesome. I thought they were fake.
I am scared now because Zeus is a rock. He is strong like an ox or bull.
Her name is Amber. She has the head of a computer and she is an adding machine.

Gma Cindy's Writing

Hello fans! Don't you just love me? My name is Cindy and don't you dare call me old!

I want to hit him until he's as flat as a pancake!

Bobby Bob's Writing

I am an old man. I am retired. I have a big house, but I don't know what to do with it. My wife is dead now. I wish she didn't die because now I have to do everything.

I found these beautiful coins and now I have to give them away to the skinny, stinky, evil looking Ferryman. Whatever! If I want to live, I have to give.

I see a tall, dark, moving hair shadow.

Team 3: Jenny, Brock, Jessie, Daddy McFlurry, Franny Clue

The characters came together at the French Castle Dungeon in the "Everland Amusement Park" in Seoul, Korea. They each battled a ghost of their own design before being caged and dropped into an underwater cave. The characters battled Sydney Funnel Back spiders and paranahs. After stepping through a door they found themselves in a future world populated by "Teletubby people". Each student then had complete freedom to end the adventure as they liked, including for the other characters.

Jenny's Writing

My special skill is being dishonest. I can fool my Mom and Dad all the time over the phone, but sometimes I feel bad for lying.

Now I feel as lazy as a snail.

My bracelet is a rock. You know what that means, right? It means it's hard.

Brock's Writing

I am alert, brave, and tireless. Sometimes I can be sneaky.

I just spin the globe and poke my finger on a place.

How can a little kid ghost carry a suit of armour? I look in the armour again. He was gone. Wicked! I think it was an illusion.

The girl with the big head is a tornado, wild and crazy.

Jessie's Writing

There's this other girl who looks like a purple candy cane. She is pretty, but she shouldn't wear that outfit. The dogs might eat her.

Suddenly the sun rose up. It was now like a normal sunny day. But it was hot as a volcano.

Daddy Mc Flurry's Writing

Wow. I see a girl with a fat head and I see this old lady with a yellow skirt or dress, but she looks super tanned like she went out in space and got close to the sun.

Franny Clue's Writing

She was so pretty that she was like a shining star.
Wow, it's so dark, the clouds are dark as a Hallowe'en night.
Why? You think your face is so beautiful? You narcissist!
I sniff myself. Ugh, I smell like a pig hugging dirty clothes. It is getting hotter and hotter each step we take. It feels like I am melting like chocolate!

Author Biography

Sam Barta is a former Canadian teacher now in her final year of a Doctorate of Education degree. Her research is on trialling Radioplay with a new class and teacher.

Appendix 2: Author's Note: Radioplay Substantial Piece Versus Published Version

There are significant differences between the final version of my "Reflection of Past Practice with Radioplay" and the published version. The published version has differences and omissions. This is due to the fact that I had not completed my Literature Review research, which influenced my interpretation of data. I outline differences and omissions here.

Title

Publication: Writing in role: A new process to engage and empower literacy students

Radioplay Substantial Piece: Writing in role: A creative new process to engage and motivate students in literacy

Omissions and Abbreviated Segments in Published Version

-"Learning Context for the Creation of Radioplay": the published version did not want to draw attention to the fact that Radioplay was originally designed to meet the needs of special education students.

-Quantitative Word Count Data: I had done an analysis of the amount of words students wrote from one chapter to the next. This was a measure of behavioral engagement.

-Team Synopsis and Writing Samples: I included plot summaries and writing samples from the various Radioplay "teams".

-Implications for Future Research: omitted in the published version that focused on presenting a "How To Guide" for Radioplay.

-Building Belief and Character Creation Activities: these were abbreviated in the publication.

Differences Between Radioplay Substantial Piece and ALEA Publication

My literature review research uncovered salient theories and key constructs that framed my methodology and data analysis. I originally thought that five forms of engagement existed, including academic and agentic along with emotional, behavioral, and cognitive. Upon completion of this portion of the research I realized that only emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement stood with merit. I also came to incorporate Creativity Theory with its constructs of collaboration and autonomy, resonating with Self-Determination Theory and Drama in Education Theory. These changes in my understandings impacted on the finished format of the Radioplay Substantial Piece. *The Case Study Teacher was provided with a*

complete "how to guide" for Radioplay prior to the start of the research project. When the final version of the substantial piece was completed, she was supplied with that, as well as a journal containing the published version.

Appendix 3: Teacher Comments on the Radioplay Process

Audio Transcript: November 16, 2015

The first Week of Radio Play found me very excited and the students were very excited too. I really built it up.

I told them my own character, who lived in Tahiti and I showed them a house that I would want to live in. And things around my house and I told them about my habits and so on.

I should state that I taught them things about idioms before we got started.

So we had quite a few lessons about idioms.

And we also started looking at capitalization and what things should be capitalized.

And additionally we spent some time really looking at adjectives and how to stretch a sentence and how to use adjectives correctly.

The questions that I encountered for that first episode were you know -

"Can I use a fake -

"Can I use an animated character?" Over and over -

"Can I use something from my video game?"

And I stated quite clearly that you must use a realistic character. Somebody who could indeed exist.

So then I also pulled up some Radio Plays that my students had done at my other school and I really showed them how, yes, they can create some amazing things out of their imagination so they went with that and seemed satisfied.

So the next day we talked more about character and really broke it down with regard to height and weight and sayings and hobbies and things that you don't like and friends that

you might have, do you have brothers and sisters, do you have a wife? Are you a male character? Are you a female character? You don't have to be a male if you're a male, you could be a female character and so on and they were very excited and in fact I talked to several parents who came in the next day and said "My goodness what is this Radio Play thing? The kids can't stop talking about it"

So I was quite happy about that.

So I digress …

 So we started to talk about the character and what the character should look like and how they might want to reflect in the character and the background of the character.

You know if they're in Tokyo then they should reflect that in that picture.

You know wherever they are we need to see things that speak to who they are as this character.

So that's where we left it the last day and the kids are very excited again and they've been coming up and showing me what they've been working on and in fact they've been

eager to do it for home work. I'm going to try to have them not do it for homework because what I find here is that the parents do a lot of it for them, they correct it for them, the ideas are not genuinely the child's or student's so I'm going to really try and get as much accomplished as I can in class time as possible.

So yah, let's see what else can I add to this comment today? They're very excited,

they're really engaged, there's a buzz in the room whenever they're doing it,

particularly again that first character development or picture.

So I'm clearing a bulletin board in my classroom for the next day and on it we will post all the characters and I will have a gallery where the kids can walk around and have a look at the pictures and talk about them and so on. So that will be the next step which will commence tomorrow afternoon. We have Language Arts four times a week, two blocks a day per class, which are half hour periods which is at least an hour four times a week.

And I may try to find some other times to do it as well because the students are just so very engaged in it.

Additionally we've started looking at onomatopoeia and I've given them some art associated with that so they're additionally excited because I've tried to encourage them to use different parts of speech and figurative language as well.

So we'll be spending some time looking at those as the weeks come and go.

Today is Nov. 16, 2015.

Appendix 4: Teacher Comments from Email Communications

*4/15/16: They all arrived in Cozumel in chapter 2. Chapter 3 they see and comment on each other…Chapter 4 they are in groups and they can go where they want…

Things are going great Sam. They are writing a lot!!! They are always excited to work on the RP. It's a challenge keeping up. I fear my editing will not meet your standards.

*4/23/16: Thinking about the interview thing because…I don't want him to feel uncomfortable by telling the truth.

*5/18/16: Today the students have half day where they can play. The whole school can play for half the day. In my classroom, I tell them that they can play. The question they ask me, "Can we work on our radio play? Priceless (happy face and heart emojis)

With regards to the recordings…I'm having difficulty using the device I bought...I will trying get it sorted out this weekend…And we will definitely have to investigate paying someone to get it on paper.

*6/7/16: The kids are writing a lot! I can't keep up! I am stopping at chapter 7…Many of them just want to keep going!!!

*6/12/16: Re: students..I don't read to the kids as much as I would like to…But I do read some of the radio plays back to them. I do a bit of reading to them in socials. I do a lot of drama with them.

*8/3/16: So…I mailed the originals to you today…as suggested. The USB will arrive later…There was a little bit of a mess up with that. I have to tell you it's very messy. I have put everybody's names on the work they did and I've numbered the pages. They are circled.

In the photocopying process they got kind of spun around. I am sure that you will find that I've left the lots and lots of mistakes. The kids wrote so much…I just could not keep up. I didn't want to stop them. All they wanted to do the whole day at school was to write the radio play!!

*10/8/16: These are big ideas from the new curriculum that we will be starting in September. I feel that your radio play addresses all of these ideas. I don't know that I have a choice but to use it again!!! (smiley face emoji)

Appendix 5: Case Study Teacher Responds to Questions

<u>*10/8/16: HEY SAM! SOME ANSWERS FOR YOU:</u>

 1. Was there just one team, or more than one?

We started with the whole class deciding where to go. They were to create character profiles and then decide on a reason to get there. Once there, they were to meet up with other characters. We were together up to chapter 3.

 2. How did you pick the teams?

I don't let them choose their own groups very often but it was important that they bought into the process…I needed them to be happy…They picked their own groups. Some worked out well…Some not so much and I was pleasantly surprised by a couple of others!

 3. Did you keep some friends together?

Many friends were together and many of them learned that friendship is complicated. I think one of the most important things they learned through this process was this idea of cooperation during the collaborative process. A little bit of give and take…they are not always going to agree. The idea that you might not like your friend's idea. They might not like your idea!! It is a great age to recognize that you want to be with people who share your work ethic!

 4. Did you vary the ability levels?

The ability in the groups were varied…they learned the truth about their friends. Some discovered that their friends did not like write…Did not take their work seriously…Had learning disabilities, were unable to stay focused! I spent a fair amount of time sorting out those types of problems. I would say out loud quite often, "Welcome to my world!"

 5. Sex?

Most groups were divided into male and female…there were a couple of goups that were both sexes. All their choice…Were I to do this again I would definitely mix of the sexes.

6. How did you help them create their plot skeletons?

Included in the package are examples of the plot skeletons I used. When I read aloud to them from their work…that was very effective. I would read sections of a radio play one of them wrote with specific dramatic effect and at this time I would draw attention to matters of plot…I would ask them why was this part so interesting? What happened in this piece…?

I also used a lot of drama games. I drew their attention to the fact that the games they found most interesting how the beginning a middle and an end…there was purpose to it…Games like Bus Stop…Crime Scene. They also came to recognize how effective a good plan for writing when they listen to their friends and read their own radio plays. The ones they found most interesting and fun were the ones that had a very good story plot. At the end of the day the teacher has to surrender to the idea that the students will spend a lot of time talking…They must talk and talk. Additionally, I talked to them about their favourite movies. Why were some movies better than others?...

Appendix 6: Case Study Teacher Responds to Questions About Ending Radioplay

1.   Wondering if you are giving students the freedom to end their adventure however they want.

Yes, the students were very excited to take over the story and take it in a multitude of directions…as you will see.

2.   Were they able to write about the other characters however they want?

Yes, they had a really good time joining other groups and interacting with other characters.

3.   Are you also using a plot skeleton?

I gave them instruction on the stages of plot and each group was to have a general plot skeleton. An important point here is that there was not enough time to really get into to planning out the (a) story or rather follo0wing up on their plot skeletons…The other constraints of the curriculum weighed heavily on me (and managing behavior!) and the dynamic nature of a school! Not only things in the classroom, but out of the classroom. If I had my way I would use the Radio Play process a a third term culminating activity. In this way you would have first and second term to zero in on all the components of "good" writing.

4.   Did you let students do conversations in Radioplay?

It was hard to orchestrate and I did spend time explicitly teaching and demonstrating conversations in writing. Some students got it and some did not. You will discover this as you read some of the plays.

….Teacher's additional observations:

*12/8/16: (Last group of pics!) I asked groups to develop a title for their piece…Not every group got to it.

*14/11/16: With regards to the boys and their boredom…I was there and saw them engaged and happy and excited. I don't know why they said that in writing. I think for them maybe using technology might help them feel more engaged I suppose. But very seriously…they wrote so much even my boys who hated writing wrote lots!!!

*17/11/16: It did actually is there way to play a part in their final mark. I marked it as a body of work as opposed to each individual piece. I didn't mark the drafts as best I could. And give it to them to do the good copies.

Appendix 7: Teacher's Use of Radioplay in the Classroom:

The Process

On Character Development:

-I told them my own character, who lived in Tahiti and showed them a house that I would want to live in. And things around my house and I told them about my habits and so on.

-The questions that I encountered for that first episode were you know-

"Can I use a fake-

"Can I use an animated character?" Over and over-

"Can I use something from my video game?"

And I stated quite clearly that you must use a realistic character. Somebody who could indeed exist.

-So then I also pulled up some Radioplays that my students had done at my other school and I really showed them how, yes, they can create some amazing things out of their imagination so they went with that and seemed satisfied.

-So the next day we talked more about character and really broke it down with regard to height and weight and sayings and hobbies and things that you don't like and friends that you might have, do you have brothers and sisters, do you have a wife? Are you a male character? Are you a female character? You don't have to be a male if you're a male, you could be a female character and so on

-So we started to talk about the character and what the character should look like and how they might want to reflect the character and the background of the character. You know if they're in Tokyo then they should reflect that in that picture. You know wherever they are we need to see things that speak to who they are as this character.

- (How did you use "imagine a day"?) I used it in conjunction with the first chapter where they had to describe their character. I thought that it would be helpful for them to think about what a day in the life of the person they described would look like…

The Classroom, Routines, and Scheduling:

-I'm going to try to have them not do it for homework because what I find here is that the parents do a lot of it for them, they correct it for them, the ideas are not genuinely the child's or student's so I'm going to really try and get as much accomplished as I can in class time as possible…There was no homework per say because I wanted the writing to come from them.

-So I'm clearing a bulletin board in my classroom for the next day and on it we will post all the characters and I will have a gallery where the kids can walk around and have a look at the pictures and talk about them and so on. So that will be the next step which will commence tomorrow afternoon.

-We have Language Arts four times a week, two blocks a day per class, which are half hour periods which is at least an hour four times a week. And I may try to find some other times to do it as well because the students are just so very engaged in it.

- (How did you use the "story maps"?) I used the maps after chapter 1 to encourage them to think about where they were going and what they wanted to happen in their story. With my next group I will go back to the map often…there is a point where the story gets away from them because they are very excited…they must be consistently reminded about where they are going.

-We started with the whole class deciding where to go. They were to create character profiles and then decide on a reason to get there. Once there, they were to meet up with other characters. We were together up to chapter 3.

-They all arrived in Cozumel in chapter 2. Chapter 3 they see and comment on each other…Chapter 4 they are in groups and they can go where they want…

-I don't let them choose their own groups very often but it was important that they bought into the process…I needed them to be happy…They picked their own groups. Some worked out well…Some not so much and I was pleasantly surprised by a couple of others!

-Regarding oral presentations: They do present in front of their peers. It is very much part of the process. If there is a particularly dramatic piece, I read it…The students read their chapters out loud to the class. They look forward to it. My regret is that I did not do the readings consistently.

-Time is definitely an issue with this process. If you are to do some instructions before they write…for example, I may do a lesson on nouns and capitalization…I have to give them opportunities to practice what they learned. Practicing the skill takes time from the writing. This is where testing came in. I would quiz them every 2 weeks or so…based on a specific

instruction they received. I am also looking at their improvement from the first chapter to where they are now. Their writing fluency has improved significantly. They have become more expressive. Their writing has become easier to read and has a flow and smoothness when it is read out loud.

- (Did you let students do conversations in Radioplay?) It was hard to orchestrate and I did spend time explicitly teaching and demonstrating conversations in writing. Some students got it and some did not. You will discover this as you read some of the plays.

-Things are going great Sam. They are writing a lot!!! They are always excited to work on the RP. It's a challenge keeping up. I fear my editing will not meet your standards.

-I didn't mark the drafts as best I could. And give it to them to do the good copies.

- (Did the Radioplay work play a part in their final mark for Language Arts?) I marked it as a body of work as opposed to a single piece.

-I would absolutely do this again…

On Plot Skeletons:

- (How did you help them create their plot skeletons?) Included in the package are examples of the plot skeletons I used. When I read aloud to them from their work…that was very effective. I would read sections of a Radioplay one of them wrote with specific dramatic effect and at this time I would draw attention to matters of plot…I would ask them why was this part so interesting? What happened in this piece…?

-I also used a lot of drama games. I drew attention to the fact that the games they found most interesting have a beginning, a middle, and an end…there was purpose to it…Games like Bus Stop…Crime Scene. They also cam to recognize how effective a good plan for writing is when they listen to their friends and read their own Radioplays. The ones they found most interesting and fun were the ones that had a very good story plot…Additionally, I talked to them about their favourite movies. Why were some movies better than others?

-I gave them instruction on the stages of plot and each group was to have a general plot skeleton. An important point here is that there was not enough time to really get into planning out the story or following up on their plot skeletons…The other constraints of the curriculum weighed heavily on me (and managing behaviour!) and the dynamic nature of a school! Not only things in the classroom, but out of the classroom. If I had my way I would

use the Radioplay process as a third term culminating activity. In this way you would have first and second term to zero in on all the components of "good writing".

-We also spent time with a plot skeleton…several types. They were to plot out their stories before they proceeded. They did do that…But I think many of them just went their own way after a while…It was a tricky group.

And Finally:

-As I said before they were writing so enthusiastically…Even though I gave them specific parameters about the amount to write I couldn't stop them after a while…I started to drown in the sea of corrections.

-While I tried to stick with your guide, I was not as successful as I would have hoped.

Radioplay as a Meaningful Context to Practice Literary Devices

-I should state that I taught them things about idioms before we got started. So we had quite a few lessons about idioms. And we also started looking at capitalization and what things should be capitalized.

-And additionally we spent some time really looking at adjectives and how to stretch a sentence and how to use adjectives correctly.

-Additionally, we've started looking at onomatopoeia and I've given them some art associated with that so they're additionally excited because I've tried to encourage them to use different parts of speech and figurative language as well. So we'll be spending some time looking at those as the weeks come and go.

-Yes, I included figurative language lessons. As well as continuing lessons on conventions. I encouraged them to use descriptive language …Adjectives… Adverbs. I asked them to show not tell. Some took to the lessons and some didn't.