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Abstract

The quality of education is a major concern worldwide. Teachers’ professional development is considered crucial to improve educational effectiveness. Studies show that professional development programs are ineffective due to a lack of knowledge and research on how to plan and conduct a program that sustains change. Literature shows that the curriculum outline for most programs follows a positivist paradigm and is focused on teaching skills and subject matter content.

This study seeks to contribute a new perspective on teacher professional development philosophy and pedagogy. It is framed within the socio-cultural-historical tradition involving Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory and Bakhtin’s dialogism. The research is developed around a case study of the seminar or workshop “Teaching and Learning with Drama” (T&L 633) offered by The Ohio State University in a week-long format every summer to practicing teachers as an option for professional development. Dr. Brian Edmiston, a leading scholar in the field of drama pedagogy, is the instructor. He uses dramatic inquiry to promote reflection and imagination in the processes of teaching and learning. His work is basically built on the dialogic concept of authorship.

The purpose of this study is to learn about the pedagogical strategies and epistemological concepts T&L 633 offers to practicing teachers and how these can be understood as authorship, a concept informed by socio-cultural-historical and dialogical theories of social life, imagination and learning. Three research questions were formulated that address the ways T&L 633’s curriculum development leads participants
to understand, interpret, and re-conceptualize teaching, learning, curriculum, and evaluation (key concepts) while re-examining their pedagogical plan and practices. They also seek to document and analyze the issues participants consider to be important for their professional development.

Data were collected from written documents and direct methods: participants’ portfolios, students’ Carmen (online course site) postings, video, interview transcripts, structured observation’s narratives, and written material distributed or elaborated during the seminar/workshop. Data were gathered at two points: during the seminar/workshop and after participants’ grades were posted. This dissertation develops case studies of three key informants’ documents and interview transcripts.

Dialogism’s epistemological and practical implications on dialogical research were taken into account. Data analysis was developed in seven phases beginning with text analysis to reduce the amount of information. I used discourse analysis and Bloome, et al.’s (2006) microdiscourse analyses for in-depth analysis. To create connections and articulations between research questions’ findings I used Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizomatic analysis. During the analysis process, emergent topics and issues were identified. Dialogism’s epistemological conflict with positivist’s validity criteria were faced using Lather’s (1991) notion of transgressive validity and Bakhtin (1993, 2004, 2006) to render an account of methodological decisions. All ethical standards and practices to protect the informants’ identity and rights were fulfilled.

Findings show that 1) authoritative discourses in education like expecting passive roles for students could be disrupted at the level of classroom learning activities; 2) re-conceptualization is crucial to promote educational change; 3) inquiry promotes
authorship as long as questions promote reflection and exploration in imagination of multiple possibilities of being in the world. A dialogic inquiry-based model and a related template for design are presented that promote authorship in professional development programs. Summaries and implications for curriculum development are presented based on the meaning and practice of authorship as the goal of education.
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Chapter 1

The Path to the Research Questions

I began to make the path toward this study when I was living in Colombia (South America). I completed my bachelor degree in sciences of education, major in physical education, by the end of 1975. From 1976 to 1987 I worked in a public high school with children living under the line of poverty. During all this time, I felt the university did not prepare me to deal with the contingencies and uncertainties that being a teacher brings along. At the same time, the in-service training sessions were occasional and meaningless for my teaching practices. They consisted on lectures on educational theories or on guidance to deal with particular issues such as child abuse and teen pregnancy. More frequently, they provide a menu of new activities that have been proven successful in the US or Europe, particularly in Germany. These countries had a great influence in physical education in Colombia.

Since then, I was motivated to find a way to become a good teacher meaning someone who really makes a difference in the students’ lives by helping them to develop their potentialities that, eventually, I came to understand as Higher Psychological Functions (HPFs). I knew in theory that there is a close relationship between movement and human development. I began my journey by enrolling in a master program in educational research and technology of education. I learned how to perform positivist research but I did not find the way to become a better teacher. The technology part of the
program, as well as the educational reform that was taking place in the country, was inspired on behaviorist theories on teaching and learning that see the step by step programmed education as a panacea. The reform motivated teachers’ reaction. They developed what is known as “the pedagogical movement” whose main features are the clamor for teachers and students’ rights to be active participants in the knowledge building process and a critique to normal science. My interest in philosophy of science was born in this informal but rich academic environment.

From 1987 to 1989, I lived in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, where I improved my basic English literacy by auditing classes on curriculum development at the University of Illinois. As soon as I returned to Colombia, I began working at the College of Physical Education of the “Universidad Pedagógica Nacional” Colombian leading university in the preparation of teachers. I was assigned to work with the “Pedagogical Practice Team” in charge of the pre-service training. The academic environment was challenging. The faculty I had to work with was what Wenger (1998) calls a community of practice. Our discussions had an interdisciplinary character because the group was integrated by professionals from different disciplines. There were educators, lawyers, philosophers, sociologist, psychologist, economists, anthropologist, and artists. In this way, educational problems were approached from the point of view of pedagogy, epistemology, politics, ethics, and aesthetics. Situated in the College of Physical Education the axis of the discussions was the role of the body in human development. The purpose of these academic debates was to reflect on the question: how could we contribute to prepare teachers able to improve the quality of education and through education transform society
and culture? In this context, I conceived the idea that education for in-service teachers was as important as their preparation.

Eventually, this idea became a professional purpose that led me to pursue a PhD in education to give structure and organization to my reflections on the topic of teachers’ professional development. In fact, The Ohio State University has given me the tools I was looking for. The fact that as a student I have the freedom and guidance to put together my own program of study has led me to approach teachers’ professional development from a dialogic paradigm. The development of this dissertation has been crucial in my knowledge building process. It allows me to build better answers to the search I initiated more than 30 years ago. This chapter tells the story of my journey as a doctoral student that led me to formulate the research questions.

Motivation of the Study

Professional development for teachers has a long history in the US. In 1986 a consortium of 96 research universities with professional education programs created the Holmes Group. It was created as a response to disturbing trends in the immediate Nation at Risk reform climate. Amongst these trends, it is worthwhile to note the elimination of the schools of education in several of the nation's strongest universities and, consequently, education began to be entrusted to colleges and universities of lesser rank, many of them unaccredited and impoverished. The central purpose of the Holmes Group was findings ways to make the schools of education relevant for the development of a genuine profession of education and help construct a true profession of teaching. (http://www.holmespartnership.org/about/history.cfm).
These ideas gained prominence and importance internationally in 1990. The notion of teachers’ professional development was adopted worldwide when representatives of 155 countries and 150 organizations pledged in Jomtien (Thailand) to provide education for all children, youth, and adults world-wide (UNESCO, 2005). These policy makers considered the traditional notion of teacher’s training as inefficient to fulfill the challenges ahead. Teachers have to be professional; that is, able to apply theory and to build knowledge onto their practices (UNESCO, 2005; Villegas-Reimers, 2003).

I was living in Colombia (South America) my country of origin at that time. I was working at the national leading university in teachers’ preparation. Instead of joining the protest movement against the reform, along with a group of colleagues, I decided to take advantage of the rhetoric of the reform’s discourse. We accepted the invitation from the Colombian Ministry of Education to democratically and actively participate in the construction of the theoretical fundaments to support the implementation of the reform in Colombia (Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia, 1998). After all, we applauded the idea of providing education to all people; in addition, the right to actively participate in deciding on education matters had been a motto of the teachers’ union. We attended weekly meetings and helped to structure academic events such as national forums by academic disciplines. It is important to note that we were not paid for this extra workload. I was not aware then that we were assuming what Christians (2003) calls a feminist communitarian approach. This social ethics approach allows the encounter of opposite position not in a synthesis as in the form of dialectical thinking but to open the path to new possibilities which is dialogical (Bakhtin, 2004; Bakhtin & Medvedev, 1991; Volosinov, 1986).
This experience was the context through which the seed of my interest for professional development programs for teachers was planted. I had the opportunity to listen to teacher’s narratives about their expectations, accomplishments, and their ingenuity to overcome the obstacles that unfair socio-economical conditions impose onto their everyday work. Their stories changed my view regarding the quality of education from fate to hope. I became aware that they wanted professional development programs that take into account their needs and expectations. They wanted to be heard, in other words, they wanted their agency to be recognized.

My colleagues and I had to face the challenge to write the texts to theoretically support the reform taking into account the teachers’ clamors. We saw this as a golden opportunity to introduce into the national debate on education topics such as the body, play, imagination, and the socio-cultural-historical factors that make education and ethical act that is decisive in the construction of a better future. We informed the analysis, previous to the elaboration of the texts, with theories dealing with the role of the body as a means to control human behavior in institutionalized settings (Foucault (1984b); theories that highlight the role of imagination and play in human development (Bronowski, 1974; Caillois, 1994); and critical pedagogy (Apple, 1986, 1993).

I found these theories interesting and holding strong arguments that explained education’s reality at national and international levels. Based on these ideas, I tried out teaching strategies like including graphics, diagrams, and non-verbal language in my own practice. I even used simulation of situations but in them my students and I assumed roles through which, as Edmiston and Enciso (2003) explain, we reflected and refracted our values, interest, and beliefs but did not explore how the situations would have been
understood from the perspective of multiple discourses. Thus, I did not observe true changes in their discourses; in addition, I was aware that the activities did not touch them enough to provoke emotions. Eventually, as I reviewed literature for this study, I came to understand that our activities were monologic naturalistic representations where characters in role “merely explain events” (Edmiston & Enciso, p. 869). They were monological because we represented everyday school situations and analyzed them only from the perspective of scientific knowledge framed within a positivist approach. This approach is different from the process of drama where we can use our “social and cultural imagination to create a shared imagined world” (Edmiston, 2003, p. 221) and in imagination “adopt multiple positions in addition to those of our everyday lives” (Edmiston, 2000, p. 67).

A decade later, “The World Education Forum 2000” that took place in Dakar (Senegal) evaluated “Education for All”. According to UNESCO’s (2000) report, while the number of participating countries increased up to 189 and around 300,000,000 more children were receiving education, statistics showed that some 113 million children were out of school, discrimination against girls was widespread and nearly a billion adults, mostly women, were illiterate. The lack of qualified teachers and learning materials was the reality for too many schools. The same report mentions amongst the challenges for education in this century: to help teachers acquire a new understanding of their role and figure out ways to help education overcome poverty to give millions of children a chance to realize their full potential. I did not get discouraged. On the contrary, my interest in teachers’ professional development continued to grow.
In the same year the contingencies of life brought me to the United States. During the next three years I was as an immigrant focused on cultural adjustment and survival. Four years later, I returned to academe. I began the doctoral program in social and cultural foundations of education at The Ohio State University in 2004. Two years later, I transferred to the Integrated Teaching and Learning Program and found the world of drama pedagogy that put together at the level of praxis what until this point had been beautiful spare theories for me. By this point, I was clear that my interest was focused on how to develop curricula for professional development for teachers at the micro-level of face to face interaction.

When I took the course “Teaching and Learning with Drama” (from now on T&L 633) and experienced drama as pedagogy, I began to see it as a possible pathway for professional development programs. Drama intertwined and interconnected in activities what I knew theoretically was important in education: the inclusion of non-verbal languages; imagination as the basis for our fundamental capacity to learn; and ethical thinking as a part of the socially and culturally constructed reality that we live in daily experiences. Furthermore, in drama by creating in imagination fictional spaces we can see how reality could have been different in the past and how it could be in the future if people chose actions that were different from those made by others (Edmiston, 2000). In drama we imagine and actually enact to explore the possibilities and consequences of our deeds seeing events and ethical dilemmas from Others’ position while continuing to be ourselves. These features of drama pedagogy meant a lot to me coming from a country that has spent the last 60 years in a civil war because people are trapped in either-or positions.
Typically, professional development programs focus on “subject matter knowledge for teaching, understanding of student thinking, and instructional practices” (Borko, 2004, p. 5). I was positively impressed by T&L 633 because it does focus on teaching in relationship with learning; it assumes the student as a whole person; and it replaces the idea of instructional practices with the praxis of collective creations.

Scholars have come to recognize that drama can be framed within the socio-cultural-historical tradition inaugurated by Lev Vygotsky’s experimental work on cognitive development and Mikhail Bakhtin’s philosophy of language. Drama pedagogy builds on the Bakhtinian notion of authorship to attain its educational purposes whether the researchers cite or not Bakhtin in their reports (see Carroll, 1996; Dorion, 2009; Edmiston, 2000, 2003, 2006; Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998; O’Neill, 1996). In chapter two I will be developing the concepts associated with authorship and sociocultural learning and how these explain drama and professional development.

In the socio-cultural-historical tradition the path followed by the researcher to formulate the research’s questions is important because in some way it defines their content and the selection of the methodology to answer it. In the following section, I describe the path I went through as a doctoral student as I eventually formulated the research questions. I have organized the description around my work with my advisor Dr. Patricia Enciso. I describe how I got acquainted with the fundamentals and precepts of the socio-cultural-historical tradition and why drama served as a bridge to connect these theories with professional development for teachers. During this process, Dr. Enciso learned and took into account my professional interests, identity, needs, and academic previous experience. Our interaction was in itself an embodiment of the theories I was
learning. I have divided this journey in three moments: Discovering T&L 633; living the experience of using drama; and the decision to study T&L 633 as a case for understanding a more dynamic philosophy and pedagogy for teachers’ professional development. The review of this journey is followed by an outline of the research questions.

**Discovering T&L 633**

One day in 2005, I sat down to read near room 200A in Ramseyer Hall. Coming from the room I heard voices, laughter, and a lot of movement. When some students walked in and out of the room I noticed that their physical demeanor looked different from the usual tired and bored students’ bodies. “This is not a class,” I thought. The scene repeated many times. One day, my curiosity was greater than my discretion and I looked inside that room. The group was in a recess. “This is definitely, not a class” I thought. The chairs were not in rows but in a circle, and people were smiling and talking to each other. I also felt an air of joy, freedom, self-sufficiency, and democracy. Everybody seemed to be so equal. I concluded that “This must be a meeting of people making decisions on important matters.”

According to my experience as a student from first grade to college in my home country Colombia, the set up of the classroom with the chairs in rows made having conversations hardly possible. Besides, there was no need. Students had to listen to the teachers’ lectures. Knowledge was believed to be transmitted and its possession tested and graded. When I began the doctoral program in Social and Cultural Foundations of education at the School of Educational Policy and Leadership, College of Education of The Ohio State University, I realized by studying theories such as Pierre Bourdieu’s
(1986) forms of capital and Basil Bernstein’s (1978) theory on class and visible and invisible pedagogies that my experience as a student was connected to the socio-cultural-historical project of modernity. This project relies a great deal on formal education because it requires individuals able to use knowledge to improve the efficiency of their labor to promote industrial, cultural, and social progress. In addition, the sole purpose of education was to reproduce the cultural values that support the capitalist model of economic development: individualism, competition, and hierarchical power relations (Giroux, 1992; Popkewitz, 1997).

**Living the Experience**

Knowing my disappointment in having to take classes that required a steady stream of essays and talks about how to transform traditional classroom teaching, my advisor Dr. Enciso, suggested I take T&L 633 “Teaching and Learning with Drama” during the summer of 2006. The course title scared me. I knew nothing about acting. “Do not worry,” she said, “you will like it.” The first day of classes, without any effort, I became one of those students that I had observed a year ago from the hallway. I did not have to “act-out” or “to perform” but to express my thoughts and feelings when I decided to participate.

In this class, I could re-visit many episodes of my life as a student, teacher, mother, friend, citizen: Dimensions that allow us to experience the world as the social, cultural, and historical beings we are. However, it was not just remembering. I was also engaged in what I have come to understand as a poststructural-dialogical analytic approach to learning. The approach was poststructural because we searched for what lies beneath, the hidden, the invisible, for connections that we had not contemplated before (Peters &
Burbules, 2004). It was dialogical because our reflection-imagination process emerged from many possible pasts, presents, and futures whether we were having face-to-face conversations or thinking to ourselves. I could make sense and meaning in action where fear and silence had dominated in other classes without leading me to any answers. This is what drama pedagogy is about: reflecting on actions and decisions we make in imagined situations where different possibilities of being in the world are critically analyzed as the students assume the role of people from different positions and points of view.

For instance, reflecting on the inquiry questions Professor Edmiston asked during a an imagined experience that located us on the sinking Titanic, I realized that I had always taken for granted that the actual decisions made by people who hold authority and power were actually driven by socio-economical factors. As a high school student I was transmitted the following information: The Titanic was in its time the largest ship in the world, it crashed into an iceberg, sank, and many people died. During this enactment in T&L 633, I not only recognized that these decisions could have been different and many more lives could have been saved but also I could actually feel anger, sympathy, and moral pain for the numerous “third class” passengers who died because their financial situation condemned them; while “first class” passengers were given the privilege to live. Understanding in-depth acquired another dimension for me. In imagination I created alternative realities that would have given them the opportunity to live. I kept many of my thoughts and reflections to myself during the class. Nevertheless, then and now, I recognize those possible worlds as invaluable sites of learning that led me to recognize
that one of the purposes of formal education is to develop awareness of our identities as socio-cultural-historical beings and of the possibility to be otherwise.

Another realization from my participation in this course had to do with my favorite activity: reading. When I was in secondary school in the literature classes we were asked to identify a book or chapter’s central ideas. I always wondered how my peers could identify the same idea the teacher was expecting. I hardly ever could. Mine was usually different. While participating in T&L 633 I realized that, like many drama practitioners’ and researchers’ work, the core activities are organized around stories. The work we did through drama with stories helped me realize that as a secondary school student I was not reading the same book that my peers did. I was experiencing a dialogical relation with the texts; that is, as Edmiston (2003) explains, I was creating, experiencing, and interpreting in imagination multiple possible stories. I understood my schoolmates’ relation with the texts were monological; i.e., “singular and static, holding authoritative uncontested meanings” (Edmiston & Enciso, 2003, p. 868). As described by Holquist (2004a, 2004b) and Emerson (1983) I was working in the Bakhtinian paradigm while my schoolmates were working in the Saussurian one. This time a smile illuminated my face.

I understood through the course what learning as a lived experience can mean and what embodied knowledge feels like. Learning conceived as a meaning-making process transcends the content in order to ask questions one has to understand and imagine. However, what impacted me the most was being able to feel emotions. I was overwhelmed because for the first time in my experience as a student it was not just my mind working. It was my whole humanity. I became curious and determined to learn how
to practice teaching that reaches so deeply into our human condition that knowledge becomes embodied.

The week-long T&L 633 course was intense and very demanding. In addition to the eight hours a day of in-class work we had to spend at least two hours reading and writing Carmen\(^1\) postings, complete readings for the next day session, develop out-of-class practices and write reports on them, and finally prepare a midterm portfolio. It was also academically challenging. We had to explain our own meanings by synthesizing readings and outcomes of reflections on our experiences and express them in iconic images and written texts. Making meaning was a constant endeavor. We were provided with questions and criteria to develop what Vygotsky (1978) calls “task situations” or concrete historical events through which people are confronted with real problems in real or in “as if” contexts and are helped to define a new insight or understanding. In every homework and in-class discussion we were asked to make meaning on issues related to education such as the relationship between teaching and learning, the role of evaluation in teacher-student learning, and the form and purpose of curriculum development.

All this reflective and creative processes led me to the awareness that the most important insight I developed from this workshop was my realization that the worst things that could happen to a student are not being able to make meaning out of an experience and not feeling that his/her voice is being heard and valued. Along with this reflection, I realized that one of the worst things that could happen to a human being is not being recognized as a legitimate and valuable speaking person who deserves to be addressed as someone who can make meaning and to respond to the world. I would

---

\(^1\) "Carmen" is The Ohio State University’s online learning environment. It is labeled after the university’s alma mater “Carmen, Ohio.” It is an extension of campus life and face-to-face classrooms.
eventually learn that when this happens there is non-recognition of the conscious and simultaneous interaction, through language, between people that as selves and mutual others share their existence (Holquist, 2004). Further in this chapter and in chapter two, I will go back to this idea developing the notion of authorship.

During the whole week I felt in a safe and caring environment where my Latina identity and previous experience both as a citizen and as a teacher were valued. I found in the workshop’s participants my colleagues. I shared with them thoughts that I did not dare before speak about in other classes. For example, I pointed out that according to critical theorists’ findings on the discriminating events related to issues of gender, ethnicity, and class I should not be a doctoral student at The Ohio State University being female, Latina and poor. In other classes I provided biographical information that perhaps was not even heard. In the context of T&L 633 my story was heard not only as information but as knowledge. I was a living text that realities are constructed and could be very different from what they are supposed to be when the author/creator strives to make his/her imagined future become reality. When I finished my assigned writing for the course I had a strange and pleasant feeling that the ideas in those texts were not quotation from books but mine—my thoughts and words. They were supported in theory but also supported in my interactions with my peers.

When I submitted the final portfolio, two weeks after we finished the workshop’s in-class interaction portion, I was both exhausted and happy. I was happy because during the workshop I lived as experience that human beings could use dialogue as the key factor in the solution of conflicts as long as we learn and create ways to deal with them. I was happy because I had participated in a professional development program where feelings
and emotions were important elements in the curriculum development. I knew, coming from Colombia, one of the most violent countries in the world, that feelings and emotion are at the root of conflict and violence; yet they are unexplored and cut off from learning in institutional spaces like the school.

One of the outcomes from this course was that my interest for teachers’ professional development began to grow stronger. It has been a professional goal but it began to be a commitment. I had been looking for a way to develop curriculum for professional development; to live through and experience an answer to this question was a dream come true. I was impressed by the possibilities for educational change that drama’s pedagogical strategies and teaching philosophy opens for classroom transformation. However, I knew by my own experience as a curriculum designer in Colombia that such a well structured and connected set of task situations and strategies are the outcome of a theoretical web. I knew that I needed to do a refined analysis of my experience with T&L 633 to be able to use this knowledge to design professional development programs for teachers. I was aware that educators’ greatest challenge is not the implementation of the “know how” to do teaching. Their real challenge is to dare to act toward radical changes in spite of the adverse environment created in the present by neoliberal economical policies (Spring, 2005; Torres, 1998).

Making the Decision

The academic year 2006-2007 was a year of awareness for me. The academic experiences I went through this year would give me the theoretical support I needed to begin building my alternative way that Dr. Edmiston, without prescribing any recipe, invites us to create. At that moment in my second year of the doctoral program, I became
acquainted with critical theories providing diagnosis and explanations of traditional pedagogical practices and warnings regarding educational policies. I had taken courses focused on the socio-cultural role of education. I also had a glimpse of hope from my work during the spring quarter of 2005 with Dr. Enciso who had the insight to build a syllabus about the educational needs of culturally diverse students with a group of culturally diverse graduate students.

The participating doctoral students in that seminar had in common our ignorance in the episteme and vocabulary of Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit) and also our desire to become acquainted with LatCrit to serve better the Latino student population. Dr. Enciso used her scholarship to build on our inquiries, ingenuity, and hard work. We wrote about the path to our research questions as the first step to write our final exams essays. As a way to show she trusted and valued our work she encouraged the whole group to present these preliminary reflections under the title “The word “Latino/a” and the work of school: Looking for change in theory, research, and practice” in the Diversity Forum and Graduate Student Symposium at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; May 27, 2005. We successfully presented our thinking. It was in this seminar where I found the key to open the door of socio-cultural-historical tradition. One day, while Dr. Enciso was explaining Cole’s (1996) view of the possibilities that imagination offers to the cultural person, she showed how we move toward an idealized future to inform and shape the present and in so doing she gave me the clue of what I was missing: the Bakhtinian notion of fullness of time according to which possible pasts and futures are encountered in the present (Bakhtin, 2004).
In addition, during this seminar I made the decision to transfer from the Cultural Foundations of Education program to the Integrated Teaching and Learning program (both part of the College of Education and Human Ecology). It might sound like a contradiction, but as an educator coming from a third world country I did not want to spend my time, money, and energy reading about what for me was a lived experience of injustice and hopelessness. I wanted to look for solutions and for paths of possibilities. I humbly wanted to identify what might be improved in education and how to improve it. I disagreed with many aspects of the school culture such as commanding students to walk in line or having to request permission by raising their hands to express an opinion. Teachers, in general, do not ask why they are enforcing these practices. During this academic year I would learn that these practices are what Vygotsky (1978) calls fossilized and Bakhtin (2004) calls authoritative discourse.

Moved by my interest in the socio-cultural-historical tradition, in the spring of 2006 I enrolled in Dr. Enciso’s doctoral seminar: T&L 908 “The Development of Literary Understanding.” The ideas, terms, and concepts related to dialogism kept me reflecting, imagining, and tirelessly drawing diagrams representing people’s interactions in the spiral of time trying to understand Bakhtin’s model of communication. The “eureka” moment finally happened when I finally experienced a gestalt perspective that helped me put all the elements together and comprehend the model’s structure as a system. In particular I could see the central importance of the notion of authorship: In the act of authorship “I” and society are fused in the “self/other” that constitutes “my self”. This complex unit, “the self/other”, is not only inseparable but dynamic. In “my self” a particular type of historical society and culture are co-created thanks to language.
Language is both the context and content used to author consciousness and the world; that is, I/we and the world are texts.

Along with T&L 908, I took independent credits with Dr. Enciso. We agreed that I would study in depth Holland, Skinner, Lachicotte, & Cain’s (2003) book *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds*. They claim that human beings enter into imaginary worlds and communities where they envision possibilities that inspire new actions. In dramatic inquiry, figured worlds are collectively realized “as if” realms that are formed as the group asks the question “what if” and “if I were.” They are conceptual worlds beyond the immediate surrounding where we participate in events as actors according to the premises of such “as if” worlds. However, our mental actions within the context of meaningful activities such as work, play, and teaching are as real as the events themselves. These worlds are possible social realities that might exist if cultural values and power relations within the current reality were different. They take shape within and have as outcomes the co-production of activities, discourses, performances and artifacts (tools with meaning) which give them material existence.

Holland et al. (2003) call these “as if” worlds “figured worlds.” They illustrate the process by which figured worlds are formed through the world created by Alcoholics Anonymous groups. In these groups, people transform their identities from alcoholics to non-drinking alcoholics. They go through a process of understanding the factors associated with their condition and the creation of alternative interpretations of such factors and of themselves (Holland, et al., 2003, pp. 66-97). They argue that through continued participation in meaningful acts the “as if” realm of the figured world becomes embodied, over time. This embodiment of activity and the use of related artifacts
facilitate socio-cultural historical change. It is important to note that figured worlds are produced and reproduced in relation to past experiences through everyday activities.

I found the concept of figured worlds a powerful tool to explain educational transformation and along with it social, cultural and historical changes. Connecting Holland et al.’s (2003) concept of figured worlds with Bakhtin’s (2004) concepts of chronotope, which means literally “time-space”, and authorship, I began to compose these questions: what if the classrooms were “as if” chronotopes where teachers and students could develop higher psychological functions (HPFs) by making meaning (learning) and building knowledge? What if those processes were carried out by them while creating answers and new questions as they try to solve inquiry questions through reflection and imagination?

I began my third year as a doctoral student with the certainty that I had found the pathway for my scholarship. The socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories provide better explanations for old inquiries I had concerning teaching, learning, the students’ evaluation and curriculum development. Nevertheless, I was aware I was not able to play with these ideas yet. Thus, in winter of 2006 I enrolled in Dr. Enciso’s seminar T&L 974 “Sociocultural Aspects of Teaching and Learning in Early and Middle Childhood”. The main purpose of this seminar was to examine the core concepts of sociocultural historical theory and dialogism. For each class session, based on readings, we had to apply a set of concepts explaining events of our own experience as teachers or as students. This reflective process led me to understand Vygotsky’s cultural historical theory and Bakhtin’s dialogism as heuristics to inquire into how people co-create meaning; for example, how teachers and students co-create or make meaning and internalize culture.
Both theories highlight the role of language in the co-creation of possible futures; and both recognize that innovation and change happen in the consciousness of the author/creator and that this process requires imagination (Bakhtin, 2004; Holland, et al., 2003; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978).

For the final exam in the course I used a video excerpt from a dramatic inquiry enactment with children led by Dr. Edmiston. This project allowed me to reflect, understand, and interpret the influence of dialogism in drama pedagogy. Based on this experience I decided to work within the T&L 633 summer format as the “pivot” to enter the world of possibilities for teachers’ professional development. Knowing my interest, Dr. Edmiston gave me access to the manuscript of his book *Forming Ethical Identities in Early Childhood Play* (2008). By reading this work I began to see dialogism as a part of a new paradigm that re-conceptualizes subject, object, time, reality, and knowledge. These are the core concepts that define a scientific paradigm (Bakhtin, 1991; Kant, 1952; Mankeliunas, 1989; Popkewitz, 1997; Wartofsky, 1983).

The next quarter, for my independent study credit hours, Dr. Enciso proposed beginning to read, reflect, and write around the relationship between two topics: Imagination and the meaning of authorship in a rapidly changing society. At one point in the process, she asked me to write inquiry questions that were emerging from my studying sessions. We met every two weeks, and in each meeting we discussed the questions. From this process we identified the topics and issues that were relevant to deal with in my doctoral candidacy exams. The first question of the candidacy exams was: “Develop an overview of sociocultural historical theoretical principles and their implications for the concept of authorship, as described by Bakhtin and others.”
Elaborating the answer I began to understand and envision connections between the notion of authorship and education.

I realized that dialogism complements cultural historical theory through its relationship to the notion of authorship. Indeed, dialogism’s importance for education is based primarily on the meaning and development of authorship. Based on Bakhtin (1993, 2004) I understood the act of authorship as an ethical act. Authorship is the event in a particular space-time, when through utterances the world addresses ME and I am answerable by giving sense (my personal interpretation) to the Other’s utterances using the word’s socially agreed upon meanings. In this way, “I” create a version of the world that cannot be exactly translated through language to Others and this is why we have no *alibi in existence* (Bakhtin, 1993). Simultaneously, following the same process, the Other interprets my utterances and subtexts (the not stated but hidden references behind the utterance) making the context sensible as while shaping the psychological events in our consciousness. It is in this process of our mutual meaning-making where dialogue takes place.

I realized that taking into account the ethical and historical dimension of the concept of authorship is crucial in formal education to respond to humankind’s current needs. Today, international forums claim the need to re-create ways of living for the sake of sustainability. There is agreement worldwide that one of the challenges of formal education is to form citizens able to imagine a different world. However, they have to be ethical in the Bakhtinian sense; that is, responsible for the version of the world they create and its consequences for Others (Bakhtin, 1993). A way to attain this educational aim is to make classrooms figured worlds. Since these worlds are “as if” worlds, the

---

2 I will further develop this topic in chapter 2.
classroom as a figured world requires a pedagogy appropriate for them. I recognized the use of drama as a suitable pedagogy for both the classroom and professional development because it engages imagination and explores the ethical dimensions of the problems and challenges we face while asking us to figure out solutions in relation with the context we actually are living in (Edmiston, 2003). Teachers engaged in professional development, are viewed, in these figured worlds as responsible and responsive meaning makers, decisions makers, and knowledge builders with one another.

Studying Holquist (2004a, 2006) I became aware that dialogue, the central category in Bakhtin’s thought, is “the most misunderstood aspect of his work” (Holquist, 2006, p. xvii). I understood that some precision was in order to interpret dialogism’s influence on education; amongst the concerns, I recognized that utterance, the term that Bakhtin (2004) uses to refer to the speech act, is produced between at least two bodies in dialogue but they have to be understood as bodies of meaning. Thus, “dialogue is not synonymous with conversation – dialogue is ‘more than talk’ between people” (Edmiston, 2000, p. 73). Furthermore, to enter in dialogue physical face to face conversation is not always necessary. Conversely, having conversations does not necessarily lead to dialogue unless participants experience internal conflict between different discourses (Edmiston, 2000). Discourses are ways of thinking about events that are built and expressed through socially and culturally constructed languages (Bakhtin, 2004; Edmiston & Enciso, 2003; Mills, 1997). This opens the possibility to enter into dialogue through different signs systems (e.g. mathematics, iconic, dance, images, gesture, etc.).

Another relevant influence in education is Bakhtin’s (1993, 2006) condition that when in dialogue I am answerable; I am responsible for the content and form of my
answer. This implies that I am conscious, I am authoring the sense and meaning, and in so doing I am ethical. I become human when I have this awareness of my consciousness, not merely when I respond by reacting. This realization provoked in me a very emotional moment when I realized that authorship is the key concept to transform education, that education has been focused on reproducing information ignoring our true nature as authors/creators of sense and meanings. I was overwhelmed realizing the implications of monological pedagogical practices that highly value rote memory through testing (Vygotsky, 1986). In tests, the students answer questions but they are not responsible for the content because they are not authoring an utterance but emitting a response to a monological or authoritative word. This explains the acceptance of behaviorism in formal education for so long. Once more, facts that were transmitted to me as “the truth” crumbled down. The idea that the quality of education and students’ ability to learn should depend a great deal on financial resources lost its ground for me in that very moment and, along with it, the fate of third world countries.

I found in Bakhtin’s model of communication support to make viable educational change regardless of a country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP). I saw in Dr. Edmiston’s T&L 633 course how the development of “higher psychological functions” (Vygotsky xx) could be achieved if the teacher has a strong academic background to guide praxis and, following Bakhtin (2004), the ability to artistically represent the curriculum’s content to the students. I experienced myself working on my research project for T&L 974 that research could be conducted with artifacts like a video camera, one TV set and a computer. It is at the level of reflection, creation of possibilities in imagination that change comes about.
I was overwhelmed by the insights I was authoring; for instance, it is in our basic human capacities (imagination, reflection, and communication) that we are all equal despite international established socioeconomics markers as developed and developing countries or socio-cultural created markers as race, ethnicity, gender, and class. Some ideas I have read about in my courses acquired a different meaning for me; for example, Freire’s (1998) arguments that without creativity democracy is not possible, that imagination and reflection are keys because to construct a serious democracy implies changes in societal structures, reorienting the politics of production and development, and reinventing power relations. Before my experience with T&L 633 I could not agree more with Freire, but I could not see how to contribute my energy, to reinvent power relations under the dominance of the current ones. The use of drama opened for me the door to hope that we can actually embody power by authoring them in a fictional world that involves both the reality as it is and as it could be (Edmiston, 2003).

As I have described so far, I grew deeply interested in the idea that by requiring the active participation of imagination in authoring ourselves and the world, dialogism is a better paradigm to create the educational changes that international political leaders expect. Dialogism is built on human beings’ power to create societies, cultures, and history.

**Formulating the Research Questions**

Through the processes of learning, reflection, and participation described above, I decided this dissertation’s horizon question: “What could be learned from T&L 633 as a professional development program?” It is a horizon question because the developments around the three research questions that guide this study contribute to the answer.
The research questions are informed throughout by the assumption that acts of authorship are the central aims of education. Taking into account that my focus of interest is teachers’ professional development programs, I addressed the questions to identify how teachers make use of their authoring capacity to interpret, re-examine, imagine, question, and plan to transform their classroom’s practices to improve learning, teaching, and knowledge building processes. In formal education these processes depend a great deal on curriculum development, thus, a central element in the formulation of the research question was a focus on curriculum development.

The research questions are:

1. How do teachers re-examine their pedagogical plans and practices in terms of the possibilities and strategies they envision that will change the relationships between knowledge and society?

2. How do teachers interpret their experiences of Ed T&L 633 in relation with social, cultural and historical assumptions about learning, knowledge building processes and curriculum development?

3. What questions do they formulate about their professional development and how do these relate to social, cultural, and historical assumptions about knowledge building and curriculum development?

Based on the fact that this study focuses on one case of professional development for teachers, I defined it as a case study, following Stake’s (2003) idea that case studies do not bind the researcher to specific methods of research. According to him, any event could be a case as long as the researcher discerns that valuable knowledge might be learned from it to contribute to the development of an area of study. In the same line of
thinking, Krathwohl (1993) argues that case studies convey the characteristic of a single event usually linked to a particular program, institution, time period, or set of events. For Stake (2003) as well as for Krathwohl (1993) case studies are not narrowed to the selection of a person from whom or onto whom information is gathered. To them, a classroom, a curriculum, a museum, a hospital, and any other specific social systems and institutions could be studied as cases.

T&L 633 is a course offered by the School of Teaching and Learning of the College of Education and Human Ecology at The Ohio State University. Every summer, it is offered in a week-long format not only to the university’s students, but also to practicing teachers as a professional development program. The purpose of this course is to introduce teachers to the use of drama as a pedagogical strategy to improve both teaching and learning. The purpose of this study is to learn about the pedagogical strategies and epistemological concepts T&L 633 offers to practicing teachers and how these can be understood as authorship, a concept informed by socio-cultural-historical and dialogical theories of social life, imagination and learning.

In chapter two I develop the theoretical frame that supports my methodological decisions and the interpretations of findings. This reviews research on the current discourses and practices on professional development programs for teachers. Next, I present my understandings and interpretations on the way dialogism informs and effects the development of dialogic pedagogy with emphasis on the re-conceptualizations and transformation of pedagogical practices that scholars working within this paradigm propose. Following this review I present an overview of drama pedagogy including its pedagogical principles and teaching strategies. In this section I also explain how Dr.
Brian Edmiston’s approach to drama pedagogy is framed within the socio-cultural-historical-dialogic tradition. Finally, I return to professional development programs to present an overview of the state of the art of these programs regarding the notion of authorship.

Chapter three describes the methodology of the study explaining how dialogism and the developments of dialogical research inform the decisions regarding data processing and analysis. Chapter four presents the findings focusing on three participants and a dialogical analysis of events and perspectives identified as relevant by participants during the development T&L 633. Chapter five presents a synthesis of the findings, recommendations for developing curriculum for teachers’ professional development programs, the significance of the study for further research and practices, and a coda in which I introduce a new horizon inquiry question that can guide further educational research and practice related to professional development.
Chapter 2

Introduction

Why Reform Professional Development

In 1990, representatives of 155 countries and 150 organizations launched in Jomtien (Thailand) the worldwide educational policy “Education for All.” This international forum announced their commitment to teachers’ professional development (UNESCO, 2005). They agreed that the traditional practice of teacher training was ineffective to face the educational challenges of the new millennium (Binde, 2001; National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), 2008; UNESCO, 2005; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). They re-conceptualized teaching as a profession and defined professional development as “the professional growth a teacher achieves as a result of gaining increased experience and examining his or her teaching systematically” (Glatthorn, 1995, p. 41 in Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p. 11). As professionals, teachers are called to be active participants in their own growth and development as teachers (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). They were valued as agents in the improvement of the quality of education.

Although the notion of teachers’ authorship of change in education is implicit in the conception of teachers as professionals, there is a gap between theory and practice. From the beginning, the reform, promoted at the international level by UNESCO, has been developed in each country by policy makers with little input from teachers (Poole, 2000). Teachers around the world felt the reform was imposed on them “without any regard to
their knowledge and day-to-day practice” (Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p. 25). Shepel (1995) says it has been a negative experience “because the necessity of change has not been objectified by their participants but was given to them as a ready-made decision” (p. 428). However, Wang and Odell (2002) point out that in societies deeply rooted in individualistic culture, teachers “enjoy much autonomy in choosing the content, process, and assessment of their work… However, that autonomy does not produce diverse teaching practices with differing assumptions about knowledge, learning, and teaching. Rather, teaching practice is found to be surprisingly consistent and similar” (p. 483). That is, teaching practices are aligned with a positivist paradigm and behaviorist approaches to formal education. Accordingly, I understand teachers’ complaints as related to their autonomy and not to their right to authorship. This explains why the same teachers who maintain a behaviorist approach to education react negatively to reform.

This study focuses on professional development programs for teachers and how they might be conceptualized through a dialogical perspective. In order to establish a theoretical context for interpreting current approaches to teacher professional development, I begin with an overview of dialogism’s core concepts, authorship and dialogue, and continue with an outline of the aims and assumptions of sociocultural – historical theory of teaching and learning that inform drama as dialogic pedagogy. Related to this theoretical review, I present an overview of the orientations and models associated with designing and implementing professional development programs for teachers. In presenting and analyzing current models of professional development programs I am particularly interested in how these are related to the concepts and practices of authorship. Next, I provide examples of scholarship related to developing
dialogic pedagogies. In the last sections of this literature review, I describe drama as a pedagogy and provide an overview of the pedagogical assumptions and practices associated with dialogic dramatic inquiry. In conclusion, I assess the potential for authorship, dialogism, and dramatic inquiry to inspire new directions for teacher professional development.

A Brief History Situating Bakhtin and Vygotsky’s Theories of Language, Culture and Learning

Bakhtin’s works (1993, 2004, 2006) and Vygotsky’s studies of learning (1978, 1986) move language from the realm of naming what is to the realm of interpreting and developing learning through relationships. Both theories represent a ‘problemshift’ in their respective fields. They are characterized by the complexity of their models and their interdisciplinary character (Bloome, et al., 2005; Bruner, 1986, 1996, Emerson, 1983; Holland, et al., 2003; Holland & Valsiner, 1988; Holquist, 1986, 2002; Lewis, et al., 2007; Moll, 1990, Souza Lima, 1995; Shepel, 1995; Smagorinsky, 1995). Bakhtin’s paradigm of possibilities entered the scenario of American education during the 1980s following Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist’s translations of “The Dialogic Imagination” published in 1981. Vygotsky’s genetic approach is known in the West under different labels such as sociocultural-historical theory, cultural historical theory, Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) (Chaiklin, 2001; Elhammoumi, 2001; Rogoff, 2003). It has influenced education since the 1960s when Vygotsky’s works were translated into English and other languages (Chaiklin, 2001; Souza Lima, 1995). Here I focus first on Bakhtin’s theories of dialogism and authorship. These ideas will be
incorporated into the subsequent overview of key concepts in sociocultural-historical theory.

The potential for a shift in viewpoints on learning initiated by socio-cultural-historical theory can be traced to the emergence of Einstein’s relativity theory at the turn of the 20th century (Holquist, 2004a). By reimagining and redefining our relationship to space, time, and location, Einstein raised new questions about what can be defined as stable and final from any particular perspective. It is important to keep in mind that the conceptualization of space and time in every historical moment is related to power relations and social change (Popkewitz, 1997). A theory of dialogism is, in many ways, a form of relativity theory applied to language when language is viewed as not merely words but the context for human communication (Emerson & Holquist, 2004). Relativity theory introduces a change of rationality regarding time, space, and the observer (the knower). The perception of time and space are not absolute for they depend on the position of the observer (Holquist, 2004a). In addition, following Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle, the mutual effect between subject, object, and context can never be known. Similarly, in a theory of dialogism recognizes that uncertainty is always present in the act of authorship and in any dialogue. This recognition is crucial for the transformation of classroom’s practices (Smagorinsky, 1995).

**Authoritative and Internally Persuasive Discourses in Education**

Many have argued that problems in education relate to the discourses that underlie teaching practices (e.g., Moll, 1990; Kumashiro, 2000; Popkewitz, 1997). Thus, when dealing with teachers’ professional development it is important to highlight the connection between discourses and forms of activities. The lack of hidden assumptions
about learning has led to what Moll (1990) notes in his analysis of the application of Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (a much contested concept and practice in education): Teachers organize the students to work in small groups, sit around tables in circle-like formations to solve problems already decided by the official curriculum’s designer or to reinforce ways of thinking and ways of actions. Working in small groups and eliminating traditional students’ individual desks are practices promoted by critical and social constructionist pedagogies; however, solving problems predetermined by policy-makers and reinforcement are authoritative practices.

Therefore, understanding the characteristics of the prevalent discourses in education, in particular the means of their transmission is crucial for collecting and interpreting data for my three research questions. Of the three questions, the first asks what means of transmission and representation of discourses were created, enacted and mediated through drama pedagogy.

I chose Bakhtin’s (2004) notions of authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse as mediating devices to analyze data to answer the research questions. Bakhtin (2004) highlights the relevance of the act of authorship in the zone of contact where these two types of discourses enter into struggle in our consciousness. The literature review on the works of dialogical researchers shows that in essence their works focus on these two types of discourses. They are at the base of any intent to effectively promote transformation of the practices in the classroom and attain the improvement of the quality of education. For example, Edmiston and Wilhelm (1996) describe how working along the principles of an inquiry-based curriculum they altered the traditional view of the teacher as “the authority on all knowledge” (p. 85); instead, they encouraged the students
to regard them as one of the many resources in the classroom. Repositioning teachers and students as both learners and co-researchers, they worked for three weeks in teams on research projects where they explore questions and write scripts on a unit on Civil Rights. Medina and Campano (2006) explain how interactive context like drama makes literacy pedagogical practices spaces to facilitate the reflection on day-to-day realities like the students’ diverse identities and cultures usually not a part of the curriculum.

Ideology is a central concept in the study of discourses. Bakhtin (2004) uses the term “ideological” in two senses: as meaning and as political discourse. Also, he uses the term “word” and “discourses” as synonymous; for example, when he refers to “the word of the other” he is not only talking about his/her utterances but also his/her discourses (ibid. 2004). The same is true of the term “authority” which he uses to refer to the person who authors a text or the person who exerts power over a text.

**Authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse: Commonalities and profound differences.**

When we assimilate the word of the other, it becomes a part of our individual ideological becoming, that is, of our capacity to make meaning of the world. It no longer performs “as information, directions, rules, models and so forth” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 342). It takes on a deeper and more basic significance. It “strives to determine the very bases of our ideological interrelations with the world, the very basis of our behavior; it performs here as authoritative discourse, and an internally persuasive discourse” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 342). These two types of discourses are translations of the world into texts through utterances. These utterances do not only come from a physically present person. They might come from written of spoken texts, that is, from whole bodies of knowledge like oral traditions and scientific reports. Both discourses are transmitted and in both the act
of authorship takes place in different degrees for without authorship there would be no assimilation, no discourse at all (Holquist, 2004a; Bakhtin, 2004, 2006).

These two categories of discourses determine the history of our ideological consciousness where it is possible to struggle over meaning when we are able to enter into a dialogical interrelationship. Authoritative discourse has to enter our consciousness to play its controlling role. This fact is both its strength and weakness because there, in our consciousness, it might enter in dialogical relation with internally persuasive discourses that we have assimilated and acknowledged. If authorship takes place, and not an automatic response, the authoritative discourse inevitably enters the play of novelness. Holquist (2004a) explains that Bakhtin calls novelness a type of innovation that requires the reconstruction of our discourses. This implies to approach them from different points of view than those we have held. These different positions allow seeing what we have not seen before; that is, to understand and interpret deeper and wider actual and possible relationships between the discourses that form the text of interest. Holquist (2004a) define novelness as “the study of any cultural activity that has treated language as dialogic” (p. 68). It is important to understand these processes when applying dialogism in formal education. If authorship is the goal, activities have to provoke novelness. It is crucial to understand that conversation by itself does not guarantee that internal dialogue will occur. As Holquist (2004a) asserts, “heteroglossia is a plurality of relations, not just a cacophony of different voices” (p. 89). Importantly for pedagogy and principles of change in learning: “Drama can make internal and external struggles more visible and more productive through students’ experience of internally competing meanings,
represented through different social positions in relation to others” (Edmiston & Enciso, 2003; p. 873).

Both discourses are highly dependent on the socio-cultural-historical contexts of the authors who build them. For example, some countries used the worldwide educational reform of the 1990s, generally recognized as a form of authoritative discourse, as a platform to launch educational transformations. Namibia constitutes an interesting example because they implemented the reform using an action research model to improve teaching and learning. Villegas-Reimers (2003) points out “For teachers who were used to submitting to the government, having no voice whatsoever in their daily practice, there is no doubt that learning to use action research as a model to improve their teaching required a major change in their preconceived ideas of what education, teaching and learning are about” (p. 111). As a result, Namibians reach transformation of their national education system that tries to accomplish social reforms through education (USAID, 2006). In Colombia, we made a socio-cultural-historical interpretation of the reform that as Gandin and Apple (2003) claim used the language of democracy to introduce a neoliberal reform. Education was the object of reflection nation-wide through a strategy called “mesas de trabajo” (discussion-working tables) (Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia, 1996). I highlight from these experiences that some nations and academic communities have made their own interpretations of the reform and valued their authorship.

Cases like Namibia (USAID, 2006), Colombia (MEN, 1996), Brazil (Gandin and Apple, 2003), Mexico (Street, 2003), and Ethiopia (Asgedom, Desta, Dufera, & Leka, 2006) led me to ask, what makes a discourse to be internally persuasive?
The history of science and education shows that internally persuasive discourses eventually become authoritative and are replaced by new ones (Volosinov, 1986). Bakhtin (2006) argues that authoritative discourses were persuasive at one time, but became fossilized. Fossilization comes about when we stop reflecting on our own actions and activities (Holland & Valsiner, 1988). At that moment, its transmission is lineal and abstract because there is no lived experience involved. In contrast, internally persuasive discourse implies embodiment, recognition of authorship, of the half self/other in me (dialogue). Examples of this transformation of discourses from internally persuasive into authoritative and the emergence of new ones are found in the realm of education: the paradigm stimulus-response was introduced as internally persuasive for its effectiveness to respond to the need to memorize information required to perform certain labor-related tasks. It became fossilized and authoritative. Then, constructivism entered the scenario. It has been acknowledged and assimilated for its proposal to prepare people to solve problems. Today, the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories are making their path as internally persuasive discourses because current historical conditions require people’s creativity, imagination, and ability to negotiate conflicts. However, according to the same set of theories they will become fossilized and other proposal will emerge from them. Authorship as the target of educational change slows down the fossilization process. It makes it more difficult. It is important to understand that the discourses that support the pedagogical practices and not the practice itself is what become fossilized (Bakhtin, 2004).
Authoritative discourse: Features for its transmission and representation.

Religious dogma, political, moral codes, father, adults, and teacher’s words are forms of authoritative discourses. They embody, for example: the authoritativeness of tradition, generally acknowledged truths like scientific truths, and official lines such as official curriculum and standards for evaluation, amongst others. However, it is worthwhile to note that when developing curriculum for professional development programs for teachers, these discourses serve teachers as referents to reflect on their own words.

Bakhtin (2004) indicates formal features for the transmission and representation of authoritative discourse that are common to all types and degrees of such discourse, whether we recognize its authority or not. It requires a distance vis-à-vis itself. For instance, authoritative discourse may organize around itself great masses of other types of discourses such theories on learning, culture, and human development. These discourses interpret it, praise it, apply it in various ways but authoritative discourse itself does not merge with these other discourses. This feature helps to understand what happens when teachers and scholars criticize and argue against NCLB or ‘Education for All’ but these policies do not change. As authoritative discourses, these educational policies remain out there at a distance, sharply demarcated, compact, and inert. Instead, teachers are obligated unconditional allegiance. They are not allowed, officially, to make any interpretation or free application because authoritative discourse cannot be represented. It can only be transmitted. Thus, it allows no gradual and flexible transition or spontaneous creative variants of it. It has to be totally affirmed or rejected.

Authoritative discourse is indissoluble fused with its authority as political power (educational policies), an institution (the school system), and a person (the school
principal and the teacher). These authorities are not interested in novelness; their goal is to keep things the same. They seek to impose order in the world (avoiding chaos and disorder). They use linearity of time and control of discourses and the body as tools. In education, the stimulus-response paradigm fulfills these purposes. Authoritative discourses as totalitarian government seeks the suppression of all otherness and absolute monologue. These extreme cases, like Nazism, reject “a condition built into the structure of human perception, and thus a condition inherent in the very fact of being humans” (Holquist, 2004a, p. 34). The study of the history of humanity shows that when authoritative discourse fossilized up to the point that it makes living impossible to bear, decay is inevitably, and from within individuals and society changes and possibilities have emerged. Authoritative discourse could be profaned.

**Internally persuasive discourse: Features of its transmission and representation.**

In contrast to authoritative discourse, all privileges are denied to internally persuasive discourses. No authority backs them at all; frequently, society’s public opinion, scholarly norms, or criticism does not acknowledge them. This is the case of new models of the world like Copernicus’ heliocentric theory and social movements like civil right of the 1960s. These two events, five centuries apart, have in common the authorship capacity of their creators to think and to imagine the world different.

The internally persuasive discourse is of decisive significance in the evolution of an individual consciousness. It is tightly interwoven with “one’s own word” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 345). Bakhtin writes the expression in quotation marks to mean that actually our discourses are not totally ours. They are half our and half someone whose words have been acknowledged and assimilated by us. These processes of assimilation and
acknowledgement, along with the process they forward are based on the act of authorship. The internally persuasive discourse’s “creativity and productiveness consists precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is, freely, developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts” (Bakhtin, 2004, pp. 345-346). Internally persuasive discourse opens up entirely different possibilities. I argue this is what has persuaded scholars within the dialogical paradigm working in formal education.

Internally persuasive discourse “enters into an intense interaction, a struggle with other internally persuasive discourses” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 346). It offers possibilities to choose and to create. Bakhtin (2004) describes the process: “Our ideological development is just such an intense struggle within us for hegemony amongst various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions, and values” (p. 346). This is facilitated because “The semantic structure of an internally persuasive discourse is not finite, it is open; in every new contexts that dialogize it, this discourse is able to reveal ever newer ways to mean” (Bakhtin, p. 346).

Another peculiarity of the internally persuasive discourse is that it is either a contemporary word born through an immediate interaction or a word reclaimed for contemporaneity like indigenous philosophy and traditional medicine. This peculiarity brings hope. The hope that my existence is not circumscribed by present circumstances alone, that in other times and places there was and there will be an Other who might understand me differently; that in the future, through dialogue, I might accomplish the
possibilities that I envision in the present. Dialogism is an epistemology founded on a loophole where the deepest past and the most distant future meet in the present where they can always be renewed (Holquist, 2004a).

Internally persuasive discourse: Methods and means for its formulation and representation.

Bakhtin (2004) states that internally persuasive discourse’s features are: being of decisive significance in the evolution of an individual consciousness, being tightly interwoven with one’s own word, and being an actual or reclaimed contemporary word. These features determine the methods for its formulation, transmission, and framing. These methods are artistic representation and objectification of another’s discourse. Artistic representation, intrinsically an act of creation or an aesthetics acts, involves transmission, interpretation, and artistic reformulation. Objectification involves development of one’s own word, which although is born and stimulated by another’s discourse will eventually be liberated from that discourse. These methods provide Maximal interaction with another’s word and its context for the dialogizing influence they have on each other. This facilitates the free and creative development of another’s word into my own and a gradation of transitions. These methods serve to regulate the play in the zone of boundaries understood as the distance between the point where the context begins to prepare for the introduction of another’s word and the point where the word is actually introduced. These methods account for peculiarities that express the essence of the internally persuasive discourse.

Artistic representation and objectification can use as means for creation three devices “always inextricably woven together” Bakhtin, 2004, p. 358). They are
hybridization, dialogized interrelation of languages, and dialogue. Hybridization “is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by a social differentiation or by some other factor” (Bakhtin, p. 358). Social languages are for example everyday and scientific languages, two consciousnesses are for example a participant in T&L 633 and a person living in the sinking Titanic or the Nazi era. In formal education, the division of labor between teachers and students represent social differentiation and the theories supporting the educational decisions other factors. Hybridization could be conscious or unconscious; however, Bakhtin (2004) argues, “intentional semantic hybrids are inevitably internally dialogic (as distinct from organic hybrids)” (p. 360). Thus, in formal education only the conscious and intentional hybridization makes sense to promote interillumination between discourses.

These three devices (hybridization, dialogized language, and dialogue) in action provoke processes of reprocessing, reformulating, and authoring. Central to these processes are the problems of representing, transmitting, and assessment of the other’s discourse that is the object of interpretation (further developments), discussion, evaluation (passing judgment), rebuttal (contesting them), and support (agree with them). When the process of transmission is an artistic representation of the other’s discourse, it favors authorship. If not, the other’s word is reified and transmitted as a thing. Authorship requires an environment that allows maximal interaction. This environment has to set conditions where participants feel free to think, reflect, inquire, and express their thoughts, feelings, and emotions not only through oral and written texts
but also through physical movement and gestures. In addition, the environment has to allow space and time for gradation of transitions from authoritative discourse toward internally persuasive discourse within the play of boundaries. These conditions of the environment facilitate internal dialogue, essence of any act of authorship, to take place. In this way, the Other’s word could become acknowledged and assimilated; that is, internally persuasive discourse.

The intense interaction with another’s word is present in different instances and levels. They are lived experiences (making meaning), ethical life (another’s judgment, recognition or non-recognition, that is, assessment), and, ideology. This is a never-ending struggle with another’s words in all realms of life and creative ideological activity. It is the hope of dialogic scholars that formal education becomes a creative ideological activity.

**Authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse in the school.**

Bakhtin (2004) asserts there are two modes of appropriation of another’s discourse in the environment of the school: reciting by heart and retelling in one’s own words. Bakhtin (2004) affirms, “An independent, responsible, and active discourse is the fundamental indicator of an ethical, legal, and political human being” (pp. 349-350). I understand these features (*independent, responsible, and active*) as indicators of the act of authorship. I think of authorship as an aim for formal education, a long-term purpose for the curriculum developed day after day in the classroom. Another’s discourse could be (or not) challenged, interpreted, and assessed. Teachers have to decide on the way they present the discourse of the subject matter: as authoritative or as internally persuasive, regardless of traditional practices. In other words, they could choose if they are going to
ask the students to recite by heart or to retell in their own words. This is an application of Edmiston’s pedagogical principle: Teachers have the responsibility to question their own discourses (see this chapter, p. 94).

Any subject matter’s content whether mathematics, natural science or social sciences and humanities could be assumed and taught as bits of information or as utterances, that is, as bodies of meaning (Bakhtin, 2004, 2006). When the teacher decides to ask the students to recite by heart, the content is perceived as a thing (abstract understanding). In this case, the word is separated from the living, ideological power of the word to mean. When this happens, the word “lose semantic depth and flexibility, the capacity to expand and renew their meanings in new living contexts – they essentially die as discourse” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 353). These forms of transmission do not care for what lies behind or beneath the content. In positivist science, this is called objectivity. Students talking about the same topic from a similar point of view, from the perspective of a single authoritative discourse, usually the one on the textbook, illustrate this case. Reciting by heart the content of the text is the goal.

On the contrary, when the teacher decides to ask the students to retell in their own words, the subject matter content is the object of deep and actual understanding and a dialogical approach takes place. In this case, the students share not only the built knowledge but also its potential and limitations. They learn by making meaning and in so doing they develop their ideological becoming, that is, their own discourses. In this learning context, the texts are mediating devises. When using retelling in one’ own words as a pedagogical strategy, the teacher has to adapt the pedagogical environment to the students so they feel safe to express their questions, difficulties, doubts, and to create.
This requires building a community of learners. He/she has to provide permanent assessment to improve the student’s cognitive development and learning. He/she has to be aware that evaluation, as in the traditional approach, only at the end to grade students has no place.

Alternative pedagogies like drama pedagogy offer strategies and practices that illuminate and help the teacher in the process of developing his/her dialogical pedagogy and in so doing authoring him/herself as teacher.

In designing curriculum development, teachers who opt for a dialogical model could find in theory an invaluable tool. When in everyday life two people enter in conversation on a topic, they might not go beyond the superficial aspects of discourse, that is, “the deeper semantic and emotionally expressive levels of discourse do not enter the game” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 341). However, the word of the other enters our consciousness in the process of assimilating the ideological world of the society and culture we are a part. This is why deep conversations are necessary because they include emotions and ethical issues of the topics object of discussions. In the realm of formal education, this justify the development of “rigorous curricula” and “to take the students where they cannot go by themselves” (Edmiston, Carmen posting June 12, 2007).

Reflecting on this issue, I realize that even though the content of the curriculum should transcend everyday life, still, everyday day life should be included so the curriculum makes sense for the students as human beings. To narrow the school curricula to everyday events do not lead to figured out alternative solutions to big problems like poverty, violence, hunger, global warming, and the like. Thus, students explore events we do not usually talk about like friendship, love, health, death, power, poverty, and media
while inquiring as they relate to personal experiences, but these are moved into a larger arena. This is a great challenge that drama pedagogy fulfills. For example, inquiring about human rights and ethical decisions in fictional worlds’ as in the sinking Titanic or in concentration camps in the Nazi era. In this way, transmission of information is not predominant and the activities focus on representation, which involves authorship. It is important to highlight that in drama transmission of information takes place; the difference between its means of transmission and traditional pedagogies is that in drama participants are aware of who is talking whether the character they are representing or themselves and how much of them is in the character. They are also aware of the social, cultural, and historical circumstances of the contexts, of the body language and intonation. That is, drama has the potential to promote participants’ awareness that all these events are historical and heteroglossic.

Authorship works in two instances: meaning making (learning) and interpretation. During these two processes, the person makes connections between theories, contexts, and people’s previous knowledge and lived experiences. The way he/she makes the connections follows a rhizome-like or web-like structure where there is no hierarchy but interconnections. The person creates new connections in his/her process of assimilating or creating. For these processes, the person uses what Bakhtin (2004) calls devices for creating the image of language. He argues these devices may be reduced to three basic categories: hybridization, interillumination, and pure dialogue. Authorship serve as catalyst to accelerate educational change and the social processes related to it. In worldwide present circumstances of poverty, climatic hazard, and war as the only certainties, this type of education is not a choice but a matter of survival.
In sum, according to socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories meaning making and interpretation come about through a loophole formed by the processes of reflecting and inquiring. These processes are antidotes against fossilization. They are made evident through the processes of: creative artistic representation, questioning, reprocessing, reformulating, and deep conversation during which discussions, evaluations, rebuttal, and support take place. They are accelerated by lived experiences and permanent assessment. During all these processes, a separation between one’s own discourse and thought from the other’s word and thought take place in addition to a separation between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse based on a decision-making process. These three processes of separation awaken one’s independent word which in itself is an act of authorship. They lead to further acts of authorship through the creative application of the internally persuasive discourse to new contexts, situations, and materials, to create for example new pedagogical environments, to create new ways to perform teaching and learning, or as the scholars within the dialogical trend are doing to create new terms to express new concepts. All these decision-making processes, essentially acts of authorship, cannot be imposed but can be mediated.

Based on Bakhtin (2004) the following are recommendations for formal education to become a creative ideological activity:

Teachers and students’ discourse on a topic should be the outcome of their free and creative variation of another’s discourse when applying it to new material, to another way of posing a problem, to conduct experiments and get solutions in the language of another discourse. For this to happens, the subject matter content (as another’s discourse) has to be artistically represented to the students to influence them in a deep and persuasive way.
If this is accomplished, Bakhtin (2004) asserts “there is no external imitation, no simple act of reproduction, but rather a further creative development of another’s (more precisely, half-other) discourse in a new context and under new conditions” (p. 347).

A pedagogical strategy to make an artistic representation of the content is to design activities where students can have lived experience with/through the content. The forms are endless; however, designing activities promoting authorship is the teachers’ challenge. The student’s objectification of the other’s discourse through artistic representation of it is an indicator of authorship. These processes involve experimenting, questioning, put the discourse in a new situation to expose its weak sides, to get a feel of its boundaries, to experience it physically as an object. This is why Bakhtin (2004) says that in artistic representations there is no simple act of reproduction.

In the drama enactment I describe later in this chapter, the created contextual situation is an artistic representation that brings the past and the future into the present to make a decision. Using information, artifacts (props) as pivots, and inquiry questions the children entered a relationship with this situation and one another where they had the opportunity to discuss, reflect, agree, disagree, and live conflicts between discourses. Professor Edmiston invited them through questions to become aware of their discourses in different positions (as American Indians, settlers, researchers, and citizens) and from there, to visualize possibilities where their ethical identities could build a better world for everybody.

Similarly, pedagogical strategies and practices like drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry facilitate the process of authoring ourselves as teachers. Drama has the potential to promote authorship and dialogue through the enactments of activities that are
essentially chronotopes or possible times/spaces/relationships that invite us to reexamine the history of signs, theories, and utterances associated with our selves/values. Drama and art in general allow us to slow down a process of fossilization or finalized meaning through the collective construction of invented chronotopes that position us to explore situations and reposition our relationship to the utterances within those situations.

**Cultural-Historical Theory’s Basic Assumptions Related to Drama as a Pedagogy for Change in Individual and Collective Learning**

An attentive reading of Vygotsky reveals that the notion of authorship, usually associated with Bakhtin, is present in his philosophical reflections on education (e.g., Vygotsky, 1986). Whereas Bakhtin was concerned with how we form worlds and identities by authoring ourselves within multiple worlds/chronotopes, Vygotsky focused his reflective research activity on how we learn together through language, activity, and artifacts. Scholars in education working within the socio-cultural-historical tradition agree on the basic assumptions underlying the formulation of the pedagogical principles that guide their work (Holland & Valsiner, 1988; Wells, 2000; Wertsch, Del Rio & Alvarez, 2002). In this section I introduce my interpretation of the application of these pedagogical principles in drama pedagogy from my reading of Edmiston’s work and my lived experience in T&L 633. I expect to shed light on the role of authorship in drama as a pedagogy to promote human development; that is, the creation of culture and history.

**Human activity is always historically and culturally situated and mediated by artifacts.**

Human beings can modify their physical environment and their own mental states through the use of tools and artifacts. That is, humans can affect their own cognition and behavior (Holland & Valsiner, 1988). It is the interaction human-environment mediated
by the intentional use of artifacts what allows humans internalize the signs systems they have culturally created (Brunner, 1986). This is why Vygotsky (1978, 1986) claims that individual and societal changes are rooted in society and culture.

Internalization is a mental process by which individuals, based on experience, develop their own thinking while planning their own actions. Human action may be external and internal but it always implies purpose, reflection, and choice; otherwise, it is only motion (Wertsch, et al., 2002). Experience in dialogic paradigm is understood as synthesis of speech, action, and perception through meaning (Volosinov, 1986). From this process, new tools, signs, artifacts, and interactions amongst them emerge (Vygotsky, 1986). However, people do not go through this process in isolation but within a system of social relations framed in a historical context. When the individual understands and makes the tools-sings’ interactions his/her own to solve new problems or to deal with new situations, it can be said that the process of internalization has taken place (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000).

Artifacts are tangible objects or activities (tools) “made collectively into artifacts (symbols) by the attribution of meaning (Holland, et al., 2003, p. 50). Thus, artifacts are not the tools in themselves but the discourses they convey. This subtle distinction between tools and artifacts is crucial in a dialogic pedagogy because tools could be used in any pedagogy to attain a specific task. Artifacts afford making connections while developing HPFs. The lack of this distinction might be related to what Moll (1990) highlights as a poor application of Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD reduced to an instrumental instructional device that works as follows: 1. A level of difficulty is established, a bit challenging but not too difficult. 2. “The adult provides guided practice to the child with
a clear sense of the goal or outcome of the child performance” (p. 7). 3. Evaluating independent performance. As Moll asserts, “Clearly, standard instructional practices do not represent what Vygotsky meant by a zone of proximal development” (p. 8).

It is important to note that people have the ability to author not only artifacts but also themselves through their interaction with cultural artifacts. This authoring process is the realization of human’s unique possibility of becoming, of setting goal to attain, of creating figured worlds. It allows learning “how to position ourselves for ourselves” (Holland, et al., 2003, p. 64). Positioning gives us a space of freedom from where we liberate ourselves “from the tyranny of environmental stimuli” (Holland, et al., p. 64) to author our own discourses, that is, we can differentiate between the authoritative discourse that drives our decisions and those that are internally persuasive for us (Bakhtin, 2004).

Drama pedagogy uses discourses as artifacts to mediate activities to promote the development of HPFs. Drama pedagogy recognizes different sources of knowledge as legitimate. Participants should feel free and safe to make meanings and decisions. In drama enactments and other activities there is a constant struggle between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. The tension between these discourses is the target of the activities. The strategy is to invite students to elaborate artistic representations of the solution of a problem. For example, what would be the relevant content to be included in a website to promote world-wide peace? In this example what is important are the discourses not the actual fact of designing the website.
All higher mental functions are internalized social relationships.

The cultural historical approach assumes human development as “the transformation of the interpersonal into the intrapersonal” (Holland & Valsiner, 1988, p. 247). Vygotsky (1986) sees history and human development determined not only by the past but also for the future; actually, the ZPD is about the future. It is a space of possibilities that is lived as experience in existence, that is, by authoring meaning in interaction with Others. This characteristic is what allows that in the ZPD one could travel in time and establish dialogues (dialogic relationships). Imagination is fundamental in the ZPD because without it nothing changes. History and culture would not exist without imagination. This is why Vygotsky and Bakhtin’s theories give fundamental explanations that nurture the construction of a deeply human, liberating, and transformative pedagogy rooted on the elements that move us away from the animal condition: language, imagination, HPFs, and the notion of space/time.

In drama, the students are brought into a ZPD by demanding activities, hard questions, and requesting them to imagine; in other words, they are invited to imagine, recall, think, and analyze while creating solutions for big problems. In short, drama locates its pedagogical action at the microgenetic level, which it is the only level an educator can act. In drama pedagogy imagination, inquiry, and reflection are the essential elements. They are simultaneously resources and goals. They are lived experiences in interaction during the development of activities and actions.

A characteristic of drama pedagogy is that the historical context and environment are approached as “what if” realms to open spaces for possible relationships; that is, drama
pedagogy cares about the future because it is concerned with history. This is a pedagogical breakthrough.

*All consciousness is connected with the development of the word that is a direct expression of the historical nature of human consciousness.*

Vygotsky was interested in “meaning and the whole inward aspect of language” (Vygotsky, 1934, p.126). However, he accepted the central role of action (as the deed) that precedes, phylogenetically, the envelopment of the word.

Edmiston (2006) establishes an important distinction between action and activity that although connected can work apart. Activities like work, play, and teaching as meaningful contexts of action have been a traditional theoretical concern of the cultural-historical school for some sixty or seventy years (Engestrom, 1999; Holland, et al., 2003; Shepel, 1995).

Action involves ways of thinking. Reflection and inquiry are the backbone of drama pedagogy. It uses artistic representation of contents so curriculum is lived in existence, that is, with other in dialogue. Edmiston (1998) explains the way he applies the Bakhtinian notion of dialogue to attain ethical education through drama. For him, “in genuine “dialogue,” we imagine how the world looks from another’s perspective at the same time as we see from our own point of view. Now we see the world with “double consciousness” and as we act, or contemplate action, we do so in dialogue by keeping both this other’s viewpoint in mind as well as our own” (Edmiston, p. 58). Thus, not for proposing the students activities that imply to talk the teacher is promoting a dialogic interaction. Edmiston argues “*talk is not genuine dialogue (or be dialogic) unless students imagine the world from another’s point of view at the same time as they see from their own*” (italics added, Edmiston, p. 60).
**Human development is the outcome of the interrelation of the three dimensions of human development: phylogenetic, ontogenetic, and microgenetic.**

The phylogenetic dimension is the history of human consciousness since the emergence of the species Homo sapiens who has a special phylogenetic capacity: cultural mediation. Culture works as a tool that changes and builds human consciousness by decoding, reconstructing, and redeveloping forms of culture (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Bruner, 1986, 1996). The ontogenetic dimension is the individual history of development. It is the transition from direct forms of behavior to indirect mediated forms of behavior’s organization that lead to voluntary behavior. The essential moment of behavior’s organization is its objectivation, that is, its representation through the mediation of signs (Vygotsky, 1986). According to Bakhtin (2004) through the process of objectivation we liberate ourselves from the influence of the other’s discourse and develop our own. This is a fertile process that involves experimenting by questioning, putting discourses in new situations and discovering its boundaries. The microgenetic dimension refers to the development of a particular HPF or process during the development of a learning activity (Shepel, 1995). She notes that for development to take place reflection is crucial on condition that it involves “the processes of considering ways of acting as opposed to conditions of action” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 435). In other words, for Shepel only “knowing how” does not foster development because reflection is the human ability “to regard oneself or one’s own action as the other, as the subject of the purposeful change.” (Bakhtin, p. 435)
In sum, as Figure 1 shows, for Vygotsky (1978, 1986) the way to intentionally affect human development’s dimensions at the phylogenetic and ontogenetic levels is through the action (mental and movement) that integrate a particular activity (mycrogenetic dimension). In the act of authorship, the history of humanity and the history of individuals in dialogue encounter and produced the utterance (Vygotsky, 1978, Bakhtin, 1993, 2004, 2006). During such encounter both authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse enter (or not) into struggle.

**Professional Development Programs: The Presence and Absence of Authorship and Contexts for Learning**

In this section I begin by presenting an overview of professional development programs’ characteristics and implementations formats. Next, I consider the different orientations and models of professional development programs and how teachers may or may not be able to engage in practices of authorship.
Characteristics.

The profusion of lists of characteristics of high quality professional development makes evident that the field is evolving (AERA, 2005; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Choy, et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Glickman, et al., 2004; NCES, 2005; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley 1989; UNESCO, 2006; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). In this study I refer only to the public sector. Information in the literature review is usually discriminated by public and private sectors.

The criteria for designing professional development programs are: focus on content and teaching methods, duration, format, collective participation, alignment with standards, degree of coherence, and opportunities for active learning (NCES, 2005; AERA, 2005; Glickman, et al., 2004; Choy, et al., 2006). There is consensus on the key elements that define high-quality programs in terms of the reform of the 1990s versus inservice training. They are: professional development should reflect teachers and students’ needs; be a part of an overall plan of change; involve teachers in planning and developing opportunities; promote collaboration at the school level; and be evaluated for its impact on teaching practices and students’ learning. There is also agreement that there is a lack of research on the last feature (Cochran-Smith & fries, 2001; Choy, et al., 2006; Glickman, et al., 2004; Grossman, 2005; Hawley & Valli, 2001).

According to Choy, et al.’s (2006) report based on the 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) professional development for teachers are guided by official standards. They do not attend to teachers and students’ needs; in addition teachers’ work in isolation has increased. They highlight, for example, that “school schedules in the United States are generally inflexible and allow teachers little time for preparation,
planning, cooperation, or professional growth” (National Education Commission on Time and Learning [NECTL], 1994, in Choy, et al., p. 32). According to the SASS’s report, 59% of the survey’s respondents affirmed that their professional development focused on subject matter’s content to update information and 73% focused on teaching methods, particularly in highest poverty schools. The 94% attend traditional “short, stand-alone workshop on topics selected by schools and districts” (Choy, et al., 2006, p. 2). These workshops were eight hours long or less for more than 50% of the respondents. In addition, “activities did not involve collective participation or emphasize content, had limited content, and offer few active learning opportunities” (p. 3).

The traditional formats are: workshops, conference, training in teaching methods and new technologies. This means that the reform is using old formats even though policy makers recommended new ones such as: observational visits to other schools, individual or collaborative research on a topic of interest, regularly scheduled collaboration with other teachers, teachers’ network, and study groups (Choy, et al., 2006; Garet, et al., 2001; Glickman, et al., 2004). I find interesting that, according to SASS’s report, although overwhelmed by the burden or their work, data show that teaches are more interested and have conducted research and collaborated with other teachers than in taking courses or networking. That is, active roles are embraced.

Coaching, mentoring, and peer observation are the most common formats for new teachers, particularly in the highest poverty schools. More experienced teachers reported they participated with peers in matters of instruction, mostly at the elementary school level. Professional development sponsored by the school’s administration is in alignment with local standards and initiatives to change instructional practices. Around 50% of
principals considered local academic standards as very important influences on determining the content of teacher professional development activities and only 26% considered teacher’s preferences as a very important influence.

Regarding organization and management features such as: who decides the content, designing, planning, and conducting activities, the SASS found that teachers participated more in deciding content that in planning, and less in conducting them (Choy, et al., 2006). This finding is consistent with Fernández-Balboa & Marshall’s (1994) assertion that government’s institutions, policy makers, and administrative staffs decide on professional development.

Students’ achievement is measured by test scores. Test scores are assumed as indicators of professional development’s effectiveness. This is consistent with the finding that teachers selected as their priorities for future professional development their main subject field, use of technology in instruction and “were least likely to choose student assessment (Choy, et al., 2006, p. 69). Teachers’ selections seem to indicate that knowledge is thought of as a thing that could be transmitted, which makes evident that the 1990s’ reform is based on the positivist paradigm that does not recognized authorship.

Glickman, et al. (2004, pp. 369-397) present a list of characteristics of successful professional development programs. Although they include in those lists teacher’s participation in project decisions and in choosing goals and activities, they emphasize training, coaching, demonstrations, supervised trials and feedback from administrators. In short, there is a marked tendency to view professional development as the acquisition of knowledge and skill to “know how” doing teaching. This tendency is present even when describing action research (Glickman et al., 2004, pp. 427-448). It is not surprising
that in their studies Karst (1987) and Tetenbaum and Mulkeen (1987) found that teachers argue they receive “little substance from professional development programs” (in Glickman, et al., 2003, p. 371). Teachers also report they find better sources of growth outside the normal in-service training which are not related with their classroom’s realities and needs (Glickman, et al., 2003). These findings are also consistent with Choy, et al. (2006) that good professional development programs for teachers are not consistently provided.

According to the purposes of this dissertation, it is worthwhile to highlight that opportunities for active learning were not prevalent (National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2005). The 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) did not collect information to measure this feature of professional development. The opportunities for active learning pointed out by NCES (2005) are observation, planning, practicing and presenting, that is, on doing teaching.

**Implementation.**

Professional development programs for teachers have specific purposes and audiences. They are addressed to unqualified teachers; to upgrade teachers; to prepare teachers for new roles like the use of computers to impart education. They are also curriculum related when there are changes in the system like new methods of teaching officially promoted like constructivist approaches. Another instance is when teachers are willing or required to take a refresher course because their knowledge and practices became fossilized (NCES, 2005; Choy, et al., 2006; Sparks and Loucks-Horsley 1989; Inside Higher Ed. 2007).
Villegas-Reimers (2003) reports that when professional development focuses on ways of doing the rote application of activities do not change the conceptual approaches to teaching and learning is not altered. She also reports that when a cognitive-conceptual component is included the programs’ effect tended to triple compare to that merely trained practitioners in new techniques. At the same time, programs too theoretical or conceptual in nature, without any teaching techniques as models, are the least effective. These findings suggest that a program that follows a good dynamic equilibrium between theory and practice have a good chance to succeed.

There is a recent tendency to consider the needs of the school and communities when planning professional development programs. In fact, in many countries they are offered by the schools and carried out on their venues with positive results; however, the project and not the teacher’s growth and possibility to authoring themselves are the target (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). Furthermore, the content is not always what teacher needs (Glickman, et al., 2004).

Researchers such as Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Futrell et al., 1995; and McLaughlin & Oberman, 1999, in Villegas-Reimers, 2003) claim that “professional development that are not embedded in a major reform of structures, policies, and organizations have not been successful because changing teachers without changing contexts, beliefs, and structures rarely creates a significant change (McLaughlin & Oberman, 1999, in Villegas-Reimers, 2003, pp. 25 -26). This claim, I argue, does not recognize teachers and students’ agency in educational processes because of their authorship. For example, Futrell et al. (1995 in Villegas-Reimers, 2003) identifies seven factors that affect the relationship between educational reform and
teachers’ professional development. They are of administrative related nature. They are: local focus on needs and solutions, funding, local school and district leadership, long-range planning, time, collegiality, and inclusion of teachers and their professional development as a way to increase the “likelihood that the reform will be successful” (p.27).

The literature review on professional development programs for teachers shows that thorough qualitative and quantitative descriptions like Villegas-Reimers (2003) and Choy, et al. (2006), respectively; or critical ones like Darling-Hammond (2000) are not enough to project future professional development programs whose goal is authorship. They are prescriptive and do not show or seems to see possibilities outside the positivist paradigm’s approaches. Official quantitative studies are focused on responding to immediate problems. They make diagnosis of current problems without a socio-cultural historical approach. Consequently, they do not shed light on the reasons that explain why the problematic situation came about, e.g., students’ low academic achievement. They do not take into account alternative ways that could have been taken. Examples are “A Nation at Risk” report of 1983 (Spring, 2004).

These arguments seem to undervalue what happens in the classroom and within every author/creator. They highlight openly visible socio-economical factors like funding as determinant of classrooms relationships. Dialogic pedagogy’s advocates recognize the incidence of external factors in the classroom; however, researchers have analyzed discourses that are embodied in the classroom from a poststructural approach such as discourses of the body (Nespor, 1997); sexuality (Kumashiro, 2000); power relations (Bloome, et al., 1989); positioning (Enciso, 2001); intertextuality and intercontextuality
(Franquiz, 1999); and Ethical identities (Edmiston, 2000, 2006; Shepel, 1995). Their findings show that formal education could contribute to its improvement and the society’s at large from the micro level of the classroom’s activities. They tend to focus on learning as a way to improve teaching. They recognize improving learning as the challenge for professional development programs. Although focused on the microgenetic level, they connect the classroom activity with the local, national, and international context (Davidov, 1995; Shepel, 1995).

Orientations and Models of Professional Development Programs for Teachers

In general, professional development programs for teachers are framed within orientations from which models of change can be generated. Some models have given way to the development of traditions for their implementation; in turn, activities are designed according to these traditions. In a sense, many teachers experience a fossilized version of teacher change and educational improvement. Others, however, encounter more ‘transgressive’ programs of change. The range and meaning of these programs and their relationship with an overview of professional development models is presented here.

Orientations.

Researchers agree that professional development programs for teachers are framed within the following orientations: academic, practical, technical, personal, critical inquiry, and dialogic.

The academic orientation seeks to update and broaden the teacher’s knowledge of the subject matter (AERA, 2005; Choy, et al., 2006; NCES, 2005). The practical orientation
focuses on teachers’ artistry and classroom technique (AERA, 2005). Teachers are expected to learn new teaching methods (Choy, et al., 2006; NCES, 2005). They are
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**Figure 2. Professional Development Programs for Teachers: Orientations and Models.**

based on an apprenticeship model of preparation. The underlying belief is that

“Instructional practices are improved if a colleague or other person observes a teacher’s classroom and provides feedback” (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley 1989, p. 1). The technical orientation assumes that the teacher’s role is to ask questions and control behavior.
Consequently, its focuses are how to discipline the students and classroom management. In these orientations, knowledge is reified. They are based on the behaviorist model of teaching which better matches neo-liberal economic policies on education (Apple, 2004; Choy, et al., 2006; Cochran-Smith & Freis, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1995; Grossman, 2005; Whitty, 1997).

The personal orientation is focused on interpersonal relationships. The teacher is view as an adviser. However, it does not prioritize one of the school’s main roles: to develop HPFs while building knowledge. Advocates of the critical inquiry orientation argue that curriculum should promote democratic values and the development of critical and reflective practices. They also see the teacher as an agent of social change (Villegas-Reimers, 2003; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley 1989). Ellsworth’s (1992) often cited article Why doesn’t this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy explains some of the shortcomings of this orientation in regards to authorship. She points out that critical pedagogues used authoritarian pedagogical practices based on hierarchical relations of power between teachers and students and the validation of scientific reason as the only legitimate knowledge to talk about empowerment, student’s voice, and dialogue. She highlights that the underlying discourse in these practices is if you do not think like me you are wrong.

While I agree with Ellsworth (1992) and Kumashiro’s (2000) critiques to critical pedagogy, I think important to note that the first generation of critical pedagogy scholars was more concerned with the development of the conceptual framework of the field (Apple, 1993, 1996; McLaren, 2003a, 2003b; Halsey, Lauder, Brown, & Stuart 1997). Their developments and reflections on the socio-political-economical role of the school
illuminated their followers. Their works pave the way for the development of the *dialogic orientation*. Ellsworth’s (1992) “*pedagogy of the unknowable*” illustrates what the *dialogic orientation* is about. This pedagogy recognizes that individual and affinity groups have only partial narratives; however, together these different discourses make us stronger. They constitute forces for change and creation. A central assumption in this pedagogy is that nothing could be known from a single master discourse. All knowledge is partial and subjects make sense from their position within changing historical contexts. In addition, making sense is both rational and emotional. As Ellsworth (1992) asserts, making-sense is a political action.

### Models.

Researchers agree on the characterization of the following models:

*Enculturation or socialization into the professional culture model.*

It focuses on classroom management, student’s discipline, and students’ performance and evaluation (Choy, et al., 2006). The *coaching-mentoring model* is the most used application of this model. *Mentoring* is a short-term form of coaching for beginners (NCES, 2005; Wang and Odell, 2002). Models of mentoring are: *Apprenticeship* (Choy, et al., 2006); *observation and assessment* (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989); *competence* (the mentor relates training and assessment to pre-determined standards of practice) (Choy, et al., 2006; NCES, 2005); and, *reflective* (the mentor is the “critical friend”). In general, the purposes of these models are “provide formal induction or mentoring programs to help new teachers adjust to their teaching responsibilities and to familiarize them with school programs, policies, and resources” (Choy, et al., 2006, p. 43).
The relationship expert teacher-novice teacher makes evident the urgent need to give relevance to authorship. The novice teachers lack teaching experience; however, they do not lack pedagogical content knowledge. Studies have shown that when working together in teams, the novice teachers, if allowed, come up with innovations, creative activities full of imagination (Glickman, et al., 2004). In addition, “Research has found that the pressure experienced by first-time teachers when trying to integrate a new school usually explain how they can, in a manner of speaking, abandon what they learned in their initial preparation as teachers, or their own exploration of their personal teaching style” (Villegas-Reimers, 2003,p. 44). The novice teacher is obligated to abandon “new theories” or to quit. I disagree with Calderhead and Shorrock’s (1997) claim that “during initial training and their first few years in the classroom many teachers, perhaps even the majority, experience difficulties in learning to teach” (p. 8 in Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p.44). Instead, I argue based on my own experience as teacher and my alumni’s in Colombia, that they find difficult is to adapt to traditional school culture, particularly with regard to the norm that control and regulate the body under the form of disciplinary rules (Nespor, 1997; Foucault, 1984b).

*Technical or knowledge and skills model.*

It is addressed to develop new teaching skills such as higher order questioning, inquiry teaching and group work. The components of this model are: Exploration of theories through lectures, discussions and readings, demonstrations of skills through videos and lived training, practice under simulated conditions, feedback provided by peers under guidance; collective assessment and self-assessment through reflection,
coaching during actual implementation in the classroom (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley 1989; Choy, et al., 2006; AERA, 2005).

**Teaching as a moral endeavor model.**

This model focuses on a method of teaching which involves: Caring for young children, taking students’ interest into consideration, preparing children to be a part of a future society, influencing the way they relate to each other (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). Choy, et al., 2006) add addressing the needs of students with disabilities.

**Reflective model.**

In this model, teachers are viewed as reflective practitioners. It builds on teachers’ personal experiences in the classrooms. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley 1989 called this model “Individually Guided Development” (p.1). Its basic assumptions are: Teacher’s commitment to serve the students’ interest are reflected on the student’s wellbeing, a professional obligation to review one’s practice to improve one’s teaching, and to continue improving one’s practical knowledge. Traditions of reflecting thinking are: Academic (focused on the representation of the subject matter to students to promote understanding); social efficiency (focused on the use of generic teaching strategies identified in research on teaching); developmentalist (focused on students’ processes of learning, development, and understanding); and, social deconstructionist (focused on issues of equality and justice and the social conditions of schooling). The following forms of reflection are used: Technical (how to adjust curriculum and teaching to a particular situation), practical (what are the means and purposes of particular actions), and critical (what children should be learning and why) (AERA, 2005; Villegas-Reimers, 2003).
Bakhtin (2006) notes that understanding “is always dialogic to some degree” (p. 111). It implies a level of authorship because what we comprehend is another’s word or any particular sign system presented to us that always has an author. He argues further that social scientific research’s positivist explanations weaken understanding because they frequently reify mankind’s acts and thoughts. He claims that maximum understanding takes place when there is reflection on a reflection on a text, which is “a subjective reflection of the objective world; the text is an expression of consciousness” (Bakhtin, p. 113). Therefore, what we learn from reality are texts (Bakhtin, 2006; Volosinov, 1986). Bakhtin’s (2006) argument is crucial: “No natural phenomenon has “meaning,” only signs (including words) have meaning. Therefore, any study of signs, regardless of the direction in which it may subsequently proceed, necessarily begins with understanding” (p. 113).

**Project-based model.**

The project-based model is intended to develop teacher’s capacity to work independently and collaboratively as a reflective professional on concrete projects like developing materials. Its components are: Reflection on experience, literature review, and discussions with peers. The model seeks to prepare for leadership at the level of the classroom and school through their involvement in a developmental or improvement process (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). However, as she notes, findings show teachers learn more when a great portion of the course is dedicated to practical activities, researchers have found that this learning is “more effective when they are coached by a tutor following completion of the course.” (p. 107). Therefore, the model does not seem to
promote becoming independent one of the main components of the dialogic orientation and indicators of authorship.

**Action research model.**

The action research model is a form of inquiry which involves investigation, reflection, and action in order to perform self-evaluation to reach critical awareness, and to build knowledge. It is aimed at improving teaching and learning in the school. It is a delivered planned action to improve the conditions for teaching and learning. Researchers like Edmiston and Wilhelm (1996); Ellsworth (1992); UNESCO (2005); Villegas-Reimers (2003); and Ward (1994) have found that action research lead to develop one of the key issues to attain educational change: changing the way one thinks about something and the content of one’s thoughts. Bakhtin (2004) asserts this is one of the features of internally persuasive discourses and of authorship.

**Writing as a means or tool for reflection.**

Villegas-Reimers (2003) reports that some researchers use teachers’ narratives and journals to promote professional development. Narratives allow the authors to be “able to ‘step outside’ of their own personal experiences and perceive/analyze themselves as any other teacher in a particular learning and teaching instance” (p. 112). Teachers use writing to record observations, play with various perspectives, analyze teachers’ own practices, interpret their understandings, and to reconstruct experiences. It is worthwhile to note that writing is already a reflective process (Edmiston & Enciso, unpublished; Ward, 1994; Smagorinsky, 1994). Therefore, this model promotes authorship.
**Collaboration with other teachers.**

This model takes different formats. The most used are teacher centers where teachers meet to hold professional dialogues on planning or to create innovations or educational materials. Another format mentioned by Choy, et al. (2006) and Glickman, et al. (2004) is networks of teachers where “teachers from different schools share information, concerns, and accomplishments and engage in common learning through computer links, newsletters, fax machines, and occasional seminars and conferences” (Glickman, et al., 2003, p. 375).

**Community of practice.**

I have identified this model in the literature review. I labeled after Wenger’s (1998) community of practice theory because of the teachers’ attitude, behaviors, and the way they organize their interactions spontaneously in non-institutionalized spaces. Evidence shows that when teachers come together to reflect and discuss their practices, no matter if they work in different schools, teach different subject matters, or teach at different levels, school change is possible (Villegas-Reimers, 2003, pp 80-83).

**Transgressive model of teachers’ professional development.**

I have identified in the literature review two models that have been recognized for their transformative potential. They are LEADS – Mt. Olivet Baptist Church partnership in Columbus, Ohio, and Reggio Emilia preschools and teacher education in Italy.

Seidl and Friend (2002) describe the foundations of a long-term and mutually beneficial partnership between LEADS M. Ed. (Literacy Education and Diverse Settings Master of Education), a teacher education program at The Ohio State University, and Mt. Olivet Baptist Church in Columbus. The purpose of this partnership was to provide to
prospective teachers, who are predominantly White, the opportunity to learn in a real life setting how to *work with* the African American community, which constitutes a high percentage of the students’ population they are going to teach.

The program is epistemologically coherent with and supported on the socio-cultural-historical approach. It is conceived as an ethical political project with a clear position facing racism. Faculty leaders took the risk to develop this program in the context of a church, which is a transgression in America due to the mandatory separation between the state and the church. The program emerged from a local social need: “More than half of the children attending city schools are African American” (p. 143). It also emerged from a reflexive process: Traditional practices such as observation and short visits reinforced stereotypes, fear, and mistrust and coursework readings are not enough to prepare teachers able to face the challenges of working with children from diverse cultures different from the White’s.

Based on a poststructural analysis, they identified as the key issue regarding the failure of university’s programs in preparing teachers able to deal with socioculturally relevant pedagogies: Americans, particularly Whites, live monocultural lives. In this way, an issue that is usually narrowed to the teacher-students relationship where either the teacher or the students are blamed for the failures acquired a socio-political-economical-historical dimension that transcends the school and the present. Thus, the first step before approaching the Mt. Olivet Baptist community, was to understand through planned meetings and discussions how the status quo “prevent us from coming to know one another and from forging the caring relationships that would allow us to see through one
another’s eyes to understand diverse realities; ultimately, they prevent us from working as allies toward a socially just society” (Seidl & Friend, 2002).

Working under an agreed equal-status relationship with the community, they set as aim of the partnership a commitment to social transformation and as purpose to prepare teachers for diverse classrooms. They took into account what literature review says about other programs’ failures and shortcomings regarding universities’ relationship with institutionalized communities like churches. They design the program in terms of relationships between people being inquiry and research a part of such interaction. In other words, it was research with people not on them. Therefore, they had to re-conceptualize traditional research and decided to assume a form of “cooperative inquiry” which is essentially emancipatory because all those involve are co-researchers in the sense that they participate with their voices and experiences in the decision making processes.

They were well aware that nurturing trust, reciprocity, and equal status were not given but challenges. To accomplish these goals, crucial for the success of the experience, they altered traditional hierarchical power relations between university and communities. During the development of the program, during 15 months for two or three hours a week, prospective teachers were placed as learners in different settings that are part of the African American students’ educational situations. They could choose to participate in the planning and implementation of different programs: formal schooling for children; after schools assistance with homework; tutoring reading and math, Sunday school; and, unity circle discussions. In this way, different sources and forms of knowledge like students and children’ narratives and community’s metaphors regarding
the improvement of their children performance in formal education like “pushing” meaning encouragement and support were considered legitimate (Seidl, 2007). In addition, crucial concepts like caring and respect for the students and curriculum development were de-constructed, re-conceptualized, and re-articulated through a process involving: interrogating, understanding, interpreting, reinterpreting, and imagining (Seidl, 2007). In this way, caring and respect the student led to develop with them rigorous curricula even for out of classroom activities such as tutoring during after school programs. Seidl’s (2007) report describes a way to implement/enact professional development from a socio-cultural-historical-dialogic perspective. She highlights the central role that writing as a process of stepping outside to reflect plays in professional development. As a reader, I highlight in this program there was not an emphasis on subject matter, or on knowing how to do teaching but on learning how to build the type of relations that make democracy a lived experience.

Reggio Emilia is an Italian city that more than 40 years ago created a school system for children from birth to six years old pursuing good education for all. Since the beginning, they recognize the ethical political dimensions of education. In order to understand Reggio Emilia process of professional development it is necessary to know their conception of teacher, student, curriculum development, and learning. Teachers at Reggio are considered “an intellectually curious person who rejects a passive approach to knowledge and prefers to construct knowledge together with others rather than simply to ‘consume’ it” (Rinaldi, p. 135). They have coined the term ‘rich child’ in contrast with the dominant image of the of “the ‘poor’, ‘weak’, or ‘innocent’ child, spoken of in terms of deficit, immaturity, fragility or cuteness” (Dahlberg & Moss, 2006, p. 13). At Reggio
Emilia all children are considered citizens and intelligent; meaning they are viewed as always able to make meaning of the world as active participants in the construction of knowledge. Therefore, all children have the right to be heard. Accordingly, teachers have developed the ‘pedagogy of listening’. They see teaching as sharing meaning, “learning is the emergence of that which was not there before” (Rinaldi, p. 141), and curriculum is not a rigid plan to be followed but lived in communication and interaction between the participants in the educational process including parents and the general community.

Throughout the years they have developed a body of theory and practice that is reflected and refracted in their pedagogical praxis. Here lies what I found particularly interesting and highlight as a transgressive way to approach teachers’ professional development defined by Rinaldi (2006) as “simply learning: our job is to learn why we are teachers” (p. 141). These developments have been attained by teachers through a process that involves a series of actions they call: observation, documentation, and weekly discussions for re-cognition. All these actions are recognized as value-laden, never neutral, and although perform by an individual they emerge from interaction with Others who construct reality from different points of view and share meanings. Accordingly, observation is “not an individual action but a reciprocal relationship: an action, a relationship, a process that makes us aware of what is taking place” (Rinaldi, 2006, p. 128). Documentation is the gathering of materials “during the process of learning-teaching enacted in the classroom” (Rinaldi, p. 62). These materials are read and interpreted after the facts in the weekly meetings that follow the dynamic described by Wenger (1998) of communities of practices. These materials are texts that teachers use as
tool for recalling, reexamine, analyze, and reconstruct. They write their reflections in journals that are the prime source for the theory building process.

**Summary.**

Analyzing the models according to the notion of authorship, I realized they go along a continuum from the coaching-mentoring model, carried out according to fixed standards, to community of practices where participation is spontaneous and learning and assessment are part of the dynamic of the interactions. I have also realized that regardless of the orientation’s goals, professional development programs, with the exception of the dialogical orientation, are carried out following the enculturation or socialization model. This model does not lead to teacher’s authorship; consequently, teachers are not treated as professionals from a dialogic approach. Instead, this model is inspired in the metaphors of teaching as a craft and teachers as workers; thus, it is based on “know how” supported on theories on learning framed within the positivist paradigm. Pedagogical strategies are seen as recipes for success. Professional development is usually implemented through one-day workshop formats (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Choy, et al., 2006; Glickman, et al., 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Wang & Odell, 2002).

In contrast, as Figure 2 shows, the dialogic orientation presents a variety of models such as: knowledge and skill model, reflective model, action research, writing as a main tool for reflection, community of practices, collaboration with other teachers, drama pedagogy, and transgressive models. The dialogic orientation builds on the recognition of human beings’ authorship as the capacity to make meaning and to create possible cultures and histories.
Overview of Drama Pedagogy

Drama pedagogy is a developing field that began in the UK with Henry Caldwell Cook’s book “The Play Way” published in 1917. However, it is from the 1960 onward with the leading work of Dorothy Heathcote that drama began its development (Edmiston & Enciso, 2003; Wright, 1985). To date, drama has extended internationally, in particular to Norway, North America, and Australia (Dorion, 2009; Edmiston & Enciso, 2003; Taylor, 1996). The field has two approaches to classroom drama: monologic and dialogic (Edmiston & Enciso, 2003). The monologic approach assumes drama as a subject matter whose central activity is “acting out” (O’Hara, 1984). Advocates of this trend follow in teachers’ training what Wright (1985) calls “the learning about drama” approach that essentially “involves teaching prospective teachers a sequence of activities to do with children.” (p. 205). The dialogic approach follows the “learning through drama” approach (Wright, 1985). They use drama as a medium to lead the students to reflect, imagine, and make sense of events of everyday life and of the world (Edmiston, 2003). It is to this approach that the following section makes reference.

The dialogic approach to classroom drama is known under different names. Edmiston and Enciso (2003) mention: “classroom drama, drama in education, educational drama, drama education, creative drama, process drama, teaching and learning with drama, or just drama” (p. 874). It has different emphasis such as Dorion’s (2009) drama in science pedagogy and Edmiston and Wilhelm’s (1998) dialogic teaching (Dorion, 2009). What follows is focused on the later. In general, researchers agree that drama pedagogy’s activities “support learning of cognitive, affective and technical objectives, especially
higher order thinking skills relating to analysis, synthesis, and evaluation” (Dorion, 2009, p. 2248).

Scholars like Edmiston (2003), Edmiston and Wilhelm (1996, 1998), Wright (1985) agree that the value of drama in education relies on the possibility to reflect in two worlds at once: the everyday world and an imagined one (Edmiston, 2003; Wright, 1985). The value of imagined contexts is that we author them. In so doing, through figured worlds, we create history for we can provoke changes in culture and, eventually, change the type of society.

Drama’s simplest definition is “wondering, what if…?” (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998, p. 3). Edmiston (1998) highlights the value of drama relies on the fact that “In drama students take action and in imagination do (italics in original) that which in discussion they might only sketchily contemplate.” (p. 59). Furthermore, in drama students “also reflect on the meanings of actions as they consider the consequences for different people” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 60). In this sense, drama education serves as mediator in the relationship between ethics and imagination. Bakhtin (2004) assume ethics as the art of living as truly human; that is, being always in the process of becoming thanks to the interaction of language and imagination essential for all human creations, including ourselves. Ethics take shape in people’s minds through the awareness of our shared existence that Bakhtin (2004) calls “otherness.” Edmiston, (1998) argues that reflection is dialogic when student evaluate critically the other’s actions and their own “and wonder what they would have done in similar situations” (p.60). He argues, “It is only when students internally experience conflicting points of view that drama exists” (p. 83).
In using drama, authorship, imagination and inquiry intertwine. Drama process uses as pedagogical strategies inquiry and play relying on imagination. Inquiry is the human capacity and natural attitude to wonder about the world. Inquiry focuses on relations. When we inquiry we always ask about how something came about? Why it happens? Therefore, underlying inquiry there are always questions about relations. When one inquires, one imagines an answer, that is, one creates in imagination relations that explain the event object of our curiosity. However, ways to satisfy our curiosity could be formalized as in the scientific method.

The socio-cultural-historical tradition facilitates the understanding of the relationship between play and imagination in education. Bronowski (1974); Caillios, 2001; Edmiston (2006); Holland, et al., (2003); and Vygotsky (1978) agree on the role of play in education. They think of play as essential for human’s cognitive development. Bronowski (1974) asserts “when a child begins to play games with things that stand for other things…he enters the gateway to reason and imagination together” (p. 120). The child discovers new relations between things by blending speculation and insights.

Holland, et al. (2003) and Edmiston (2006) stand out the importance of play as pedagogy for “The social practices of ‘acting otherwise’ becomes the ground for our ‘thinking otherwise’”. Holland, et al., (2003) note that by mastering play we master our imagination. They claim that play has pedagogical and epistemological value to create ‘figured worlds’ in which imagination becomes embodied and, eventually, reshape selves and lives. Figured worlds become materialized through “repeated” participation. In this way, they afford the transformation of reality. It is important to note that one of the main characteristics of play is its endless repetitions, none of which is identical to another.
because authorship keeps us in a permanent becoming. Participants get engaged with the same playful attitude as if every time were the first time (Caillois, 2001). Thus, in children’s play the Bakhtinian notion of authorship is made evident. In fact, following Bakhtin (1993, 2004) every time a child play the same is a new one because the child in his/her process of becoming is different from the one who has played the game before.

Drama offers the advantage to be suitable for all ages and simultaneously to maintain the essence of play. Edmiston’s (2006) notion of play explains this feature of drama. He argues play is “a function of our attitude; we are playing when we have a ‘play attitude’ as opposed to a ‘survival attitude’” (p. 13). So understood, playing is “an attitude toward any activity” (p. 14) and we are playing whenever we adopt a “what if” attitude and act “as if” we, the Other, or the context were different from the actual ones. Play is an approach to action, not a form of activity” (p. 13). This attitude is favored by and simultaneously is the outcome of other characteristics of play such as spontaneous participation and getting engaged as the activity develops. Caillois (2001) argues that during its development the rules that are part of the play’s dynamic, not to control the game, can be adjusted or changed according to the needs of the participants; for instance, children playing “hopscotch” adapt the rules to the age and physical capabilities of the participants.

Under this conceptualization of play, “if” is a dimension that allows the players to create new possible relations among subjects and objects, and more important, new ways of being. Players are able to imagine the impossible and make it reality in imagination. In this sense, I argue, play is equivalent to what Einstein called “thought experiments” (Valentzas, Halkia & Skordoulis, 2005). It is worthwhile to note that in science the
greatest discoveries have emerged from wondering “what if” (Bronowski, 1974; Valentzas, et al., 2005; Waldrop.1992).

Bronowski (1974) claims that imagination is the human mind’s specifically gift that allows creating in our minds, through symbolic vocabulary, not one but many futures but some may never come to exist. In contrast, animals are imprisoned in the present due to their lack of symbolic ideas; therefore, he argues, the characteristic gift which makes us human is the power to work with symbolic images: the gift of imagination. In the same line of thinking, Greene (2000) argues imagination is what allows us to imagine “being otherwise”. This is the way we create history. She argues that imagining things otherwise is the first step toward acting on the belief that things can be changed. She asserts that thanks to our social imagination, that is, the “capacity to invent visions of what should be and what might be in our deficient society” (Greene, p. 5) we can imagine through dialogue humane classrooms where every learner’s potential is recognized. In so doing, imaginative teachers will “open pathways toward better ways of teaching and better ways of life” (Greene, p. 12). She highlights the need to recover imagination to lessen “the social paralysis we see around us and restores the sense that something can be done in the name of what is decent and humane” (Greene, p. 35). Nevertheless, she calls us to be advised “the role of imagination is not to resolve, not to point the way, not to improve. It is to awaken, to disclose the ordinarily unseen, unheard, and unexpected” (Greene, p. 28). In short, for Greene imagination and learning are basic for the transformation of the self and consequently for everything that depends on human agency.

Regardless of the advantages that imagination has brought to humankind, it is important that educators take into account the following considerations that Sounders
(1962) highlights. He distinguishes between creative imagination and imitative imagination as two poles. Creative imagination is capable of creating images of what is not present yet in the physical world. Their materials are ideas expressed in words. With them, the mind makes a re-synthesis of previous experiences; however, we develop these new images “by understanding the principles underlying the experiences taking place within the creative mind” (Saunders, 1962, p. 13). Thus, understanding both the principles at work in the event object of the experience and the mental process the person is going through is necessary to develop the creative mind; only then, we might say that a learning experience took place. Without fulfilling this condition, the result is recall and imitation without understanding.

Scholars within the field of drama in education like Edmiston (1998) and Heathcote (1985) agree with Sounders (1962) that the development of a child’s creative imagination requires not a limitless expression but a guided freedom of his/her expression. Sounders (1962) also highlights the danger of an imitative imagination without ethical concepts because it “will follow whichever creative imagination seems the strongest leader” (Sounders, p. 14). I think Saunders’ concern target our ethical responsibility as educators not only with the child in front of us in the classroom but also with the historical child hundreds of miles away, with the child in the future everywhere.

Edmiston (2000, 2006) has developed his theory using his own experiences and the scholarship of others in the ongoing study of dramatic inquiry. In a lecture during T&L 633 (summer, 2007), he explained the essence of dramatic inquiry is to reflect in imagination multiplicity of points of view and their possible consequences. Through drama, for instance, Edmiston (2000; 2006) invites people to step outside the binary right
and wrong or good and bad; instead, they are encouraged, with the mediation of critical thinking (reflection) to authoring argumentations with the Other, that is, dialogically. Edmiston (2006) applies what for Morson and Emerson (1990) is an ethical imperative that Bakhtin offers: “one should address others with a presumption that they are capable of responding meaningfully, responsibly, and, above all, unexpectedly” (italics in original) (p. viii).

In a Carmen posting, Dr. Edmiston introduces the notion of “inquiry as an organizing principle in the classroom. Inquiry leads us into dialogue; authentic, critical conversations; negotiations; raising questions and questioning answers. When is it worth it? When not?” (Jun 12, 2007). For him “inquiry is the exploration of problems and questions that arise for you and though they can be negotiated, they cannot be given.” (Jun 12, 2007). Dramatic inquiry focuses on what might be. It focuses on learning processes more than on teaching. When learning is the focus, the pedagogical strategies adjust to students needs and teaching is improved. He makes clear the relationship between drama and inquiry: “Finally, I actually see all educational uses of drama as always what I call dramatic inquiry -- so the two are complementary for me and are less the application of drama to inquiry and more the imaginative and dramatic enactment of the ideas that inquiry raises as carried into possible actions and their possible answers” (Brian Edmiston, Carmen posting on Jun 21, 2007).

*The reflection on the literature review led me to understand drama pedagogy as a metaphor to mean a pedagogy that seeks to understand and interpret events from different points of view. These are not only possible because every participant has his/her own point of view but also because everyone has the opportunity to imagine that they are*
other people and “take on” roles in an imagined world (Edmiston, 2003). In drama, Edmiston (2003) points out, “participants use their social and cultural imagination to create a shared imagined world. The imagined world does not replace the everyday classroom world; but rather begins to be created alongside the everyday world. Teacher and students interact in both worlds simultaneously, and as necessary, they move back and forth between them at will” (Heathcote, 1975, in Edmiston, 2003, p. 2). This possibility brings the theatrical dimension into drama that allows participants being addressed and answerable as a possible you but at the same time having the opportunity to address and answer Others from their self/others position. In terms of Bakhtin (2004) this is known as double consciousness.

Thus, by definition drama pedagogy is different from traditional pedagogies. Drama brings the need to reflect on the role of the aesthetic experience, closely related to emotions and values, to develop curricula (Guimaraes Lima, 1995; O’Neill, 1996). As Guimaraes Lima (1995) highlights, for Vygotsky art is a process of transformation not only of the material that gives form and content to the work of art but also of the artist and the spectator who live the aesthetic experience. According to Guimaraes Lima’s (1995) reading of Vygotsky, art “by overcoming the restricted circle of ordinary experience, it prepares the subject for a qualitative reshaping of experience itself; it unsettles and project us toward new personal and social horizons.” (p. 421). This is coherent with Edmiston’s assertion that using drama is “to do more than a rote application of strategies” because it “inevitably leads a teacher to some re-examination of his/her identity including assumptions about teaching and learning and relationships with students” (TPS).
Drama’s teaching strategies.

Edmiston defines in a Carmen posting drama as: “Drama is pretend play among children and adults where the adults not only play along with the children but in dialogue shape the play.” (Brian Edmiston, Jun 11, 2007). He also points out that to shape the play teachers use strategies such as focusing, raising a question, pressing for a decision, introducing a character. The questions and perspectives give focus and direction to the activities. Simultaneously, they open the space for possible alternative ways to solve a problem or answer an inquiry question as participants in the activity ask new questions and come with new ideas that form what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) metaphorically call a “rhizome”. A rhizome similar to the roots of a tree allows life. It not only has points of connection and linkages that can be observed but also plausible and provisional ones which justifies that in drama pedagogy there are no right or wrong answers but better or stronger arguments.

Edmiston and Wilhelm (1998) mention various activities they have developed to implement drama pedagogy: “teacher in role, interviews, radio shows, rituals, narrative, choral montage, dramatic play, frozen pictures, and teaching techniques (questioning, pair work, small group work)” (p. 12). These activities are developed working in small or whole-class groups (Edmiston, 1998). It is worthwhile to note that the teaching strategies that Dr. Edmiston has developed through his research work are reported throughout his written work. I have summarized a great deal of these strategies for this dissertation to analyze data (See Appendix A). In the following I present my synthesis.

The first strategy is to invite and get students consent to enter into the drama. Without students’ consent any drama is fate to fail (Edmiston, 1998). Next, he recommends
making a list of the topics and issues of the students’ interest. Narrowing the list down, through debate, until consensus is reached, facilitates the development of the enactments because in drama students take action as if they were other people, “as if they are elsewhere” (Edmiston & Wilhelm1998, p. 6). This allows them to create “alternative worlds and world views to explore in dialogue” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 64). Edmiston and Enciso (unpublished) highlight the use of the strategy “to steep inside and outside of texts” (Edmiston, p.1). They make clear that “drama does not have to be used over long periods of time” (Edmiston, p. 2) but as needed to promote students’ engagement with reading.

To facilitate critical thinking and reflection, Edmiston (1998) suggests the performance of tableaus to represent the relationships amongst elements. This strategy is helpful to assist students to imagine possible relationships and possible futures. The same mental processes are promoted by the strategy to make analogies. This consists on comparing the values that underlie two situations that apparently are not related to each other (Edmiston, 1998).

Another strategy that Edmiston uses frequently is re-contextualize, that is, to create conditions that allow looking at one event in a new way. He uses artifacts (handouts, stories, and objects) as pivots to provoke students’ thinking. In addition, since re-contextualization requires information this strategy facilitates the acquisition of new information and building new knowledge.

Strategies to develop ethical thinking are, for example, asking the students to write diary entries from different points of view, from different points in time (past, present, and future), to imagine different scenarios (past, present, future, worst, best, possible,
including or excluding some elements, and so on). These strategies can be used in combination (Edmiston, 1998). As Langer (1953, p. 307) argues “A present filled with its own future” is the unique dramatic experience (in Edmiston, 1998, p. 80). Also, re-enacting historical episodes to be analyzed and criticized by “experts” like historians, anthropologist, journalist, etc. (Edmiston, 1998; Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998).

To provoke intense ethical dialogue Edmiston uses the strategy of resisting the students’ arguments to press them to explain themselves further (Edmiston, 1998). He ventriloquates, in the Bakhtinian sense of the word, the students’ current and previous beliefs on an issue to make them object of critic. Ventriloquation is a strategy for people to hear from Other their discourses. It is effective for critically analyzing authoritative discourse that for being fossilized has stop meaning.

Inquiry has a central role in drama pedagogy. It is promoted through key questions. These are questions that are addressed to bring to light previous knowledge, provoke critical thinking, reflection, and more inquiry questions. Key question are labeled according to the intention for their formulation (Morgan & Saxton, 1994). The underlying assumption is that by making meaning the person is inspired not only to ask questions but also to ask questions on the questions such as “What do I want this question to do?” (p. 41): elicit information, shape understanding, or promote reflection?

Edmiston and Enciso (unpublished) identify “engaging questions” those that invite the students to be in possible worlds or situations; for example, “what if I were…?” They also identify as “exploring questions” those that invite the students to look for reasons and make arguments; for example: “Why would a person act like that?” “What if they had done something different?” and “How would I have acted (or reacted) if I had been in
those situations encountered by the characters in the narrative?” (Edmiston & Enciso, p. 3). Edmiston and Wilhelm (1998) identify as “authentic questions” those formulated by the students out of their curiosity that usually are not contemplated in the official curriculum. For example, inquiring about castles, the students asked: “What about bathrooms?” “What could people do if they did not like the king?” “What did the people eat?” It is expected that key questions provoke significant or deep conversations that lead the students to “change the ethical ways they view the world and themselves” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 83).

**Edmiston’s Approach to Drama Pedagogy and the Socio-Cultural-Historical Tradition**

Vygotsky and Bakhtin never met each other but they shared the same concrete historical context: the Russia of the 1920s and 1930s (Holquist, 2004a, 2004b; Wertsch, et al., 2002). The paradigm of their time led them to develop discourses about language, existence, experience, “the Other,” and the spiral of time or fullness of time as Bakhtin (2006) calls it. It is this notion of time that makes possible that Brian Edmiston entered in dialogue with them from 1980s on. This is the hope that initiators of a paradigm like dialogical pedagogy have: to plant a seed that one day will grow.

The literature review shows that Edmiston made his own interpretation and development of drama pedagogy by using dramatic inquiry as strategy. For the way he uses socio-cultural-historical tradition I argue that he not only builds on this set of theories but also that he plays with them for as he asserts (2006), play is a creative attitude toward any activity. If asked: What is the main characteristic of Edmiston’s application of drama pedagogy? My answer with Lakoff and Johnson (1999) would be
that theories of high level of abstraction like Bakhtin’s dialogism and Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory are brought to the level of the flesh to facilitate their embodiment.

The literature also shows that Edmiston is developing not a technique but a theory of education that he called “Ethical Education” (Edmiston, 2000, 2006). Ethical education is an approach to teaching and learning built on/with the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories. Its goal is the development of ethical thinking, based on reflection, by positioning in the Other’s place in a time/space where past, present, and future interact (Edmiston, 2006). He states his goals are to create through drama “powerful dialogic spaces in which students’ “ethical imagination” changes their moral understanding in making their views more multifaceted, interwoven, and complex” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 61). He explains that he seeks to promote the formation of ethical identities by exploring through critical thinking and in-depth analysis of a situation’s ethical concerns while imagining alternative selves and possible scenarios (Edmiston, 1998, 2000, 2006, Teaching Philosophy Statement (refer from now on as TPS), and Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998).

As he asserts in his TPS “I have applied and extended, in particular, Bakhtin’s theories of “dialogism” both to develop my pedagogy and to analyze my practice in order to develop theory.” He seeks to contribute through his ethical education project to make people more humane. This aim fits with Vygotsky’s (1934, 1978, 1986) project of human development through education. According to Wells (2000 in Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000) Vygotsky had the intention to create a theory to understand both what is to be human and how to improve our human situation. Edmiston also uses to reflect on his own experience the works of other thinkers like Freire’s (1998, 2000) pedagogy of curiosity and hope,
Johnson & O’Neill’s (1985) editing work on Heathcote’s writings on education and drama, Holland et al.’s (2003) notion of figured worlds, and Wenger’s (1998) community of practice theory of learning. It is important to note that ethical education is built upon the critical analysis and reflection on the intersection theory-praxis.

Brian Edmiston’s scholarship during 25 years is so comprehensive that in this work I focus on what he does to apply the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories in his teaching. This is important to understand what happens in T&L 633 that promotes participants re-examination of their teaching practices, based on their understanding and interpretations, and the formulation of questions and statements of change about their teaching practices to improve their professional development. I focus on what he says in different types of texts according to the interest of this dissertation’s purpose and research questions. These texts include written materials such as papers, books, TPS, handouts, and Carmen postings. I have also included video recorded material.

**What makes Edmiston’s work dialogic?**

Underlying my reading of Edmiston’s work are two questions: What makes Edmiston’s work dialogic? What drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry have to do with Bakhtin’s notions of authorship and dialogue? To answer these questions, I focus on the strategies and practices Edmiston uses to facilitate students to experience the act of authorship and enter in dialogue, learning as meaning-making process, teaching-learning as a shared event, and curriculum as a process.

Edmiston’s pedagogy is dialogic because the voices of different actors are respected and heard; however, these actors are not necessarily present in corporeal form but through their historical past and future voices. His pedagogical strategies and teaching
practices are addressed to study events not isolated facts. In them, how people act and react to each other is what matters. In this process he expects the students to create meaning. As Edmiston (1998) states, he expects his students to play with endless possibilities according to the activity’s context, inquiry questions, and purposes. Thus, in these activities there are not “right” answers to evaluate but processes to be assessed. Enacting the activities, participants enter in dialogue with the past, present, and future through/with language in its different forms of manifestation. Scholars agree that talking, writing, gestures, movement, graphics, craft, and art forms are expressions of human beings’ language capacity (Bakhtin, 2004; Bruner, 1986; Leroi-Gourhan, 1993; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wartofsky, 1979).

The socio-cultural-historical tradition’s basic assumptions and Edmiston’s pedagogical principles.

An attentive reading of Vygotsky reveals that the notion of authorship, usually associated with Bakhtin, is present in his philosophical reflections on education (Vygotsky, 1986). Both thinkers, Vygotsky and Bakhtin, agree that the positivist discourse, as authoritative discourse, does not take into account authorship. They propose theories of education addressed to forward it. Vygotsky (1978, 1986) has shaken and impacted educators for the recognition of children’s active role in their process of learning. Bakhtin’s novel of education was burned by the Nazis (Holquist, 2006). However, his thoughts about education could be brought to light through his work, particularly in Bakhtin (2006)’s chapter about “The Bildungsroman”, a special subcategory of the novel that he called the “novel of education” (see Bakhtin, 2006, pp. 10-59).
A way to understand how Edmiston frames his work within the socio-cultural-historical tradition is by analyzing how Vygotsky’s basic assumption and the core concepts of Bakhtin’s dialogism authorship, dialogue, self/other, chronotope, change and uncertainty (axis concepts in this study) are present in the pedagogical principles that guide Edmiston’s understanding and interpretation of drama pedagogy. From my reading of Edmiston’s work, I have identified a set of pedagogical principles that guide his praxis. They form a web, thus, they are not applied in isolation but intertwined. They are present at the level of curriculum’s macro-structure and at the level of activities (microgenesis). They fulfill, as a web, Vygotsky’s basic assumptions. They are:

**Education is not instruction and curriculum is co-created meaning.**

Edmiston (1998) points out education should not be confused with instruction and “curriculum can no longer be regarded as a prepackaged thing which is delivered to students; curriculum is meanings which are *cocreates* (italics in original) by teachers and students in their day-to-day lives in the classroom.” (p. 14). This view of curriculum facilitates an interdisciplinary approach because as Edmiston & Wilhelm (1998) affirm they frequently found themselves “touching on domains that crossed the boundaries of science, math, history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and other disciplines.” (p.16). Moreover, “Because content is always contextualized, the relationship with subject
matter must be grounded in students interest and negotiation among teacher and students rather than solely in teacher direction” (TPS).

Figure 3. Description of Dr. Edmiston Drama Enactment with a Group of Fifth grade Children.
Re-conceptualization is another feature of Edmiston’s work. I find his re-conceptualization of curriculum has great potential to profoundly affect education. For him, curriculum development is a scenario according to the definition of this term as “an imagined sequence of possible events, or an imagined set of circumstances” (On line Encarta Dictionary). In enacting curriculum he utilizes various strategies and practices such as reflecting, imagining possible worlds, inquiry, debate, shared responsibilities, and wrapping-up. In drama pedagogy planning is very demanding. All units must have a purpose. Students need to know how the activity is connected to the proposed curriculum. However, activities should not be restricted by clock time. They can last a week or more if necessary. Nevertheless, to establish an expected time-frame imprint dynamic to the activity. Time is an important issue in Dr. Edmiston’s proposal in two senses: one, to bring to enact the dynamic of historical time in which the past is re-constructed and the future is brought back to the present to make it reality. In this sense, his time management is dialogic. The other, he makes a practical use of time management to maintain the dynamic of the activity; for example, giving short periods of time like two or five minutes to develop an activity such as talk to the person besides you or write down on a post-it an idea (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998; Edmiston, 2006).

Edmiston designs (or improvises) activities according to his pedagogical and ethical principles based on socio-cultural-historical theoretical assumptions. In his work it is made visible that when the curriculum’s goal is human development the topic is not the target but the means. Furthermore, the topic could be changed and the goals remain the same. This facilitates to focus the content in students’ interest and negotiation between teachers and students. Additionally, the focus of assessment is not the outcomes (products
or tangible evidence as test score) but the process that the student makes evident through texts: conversations, drawing, writings, tableaus, charts, etc. These texts, following Bakhtin (2004) are aesthetic expressions that cannot be predetermined and are not sterile, static, fixed material products. The difference between expected outcomes and created texts is the freedom to imagine. In this regard, it is important to note that in Edmiston’s work, objects become artifacts that are part of the activity. They awaken feelings, serve as pivots to focus attention on specific issues to be reflected upon, and, often, are sings of the past that invite to image the future.

**Teachers have the responsibility to question their own discourses.**

Although the physical context of the classroom that drama enactments create breaks with the orderly, steady, lifeless traditional classroom, Edmiston’s proposal is not about external forms. It is about profound ethical reflections on teachers’ projects for human life’s dignity and the courage to be answerable and responsible for their actions. Drama is very demanding for it breaks with the authoritative discourse of the school culture that teachers and students have assimilated. Edmiston and Enciso (2003) argue that we live and act by discourses that are integral to our opinions and interactions. However, we take them for granted and do not question them. According to Bakhtin (2004) when we instrumentally use these discourses they become authoritative.

Bakhtin (1993, 2004) argues that the act of authorship is an ethical act, that we are responsible for the sense and meaning we build. Edmiston (1998) asserts that “We are ethical when we recognize that as we act we are responsible for the consequences of our actions” (p. 59). Thus, to be ethical means that we are “answerable” for our actions, that is, “that we acknowledge our agency within a specific context and particular
circumstances – we are prepared to answer to other people who are affected by our deeds” (p. 59). But, in being answerable we have to take into account the Other’s point of view that we discover in dialogue through face-to-face conversations and in imagination. Edmiston sets a condition: “Though moral codes or policies will be influential, we are not ethical if we have an unquestioning reliance on either in order to determine how to act because any generalized or abstract principles cannot take into account considerations of a specific context” (Edmiston, p. 59). Thus, he sees as a part of teachers’ professional identities the ethical obligation to question their discourses.

People’s ethical identities determine how we frame our relationships to the world. They also influence one’s evaluation about our own and other’s actions (Edmiston, 1998, 2000). During T&L 633 in 2007 Edmiston argued that in the social and cultural relationships it is our ethical self who evaluates such relations; for example, as teachers it is our ethical self who evaluates some school culture practices like detention, retention, exclusions, and evaluation procedures. And, when grading multiple choice tests using grids, teachers are not evaluating but doing a mechanical action: marking and counting right answers. Scores are told to students but a conversation about their processes usually does not take place.

In his proposal Edmiston adopts a poststructuralist stance from where traditional binaries (e.g., bad/good; right/wrong; work/play; normal/non-normal) are viewed as ideologies socially constructed and culturally maintained as authoritative discourse. Instead, a third way or third position is conceived where reconciliation is possible. Reconciliation viewed as the outcome of a profound reflection in dialogue with the Other, that is, by approaching a particular situation from mine and the Other’s point of view that
leads me to transform my view into one that involve both: This third view is not an
addition but a different one. Bakhtin (2004) calls this process hybridization which is one
of the categories used in the novel to create the image of a language.

Classrooms should be caring spaces: Engaging yet safe, demanding yet fare,
challenging yet respectful.

Edmiston (1998) asserts that creating a caring environment is integral to his proposal.
It is an ethical conscious decision. His explanation of the ethics of care is an illustration
of how a poststructuralist approach could be applied at the level of the classroom:

“When I work with students, I want us all to be open to difference and tolerant of
diverse whatever their source. I want us to listen for the silenced, to talk with the
powerless, to see beneath the stereotype, and to hear above the rhetoric. I want us to
listen for new voices, to continue to question, to argue, to rage, to laugh, and literally
to make up our own minds. Drama is integral to my process or working toward these
goals.” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 57)

A safe environment facilitates keeping the dynamic of the activity and learning.
Students can have deep conversations on the different ways that power is experienced.
Edmiston (2006) identifies “power over others” (to force people to act or reflect in a
certain way. People may resist, refuse or accept this position); “power with others” (to
dialogue and negotiate new ways of acting or reflecting that are mutually agreed); and
“power for others” (to assist people to act or to reflect in a way they have already
chosen).

Working with the whole person: Internal and external actions are inseparable.

Drama pedagogy assumes human beings as socio-cultural historical actors. As such,
they are multidimensional. Their ethical, aesthetical, corporeal, communicative, and
cognitive dimensions act simultaneously in any event they participate. Edmiston (2006)
notes that the social position determines the way one interacts culturally. Thus, in order
to understand our present behavior we need to be aware of one’s position in the social web. For example, Edmiston and Enciso (unpublished) and Edmiston and Wilhelm (1998) highlight the social character of imagination. They claim that although we experience imagination as an individual act, a great deal of the content of our imagination is socially and culturally constructed. This process is essentially the same process Bakhtin (1993) describes for the act of authorship. Edmiston (2006) asserts “imagination, interpretation, and will are internal processes in external action” (p.17). Edmiston and Enciso (unpublished) point out “when we interpret we analyze, infer, predict, synthesize, and evaluate the action of characters.” (p. 3).

From my reading of Edmiston’s work authorship is the target of his pedagogical action in his application of drama pedagogy. To accomplish this goal, he designs activities to develop HPFs by putting them into action in creating solutions for big problems in the ZPD. In short, Edmiston locates his pedagogical action at the microgenetic level, which it is the only level an educator can act.
Chapter 3

Methodology

This chapter responds to the question: How were data collected, processed, and analyzed? I describe how I decided the function of every source of data, the role of theory during these processes, and how I related the sources between them according to the research questions. I also point out issues related to validity: what I have learned from the methodological process through reflecting on what did work, what did not work, and what I have had to elaborate to support and conduct the methodology of the study.

Research Design

The project focused on participants in T&L 633 summer 2007 at The Ohio State University. Three participants in the class volunteered to function in this research as key informants in order to determine, in a more focused way, how they understood and interpreted a key set of concepts, what questions asked, and what statements of change they formulated as they authored themselves as teachers. Their understandings, interpretations, and questions were framed within the socio-cultural-historical tradition that was underlying and often explicitly informing the course discourse about teaching and learning. This theoretical framework was crucial as a framework for collecting data and for describing and analyzing what happened before, during, and after the course implementation.
I used Stakes’ (2003) conceptualization to define this research as a case study. He argues there is not agreement in defining case studies. He points out “Even if my definition of case study were agreed upon, and it is not, the terms case and study (italics in original) defy full specifications” (Stake, p. 134). Stake argues that a case must meet the following conditions: it must be specific, unique, and a bounded system. T&L 633 fulfills these conditions. Stake (2003) argues that the researcher could consider a classroom, a curriculum, a hospital or an agency as cases. In the same line of thinking, Krathwohl (1993) argues that case studies convey “the characteristic of a single individual, situation, or problem… Case studies are bounded by a particular program, institution, time period, or set of events” (p. 347). A recent literature review reaffirms my decision to study T&L 633. Luttrell (2010) says that case selection should be driven by assessment of the case. She states “The point is to provide a clear explanation for why particular sites, participants, events, or cases have been chosen and why data being gathered will be significant beyond these particulars” (Luttrell, p. 6). In this study T&L 633 is assumed as an event, understanding event as a chronotope where people act and react to each other to make meanings (Bloome, et al., 2005).

I adhere to Stake’s (2003) idea that “As a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used… case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied”(p. 134). This notion allows a researcher the freedom to develop and explain the methodology needed to approach the case, which in this study is crucial due to the state of the art of dialogic research in education (see chapter two). It is worthwhile to note that the central topic of this study is professional development programs for teachers framed within the dialogical paradigm.
This study has as its aim or horizon the epistemologically driven question suggested by Stake (2003): “What can be learned from this single case?” According to Stake (2003), a case could be studied with the methodology and methods that best match the researcher’s purposes and the case itself. I had to review literature to put together a methodology and methods for the study. I had to connect drama research, dialogical research, dialogism and dialogical researcher’s decisions, concerns, and solutions. I took some methods from different qualitative research approaches for as O’Neill (1996) argues “we are never working in a vacuum, and our efforts must rest firmly on those of our predecessors if we are not to find ourselves ceaselessly reinventing the wheel. They spring from an immersion in existing practice and theory, and an appreciation of the central traditions, rules, demands and possibilities in the field” (p. 136).

**Drama and Dialogical Research**

From the literature review it became clear that researchers within drama have turned to the dialogical paradigm as the worldview (paradigm) that best explains their experiences and interests in social and interactive approaches to learning. They see drama as a multilayered practice and a complex event that is negotiated and a non-reproducible experience (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1996; Medina, 2004; Medina & Campano, 2006; O’Neill, 1996). Therefore, “the whole creative sequence needs to be studied and not just aspects of variables within it” (Hartfield, 1982 in Carroll, 1996, p. 77). They also agree that “the research methodology that most clearly fits the special conditions of drama is that of the case study” (Carroll, 1996, p. 77). Case study honors participants’ agency and does not see them as mere sources of data for analysis. Furthermore, case study research uses multiple sources of evidence, and its methodology allows the researcher to be open
to making decisions as unexpected events emerge from the case being studied. The researcher is always aware that he/she is dealing with texts and discourses from his/her interpretative frameworks (Carroll, 1996).

It is also clear in the literature that dialogical research’s methodology and methods are in the process of development (Carroll, 1996; Coulter, 1999; Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1996; Frank, 2005; O’Neill, 1996). Research on/with drama is part of this process. It has similarities with the alternative research paradigms now available within qualitative research (O’Neill, 1996). For example, drama shares with critical and transformative research the recognition of participants’ agency. In education these types of research study the institutionalized relationship between teachers and students in terms of power, roles, and context. As Lather (1992) argues critical and transformational research is an attempt to understand and change social reality (in Carroll, 1996). Both types of research use imagination to transform reality, rely on authorship to pursue their purposes, and contest authoritative discourses on education. I find worthwhile to highlight that dialogical research is critical and transformational but is not dialectical. It is dialogical. It does not seek to reach a synthesis of opposites. It reaches encounters, negotiations, agreements about the points of difference and conflict. It always leaves open the possibility for further developments. In dialogical research nothing is fixed or static (Carroll, 1996; Coulter, 1999; Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1996; Frank, 2005; O’Neill, 1996).

**Dialogism and Dialogical Research’s Principles and Assumptions**

The research process in dialogical research is characterized by a “constantly moving between concepts and data” (Carroll, 1996, p. 77). The process begins with initial concepts to be investigated. However, along the process other concepts and connections
emerge. The researcher has to re-examine the emerging concepts and their relationship to theory. As I was going through this process, I formulated a series of questions. They were related to how I could apply dialogism’s epistemology into dialogical research methodology. These questions were illuminated by the inquiry questions scholars make regarding the application of Bakhtin’s dialogism and the way they have solved them. I introduce these questions throughout this chapter. However, I highlight that the most challenging question was: what makes a study dialogical? This question was crucial to my decision making along the whole process.

It is worthwhile to note that it is difficult to find in the literature sources to conduct dialogical research. On the one hand, it would be against its nature. On the other hand, the core concept of dialogical research, dialogue, is the most misunderstood (Holquist, 2004); thus, quite often research reports refer as dialogue what actually are conversations. Frank (2005) argues “To propose a template would be monological; such a template would finalize the researcher” (p. 968). Scholars agree that the solution is the researcher’s self-reflexivity (Frank, 2005; Lather, 2001; Luttrell, 2010). Frank (2005) alerts us that research examples are not models but guides. They agree that studies in the social sciences offer only partial views of the studied reality. The researcher has to be aware that he/she is holding two points of view simultaneously: his/her own and the participants’. Augusto Boal (1981; 1995 in Carroll, 1996) calls this event “metaxis”.

Scholars agree that Bakhtin’s theories offer valuable conceptual resources that might be useful as criteria to think about practice and research on practice (Coulter, 1999; Frank, 2005; Scheurich, 1996). In dialogical research theoretical principles and research frameworks are gradually arising to organize the efforts (Coulter, 1999; Edmiston &
Wilhelm, 1996; Frank, 2005; O’Neill, 1996; Scheurich, 1996). O’Neill (1996) points out that these efforts “call imagination into play, the cognitive capacity that allows us to construct alternative worlds” (p. 142). She points out the use of metaphors such as “the researcher as hero struggling to find a way through the labyrinth” (O’Neill, p. 141). The labyrinth is the “long-standing conflicts between the quantitative and the qualitative, the subjective and the objective” (O’Neill, p. 142). Research reports on education framed within dialogism are characterized by the researchers’ reflections around methodological issues. They have highlighted some basic assumptions and principles. I summarize as follows those of interest for this study:

Researchers have to find ways to link theory and experience to include heteroglossia and to interpret the findings from a plurality of points of view (Borg, 2004; Coulter, 1999; Dorion, 2009; Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1996; Frank, 2005; O’Neill, 1996; Smith, 2007). My interpretation of this assumption is that the actors are not necessarily present in corporeal form but through their historical past and future (anticipated) voices. Following Bakhtin (2004) in this study there are different actors: the researcher, previous researchers and thinkers, and participants. However, following Bakhtin’s notion of kaleidoscope or constellation of self/others (in Holquist, 2004), they bring to the study the polyphony of their past and future interactions. Holstein and Gubrium (2000; cited in Frank, 2005) argue that personal stories should not “be understood as strictly individual. Any person’s story is the site of struggles permeated by multiple voices. Thus, the personal generates a sense of a social world, which, in turn, generates both typical conflicts that require dialogue and the conversational resources to engage in that dialogue” (p. 972).
Frank (2005) argues that dialogical research, based on Bakhtin’s work should include the subjects’ feelings if it wants to make an adequate description of their human condition. He argues that as long as a person is alive she/he has not yet uttered the last word. He calls this “The principle of perpetual generation” (Frank, p. 967). He argues that dialogical research’s core issues of dialogue and utterance are, respectively, always an ongoing process and one amongst many possible; thus, findings are never a description of a finalized other but of what he/she has become. That is, research findings can never claim any last word. They “can only look toward an open future” (Frank, p. 967). He sees this principle as an ethical issue. Researchers cannot determine that “the other has not, cannot, and will not change, that she or he will die just as she or he always has been” (Frank, p. 966). Following Bakhtin’s (2004) dialogical ideal “participants will continue to form themselves, as they continue to become who they may yet be” (Frank, 2005, pp. 966-967). He states “The key question for qualitative research: “What can one person say about another? Research is, in the simplest terms, one person’s representation of another.” (Frank, p. 966)

The principle of perpetual generation is crucial in this study to interpret data and to elaborate findings. It is also important for dialogical research in education in general and to develop curricula for professional development programs for teachers. It is crucial because this principle is the foundation of our ‘hope’ as educators and researchers. We hope that the people we have the opportunity to interact with will promote educational change, thanks to their authorship, in an ethically desirable way. This principle calls for our humbleness as researchers; for instance, I hope this study’s findings will initiate an aesthetic adventure of creating professional development programs for/with teachers.
Dialogical research studies events not objects. I understand event with Bloome, et al., (2005) as a heuristic to approach and understand how people create meaning through how they act and react to each other. Studying events is a way to place emphasis on the dynamic and creative aspects of what people do accomplish in interaction with each other. This implies that the researcher has in some way been involved in the lived experiences that being a part of the event conveys. It allows the researcher to step in and out of the event under study. This is an application of the Bakhtinian notion of outsideness understood as the ability of the author to be “somehow both inside and outside their work” (Holquist, 2004, p. 30). This allows making critical analysis, interpretations, and the development of proposals for analysis and change. In this study, T&L 633 is assumed, following Bakhtin (2006), as an event that happens within a particular speech genre: the educational profession. I participated in T&L 633 as a student in 2006 and as a learner/researcher in 2007. The 2006 experience was crucial to step inside and outside the 2007 event to reflect and learn from it.

As in the positivist research paradigm, dialogic research also requires defined purposes and research questions. However, while in the positivist paradigm questions and purposes are closed, in dialogism they are open-ended. Dialogical research has, in addition to the purposes, a horizon that makes the research intentionally historical as it references the past while imagining an idealized future that is brought into the present. The research problems are guiding questions that generate more inquiry questions. This inquiring process leads to a review of literature not foreseen when the research process started. These questions and topics emerge from the data as the participants’ utterances and the researchers’ interests and insights enter into a dialogue. The literature review
serves as a reference throughout the whole process to guide methodological decisions both foreseen and made along the way (Coulter, 1999; Frank, 2005). I describe my lived experience of this process in the “data analysis” section.

**Research Questions**

Research reports, both qualitative and quantitative, show the need to transform teaching practices to improve the students’ learning and academic achievement. Understanding teachers’ professional development as the key for such a transformation, this study is guided by the following inquiry questions:

1. How do teachers re-examine their pedagogical plans and practices in terms of the possibilities and strategies they envision will change the relationships between knowledge and society?

2. How do teachers interpret their experiences of Ed T&L 633 in relation with social, cultural and historical assumptions about learning, knowledge building processes and curriculum development?

3. What questions do they formulate about their professional development and how do these relate to social, cultural, and historical assumptions about knowledge building and curriculum development?

Research question one seeks to understand in what ways the socio-cultural-historical tradition was presented in T&L 633 and in what ways this viewpoint assisted in developing practices and concepts of authorship and dialogue. I focused my review of data for this question on what happened in T&L 633 that made participants envision possibilities and strategies to change their pedagogical practices. Crucial in this search is the role of formal education in the relationship between
knowledge and society that Bakhtin’s (2004) notions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses brings to light.

Research question two seeks to learn from T&L 633 about professional development programs through participants’ understandings and interpretations of the concepts of teaching, learning, curriculum development, and evaluation when they are exposed to socio-cultural historical tradition’s theories through drama pedagogy.

Research question three focuses on what topics and issues emerged from participants’ questions and statements of change regarding their own professional development. These topics and issues could be used as referents to develop curricula for teachers’ professional development programs. This question targets how teachers’ questions and statements of change relate to social, cultural, and historical assumptions about knowledge building and curriculum development.

**Researcher Positionality**

This dissertation is full of human issues from its beginning. I was aware of the possible ethical conflict that studying the work of one of my committee members could bring along. Nevertheless, I accepted the challenge because I am learning from his work not evaluating it. I am interested in the participants’ interactions and conceptual developments. Furthermore, I am theoretically clear that this study positions Professor Edmiston and me in a teacher-student relationship within a ZPD (zone of proximal development; see chapter two). I am learning with him possibilities that drama pedagogy offers to develop professional development programs.

Although Dr. Edmiston invited me to participate as a student, this was not entirely possible because on the one hand the logistic kept me busy in my role as researcher
without assistants. On the other hand, I thought it was not ethically appropriate to alter in any way what was supposed to happen in that course. However, it was difficult for me to stay completely within the researcher’ role. Sometimes, I was a student. I am learning how drama pedagogy works; thus, I often focused on my meaning-making process. I did not take part in the enactments or activities, but I was attentive all the time without making people feel like the ‘object’ of my observation. Participants not only accepted me but also showed care, kindness, and willingness to cooperate. As a researcher and educator I see them as brilliant, wonderful human beings, as people who represent hope in this world.

Participants in T&L 633 and Key Informants Selection

Following the terms of the research proposal the nineteen students registered in T&L 633 for the summer 2007 were introduced to this research project through a written note (See appendix B). They were informed that they could decline to sign the consent letter and refuse to participate in the research process, or withdraw at any time without penalty or repercussion. They all signed a “general consent letter” (See appendix C). Once the consent letters were signed the data gathering process began. The first task was to ask the participants to fill out a survey to learn about them by making a brief description in terms of gender, school level, age, and teaching experience (see appendix D).

The group of participants, according to the survey, had the following features: Sixteen were women and three men; 75% were currently working as teachers; ten were between 22 and 28 years old, three were in the early 30s, and four were in their 40s. Three did not report age. In regard to the school level, 16 had or were working towards their masters degree, one was enrolled in the doctoral program, and one did not report. Thirteen of the
teachers have attended in-service workshops. The five teachers with more years of teaching experience (17, 18, and 20) were working at the early or middle childhood education levels. These results are consistent with the literature review: teachers with more years of teaching experience and working at the elementary school levels attend more workshops than teachers who have recently graduated from college (Choy, et al., 2006).

At the beginning of the seminar/workshop all participants had the same opportunity to be selected as key informants. The next day, I selected the key informants based on the survey and the open observation. I applied the purposeful sampling criteria stated by Patton (1990). The basic criteria to make the selection were: the participants have taught and will teach next year, each one teaching a different subject matter or level, and previous attendance in teacher training. Based on the open observation I selected those participants that in addition to fulfilling the aforementioned criteria had also actively participated during the first day of class and expressed interesting arguments. The participants selected as key informants were asked to sign a “key informant consent letter” (See appendix E). In fulfillment of the anonymity research principle I refer to them as Ms. A., Ms. K, and Ms. S.

The three key informants love teaching. They all are white female Americans. By the time of the seminar/workshop: Ms. K. described herself as 41 years old. She has a Masters degree in early/Middle childhood education and 20 years of teaching experience. She expected from T&L 633 “to learn some new and fresh techniques to get some excitement going on in the classroom”. She has “very little” previous experience with drama. Ms. S. reported that she is 27 years old. She is finishing a Masters degree in
“Drama, Language Arts, Literacy and Reading Education”. She has 5 years of teaching experience. She expected from T&L 633 “to get more insight concerning how to use social imagination and drama in the classroom setting.” She has some previous experience with drama pedagogy. Ms. A. identified herself as 31 years old. She has a Masters degree in Literacy. She has 10 years of teaching experience. She expected from T&L 633 “to improve my craft as a teacher and learn from other teachers. Be inspired and introduced to new literature.” She had some experience with drama.

On June 15, 2007, the last day of the seminar/workshop I wrote in my field notes: “In this group everybody seems to be so creative, good teacher, nice, pro alternative pedagogy, so connected with life that extreme or outside cases like people opposing or against this pedagogy (dramatic inquiry) will be hard to find. Perhaps we can find misunderstandings, lack of practices, but they all seems so willing to change.” After the seminar/workshop, in my first approach to their portfolios for the interview I identified that reflection was of major concern for the three of them. Self-criticism as teachers was Ms. K and Ms. S’s strength. Ms. K was particularly interested in how to deal with students’ culture; Ms. S. in how to deal with the issues of power and authority; and, Ms. A. in how to create a safe environment not only in the classroom but in the whole school.

After a preliminary analysis of all data, it was clear that participants were not so much distinctive cases regardless of their years of teaching experience, or location, or subject matter. They are assumed as “those informants through whom the case can be known” (Stake, 2003, p. 140). For all of them T&L 633 was a new or at least different experience so they became exemplars to elaborate around this study’s larger topics. Thus, rather than present individual cases I drew from across cases to support my analysis of the key
concepts in relationship with the axis and satellite concepts. Their voices are assumed as contributions to shed light on how to develop curriculum for professional development programs for teachers within the dialogical paradigm which is the purpose of this dissertation.

**Context**

Participants lived the experience of a dialogical pedagogy in Room 200A at Ramseyer Hall at The Ohio State University. It is a large room with large windows. There are no traditional individual student chairs with the desk attached to them; instead, there are rectangular large tables where students can sit at both sides to work in small groups up to six people by table. These tables are located near the windows in a semicircle-shape; thus, there is enough space at the center of the room where participants can move to perform the enactments or to develop other activities. The room also has technical equipment: a TV set with video, a slide projector, and equipment to connect personal computers to the TV set. There is also a big table with written materials such as syllabus, handouts, and forms to be filled. There are also office supplies: pencils, post-its, glue, construction and butcher paper, markers of various color, and tapes. Under the table, there is a box with props for the drama enactments like pieces of fabrics, a foam-rubber made sword, and a gigantic gold coin. By the board there are exhibited, one beside the other, around 30 children’s books that participants could choose for their individual practices. Some of these books were selected for enactment and shared exploration through drama pedagogy.
In dialogic research, participants are not only part of the context but their interactions create the context. I will describe these interactions in chapter four. In this section I introduce the teachers’ expectations. The last item of the survey was an open question about their expectations from the seminar/workshop. Participants expectations from the seminar/workshop can be summarized as follows: They expected to learn: to reach more students; new techniques, strategies, and methods for teaching to implement in class next year; to get students excited about reading; to bring fun into the classroom; and, to create a more active, interactive learning environment. They also expected to acquire tools like new literature and ideas to improve teaching and academic achievement. None of the participants anticipated or looked forward to rethinking or redefining what it means to teach and learn.

Methodology

I initiated this research project to find out what could be learned from T&L 633 as a professional development program. My goal was to bring to light what this course offers to educators both pedagogically and epistemologically from the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s perspective. Participants enacted activities to embody this theoretical framework. They had a lived experience, amongst endless, of how such theories could be woven into curriculum development (design and enactment). I focused on participants’ understandings, interpretations, and questions on the key concepts. I also examined their questions and statement of change regarding their professional development in relation to a set of concepts that emerged from the data during the analysis and I synthesized around functions and called “satellite concepts” (see Appendix J). I examine what happened during the seminar/workshop using Bakhtin’s (2004) theory of authoritative and
internally persuasive discourses as heuristic devises. This analysis facilitated my understanding of how participants re-examine their own pedagogical plans and practices.

Timeline.

I summarize the research activities in Figure 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collected during the seminar/workshop</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collected after the seminar/workshop: (Portfolios and Interviews),</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Literature review</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing researcher’s journal</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Processing-Analyzing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Typing in-class written works</td>
<td>June 2007 – June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Download Carmen postings</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selection of posting for further analysis.</td>
<td>September 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transcriptions of three interviews.</td>
<td>November 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Structured observation of videotapes</td>
<td>June 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing narratives to convert data sources into written texts.</td>
<td>October 2007-May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Literature review</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing researcher’s journal</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analyzing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First to seven moments.</td>
<td>June 2007 – December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Literature review.</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing researcher’s journal</td>
<td>During the whole process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4. Research project’s timeline*

**Data collection: Sources.**

I collected data from documents and direct methods: observations (open and structured) and interviews (open and structured). These data were gathered in two moments: during and after the seminar/workshop. During the seminar/workshop, from June 11 to June 15, I took field notes, recorded in videotapes almost the whole
seminar/workshop, collected exemplars of the syllabus, handouts, and in-class written works which include charts and signs, and made photocopies of a set of forms participants filled out called the “What do you mean by… series”. I label this set of documents “documents collected during the seminar/workshop”. The other documents (the Carmen postings and the students’ portfolios) were collected after the seminar/workshop was completed and the students’ grades posted. It is worthwhile to note that the Carmen postings were posted during and after the seminar/workshop but I was not allowed to download them or to interview the key informants until grades were posted. I also kept my researcher journal throughout the whole process of study.

In a dialogical paradigm the voice of the other not only enters the study by direct methods of collecting data like answering a questionnaire or being interviewed. The voice of the other could also enter the study through his/her explanations on written works. I valued the detailed work in Carmen’s postings, portfolios, and “what do you mean by…?” series because writing implies reflection. Thus, I decided to review in a first approach to data all participants’ Carmen postings and “What do you mean by…? Series forms. This decision was made because what happened and was elaborated during this seminar/workshop is important for the study’s purposes and research questions. It is worthwhile to note that all participants had signed a consent letter granting access to the Carmen postings.

**Description of the Sources**

**Documents collected during the seminar/workshop.**

Documents gathered during the seminar/workshop complement each other during the analysis of data. They inform research questions one and two.
Syllabus: The syllabus informs research question two. It reflects and explicitly states Professor Edmiston’s concept of curriculum development and assessment.

Handouts: They present in graphics central ideas and connections. They offer opportunities to reflect and build knowledge together. I selected the handouts delivered on June 14 (see Appendixes F). They are about being engaged, being critical, and the connection with previous knowledge and experiences. Its analysis is an invitation to alter social relationships from hierarchical to democratic.

What do you mean by...? Series: Participants were asked to write their conceptualizations of: teaching, learning, curriculum, drama, and evaluation for three days in a row. Each day they were given a blank form to record; however, the content and structure of the form was the same. I decided to collect these records as a source of data because they present an overview of the of participants’ concept evolution during the workshop days.

Structured and open observations: Observations inform the teacher-student relationship in T&L 633. They complement each other by reinforcing what I considered relevant and also by pointing out what I might overcome. They both became a narrative (see Appendix G). The open observation is based on my field notes. The structured observation is based on the video recording. I used two cameras to have a backup in case of a technical failure. It is important to note that participants did not manifest at any moment that the presence of the cameras bothered them in any way. Observations are relevant to understand what happened during the seminar/workshop, that is, to answer research question one.
The structured observation describes what happened in relation with the three major categories considered in this study as important to develop curriculum for teachers’ professional development programs. They are: verbal, non-verbal or body language, and contextual. By verbal I understand what participants expressed in oral or written forms of language. By non-verbal language, assuming the body as a cultural-historical event, I understood everything that involved gestures and physical movements. By context I understood aspects, factors, or features of the environment that created conditions for participating in a certain way. Thus context not only refers to objects but also to behaviors. As a matter of fact, one of the major observations is that in T&L 633 these categories are so intertwined that to talk about them in isolation would not be an accurate description of what happened during the seminar/workshop.

I performed the structured observation one year later after I became theoretically stronger through a process of reflection, study, data processing and first approach to analysis. It is not structured in the sense of following a rigid format but in the sense that I focused on what I could learn from T&L 633 as a professional development program in regard to the axis, key, and satellite concepts. I used features of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses (and their forms of transmission) as heuristic devices to structure my review of the video data.

I went through all the videos recorded with one camera. I was particularly interested in the environment created by body language and the physical and emotional context. The structured observation allowed me to compose a picture about what happened in regard to non-verbal language, the physical transformation of the classroom during the week (material objects like chairs, desks, food, clothes), and the emotional context.
participants’ attitudes shown through their behaviors). I also selected three segments to focus on the way authoritative and persuasive discourses were brought to the zone of boundaries and the struggle between them. My interest in body language and the physical and emotional context stemmed from the fact that according to Vygotsky (1986, 1987) and Bakhtin (2004) these factors are crucial for the success or failure of educational reforms. Scholars within the dialogical paradigm agree they are at the core of educational change (Edmiston, 2000, 2003, 2006; Foster, 1995; Heap, 1985; Ward, 1994).

**Documents collected after the seminar/workshop.**

**Portfolios:** Portfolios are demanding written assignments required to pass the course. However, from a dialogical perspective, I see them as events because their development implies to revisit and reflect on people in interaction with each other (Bloome, et al., 2006). They are chronotopes where participants have the opportunity to step inside and outside of their experiences during the seminar/workshop. The mediating tools in this process are their lived experiences, built knowledge, and reflection. They are an invitation to make what Bakhtin (2004) calls an artistic representation of the assimilated discourses. They illustrate what assessment should be: an opportunity to continue making-meaning.

**Carmen Postings:** The postings are paragraphs used to exchange ideas and have discussions on specific topics and issues. The first step of the process was to download the posting from the Carmen website to convert them into a written text. This is not a mechanical task. Instead, it is really demanding. I decided to organize them by the “themes” and “topics” established by Dr. Edmiston & the participants (See Appendix H). Participants, including Professor Edmiston, wrote a total of 371 postings from June 11th,
2007 until the day I began to download them July 17th, 2007. I coded the postings to guarantee anonymity and a way to identify them on the row data sources. The first digit indicates the theme, the following the topic content (counted from zero and up), and the third the sequential number in the series, for example the following posting code was: 2-0-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 2: Teachers (and students?) as firefighters?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Contents: &quot;Learning about values&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting Title: I thought about my values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. K (Jun 12, 2007 8:47 PM EDT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like XXXXX...I also found that I could never be a firefighter. Good questions were posed today about what it really takes to be a firefighter. I do not have the kind of mental capacity that it takes. However, it made me think about what it takes to be a teacher. Teachers must be able to be accepting of all students. (No matter what they bring to class) We must be patient. We must be resourceful. It makes me proud that I am a teacher. After twenty years, I am not tired of this yet. It makes me feel good when people want to know about my experiences as a teacher. Then they usually say, &quot;I could never be a teacher.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviews:** Prior to the interview I reviewed literature about understanding and interpretation in the interview process. I focused on the epistemological, methodological, and educational implications. I became aware that I should not proceed with the interviews until I have a better picture of the informants through their writings. Thus, I performed a preliminary analysis of their portfolios that included their Carmen postings. I realized that the guiding questions presented in the research proposal were addressed to an unknown audience. Thus, I added to these questions others, based on the key informants’ portfolios. In addition, I organized these questions by research questions. I called this new set “projected questions for the interview” addressed now toward a more concrete audience. However, due to the character of the interview as a deep conversation
and the dialogical approach of this study it was not possible to ask all the questions
during the interview. The interviewees were pleased with the fact that I had read their
work. They also liked that I had elaborated specific questions for each one of them based
on their insights and creations.

Questions for research question one seek information about key informants’ re-
examination of their pedagogical plans and practices in terms of envisioned possibilities
and strategies. I also included questions about their attitude toward themselves in terms of
social markers such as: race, gender, class, and ethnicity and the ways these social
markers have affected their role as students throughout their lives, and as teachers. The
projected questions for the interview were:

- What will you definitely change in your teaching practice?
- What roles have evaluation and assessment played in those strategies?
- What would you change in the school where you work?
- Do you think such changes will be supported by children, colleagues, administrators, and parents?
- In what ways have the social markers such as race, gender, class, and ethnicity affected your role as student from kindergarten to present?
- In what ways do these social markers affect you as a teacher in relation to the children and content you are teaching?
- In terms of social markers, what questions do you ask about yourself as a socio-cultural-historical being?

Questions for research question two seek information about key informants’
interpretation of their experiences of T&L 633 in relation to the conceptual awareness
that mediate their participation. The projected questions for the interview including the guiding questions were:

- After this experience with T&L 633: What do you think has changed in your professional identity in general?
- And, particular, related to your pedagogical actions both conceptually and in practical terms?
- What has changed in terms of your conceptions of learning, knowledge building, curriculum development, and evaluation?

Questions for research question three seek information on how key informants’ questions and reflections on professional development relate to the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s assumptions on knowledge building and curriculum development. Reflection understood as the human ability of the agent to critically analyze and inquire into his or her own and others’ actions to promote purposeful change (Bakhtin, 2004).

The projected questions for the interview were:

- After participating in T&L 633, what questions do you have, in general, about professional development?
- What are your expectations from a professional development program in terms of knowledge building and curriculum development?

At the beginning of the interview I used in combination a couple of techniques called “retrospective account” (Greene & Higgins, 1994) and “stimulated recall” (Di Pardo, 1994). In these research practices, video clips are used as pivots to bring alive memories of the cognitive process the informants have been going through. Following Greene and Higgins’ (1994) notion of “critical incidents that refer to specific but also dramatic
events, which are typically remembered with more vividness and detail than routine events” (p. 125), I considered that the video-clips on “Erika’s story”, which is an enactment that illustrated the intensity of drama pedagogy, could be considered a critical event during the seminar/workshop. However, I was aware during the interview we are never the same, we are always becoming. I was aware that the informants were sharing with me their thoughts at the moment of the interview. I was also aware that the interview itself would be an event that would affect their thinking because “the very act of explaining one’s thinking might actually distort or modify that thinking” (Greene & Higgins, 1994, p. 118).

**Data analysis.**

In dialogical studies, qualitative in nature, the analysis of data in its different moments involves a phase of data processing where the information from a previous step is re-organized for analysis (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). In every processing phase the researcher selects the segments to be analyzed in more depth. The selection process requires analysis. Thus, it is difficult to talk about these two processes in isolation; rather one performs processing-analyzing. As Greene and Higgins (1994) assert “Research is, after all, a form of argument based on interpretation” (p. 123).

Following Bloome, et al. (2005)’s argument that methodological issues and procedures should not be separated from theoretical or epistemological ones, the first step of the analysis was to review literature on methodology according to this study’s theoretical background. Researchers agree that the methods (techniques, tactics, and strategies) should be decided according to the event under study (Bloome et al., 2005; Bloome et al., 2006; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005; Lather, 1986, 2001; Stake, 2003).
They also agree that qualitative studies are characterized by the inclusion of “multiple data sources, methods, and theoretical schemes” (Lather, 1986, p. 270). These arguments gave me a basis from which to decide that, as I was analyzing data, I could use together: text analysis, inductive analysis, discourse analysis, microanalysis, and rhizomatic analysis.

Processing data was an overwhelming experience due to the amount of sources and the large amount of information within everyone of them. During the analysis, theory was playing its true role as an artifact (Bakhtin, 2006; Freire, 1998). It informed the analysis of the key and satellite concepts from the perspective of the axis concepts. It was also crucial to imagine. I re-conceptualized some concepts (e.g. authority and power), clarified others (e.g. teaching and pedagogy), enhanced and/or deepened others (e.g. evaluation, assessment, and enactment). Additionally, other concepts emerged as crucial for the development of the study like praxis, paradigm, the notions of unit for analysis, and message unit.

Based on Smagorinsky (1995) this study’s units of analysis are events that happened during the whole process, that is, during and after the seminar/workshop’s in-class portion. They are layered, that is, there are events within events. I analyze these events through the texts (verbal, non-verbal, and contextual) that make them observable. I translated my observations into narratives. These texts form the data. In the observations’ narratives, participants’ portfolios, and interview transcripts I selected ‘message units’. Following Green and Wallat (1981) I conceptualized the message unit as the minimum unit selected in a segment. The message unit conveys meanings on particular pedagogical, epistemological, and socio-cultural aspects. In this study these aspects are
key informants’ understandings, interpretations, re-examinations, and question and statements of change regarding teacher’s own professional development. They also make reference to non-verbal and contextual issues (Green & Wallat, 1981).

Trying not to alter the complex character of data, that is, the many layers and interconnections, I structured the analysis in seven moments in contrast with phases because I did not predetermine them. Instead, with Holquist (2004) I understood moment “as a discrete point in the development of several interrelated factors” (p. 152). Applying dialogism, I dealt with the uncertainty that the results of every moment brought along with it with what Edmiston (2006) calls a playful attitude, which, according to Bakhtin (2004) is a centrifugal force, i.e. those forces, discourses and practices among a group that seek change and engender a pull away from a centralizing or finalized meaning. I balanced the playful attitude of engagement and imagination of possible interpretations of data with reflection supported in theory on research methodology. I assumed this theory as a centripetal force, i.e., those forces, discourses and practices among a group and society that engender a pull toward the center or coherence and finalization of meaning.

In what follows I describe the process and illustrate with examples:

**First moment.**

I went through all participants’ Carmen postings following Janesick’s (2003) recommendation: to reduce the amount of information and have meaningful statements suitable for the analysis according to the study’s purposes and research questions. I used text analysis to identify the a priori codes. These codes included: learning, knowledge building process, curriculum development, pedagogical practices, knowledge and society relationship, and professional development. I selected and printed the postings where I
could explicitly or implicitly identify those codes. However, I was aware that text analysis allows identifying but it does not tell why the identified topics, issues, and patterns occur (Greene & Higgins, 1994).

*Second moment.*

I went through this new list of Carmen postings applying this time the basic idea of “inductive analysis”, that is, to let the data talk (Janesick, 2003). From this reading a set of topics and issue emerged. I called them “emergent concepts”. The emergent concepts included: teaching, values, community, context, power, pedagogical strategies, evaluation, body language and teachers’ role. I reviewed literature on these emergent concepts and as Dr. Patti Lather says I became smarter (Lather, 1991). I could see more clearly the connections of these emergent concepts with the key concepts under the light of the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories. For example, I realized that body language and aspects related to context are in relationship with the pedagogical strategies the teachers use.

*Third moment.*

From the previous analysis I focused on the key informants’ portfolios, Carmen postings, and interview transcripts due to the volume of data. I applied again “inductive analysis” which involves analyzing multiple forms of data (e.g., texts, observations, interviews) (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). During this browsing I identified additional emergent concepts: fictional worlds, dreamed worlds, figured worlds, time management, freedom, fear, imagination, reflection, surveillance, control, corporeality, silence, absence, emotions, feelings, inquiry, culture, classroom culture, parental pressure, planning. Inductive analysis also involves “multiple and interrelated phases of
coding or categorizing, along with various forms of preliminary analysis and cross-checking” (Janesick, 2003p. 19). Using this strategy I made the list of emergent concepts more functional by clustering them according to the following functions: creation of possible worlds and futures; development of basic HPF (higher psychological functions) to create society, culture, and history; and mechanisms to maintain the status quo and reproduce culture. I called the emergent concepts “satellite concepts”. This systematization made evident the layers and complexity of the issues involved in participants’ learning processes. I recognized that a more detailed analysis was necessary.

**Fourth moment.**

Inductive analysis provided a map of relationships between topics and issues at the macro level. In order to understand better the relationships that inductive analysis was pointing out, I used discourse analysis. Applying discourse analysis I used as a tool Bloome et al.’s (2005) notion of “thematic coherence” understood as “the organization of a set of meanings in and through an event” (p. 33). When using this notion the researcher uses as a guiding question: “what is this segment about?” “What is it that the participants are really talking about?”

Again, I went through key informants’ portfolios, which include the Carmen postings, and the interview transcripts. I began by identifying questions and statements of change focused on research question three. I included in the list of questions those questions that the informant selected from a class handout to develop their portfolios (see Appendix I). I assumed the questions and statements of change as outcomes of what happened during the seminar/workshop and of key informants’ understandings and interpretations. For example:
Questions:

“How can I share power with students to engage them in learning activities that will promote greater depth of understanding?” (Ms. S)

“How teach children to deal with cultural differences?” (Ms. K)

“How get students to see things from another perspective, though?” (Ms. A.)

Statements of change:

“The students in my district (Columbus) are lacking the higher level thinking skills...the predicting, analyzing characters, inferring, evaluating, discovering themes, etc. The activities we've done together this week have included all of these skills. They are bound to make kids better thinkers. I can't wait to start trying them.” (Ms. K)

We often value and ask our students to be creative, yet we don’t do any work in the classroom to help them develop that way of thinking. By using dramatic inquiry together and often, my students are going to be able to really access and apply their imagination.” (Ms. A.)

However, the borderline between statements of change and interpretations is often blurred. Participants expressed their interpretations in such a vehement way that is hard to believe they are not going to implement this knowledge in their classrooms to change their practices. For example, the following interpretation could be assumed as a statement of change:

“The notion of moving from “I” to “we” is a valuable way of thinking about sharing power and constructing meaning with others. Rather than think I (the teacher) want you (the student) to do this assignment, we can approach learning from a more collaborative view where the teacher and students learn together.” (Ms. S)
In order to differentiate interpretations from statements of change, I assume as interpretations those statements where key informants expressed, implicitly or explicitly, re-conceptualizations. I identified as statements of change those sentences where they expressed their intentions of doing something new and/or to incorporate the knowledge built during the seminar/workshop. For example: “I’m encouraged to monitor ways to create a learning environment that focuses more on dialogic and equal positioning” (Ms. S).

I organized the questions and statements of change in a list. Based on the outcomes of the second moment and the a priori codes, I identified categories to reorganize the list of questions and statements of change. These categories are: learning, evaluation, teacher’s role, curriculum, context, community, teaching, power, values, and pedagogical strategies. Following my construction of categories I clustered their question and statements of change into these categories. Then, within every category I made clusters by thematic affinity; for example Ms. S in different instances re-examined her practice by formulating questions about reflection:

“Do I demonstrate the value importance of action + reflection or do I focus more on action in my teaching?”

“How much time do I devote to reflection?”

“How do I value action more than reflection in my own teaching?”

“How do I encourage my students to think critically?”

Next, I elaborated assertions based on evidence and theory; for example:

Assertion: “Professional development programs for teachers, framed within a dialogical approach, should include central topics within the socio-cultural-historical
tradition such as reflection. They should be studied, critically analyzed, de-constructed, and re-conceptualized for the praxis associated with them to attain its educational purposes.”

During another reading I realized that not all questions and statements of change were related to the purpose of research questions three. After all, understanding, interpretation, and questioning are forms of participation. I began to mark the questions and statements of change according to the research question to which they respond. Verbs were the indicators to make the assignation; for example, “understanding” for research question two; expressions of time like “this week” or “today” were reference to assign the text to research question one.

In addition, I signaled in the three sources of data (portfolios, Carmen postings, and interviews’ transcripts) the assertions different from questions and statement of change, that were related to “what happened” during T&L 633 (research question one) and to understandings and interpretations (research question two). I follow the same criteria for assignation. The interconnection between the three research questions became evident. For example, Ms. K. elaborated for her portfolio the following “focus question”:

“How important is it to me to build a strong classroom community?”

Her answer was: “I heard so many ideas from other people on the importance of community that I realize my community was lacking.”

Thus, while the question is showing a topic of interest for a professional development program for teachers (research question three), the answer made reference to what happened during the seminar/workshop (research question one).
**Fifth moment.**

The discourse analysis prepared me to perform a more detailed analysis. I used Bloome, et al.’s (2006) microethnographic approach to discourse analysis as a heuristic device. At this moment in the process, I had a list of questions, statement of change, and assertions organized by research questions. However, going over the texts, often, I had to break a question or statement of change into smaller ones because what I had considered as a whole question or statement, after close analysis, contained two or more questions or statements.

I selected the following segment to illustrate how in a single segment I could identify excerpts for different research questions.

“T&L with drama has really improved my ability to question and guide my students. Instead of listening for answers that I want to hear, or interest that I think should be there, I am now more aware of how I question and listen for answers. I will use the students’ answers to guide my questions, not the “correct” answer I want to hear. I really want my students to feel powerful, in charge, and engaged in their learning, so addressing even the smallest ways I communicate that will make a big difference in the classroom” (Ms. A).

Research question one: “T&L with drama has really improved my ability to question and guide my students. Instead of listening”

Research question two: “Instead of listening for answers that I want to hear, or interest that I think should be there, I am now more aware of how I question and listen for answers. I will use the students’ answers to guide my questions, not the “correct” answer I want to hear.”
Research question three: “I really want my students to feel powerful, in charge, and engaged in their learning, so addressing even the smallest ways I communicate that will make a big difference in the classroom.”

**Sixth moment.**

I have been working on the three research questions simultaneously. I synthesized findings for every research question into assertions and supported with evidence; for example:

For research question one:

Assertion: Living the pedagogical and teaching strategies that are expected to be learned as experiences (action/reflection) is the best way to learn them and to ensure their future application.

Evidence:

“I’ve learned about the complexities of teaching and learning with drama through my experiences. My participation in the book/pretend activities have given me many examples to use in my classroom.” (Ms. K).

For research question two:

Assertion: Participants understood reflection as a tool for learning.

Evidence:

“It’s amazing to realize how much you’ve really learned when you stop to reflect” (Ms. K). “I have learned this week that it is during the reflection time that most of the learning is taking place. I have experienced it myself.” (Ms. A)

For research question three:
Assertion: Professional development programs should deal with crucial topics and issues that positively or negatively affect teachers’ role as mediators of students’ learning and knowledge building processes. Power, values, and culture are amongst those topics and issues.

Evidence:

“Well, in this class I learned to let go more of the teacher’s power. “ (Ms. K).

“If I want my students to be able to evaluate multiple perspectives I have to be committed to creating space for authentic, meaningful discussions. These critical conversations can transform understanding” (Ms. S).

“How do I teach children to deal with cultural differences? (Ms. K.)

In addition to this reflective process, to understand better what happened, I used Bakhtin’s (2004) notions of authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse. I used as a heuristic their defining features stated by Bakhtin (2004). I also used the means for their transmission and representation and what could be expected in the zone of boundaries. This was supported and facilitated because Dr. Edmiston’s proposal as he asserts (Edmiston, 2006), is based on Bakhtin’s work. These heuristic devices allow me to respond to the question that I had as his student and later as a researcher: Why does Dr. Edmiston develop T&L 633 curriculum in this way?

At this point I had to observe the videos again focused on authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, but also taking into account drama strategies. I used as a referent to perform this structured observation two lists: one with drama strategies and the other with the means of transmission and representation for authoritative and persuasive discourse. I positioned T&L 633 in the zone of boundaries that by definition is a zone of
tension. I used the documents collected during the workshop to support my understandings and interpretations of this second round of structured observation.

**Seventh moment.**

I used the rhizome-like structure proposed by Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) based on Deleuze and Guattari (1987). The idea was to create connections and articulations between the findings within and across research questions. I expected to elaborate a broad picture of what participants understood, interpreted, wondered about, and proposed to change based on what happened during T&L 633. I expressed these articulations through assertions; in turn, these assertions were the basis for making recommendations and envisioning implications for future professional development programs.

**Methodological conclusion.**

In the dialogical paradigm as I understood it for the elaboration of this study, it is necessary to make identifications and distinctions but not isolation or exclusion as in the positivist paradigm; rather, the focus is on conceptual relationships. This is challenging because the researcher has to keep in mind all the elements from every source of data, including theory. At the same time it requires a lot of organization of the material available, and a lot of what I call "crafting data": highlighting, establishing color and shapes codes, drawing diagrams, making tables again and again. All these crafting requires a good knowledge of the theory supporting every decision. Bakhtin (2006) says: “Even the most complex and crucial concepts and ideas, according to Goethe, can always be represented in visible form (italics in original), can be demonstrated (italics in original) with a schematic or symbolic blueprint or model, or with an adequate drawing.” (p. 27).
In this sense, while the computer was a wonderful tool to facilitate the whole process it does not have the imagination to make the decisions I did having my hands on data. It seems that Bakhtin’s (2004) claim for a lived body is required for conducting dialogical research.

**Trustworthiness’ development.**

I agree with Lather (2001) that if we decide to play the game of science we need to rethink the way we approach validity. It is not a matter of just saying “I do not need validity” (Denzin, 1994, in Lather 2001, p. 241). Instead of lack of rigor that involves the risk of not doing research at all (Roberts, 1996, in Lather, 2001), in this study, I followed Lather’s (2001) strategy of re-reading and interpreted Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) criteria for establishing trustworthiness from a dialogical perspective. These criteria are: credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, and authenticity.

Lincoln and Guba (2003) conceptualize authenticity as the researcher’s raised level of awareness of both the epistemological aspects and the ethical impactions of his/her work. The reflections I have elaborated around the way dialogism has affected this study witness the rigorous way in which this work has been conducted. Additionally, I am committed to a long-term goal as a professional educator to contribute to the transformation of pedagogical practices in the classroom. I consider this commitment as the educative authenticity that Lincoln and Guba (2003) point out as one of the forms of authenticity that can serve as a criteria for validity.

I also support Lather’s (1993) notion of “transgressive validity” that rejects the truth regimes, recognizes difference and heterogeneity, social justice and transformation as the aim of educational research (Lather, 2001, Schurich, 1996). Transgressive validity opens
the possibility for the creation of forms of validity supported by the works of philosophers of science such as Foucault, Lyotard, and Derrida. Later set a condition that ethics and epistemology come together “via practices of engagement and self-reflexivity” (1993, p. 686; cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 280). Thus, taking into account that validity in dialogical research is under construction and following Lather (2001) I use Bakhtin (1993, 2004, and 2006) to render an account of methodological decisions. I understand that validity is a goal not a product. It is relative to the study’s purposes and circumstances of the research. My criteria of validity are: the thick description of what happened in T&L 633, the detailed report of the methodological procedures and decisions made during the research process supported with evidences and arguments.

Researchers within the qualitative paradigm following a poststructural approach value discrepant evidence and negative cases as a part of the studies’ validity reporting (Lather, 2001; Maxwell, 2010). In this study, I was exploring what emerged. I was interested in assertions expressing interpretations and statements of change. I was also looking for questions leading to actions. I was looking for what I could learn from T&L 633 through participants’ and key informants’ academic and in-class performances. Thus, in a strict sense, I did not have discrepant evidences and negative cases. I had participants’ doubts like “how am I going to plan for drama?” However, later in the seminar/workshop, some participants, like the key informants, found their way after independent praxis (out-of-class practices). There was an ongoing process of assessment, meaning-making, and knowledge building. There were no right or wrong answers.
Credibility was built through triangulation understood not as consensus but as coherence between what key informants stated in their portfolios, Carmen postings, and interview. Member checks of the interview transcripts were also considered as part of the triangulation process. This is consistent with recent views of triangulation (Guba & Lincoln, 1989 in Lather, 2001). It is also in line with Hall’s (1986) notion of “articulation” which can be framed within dialogism (in Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005).

Reflexivity and triangulation are also interdependent processes that warrant different forms of validity. Stakes (2003) emphasizes reflexivity as central in developing case studies. As described above, the time I have devoted to the processes of collecting, processing, and analyzing data point to the rigor with which this study was conducted; and the related desire to follow a dialogic theoretical model of interrelated voices, theory, and emerging questions. In addition, Luttrell’s (2010) “Reflexive Model of Research Design” emphasizes reflexivity as central for bringing to light the relationships between “what and how we learn with and about others and ourselves” (p. 160). She also points out that the contingencies that shape the nature of those relationships are “practical, theoretical, ethical, moral, and political” (p. 160). The interrelated dimensions of a dialogic methodology and its consequent value for other educators and researchers is dependent on the extent to which all of these relationships can be accounted for in the design, analysis, and findings of the research project.

To fulfill the transferability criterion I have provided a detailed report of the methodology and methods I followed, so they could serve as guides for other researchers. Dialogical projects cannot be replicated (in the sense of exact duplication) because in the
dialogical paradigm no one is ever the same, it is always becoming; thus the person’s representations with/through language change because of their authorship. This is what Frank (2005) calls “The principle of perpetual generation” (p. 967).

I kept a research journal throughout the whole research process. It facilitated deep reflection on the decisions I made. They are supported both in theory and in data. In addition, I kept a file with the data in a safe place in my home office. Furthermore, to guarantee confidentiality, I coded data and used pseudonymous for key informants. In this way I guaranteed a systematic approach to the anonymity process.

Dialogism’s core concepts, authorship and dialogue, made impossible fulfilling the criterion of confirmability. The research process and report are the outcomes of my readings of T&L 633 as a professional development program. Instead, I call for continuing the discussion initiated by Bakhtin (2004, 2006) and Volosinov (1986) on the philosophy of language focused on qualitative research. I think this opens an area of study to be developed. The discussion should focus, amongst many issues, on how much centrifugal and centripetal forces weigh in the research process. In this project, for example, I assumed official standards of validity for research and the official curriculum as centripetal forces. They hold authoritative discourses. As Lather and Moss (2005) argue, the official discourses on educational research seem to ignore or to relegate to the margins educational research that crosses disciplinary boundaries, include relationships between researcher and researched, and addresses “the complexity and messiness of practice-in-context which call into question the adequacy of conventional methods” (p. 2).
I interact with Dr. Edmiston through his written work. Following Bakhtin (2004) I was aware that my student-teacher interaction with him could affect my observations; therefore, I had to objectify his discourse to create and represent my own. As a part of this objectification process, I read other scholars’ contributions to position his discourse alongside theirs. In this way I became theoretically stronger and broadened the spectrum of possibilities for professional development programs for teachers.

My advisor was a wonderful self/other to have deep conversations that led me to have dialogues with the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories and scholars and, through them, with teachers and students around the world. However, it is worthwhile to mention that the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories, particularly dialogism, are often not of interest to many fellow graduate students and faculty, thus it was difficult to find people to talk with about my project.

**Ethics.**

In terms of formalities of conducting research, I fulfilled all the items I submitted to the IRB: All participants at T&L 633 summer version of 2007 signed informed consent. Additionally, the key informants signed another consent form. At the moment of the interview I asked their oral consent and recorded it. They reviewed the interview transcripts. I protected their identities with pseudonymous and covering with black ink their names in the written texts. I also made the effort to fulfill another aspect of the ethics in dialogical research that Frank (2005) states as follows: “the dialogical research report offers an account of how researcher and participant came together in some shared time and space and had diverse effects on each other (p. 968). It is expected that these effects will cause further reverberations. I adhere to Frank’s (2005) assertion that the
inconclusive character of dialogical research “is both empirically correct and ethically appropriate” (p. 968). In addition, when this work reaches the public, participants will have the opportunity to re-visit the seminar/workshop to nurture the processes of reflection, inquiry, and interpretation that I hope they are continuing to go through.
Chapter 4

Findings

The dialogic paradigm inspired by Bakhtin’s dialogism and Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory is T&L 633’s theoretical frame. Dialogic pedagogy is a wide category that involves applications such as drama pedagogy, action research, and community of practice. This chapter describes one possible application, amongst many, of how the dialogic paradigm works in education when authorship is the goal. I have assumed key informants’ understandings, interpretations, re-conceptualizations, re-examinations, and plans to change their practices as indicators of authorship. These actions express the development of one’s word (Bakhtin, 1993, 2004, 2006; Bakhtin & Medvedev, 1991; Volosinov, 1986).

Accordingly, in learning from T&L 633 to develop curricula for professional development programs for teachers makes it important to identify in data: How is it possible to promote authorship and how can the promotion of authorship lead to educational change? More precisely, it is important to focus on what events and practices according to the data, promote authorship. It is also important to identify in the data how authoritative and internally persuasive discourses enter into struggle of promoting authorship.

This chapter introduces some answers to these questions. They are the outcome of data analyses that answer the study’s three research questions. I remind the reader that
research question one makes reference to what happened during T&L 633, that is, to the means of transmission, appropriation, and assimilation of another’s discourse. Research question two makes reference to what key informants express through oral and written texts they have learned and project to do (interpretation) with that knowledge. Research question three makes reference to the changes they plan as a part of their professional development based on what they have learned in T&L 633, that is, as a part of their capacity to author themselves as professionals of education.

I present in this chapter the findings from the third moment onward in the data analysis process after I have let the data “talk” and have selected from all participants’ Carmen postings the initial segments for analyzing data. At that moment, I zeroed in on the three key informants. However, it has to be kept in mind that for research question one, in addition to key informants’ portfolios and interview transcripts, I used the structured observation narrative (as described in chapter three, page 115, and in Appendix G) as a reference for the analysis.

I have narrowed down the search to the axis, key, and satellite concepts’ functions considered in this work. Axis concepts are tacitly or explicitly present in any of the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theoretical construction like definitions and assumptions. I expect to highlight how the Bakhtinian notions of authorship, dialogue, self/other, chronotope, change and uncertainty (axis concepts) are present in participants conceptualizations (more precisely re-conceptualizations) of the key concepts: teaching, learning, knowledge building process, curriculum development, evaluation, and the relationship between knowledge and society. I also expect to highlight the possible incidence of these re-conceptualizations in key informants’ practices through the
reflections they made on the satellite concepts’ functions: creation of possibilities, development of basic HPF, and maintenance and change of the status quo.

Although dialogism’s basic assumptions makes us aware that research findings are the researcher’s interpretation of the particular case under study (T&L 633) Bakhtin’s (2006) notion of speech genre as the vocabulary that people practicing the same profession shared allows identifying commonalities between key informants. At the end of every research question, I present a summary of those commonalities. I assumed the researcher’s role to analyze and to interpret the findings from theory but I let the key informants’ voices tell them with me.

******************************

Research Questions’ Findings

Research question one.

In keeping with the production of a multi-vocal text, I have used different fonts to indicate the changing voices of participants:

Normal times new roman font = narrative of events.

*Italics* = Dr. Edmiston or participants voices during activities and drama enactments.

Text in Candara font = Herrera’s analytic perspective and related theoretical voices.

Answering this question, I focused on the way Bakhtin’s (2004) notions of authoritative and internally persuasive discourses are applied in T&L 633’s curriculum development. When teachers enrolled in T&L 633, according to a survey on their expectations from the workshop, they were seeking something new. They were willing to change their practices. However, most of them entered with the authoritative discourse
that does not recognize students’ authorship but the transmission of knowledge and skills. This was evident in their contributions. For example, at the beginning of the workshop, during one of the activities designed to get to know one another, professor Edmiston asked them to make a line by the age level they teach and “tell people around you who do not work with your age group something that you think they should know. This is your inside knowledge. It has to be positive.”

Participants teaching kindergarten said, “In general, do not assume that they know how to do certain things like cutting with scissors. You have to model everything”

Participants teaching second and third grades said, “Kids at that age are really like a sponge and they would take much of what you teach them. They are eager to learn”

These utterances convey discourses that conceptualize the student as “‘receptacles’ to be filled by the teacher. The more completely she fills the receptacles, the better a teacher she is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are.” (Freire, 1970, in Cahn, 1997, p. 461)

T&L 633 offers participants a discourse (theories, activities, and environment) that Dr. Edmiston expects to become persuasive for them, i.e., assimilated and acknowledged. The way to make this discourse persuasive is by living it, experiencing it, and reflecting on action. In this process, one of the defining features of internally persuasive discourse is crucial: It admits gradual and flexible transitions from one discourse to another (Bakhtin (2004). To attain this goal, T&L 633 works at the meta-level to reflect on the role of reflection in learning, to assess evaluation, to create community by intentionally becoming an authentic community of learners. This is facilitated by the fact that in T&L 633 teaching and learning get into a peculiar relationship because teachers are learning how to become better teachers. This relationship puts both teaching and learning in a
unique position: teaching and learning are at the same time the objects of study and the actions required for teachers to improve teaching. From their identity as teachers, teachers are students. Ms. S’s Carmen posting illustrates:

“Being the “student” in the shared power has really made me feel like my ideas and values of the time we spend in class are important. The way that Dr. E gives us this power for does allow me to get the most out of this class. Step by step, lesson by lesson, and day by day, I hope I can build a classroom that allows for not only learning to happen but significant learning to go on everyday for the students.”

During the workshop, participants are treated as professionals capable of providing and building reasons for their decisions. The activities’ design facilitates the knowledge building process at the microgenetic level. The underlying assumption is that in order to learn and to build discourses the center of any action is the body which is to be located at the intersection of social and cultural forces (Bakhtin, 2004; Bakhtin & Medvedev, 1991; Cavallaro, 2001; Foucault, 1979; Leroi-Gourhan, 1993; Nespor, 1997). I illustrate the process of connecting meta-level and microgenetic dimension with three activities: “how do we build community,” “how to plan to read a book,” and the enactment of a central story. They are major activities that involve sub-tasks and different skills. Together they illustrate the content, context, and processes lived during the workshop. I have given names to some strategies to describe the findings. I identify them in this report with italic font and single quotation marks to distinguish them from Dr. Edmiston’s named strategies, which I will write in underlined italics. Additionally, throughout the narrative I will refer to “participant(s)” because I quote other class members in addition to the three key informants as I describe the activities.
Building community.

The strategy of building community is the focus of attention of the activities described in this section. They are developed on day one; however, Professor Edmiston initiated the process from activity one. This process continued throughout the workshop. He began by asking people information related to their lives that is important for formal education. In this way, their private lives are respected; for example, where do they come from? Where do they teach? What do they know about their students? This knowledge is highlighted as their inside knowledge. I called this strategy ‘careful selection of criteria’; for instance, by establishing as a criterion to form small groups by participants’ geographic origin people are brought together despite their ethnicity, races, ages, gender, and other social markers that otherwise might compel them to isolate from a particular group or individuals. Another criterion to form groups is assigning numbers and then organizing subgroups by criteria such as same numbers or even numbers. I liked this activity because the randomness of life itself represented by the numbers brings people together.

Professor Edmiston used the latter strategy to organize participants to develop this activity. I transcribed the whole activity as a way to show how socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories were introduced as persuasive discourses. Participants were asked to think about “How to build community” “What actions, attitudes, and values should be taken into account?”

Dr. Edmiston: “Let’s get in order again by number of years as a teacher and you define teacher anyway you want.”
My interpretation of this utterance is that he is opening the possibility of having different conceptualizations on key topics like teaching. In so doing, he is recognizing authorship; that he cannot impose or control their sense and meanings.

Dr. Edmiston assigned numbers from one to 12 to half of the group and from 12 to one to the other half. He said, “Find people with your same number and talk about what is important in building community.”

Here the randomness of life represented by numbers got people together. Dialogism recognizes uncertainty as a component of human beings’ interactions for two reasons: without utterances there is no communication and the context of an utterance are the previous and future utterances of those involved in dialogue. Although being in communication within a speech genre allows anticipating the content of the utterance there is always the possibility of an unexpected turn (Bakhtin, 2006, pp. 60-130).

People are talking, smiling, and looking more confident.

Dr. Edmiston said, “Three, two, one…” This is a clue Professor Edmiston gives participants to call their attention and/or to let them know that he is going to propose another teaching move. Teaching move is a term coined by Edmiston & Wilhelm (1998) to refer to a change of activity. I will indicate them with the sentence: dramatic inquiry process.

Dr. Edmiston said, “A couple of things before I go on: if you need to go to the bathroom, please go. If you get tired and need to sit down, sit down, and if it is not clear what I said because I have a mixed accent, let me know by raising your hand.”

I interpret his comment as a way to let participants know in this workshop they are recognized as human beings from Bakhtin’s (2004) notion of “laughter”; that is, their whole
humanity, including their bodies’ physiological functions. This is important because school’s authoritative discourse sanctions the students’ body movements and natural functions.

Dr. Edmiston pointed out an empty chart on a wall entitled: “How do we build community.” He said, “Because of the years of teaching experience by being in the classroom we have been a part of the classroom community, but there are other communities that have to be built, they are not given. For example, who has a hobby?”

Participant: theater

Dr. Edmiston: “Every time you get together you have to build community. Another example is family. Families get built.”

He is bringing to the participants’ attention the social, cultural, and historical character of institutions that we usually assumed as natural or given and not as our creations. Ogawa, et al., (2008) explain that institutions as social processes are reproduced over time and “take on meaning as systematic patterns of social behaviors, which become “naturalized” as the “rules of the game” of social behavior... Institutions seem to define “normal” behavior, but they are the systematic expression of dominant cultural values” (pp. 88-89). Wenger (1998) asserts, “We must also remember that our institutions are designs and that our designs are hostage to our understanding, perspectives, and theories” (p. 10). He points out that, institutions as social systems involve discourses on issues such as social structure, power, identity, experience, practices, and ways and forms of participation. The way these issues are related determine “the way we justify our actions to ourselves and to each other” (p. 11).

He explains the activity: “Think how we build community, what actions, what values, and what attitudes. Share with the person beside you and let’s see what we come up with. I will put some post-its on this table. Pick up one or two things that you think really make
a difference in building community. We can have thousands, but please be selective.

Write on the post-its and stick them on the chart.”

People chatting: Noise increased compared to former activities while participants write on post-it and stick them on the chart. People’s bodies, attitudes, show that by this moment they feel in a caring environment. The room is messy compared with the traditional classroom: chairs are scattered, some people sat down, and some are standing up.

“Three, two, one...”

Dr. Edmiston: “Read up what you wrote”

Participants:

“Safe”

“Support”

“Caring and respect”

“Unspoken rules and modeling”

“Appreciation.” Two participants said simultaneously “appreciation.” One apologized to the other. Dr. Edmiston made a comment:

“One of the things we’ll learn to do is to find a space. It is what you are doing at this moment. Groups need to learn that it is OK to talk when another person is trying to do that. That is what good groups do. So it is not surprising that the very first time we (inaudible). Instead, of me saying OK I’m going to call your number to assign you a turn, which is just stupid because you can listen to one another and feel the space, look for your space.”

When not only subject matter’s content but also the students’ human development is a part of the teacher’s educational goals, he/she should take advantage of events usually
overlooked. He/she should be open and ready for these unexpected events. Teachers should be aware of their personal values and the aims and goals they assign to formal education.

Participants continue making the list together. After some minutes, Professor Edmiston asked, “Is our list complete?” “Are there other things out there?” “Of course!” “The list will be completed during the week. How are we doing in this classroom, at this moment, in terms of these qualities? Does anyone want to name or add something they want to do more?”

Participants:

“Keep support”

“Share about yourself, you learn from other people. You make connections listening to other stories.”

Dr. Edmiston advised: “If during the week you find something else, write it up, and stick it on the chart.”

One participant said, “Show up.” The group laughs

Dr. Edmiston made a comment: “In the syllabus I wrote “non attendance will affect your grades” but this morning I was thinking I should have said, “Non attendance will affect your experience and your learning.”

He is again taking advantage of an apparently irrelevant event. He is openly contrasting authoritative discourse with internally persuasive discourse. In this case, contrasting punishment with teaching and learning as interactions and assuming the classroom as the context/chronotopoe where they are carried out.

Dramatic inquiry process

Dr. Edmiston made a comment:
“One thing I want to say is that because of I tend not to do formal lectures, sometimes people miss the fact to make notes about the great things that are happening here and that they can apply in their classrooms. So please take notes about what you find interesting. I encourage you to keep a journal. Journaling is about thinking about things and write about them.”

Independent work is encouraged. Curriculum is about making meaning together but each participant has his/her own interest. So the individual and social aspects of learning are recognized and suggesting writing as a means to build knowledge. As Holquist (2004a) asserts “Dialogism is a philosophy of the trees as opposed to a philosophy of the forest: it conceives society as a simultaneity of uniqueness” (p. 153).

I made a comment to call attention that everything on the chart seemed so rosy, so perfect, but I did not see the different or difficult child on the chart. I also said that I did not know what would be the best word in English to express my concern.

Dr. Edmiston invites people to find a word and asked, “Is there any recipe there to build something superficial? It could be. I think this is what Mariela is calling attention to”

Participants named “Compassion and conflict resolution”

Dr. Edmiston claimed: “Because if we do not have conflict, we do not have obstacles and obstacles make community.”

It is important to note that in dialogic pedagogy and particularly in using drama, conflict is highly valued. It facilitates to approach a problematic complex situation from different positions. In fact, one of the goals of Edmiston’s proposal of ethical education is to prepare citizens able to create and develop informed and peaceful solution to conflictive situations through reflection and imagination. He expresses the ethical dimension of drama as follows:
“When drama activities explore conflict we need to recognize the potential social and cultural effects.” (Edmiston, 2003, p. 4)

He asked, “Would you agree that a classroom is a community?” if you agree, let’s think about the title of this class. This class is called “Teaching and Learning with Drama.” the question is:

“What does it mean to learn?
What does it mean to teach?
What does mean curriculum?
What we do in teaching and learning is curriculum, is assessment, and to make that happen we plan.”

He introduced the form “What do you mean by ….series” and said, “At this moment 10:30 am where are you conceptually?” there is no right or wrong answer. ”

Traditional educational discourse, which is authoritative according to the features pointed out by Bakhtin (2004), is recognized as a part of the starting dialogizing background (pp 342-345). Participants are invited to become aware of the initial point of interaction within the zone of boundaries (where are they conceptually on day one?). This is according to Bakhtin (2004) the first step in the gradual transition from authoritative discourse toward internally persuasive discourse and the changes in praxis it carries out when assimilated and acknowledged.

After a short break (15 minutes or so), Professor Edmiston offered choices to the group: “What would you like to do: go over the syllabus first, another post-it activity, read a story so we can do something together?” “If you are desperate for syllabus, they are over there” (pointing at the large table where materials are available). Immediately, he sat on the floor and some students did so too.
Dr. Edmiston is resisting following authoritative discourse; instead, he introduces his internally persuasive discourse through body language (sitting on the floor). I wrote in my field notes and recorded in the video how anxious participants are for going over the syllabus.

He began an activity to introduce the notion of drama by reading the book entitled “In the attic.” Sigi, the main character whose gender could not be identified on the pictures, says that S/he has a million toys but s/he is bored. S/he climbed a ladder to the attic where s/he found a family of mice, a spider, an open window to other worlds, an old flying machine, and a friend that s/he could talk to but at that moment his/her mother called “dinner!!!”. Sigi shared his/her adventure with her. The mother responded: “But we don’t have an attic.” Sigi thinks, “I guess she doesn’t know about the attic. She hasn’t found the ladder”

Dr. Edmiston asked the group what they think is the ladder. After three or four answers, he stated, “So the ladder is imagination.” He proceeded explaining: “Drama at its simplest is imagining that you are with other people, that you are somewhere else, action in the place where you are. In drama you don’t have to do anything except be yourself”.

The activity continues: Professor Edmiston played the role of Sigi’s mother in a pathetic imitation to show what drama is not: He sat on a chair and changing his voices trying to talk like a woman crying expressed the mother’s concern about Sigi. Then he asked, “Do you think that works?” “Can you see me as a mother?” Participants laughed.

After making agreements with participants, they set the situations and context to enact the story: They gave the character a new name “Max” and a gender (a boy). Dr.
Edmiston is the mother and they are her friends. They are talking on the phone. He takes the mother’s role using this time his normal tone of voice. Participation increased.

During the enactment, “the mother” always talked from the authoritative discourse’s point of view. She highlights how imagination affects Max’s performance as citizen in the real world: “We should take him into practical important things. He is wasting his time pretending to be a tiger.”

The mother’s friends (participants) responded from a discourse where imagination and play are important and valued: “You should feel lucky that you have such a smart child.”

As I stated in chapter two, dialogic pedagogies rely on imagination to promote HPF such as reflection and inquiry. In addition, dialogic scholars recognize imagination as a key factor to transform society and culture (Bakhtin, 2006; Greene, 2000). It is interesting to note that outside their teachers’ role, participants’ arguments regarding imagination are framed (aware them or not) within the socio-cultural-historical tradition. They are a part of their conceptual background to entry the zone of boundaries. This activity brings them to light.

- Professor Edmiston asked:

- “Was this teaching and learning with drama?”
- “What were we learning?”
- “Why is imagination a good idea?”
- “What about teaching? “Is there any teaching?”

There were no answers but I think they were not expected. He was using questioning to promote and mediate learning.
Wrapping up Professor Edmiston said, “Drama is not about acting out, it is about deep conversations.”

**Dramatic inquiry process**

Dr. Edmiston: “Do you want to do a little bit more of this or do you want to do syllabus?”

Participants: “Syllabus!”

Authoritative discourse is governing participants’ decision. However, it is worthwhile to note that the evaluation’s criteria in the syllabus (which is in general the students’ major concern) represent a form of negotiation between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses.

Dr. Edmiston explained the syllabus highlighting the expected creative outcomes such as the design of diagrams to represent participants’ insights and built knowledge. He emphasized their portfolios should be the outcome of their reflection on the dialogue between the theory and the experiences lived during the workshop. He remarked they are free to exert their authorship and that he is open to negotiate with them proposals that are outside of the criteria in the syllabus.

Before introducing the next segment, it is important to say that another strategy used in dramatic inquiry is *asking short but profound questions that are apparently simple*, e.g. the strategy of posing inquiry questions about values and value systems. Values are crucial for community building in the classroom. During the workshop participants talked a lot about values. Dr. Edmiston asserts, “Everything I do is what I value”; then he asked, “What do we say yes to?” “How do I decide what is appropriate in our classroom?”
My interpretation of the relevance given to values in T&L 633’s curriculum development is that as teachers we teach what we are. As Holland et al. (2003) argue, identity is the way people understand themselves. With Bakhtin (1993) I understood that our existence is a text and with Bakhtin (2004) that we author the text of our lives as a novel. I comprehended that all our discourses are charged with values. Therefore, as Edmiston & Enciso (2003) explain, “the words we use in everyday interactions do more than state our meaning. As “discourse,” our words also express our social, cultural, ideological, and ethical positions about social relations, whether those relations are very intimate and close to our lives or distant from our immediate experience” (p. 871). In relation with Edmiston & Enciso (2003) Holland et al., (2003) define identity as “a concept that figuratively combines the intimate or personal world with the collective space of cultural forms and social relations.” (p. 5)

Strategies like these and activities designed to enact them facilitated participants to live not only the experience of powerful learning as a social process, but also of reflecting on teaching practices that can foster the creation of a caring reflective community. During the seminar/workshop, participants had the opportunity to experience as students the importance in the learning process of:

- Valuing students’ ideas, listening to them, and listening to silence.
- Sharing ideas with a partner.
- Sharing ideas through gestures or tableaus.
- Working in small groups
- Using “WE” statements to encourage collective knowledge building.
- Listen the students more than tell them what to do.
**How to plan to read a book.**

Implementing dramatic inquiry, Professor Edmiston uses different strategies to promote meaning making and knowledge building using as mediating devise a book’s story. Thus, the strategy of *how to plan to read a book* with the students is fundamental in his curriculum building. He illustrates how to use a narrative to read and interpret with the children’s book “Brave Margaret” written by Robert D. San Souci (2002). This is a tale about a heroine who lives alone in an island and assumes roles usually played by men. As any story, it can be read from different points of view (Bakhtin, 2004). After making clear that his purpose is to teach how to work with drama pedagogy using dramatic inquiry as a strategy he shared that he has read the book from the point of view of “bravery.” He started by finding out what participants knew about the book: “How did you read the book? What do you think is important to think about?” “In terms of planning, why on earth do we want to read this book?”

Participant: “I used it with fifth grade and was really good to talk about stereotypes, which is an ongoing conversation in my school.”

Professor Edmiston took notes on the board of participants’ contributions to make an exploration of the topics and issues they see in the book and said, “As we read, I am interested in what you are interested in this book.”

He made clear that as teachers we do not have to kill the story by writing on the board the topic, the structure, the main character, and so on. He is referring to what traditional grammar and literature courses do following Saussure’s linguistics that was highly criticized by Bakhtin (see Bakhtin, 2004, 2006; Volosinov, 1986). He let participants know “we are going to stop at certain points and have a conversation. You are free to
ask, as I read, where to stop.” He is introducing the strategy: how to spot the moments to stop the actual reading and look for big problems and big questions so the group creates the text. This strategy allows participants’ imagination and voices to enter into action; to step inside and outside the story (outsiderness); and, to use the syllabus and the textbooks as guides and not as normative prescriptions. These are according to Bakhtin (2004) internally persuasive discourse’s means for its transmission, interpretation, and artistic reformulation. Bakhtin (2006) argues that understanding is not duplication because it “would not entail anything new or enriching…In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside (italics in original) the object of his or her creative understanding – in time, in space, in culture” (p. 7).

He began to read the book along with the participants. They began by reading the pictures (not the written text) and authoring, by imagining, a psychological picture of the character.

It is important to keep in mind that according to Bakhtin (1993), we author the other and ourselves from our unique place in existence; that is, from the chronotope where/when/identity at a particular moment the world addresses me and I am answerable/responsible for the sense and meaning that I make. However, our existence is a shared event. This is why we can build types of societies and culture together (Bakhtin, 2006, pp. 103-131)

After reading the first two paragraphs, Professor Edmiston stops and asked:

“Are you wondering anything already?” “Why is she alone?” “Does it bother you?”

“Do you think she chose to be alone or that she might be alone for another reason?”

“Maybe she is a widow” “Maybe she is an orphan” “But at some time in her past there were people around her that are not there anymore.”

Participant: “I think for whatever reason she became brave and independent.”
Dr. Edmiston: “Do you want to imagine or continue the story? Or we could make our own story about why she became so strong. Would you like to do that?” “Talk to the person besides you for ten seconds if you want to stop and go backwards in time.”

Participants decide to continue.

Dr. Edmiston: “So, we will leave that unknown at this moment.”

He is pointing out the past could be imagined and re-created. In dialogism, inspired in Einstein’s relativity theory, past, present, and future are always in relationship. Bakhtin (2004) uses the term “fullness of time” to express such a relationship. He argues that if we take the present out of its relationship with the past and the future it becomes reified, dead, it loses its historical relevance.

In the text, one day Margaret spots a gallant ship and sees a handsome man approaching her. He introduces himself as a prince. He tells her his crew desperately needs meat to recover strength; thus, he needs her cattle.

Professor Edmiston asked, “What should she do?”

Participants: “Invite them up”

Dr. Edmiston: “How do you know when to trust someone?”

Participant: “She should say that her husband will be back soon.”

Dr. Edmiston: “So, should she lie to him?”

Again, Dr. Edmiston introduced values in the inquiry questions. My interpretation is that professor Edmiston is not interested in particular values but highlighting the fact that values are present in our utterances, in our decisions. This realization is very important for educators concerned as they are (or are made to be) with the content of subject matters. Educators should be aware that the content changes as science progresses in its discoveries.

Today, we can have access to enormous amount of information through high-tech
communication systems like Internet; however, values as essential component of our identities are always present in our understandings and interpretations on any type of discourse, even scientific discourse.

*Dramatic inquiry process*

Strategy: *supporting the person taking up the main character’s role.* In the story, gender roles are at the center of dialogue in both characterization and content. Participants at T&L 633 are mostly women. Professor Edmiston using his teacher’s authority divides the group into two subgroups: men and women’s regardless of members’ gender. Women had to advise Margaret on what to do and what to say. Men had to discuss with Simon about the convenience (or not) to take Margaret with them as she has requested in exchange for cattle. In this way, all participants have the chance to be in the position of a different gender Other and to participate from that double consciousness. In drama the world of the IS (actual reality) and the IF or the imagined world interact. Participants could go back and forth between these two worlds as they decide (Edmiston, 2003).

Women advise Margaret to say, “I will cook for you” “I will care for you”

Men said: “We have been looking after ourselves for months. We don’t need a woman to cook for us” “How are you going to prove us that you are brave?”

Margaret said that she could match their qualities and exceed them. She made up that she has been taking care of the farm since she was seven years old.

Women talking about Margaret’s offer to help to clean the ship: “He is asking for too much.”

Dr. Edmiston whispering on the women’s ears: “Should she as a woman be the one who clean the ship?” “Should she join the men in the cleaning?”
He is bringing to the participants’ attention traditional discourses on gender to be the
target of critical analysis. This is a careful selection of a topic because gender roles have
played a crucial role in men and women’s performance as citizens.

Dramatic inquiry process

Strategy: Inviting participants to change opinion. Professor Edmiston challenged
women’s role with a concrete question: “Margaret should or should not be allowed to
go in the ship?” Reasons and values are brought to light through the strategy of
whispering and including in the dialogue different characters.

Professor Edmiston asked men, “What make you think that she should come?”
Participant: “Should she be taken for a trial period?”
Participant: “It brings bad luck to bring women on board”
Participant: “Give her some coins”
Participant: “It’s the only way to get the meat”

Questioning is used to make participants to bring their values to the surface. In drama,
the leading teacher should have the ability to provoke “powerful dialogic spaces in which
students’ “ethical imagination” changes their moral understanding making their views more
multifaceted, interwoven, and complex” (Edmiston, 1998, p. 61). In this activity, participants
are living the experience of making decisions based on discourses that are charged with
values such as the value of gender, money, survival, self/interest that determine our
behaviors toward the Other and that we usually do not question.

Dramatic inquiry process

Professor Edmiston addressing the whole group: “If you think she should go come
and stand here.”
Strategy: **How to create possible futures.** In T&L 633, textbooks are valued as cultural artifacts but they are not the only valuable and reliable source of knowledge. People’s wisdom and previous knowledge are also respected and accepted. With “Brave Margaret” Dr. Edmiston illustrated how to make layers of stories, to envision possibilities. He used a strategy he calls *How to build a story upon a story?* These stories should be totally possible and credible and filled with values and beliefs systems.

Margaret made up the story that when the Vikings and the pirates came she survived and she never has run out of food. She said that she needed to go in the ship to look for her family. Her story is totally possible and credible and expresses her values toward family. In addition, she is making evident how our past actions determine our future; however, they could have also been different. In this sense, she is not lying. She is building a possible future based on possible pasts.

In education, this is particular important for example for minority students such as Latinos and African American. Drama education offers them the possibility to create and actually experience in imagination possibilities of being where their potentialities for example as successful students, artists, professionals, leaders are developed.

At the end of the enactment, Dr. Edmiston asked, “*Why bother to do that instead of just read the story?*” “*What difference does it make?*” *Did it make any difference to you?***

Participants: “*You brought different situations***”

Participant: “*I could learn about myself, like the cleaning***”

Participant: “*We are protected in the fictional world***”

Participant: “*One book could lead to another***” “*It feels strange as if it were another story***”
Participant: “It was a clear dilemma: Should she go or stay?”

Dr. Edmiston continues reading but before he said, “Stop me when you see another big problem.”

**Dramatic inquiry process**

Strategy: *Wrapping-up*. This is a way to assess if students have built knowledge, if they are engaged, sharing ideas, valuing students’ work. To close the enactment of Brave Margaret professor Edmiston states that in general the strategy to work with dramatic inquiry is: Get into the text – try out possibilities – going back to the text. In addition, when trying something new he recommends the strategy: *to keep the group together and make every one to feel responsible for something to the group*. This leads to building community. It is important to remember that participants in this course are in-service teachers learning how to use drama. When he is working with children, professor Edmiston usually finishes the enactments with activities addressed to reach reconciliation by negotiation of conflicts.

**Enactment of a central story.**

According to my experience in T&L 633 and data, during the workshop, every activity has a purpose and is important in the curriculum’s enactment. Nevertheless, there is a central story that, for its intensity, illustrates the richness and complexity of drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry as strategy. By the time the central story is enacted, participants have learned basic elements of drama pedagogy; they are acquainted with the dynamic of using drama; and, feel confident enough to participate in the enactments. This time this story is Ruth Vander Zee’s (2003) “Erika’s story.” The story’s central character is a woman who does not know her autobiographical data. All she knows is that when she
was a few months old her parents dropped her from a train to save her from the Holocaust. A woman from the locality, risking her life, picked her up, gave her a name, and took care of her. Erika is full of questions about her parents: why did they drop her from the train? How did they make the decision? How was the farewell?

The structured observation allowed me to identify the ways enactments were structured in phases. I have called them: introduction, warming-up, intense participation, and closing. The intense participation phase involved sub-phases: deep reflections, intense enactments, and wrapping-up. These sub-phases do not follow a strict pattern; instead, they are enacted as needed. In this central story, for example, a wrapping-up takes place before the intense enactment.

The introduction phase is addressed “to create conditions in which the students felt comfortable enough to talk, share, ask questions, or leave the security of their chairs” (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998, p. 2). In this phase, the rules to be followed are agreed. These rules involved, for example, mutual respect and time management. The purpose of the warming-up phase is to assist the students to enter into the drama world. During this phase, drama is contextualized through questions. In the intense participation phase, students are invited to enter into the fictional world of drama usually with a question. Artifacts are used to support imagination and to bring to discussion difficult complex topics and ethical dilemmas. Movement, dialogue, and the use of technical and scientific concepts characterize this phase. The closing phase involves finding a point of agreement and ways of negotiation between the different groups representing opposite positions. Questions, movement, and dialogue are present in all phases.
Introduction phase.

On June 13, 2007, the enactment of Erika’s Story began applying the strategy ‘How to plan to read a book? Professor Edmiston announces, “We are going to read the story together.” Photocopies of the pages of the book are lying on the floor. Every participant picked up one page and read to the whole group. The reading helped to locate the story in a concentration camp during WWII.

After reading the story in-group, Dr. Edmiston asked, “What would be your inquiry question?” Think about how & why, when & who, and what & where. Participants said what they want to know, why they want to know that, and Dr. Edmiston took notes.

Professor Edmiston used the strategy of asking short but profound questions about crucial issues usually not talked about in the classroom. He asked, “What would you like to know about this story?” “Talk to the person beside you about what would you like to find out” Your guiding questions are how and why, when and who, and what and where. Participants began to answer the question: why did the adoptive parents decide to tell her the truth?

Race and religious issues are discussed, but discussion is guided by participants’ questions:

“Why did Nazis use the golden star and not the Jewish one?
Iconic question trying out possibilities.

“Where did Erika live?”

Bakhtin & Medvedev’s, (1991) notion of chronotope as lived time seems to be acknowledged. This participant did not ask where Erika was born but where did she live.

Dr. Edmiston asked, “What does the text tell us?” Participants go back to the text to find out.
It became clear from this experience that before enacting a story, information, analysis, and inquiry are in order. However, before that, the teacher had to lead the creation of a caring environment. In this context, the creation of fictional worlds is possible. It facilitates a discussion of big questions and complex ethical dilemmas through deep conversations where participants go beyond the level of information and learn from each other. In deep conversations, information and knowledge meet with imagination and questioning. Additionally, it is necessary for the success of the enactment that teacher and students agree on the task. We cannot force anyone; however, participation should be encouraged. This is an ethical-pedagogical principle. In this sense, Professor Edmiston’s strategy of *pressing the students for a decision* illustrates a way to ensure everybody’s participation. In short, freedom of speech and a safe environment are necessary conditions for dramatic inquiry (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998).

**Dramatic inquiry process**

*Warming-up phase.*

Professor Edmiston rolled a piece of robe to represent the baby. He holds the baby in a gesture of tenderness. He asked questions to evoke feelings: “*what was she carrying?*” “*a lot?*”

Participants are invited to simulate they are holding the baby too without the robe and to express their imagination of the scene back in time.

**Dramatic inquiry process**

Professor Edmiston, lying on the floor, pretends he is sick, dying on the way. It smells awful. One of the participants said she does not want to look down to him. “*I do not want to see.*”
Professor Edmiston invited participants to step inside the story to talk about the issue of the “shower,” term used by Nazis to refer to the gas chambers. He asked, “Was this a well kept secret or an open secret?”

He is using as strategy the theatrical dimension of drama. It allows members to play with chronotopes to facilitate reflection; for instance, going back in time to re-create it from the present knowledge about that past. It is important to note that one of the characteristics of authoritative discourse is that it keeps distance to be safe, and one of the factors that keep it ruling people’s lives is that people do not want to see inside authoritative discourse. The reasons for this behavior are beyond the scope of this study. Scholars such as Foucault (1979) highlight fear as one of the main reasons. I found that this should be the object of study of research within the frame of the schools and the classrooms.

Participants shared what they knew about Nazi era and gas chambers, for example: Nazis wanted to keep the people calm.

Dr. Edmiston representing a Nazi soldier said: “I’m a corporal. I wouldn’t known”

Participants: “Our brains were washed.”

Dr. Edmiston invites participants to step outside the Nazi era share with another participant: “What do you think Nazi thought? What were their values?” Next, sharing with the whole group one participant said, “People could not do anything”

They also shared that regardless of mental health conditions, sex, or age, everybody was considered inferior because they were Jews.

Dr. Edmiston deepening into the topic by questioning asked: “Why were Jews inferior?”

Participants pretending they were German people responded one at a time:

“Eugenic”
“Beliefs”

“They look different”

“They steal jobs”

“The economy was down but they run a lot of businesses”

“Money is power.”

Dr. Edmiston requested, “Talk to the person beside you about what law we could change first when we are elected.” He reminded them that in 1933 the Nazi party won the election.

One of the educational values of drama is that deep conversation in fictional worlds are nurtured with factual information; thus, as a pedagogical strategy drama requires participants to look for information in different sources as other strategies but, drama offers the advantage that the content of information is questioned, reflected upon, and re-created, and transmitted into new contexts and situations. In this way, drama fulfills the characteristics pointed out by Bakhtin (2004) for transmission, formulation, and representation of internally persuasive discourse.

Participants named authoritative discourse’s meanings, ideas, values, and measures to enforce authoritative discourse like identity cards. In addition, individual concerns and public concerns like 1916- WWI defeat and the pride Germans want to regain. This conversation illustrates how in hybridization two epochs enter in dialogue: Nazis position facing Jews and some US citizens facing immigrants in 2007.

It is important to note that authorship requires and seeks to develop independent, responsible, and active individuals. Instead, authoritative discourse, artistically represented in this enactment through the Nazi party, requires followers, non-responsible, and calm subjects. In the following segment of the enactment, participants lived
authoritative discourse’s ways of operation and ways of fissuring it. It is evident that one of these ways is artistically representing its discourses to perform a poststructural analysis.

Dr. Edmiston requested, “The person who is a Nazi party member stand up.” “The people who might be or becomes a Nazi or is against sit down.” “Is anyone uncomfortable with where they are?” “Decide your own lines. Look for a keyword.”

People standing up closed their eyes and people sitting down came to the center of the room to whisper between them things that are told behind Nazis.

Participants expressing through body language what happened with authoritative discourse when fear silences people’s voices.

The whole group is requested to show their support to the Nazi party through the well-known Nazi salute to the Fuehrer (gesture and voice): “Heil Hitler!”

After a couple of repetitions, one participant expressed her concern about her students whom she is trying to imagine. Her participation gives way to a discussion of the role of gesture to express and ways to control body movements. Following, Professor Edmiston suggested changing the well-known Nazi salute to Hitler by a hand in fist and the extension of the index finger as a way to feel more comfortable. Upon Dr. Edmiston’s command, participants repeat the gesture several times embodying in this way the role of repetition as controlling practice by the mechanization of the behaviors. It was difficult at the beginning when participants were still paying attention to their feelings; however, the fast speed of the command eliminated reflection time and made easier to make the gesture.
One of the characteristics of any form of art is its capacity to synthesize whole bodies of discourses. In this case, a gesture represents one of behaviorism’s salient features: repetition.

*Intensive participation phase.*

*Intensive reflection sub-phase.*

Participants are in role. The strategy in this segment is to live how ethical dilemmas and the tension they create are crucial in the decision-making process regardless of participants’ final decisions. The fictional world’s situation is that one of the participants becomes caught as being opposed to Nazi party because she is a friend of the Jews.

*Dr. Edmiston posed an ethical dilemma: “Do you think we can invite someone to the party that is best friend of the Jews?” “What should we do”*?

One participant said: “you are either with us or against us”

This is one of the defining characteristics of authoritative discourse: It can only be accepted or rejected (Bakhtin (2004)).

During all this period, the drama enactment session was full of inquiry questions about values, human beings’ everyday life situations such as friendship, nationality, ethnicity, fear, and war experiences. Regardless of affecting our everyday life, we usually do not talk about these issues. Additionally, the imagined situations were based on facts that are known to have happened during the Nazi era. This information facilitates the theatrical dimension; that is, to move between two worlds: IS and WHAT IF? (Edmiston, 2000, 2003)
Professor Edmiston in role called the group’s attention to the possibility that there is a different interpretation of the situation between him and one of the participants. He said, “Stand with me or stand with him.” “The time has come to make a decision”

Participants share their reasons for the side they take without fear; however, some participants’ behavior and utterances made evident the tension of not having a third option.

Dr. Edmiston asked question about the possible future consequences of their decision like “who is going to be next? … The Gypsies? He also asked participants to imagine years later, in the future, Jews as survivors of the war visiting the graves.

Two participants are lying on the floor representing people in their graves while other participants expressed the feelings of those visitors.

It is worthwhile to note that according to Bakhtin (1993) bringing the imagined future into the present to make historical decisions about the future is one of the most profound ethical decisions a person could make. Therefore, the core question is what is it to be ethical? Bakhtin’s answer is being responsible for the sense and meaning I make.

Another teaching move took place as the dramatic inquiry process continues. Dr. Edmiston requested, “Share with us something you did during the war that you are proud of”:

Participants:

“I killed many people”

“I was not committed but I joined the party because of fear”

“I helped someone to escape”

“I raised a Jewish baby in my family”

“I kept many children alive”
Wrapping-up sub-phase.

A wrapping-up takes place to think about what they have been doing. Professor Edmiston used handouts that systematize important information to work with drama as mediating devices to support the reflection time. The activity had two moments: First, participants in pairs or small groups discussed about the reflections they made based on the story. Next, the whole group was asked to share their emotions, thoughts, and values if they wanted to. Connections between handouts and enactment are openly talked about, but not from the operational or “know how” point of view. Instead, participants highlighted the relations and emotions that dramatic inquiry brings along within and between teachers and students; for example, participants discussed about dilemmas they faced during the enactment and in their daily lives. They also pointed out that “why” is a key question to work with drama. The whole group built around this topic.

Professor Edmiston restated that drama is not acting out but about reflection and action. Drama is about moving back and forth in time but it is not pretending all the time. He remarked that during drama, the leading teacher has to stay in the teacher’s role to think about “what comes next,” according to the way the group is reading the story. Everything in drama is selected, planned, or improvised in the moment but according to an educational goal.

During this reflection time, participants talk about their independent practices connecting their lived experiences with drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry, the knowledge systematized in the handouts, and their future practices. For example, one participant asked about conflicts: “How do we create them?” The group advised her to
create dialogic interactions by approaching the situation from different positions. They also reminded her to be ready to deal with uncertainty.

Participants shared how they are planning their independent practices: who is the person they have selected and do they think that person would be suitable to perform the practice. Dr. Edmiston suggested a structure: Find a problem, reflect on it, keep in mind the text is a means to attain a goal. Supporting his explanations on the handouts, he restated, “Frame means that you could look at things different” and asked, “What factors make people to see different?” He also restated that giving people higher, equal, or lower position determines their authority to act. In this matter, it is important to distinguish between author, authoring (meaning making), and authority. He explained that in this class (T&L 633), he is the authority because of his experience; however, he highlights, he seeks to create an environment where he could share power in a Teacher-Student equal authority position to facilitate participants to develop their authoring capacity. He remarks that in the environment of T&L 633 they have freedom to act, meaning answering what they want and moving around, as they need. He wants to create conditions for them to have the authority to interpret and reflect; that is to author. He pointed out a fact: “This is huge and is not written about in literature.” Therefore, authority is a position issue and our authoring capacity (authorship) would be exerted at different degrees depending on “whose power and whose authority dominates, is silenced, or gets shared in a group” (Edmiston, 2003, p. 226).

Professor Edmiston asked, “What does this have to do with drama?” and he states “Everything. In drama, what counts is positioning to share power for authoring. In
drama you have got to separate you as a teacher in relationship with students. Every day in the classroom is about position and framing.” This has to do with power relations.

He explains the different types of power relations he identifies: Power over that is teaching centered, for example, assignments. Power for that focuses on learning to assist the students to do something; for example, the Carmen postings. The underlying idea is “I’ll do this so you can do that.” Finally, power with in which the two extremes come in the middle to promote authority to make meaning. It is dialogic. It is equal positioning teacher and students; that is, teacher and students share the power for authoring. I am here for you. I work with you. It is caring. Power with is Dr. Edmiston’s great breakthrough. He wraps-up claiming: “Power allows negotiating new ways to do things.” Teachers have to ask themselves: “where I am most of the time and where would I like to be? “ How do we position ourselves as teacher and the students?”

This is an invitation to reflect on the authoritative discourse and the internally persuasive discourse about power and authority.

*Intense enactment sub-phase.*

By the time of the enactment, participants have accrued enough knowledge and confidence through the community they have built to get in role. Enactments seek to make participants to live the struggle between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse through the story’s lines. Enactments are about reflecting on big problems to make decisions. In them, the situations are contextualized in history to elaborate arguments but they happen in fictional worlds. Consequences of decisions are lived in the fictional world so everyone is safe both physically and to express thoughts and feelings. In these enactments, all participants are in character.

Participants enacted five versions of the “Erika’s Story” as follows:
In version one, nobody picked the baby up. The guiding question was, “Why did you not pick the baby?” “Go to your inner thoughts. Then, share your inner thoughts.”

In version two, someone almost picked the baby. We do not know whom, but he or she put her back.

In version three, someone actually picked the baby up and hid her.

In version four, the whole group created another version. They had as a guide Heathcote’s (1985) teaching strategy the “Mantle of the expert.” Erika’s daughter wants to know the pieces of her mother’s story she does not know and hired the T&L 633 group of private investigators specializing in Holocaust survivors. These experts take care of cases like this one. To frame the version, they have to face ethical dilemmas such as, “Do we tell her everything?” “What about if we find out something that it is really horrible, which is very likely?”

In the Mantle of the Expert, the real and fictional worlds overlap. Versions are endless, but one always has to keep the story. One of the purposes of the application in this case is to bring to consciousness how participants have had affected their value systems through the previous enactments and the whole process: enactment’s phases and sub-phases.

Erika and her daughter sat down to receive the experts’ report (present time, 2007). The group of private investigators let them know that even though there are many sad tells around Erika’s story, they found out that Erika has many mothers and grandmothers because the entire community worked together to protect her. The investigators also found out that even German Nazi people were moved by her situation and took care of her needs financially. In addition, a reliable source of information assured them that Erika’s parents knew that she was fine before they died; therefore, they made the right decision. Erika’s daughter expressed her gratitude to the people who made the right
decision in the past. These people allowed her to be here today attending college and having a good life.

It is evident in the lines that participants created in imagination while being simultaneously private investigators and teachers/students in T&L 633 that a set of topics and issues that were the object of reflection in activities have been assimilated such as the importance of working together in community, the quality of the information that is provided to the students, the value of taking care of each other in people's lives, and the incidence of our ethical decisions in the future of people we might not even know in the present.

**Summary of findings for research question one.**

I found in my analysis of what happened in T&L 633 that the whole seminar/workshop is a ZPD where Professor Edmiston’s goal is to promote authorship for it to become valued as one of the aims of education. To attain this goal, in developing T&L 633’s curriculum he moves, as needed, in a continuum of power relations: power over, power for, and power with. In power over, he uses his authority as a recognized scholar to lead participants in the workshop to experience authorship in their learning process. He uses power for to accompany participants in their processes as in the Carmen postings. He uses power with for creating along with participants.

Bakhtin (2004) states “Every discourse presupposes a special conception of the listener, of his apperceptive background, and the degree of his responsiveness; it presupposes a specific distance” (p. 346). He claims that these factors are very important for coming to grips with the historical life of a discourse. Bakhtin also alerts us that “Ignoring such aspects and nuances leads to a reification of the (and to a muffling of the
dialogism native to it).” (p. 346). I find these components as key to compare authoritative and internally persuasive discourses. I have organized this summary around this idea.

According to data, in T&L 633 participants are authorial consciousness; that is, human beings that bring with them their previous knowledge and experience. In short, they are authors that embody both tradition and the possibility of change. Furthermore, since socio-cultural-historical tradition’s assumptions and concepts are not imposed but lived, it could be argued that it is within the participants that traditional and dialogic pedagogies come together in dialogue as two socio-linguistic consciousness that are not “unconsciously mixed but …consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance” (Bakhtin, 2004, p. 360). T&L 633 offers different views and strategies so a gradual transition between discourses takes place. It does not offer recipes for success in the solution of school’s problems; instead, it seeks to help teachers to open their minds to possibilities. This is one of the characteristics of dialogic pedagogy and inquiry. In T&L 633, participants have the opportunity to re-create themselves and their discourses by means of drama pedagogy. Discourses are the object of artistic representation by means of the hybridization between socio-cultural-historical tradition’s discourses and participants’ owns words through authorship/dialogue. In other words, participants do not merely reproduce discourses; instead, they author their new discourse.

The pedagogical environment of T&L 633 is the outcome of the permanent ongoing process of building community. It is safe and caring. Professor Edmiston does not impose his point of view but promotes processes; in addition, assessment of process and not evaluation of answers contributes to the safe and caring environment. This is accomplished by enacting the curriculum through practices different from the traditional
ones; for example, the set up of the chairs in a circle invites participation; constant assessment during the activities improves learning; and, instead of lecturing, participants are invited to create activities and to build knowledge.

It is worthwhile to highlight that in T&L 633 the teaching and learning activities proposed to participants are in themselves artistic representations of socio-cultural-historical traditions’ basic assumptions. The activities are performed in what Bakhtin (2004) calls the zone of boundaries or contact zone. They form a web where the intersection between reflection and inquiry was a constant axial mental action. Participants had the opportunity of leaning by acting which is different from learning by doing. Learning by acting implies mental actions like inquiry and reflection, imagination, and hybridization. It focuses on processes, which are the outcomes. A strategy used in T&L 633 is to have deep conversations on complex problems approached from different positions and points of view to promote conflict. Questions addressed to promote reflection and critical thinking lead participants to figure out solutions. It is at this micro level that authoritative discourse is fissured following Foucault’s (2003) notion of microphysics of power. In contrast, learning by doing implies repetition by following directions. Its focus is the transmission of contents to get results.

During the seminar/workshop, activities promoted participants spending a great deal of time in intensive dialogue with people and theories through their in-class developments, Carmen postings, daily assignments (practice with drama), readings, and portfolios. Dialogism assumes theory as the voice of a historical third party, as a part of that half of one’s word that is not ours but someone else’s. However, practitioners are
aware that we frame theory from our point of view, that is, from our unique place in existence (Holquist, 2004a).

In the contact zone, discourses are the subject of artistic representation. In addition, the enactment of curriculum involves activities that promote mental actions (reflection and inquiry). In this way, participants make meaning, re-conceptualize, and apply the built knowledge in the solution of big problems; that is, there are no passive roles. The activities involved intensive interaction between different sources of discourses such as: different theories on learning; the experiences with drama pedagogy of guests usually introduced through videos and other graphic modes; lived experiences of dramatic inquiry and other pedagogical strategies and practices, and participants’ previous knowledge. These sources bring the participants’ attention different points of view, approaches, directions and values as well as different ways of enacting drama pedagogy. Thus, one characteristic of T&L 633 is the profusion of examples. Participants received constant assessment from Professor Edmiston and peers during all these spaces of intensive interaction.

Another strategy is to extend the context into a contact zone outside the classroom in real-life situations. Here, participants bring to the level of lived experience the discourse they are assimilating and acknowledging as internally persuasive. In these activities, authorship is in action for the independent person is an ideal for education. Performing the activities participants have the opportunity to apply the meaning they have made during the workshop in the situation they decided, within the context they wanted, with the person they choose, and the book they selected. In short, they had the freedom, the text, and the pedagogical environment they decided within the socio-cultural-historical
constraint. It is important to note that *freedom, text, and pedagogical environment* are the factors that Bakhtin (2004) points out as important when transmitting and appropriating another’s word. These practices facilitate participants to find their own discourses and thoughts regarding drama pedagogy. They also self-assess their performance and make decisions to improve.

Assessing learning processes and not content allows participants to expand the context beyond the classroom, to transgress borders between academic fields, and to promote creativity. The conditions set in the T&L 633’s syllabus as evaluation’s guidelines encourage participants to make complex connections. The idea is to mediate participants’ meaning-making process so they get where they could not by themselves. Activities promote experimenting with different discourses so participants could become conscious of their own. Experimenting includes the application of made meanings to new material, to new conditions and contexts, to pose different questions. These processes lead to new interpretations, expressed in terms of questions and statement of change (acts of authorship) in an endless cycle. These processes are basic for educational change.

In sum, in T&L 633, activities seek to promote independent thinking (responsiveness in Bakhtin’s (2004) terms. Bakhtin (2004) argues that when thought begins to work in an independent, experimenting, and discriminating way two processes occur: one a separation between internally persuasive discourse and the authoritarian enforced discourse. The other, is a rejection of the discourse that does not matter to us. In T&L 633, activities facilitate these processes by promoting reflection and inquiry. Questioning is the key element with the hope that participants by making meaning (learning) make the decision to change their practices. Following Bakhtin (2004) retelling in one’s own words
is the form of appropriation promoted in T&L 633. The content of texts like children’s books and the course’s package of readings are respected but ideological changes are encouraged. Different forms of transmission facilitate the appropriation of knowledge from different sources. The lived experiences in T&L 633 through dramatic inquiry consist of thinking critically, problem solving, full participation, enjoying learning, writing your own voice, questioning, and reflection.

********************************

**Research question two.**

Question two asks what key informants express they have learned and envision doing with that knowledge. The question focuses on how they interpreted teaching, learning, curriculum development, and evaluation. To answer the question I indentified in data how they understood these concepts after participating in T&L 633. I focused on their re-conceptualizations assumed as expression of the development of their own words. Following Bakhtin (2004), in this study, as in T&L 633, interpretation is understood as application in projected change. As Holquist (2006) reminds us, Bakhtin “celebrates the infinite possibility of interpretation” (p. xix) and deplores “the captivity of narrow and homogeneous interpretations” (p. xix).

I summarized the key informants’ re-conceptualizations into assertions and support these with evidence. In this way, not only my voice but also theirs are heard. I used participants’ conceptualizations on the “What do you mean by…?” Series as the entry point in the zone of boundaries and the final portfolios and interview to assess their conceptual development at the end of the process comparing these two instances. I
introduce the findings by key concepts: teaching, learning, curriculum development, and evaluation.

**Teaching.**

Key informants re-conceptualized teaching as a constant process of learning for the teacher. They realized that reflection is crucial as means of discourse’s appropriation to improve teaching. It involves awareness of teacher’s authoritative discourse and acknowledgment that there are different discourses that might be persuasive for them. Developing this awareness requires separation of these discourses and the teacher’s decision of embracing and building his/her new word.

Evidence:

“However, when we release ourselves from the “should have” kind of thinking and just let ourselves learn along with the students without judgment and unnecessary criticism, we will always discover that good teaching develops over TIME from practice, observation, reflection, feedback, and kindness. Those teachers are the ones that can inspire the students and create classrooms that are safe, productive, and engaged (Ms. A).

“I was not as comfortable with myself when I facilitated my first dramatic experience outside of 633, and the possibility of learning for myself and my student suffered. However, because I reflected on my actions and acted on the changes I wanted to make for the next time, I improved greatly. I was true to myself by first knowing myself, and when you are genuine in your classroom, everything falls in line.” (Ms. A)

“I’ve posed more demanding questions. I developed six focus questions that I will use to help guide me as I try to incorporate drama into my classroom” (Ms. K).
“I need to work on accepting the answers and think of the possibilities of where we can go with this” (Ms. K).

They understood that teaching involves more than subject-matter content. They value as vital to take into account other components like imagination and power relations. They realized how much power relations affect their teaching practices; how crucial they are to create the safe environment required by learning as meaning making, that is, focus on authorship. Living in experience the effects of these elements in developing curriculum, they recognized, for example, that imagination as a natural psychological function could be used as resource despite socio-cultural constructed markers. During the interview, Ms. K said:

“The thing that I noticed right off with 633 is that drama and imagination can be used with any child of any socioeconomic level, neighborhood, whatever, any level. I think that is the best thing that I’ve got. This is something that I can really use in my work with these children who might come to me with no experiences, no background knowledge to a lot of things.”

These understandings were the outcome of struggle between authoritative discourses and the persuasive they were living in experience. Ms. S. said during the interview:

“I think I’m expected to play that role and not being able to have that shared power that we talked about in 633, so I think for me is a conscious remembering that I have to be careful the way that I use the power I have... I have to decide if is for others or with others”.

The effect of authoritative discourse in teaching practices was evident in one of Ms. K’s Carmen postings:
“I would like to build a learning community in my classroom. Too often, I tend to give up on this style of classroom when things do not work out. I probably need to give it more time. When things start to feel chaotic to me, I go back to the old rows and working independently.” (Ms. K.)

Theory, inquiry, and reflection were tools for key informants recognizing they need to reflect about power and control:

“Edwards (2000) “The things we steal from children” “reminded me of how much I learned this week about the power of the children. I need to let up on the power and share some with the children.” (Ms. K.).

“I don’t always give much power to the students. I have learned from class that an ideal world is where the students take ownership of the classroom with me as a guide. This is an area I need to improve. I have learned from class that I can move along the line Ts....TS....St. I think this is what has been missing from my community. I need to spend more time in the “we” and “you” mode.” (Ms. K.).

“What is the “shared power status” of my classroom?” (Ms. S.)

“I find that making room for choice and actually following the students’ choices is one way to share power in the classroom.” (Ms. S.)

The activities addressed for building community help key informants to realize that traditional school’s culture promotes niceness and politeness but not a true learning community. They recognized that building community implies hard work. They also realized that not only the classroom but also the whole school should become a community. Ms. K reflections illustrate the process that, at least, she went through during the workshop:
“What strategies could I use to build a learning community in my classroom?” (Ms. K.)

“I’m going to work hard to build community in my classroom. I’ll stick with it when it seems to me that it’s falling apart.” (Ms. K.)

“If we build community in the classroom, we need to build community in the whole school and have everybody buy into it, that everybody agree that this is what we need to do and then be consistent with it and kids do it.” (Ms. K.).

Working together, participants put together the following list of strategies to keep in mind to foster building community:

- Sharing ideas with a partner.
- Sharing ideas but through gestures or tableaus.
- Working in small groups
- Using “WE” statements to encourage collective knowledge building.
- Listen more than tell.
- Create a caring, reflective community by valuing students’ ideas, listening to them, and listening to what is silenced. In a Carmen posting, Ms. A. also openly recognizes the student as a self/other. She wrote:

  “It is very easy to get in the habit of not listening because I am thinking of the next thing I want to say, when the next thing I want to say is right there in what the student is saying.”

Ms. S’s comments points out an important issue regarding building community:
“When considering how to develop a strong community of learners, always remember that community building is an ongoing process that must be re-visited with each new activity and exploration.”

The following posting for a hypothetical website about drama illustrates how to promote creativity and summarizes key informants’ developments around the topic:

“Creating a caring, reflective community is key in teaching and learning with drama. When students feel they are validated and valued in a community, they are much more likely to share ideas. One way that this community is constructed is through listening to students and encouraging them to listen and respond to one another. Sometimes this listening takes the form of listening for what is silenced. Ask yourself as you facilitate the drama or learning experience “who hasn’t had an opportunity to share? Whose voice is dominating? What perspective are we missing?” These reflective questions can begin to help ensure that no one is excluded from your community” (Ms. S).

The first day of the workshop, in general, participants define teaching on the “What do you mean by…?” series form writing one verb; for example, they wrote: interacting, guiding, facilitating, reflecting, mediating, asking questions, and modeling. They also wrote: new things, curriculum, respect students, planning, evaluation, and new knowledge. The following Carmen postings shows the re-conceptualization at the end of the workshop where students have a more active role.

“The temptation at times in teaching is to “give students answers” or at best give them two sides and let them choose. Through our drama work and discussions, critical means much more than picking sides. It requires students to weigh the pros and cons of a variety of options. It means engaging in the uncomfortable tension of not knowing all of
the answers and living with the many questions that come from true inquiry. In terms of helping my students construct meaning, I need to create space and time for them to grapple with issues.” (Ms. S)

“I had an interesting interaction this evening “following the child’s lead” which caused me to reflect on the fact that as a teacher, I always have an agenda. I think that’s the hardest thing to let go of.” (Ms. S.)

**Learning.**

Key informants stretched or re-conceptualized the concept of learning. Living as teachers the experience of being in the students’ position was crucial in the re-conceptualization process. Data allow claiming they experienced how power relations affect learning, reflection as a tool for learning, and freedom as a necessary condition for learning to take place. Key informants also experienced the development of community as a fundamental component of the learning context.

**Evidence:**

“It takes teachers recognizing their strengths and weakness and the needs of each individual to help foster a sense of community. This is an ongoing process that must be re-visited with each new activity and throughout the year.” (Ms. S.)

“In thinking of developing a stronger community within my own classroom, Paley’s quote is particularly helpful “Clearly, it was not enough simply to copy someone else’s teaching manner; real change comes about only through the painful recognition of one’s own vulnerability” (Paley, 1986, p. 123). (Ms. S.)

“It’s amazing to realize how much you’ve really learned when you stop to reflect.” (Ms. K)
“I have learned this week that it is during the reflection time that most of the learning is taking place. I have experienced it myself” (Ms. A)

“My learning in the classroom today was greatly enhanced by the freedom to focus on the big problem that stood out to me in the Would You Rather text” (Ms. A)

Based on data, I summarize the lived experiences during T&L 633 through dramatic inquiry: Think critically, problem solving, full participation, truly enjoy learning, writing your own voice, powerful learning, questioning, and action/reflection. In two Carmen postings, Ms. S weaves them in a statement where she creatively promotes in a fictional world’s website drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry:

“The Learning cycle of Inquiry (Edmiston) involves relationship between actions and reflections on those actions. For every action that you take, you need to reflect by asking yourself questions. What did you value? This cycle is not only helpful in drama, but many aspects of teaching. The reflections are where the deep learning is occurring. The teacher and the students are constantly looping in this cycle as they reflect alone or together in discussions. Students must have opportunities to reflect in different settings.”

“Dramatic inquiry is at its simplest, wondering, “What if...?” with students and then interacting with others in a dramatized world, as if that imagined reality was actual (Edmiston, Wilhelm). Through dramatic inquiry, your classroom can be a place of powerful learning, questioning, action, and reflection. Use dramatic inquiry to plan your lessons and bring out the true capabilities of your students –their creativity, critical thinking, problem solving, leadership ability, and love of learning. Access your students’ inner values and use them to create a safe and harmonious classroom.”
Key informants realized that teaching and learning are not isolated events but two sides of the same coin because they are social processes that happen between two authors/creators. They are ongoing processes. During the interview, Ms. A. states:

“Strategies like drama as pedagogy open up possibilities that enrich teaching and learning like the use of play in the classroom. They also are powerful to get students engaged which is a necessary condition for them to make meaning. In its absence, students apply “rote memory.””

**Curriculum development.**

On the first day of the workshop, based on the information on the “What do you mean by…? Series” I found that, in general, curriculum was seen as a “thing,” as content, as imposed, and as an outside source. Some participants defined it as “that which is taught,” “scope and sequence,” “mission statement,” and “models and exemplars.”

Looking over the forms they filled on June 14, 2007, it is evident that T&L 633 has affected the participants. Their re-conceptualizations involve the use of pedagogies and teaching strategies as references to plan and promote students’ creativity, critical thinking, problem solving, leadership ability, and create a safe and harmonious classroom. During the interview, Ms. K said:

“One thing that I’ve learned that a lot of learning can happen with my kids if we are working together, leading their own discussions, coming up with their own ideas, and also coming up with their own curriculum in the classroom. I know we should follow a strict curriculum in every subject area that sometimes I do not to take the time to get involved the kids in what their doing.”
The Carmen page for curriculum was one of the most numbers of postings. Key informants wrote:

“I didn't think of it this way before. I was worried about how to plan in the drama. If I start with it, I may be pleasantly surprised at how many connections take place. I guess my idea of planning will need to include the flexibility of moving back and forth among activities...not just following a plan that dictates doing 1-2-3 and ending up with a final destination.” (Ms. S.)

“This is a good reminder for me when I plan lessons or discussions-let the kids chose their big problem because they will be the more involved in and inspired by the lesson.” (Ms. A.)

“I want to break that gap between the curriculum and the reflection.” (Ms. S.)

“I agree it’s so helpful to have someone else to plan with and to work with during the drama experience.” (Ms. S)

Teachers realized how important is to use time wisely so space is open for both attending students’ interests and implementing the mandatory curriculum through the enactment of more engaging activities.

Evidence:

“I'm thinking that I don’t need to spend as much time as I have been in certain areas I try to get away from focusing too long” (Ms. K.)

“I think that I need to use my time more wisely.” (Ms. K.)

“How do I mediate both deep emotional learning and broad curricular knowledge within the time constraints of the classroom?” (Ms. K.)

“What curriculum do I need to cover and not waste the time?” (Ms. S.)
In their portfolios, key informants conceptualize curriculum as not only the official mandatory manual but also as the student’s active participation, their ideas and teacher’s leadership. Accordingly, they plan to open space in curriculum development for students’ ideas; include flexibility and reflection in curriculum development. To attain these goals they plan to use time more wisely.

**Assessment and evaluation.**

Regarding assessment and evaluation data show that on June 11, 2007, participants associate assessment and evaluation with the following terms: achievement, use of new information, reflection, evidence, responses, pre and posttests, checking effectiveness, measurement, gauge students’ understanding, and learned content. They associated assessment with informal or unofficial, and qualitative evaluation and evaluation with the question: What did the students learn? By the end of the workshop, re-conceptualizations of assessment and evaluation include values, care for each other, students’ interest, and questioning. Key informants enhanced the use of evaluation and assessment beyond grading which constitutes a profound change. They realized their crucial role to improve learning by assessing the processes the students are going through. Accordingly, key informants plan to use questioning as a tool to promote inquiry and reflection.

Evidence:

“*Questioning is key in the reflection and evaluation processes and it can be the driving force of dramatic inquiry.*” (Ms. S)

“I need to spend more time on critical thinking and inquiry style learning not in making sure they know all the facts” (Ms. K.).
However, data also shows the need of studying in-depth basic concepts to develop dialogic pedagogy; for example, it is important to understand that the Bakhtinian notion of “laughter,” axial in dialogism for it essentially convey a discourse on the body, is different from “having fun.” Teachers can figure out activities for students to have fun without taking into account the discourse of the body in the Bakhtinian sense. In the interview, Ms. K said:

“The focus of test scores and standards is creating classrooms with bored students. Great teachers are quitting. We have moved away from, “teaching the whole child,” and now we just focus on the results of Reading and Math Standardized test scores. I can say that school is not fun anymore. It use to be fun and learning was going on. I’m hoping that bringing the drama approach into my classroom will bring back some of the fun.” (Ms. K)

Key informants understood that they can help the students to perform well in taking tests and, simultaneously, to develop higher psychological functions. In the interview, Ms. S. said:

“I think as a teacher I need not to see them [standards and HPF] as two different things, as the standards and then the high level of thinking but to try to look for opportunities to bind the two together.”

**Summary of findings from research question two.**

The analysis of data allows claiming that key informants’ re-examination of their pedagogical practices led them to understand, re-conceptualize, and interpret the key concepts. The re-conceptualization process was benefitted by and was the outcome of
lived experiences, artistic representations, and the process of objectification toward building their own words.

Key informants understood that teaching dialogically implies to include in curriculum development more than subject-matter content. It involves taking into account that culturally created values and social markers affect the teacher and students’ identity and their performances as social, cultural, and historical beings. They realized that curriculum development should rely on humans’ basic capacities (imagination and authorship) to build knowledge. Teaching dialogically also implies the recognition of teaching as an embodiment of power relations. Accordingly, they recognized building community as a sensible issue and that improving teaching involves the recognition of teacher’s strength, weakness, success, and shortcomings.

Based on these understandings they made some interpretations in Bakhtin’s (2006) sense: “as the discovery of a path to seeing (contemplating) and supplementing through creative thinking” (p. 159). They plan to build community. They also plan to figure out ways to share power with the students such as listening to them, listening for what is silenced, promoting deep conversations, reflecting on their teaching practices. They also plan to be critical and promote the students’ critical thinking and to face the challenge of the uncertainty that being critical brings along. One of these challenges is time management, which under current conditions of accountability becomes a big issue for teachers.

Concerning learning, key informants recognized that freedom facilitates individual learning because the students can benefit from interacting with peers and entering in dialogue with them. Freedom is a necessary condition for making-meaning and building
knowledge together in the classroom. To improve the students’ leaning, key informants plan to reflect permanently on the status of the classroom community. They also re-conceptualized learning as an individual/social process facilitated by activities whose goal is to promote HPFs such as critical thinking, problem solving, questioning, reflection, and writing one’s own word as a means to make visible those processes. They also recognize that learning improves when students’ full participation is encouraged and facilitated by activities that make it enjoyable.

Key informants understood professor Edmiston’s distinction between evaluation as assessment of learning and assessment as evaluation for learning. Evaluation focuses on measuring how much knowledge the students have assimilated or are able to recite by heart according to Bakhtin (2004). Assessment involves values, care for each other, students’ interest, questioning (inquiry questions) with the purpose of improving learning, developing HPFs, and even preparing students to take tests and achieve high scores. Since evaluation, according to official standards, is today such a sensible issue under current authoritative discourse ruling formal education worldwide, negotiation between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses is necessary. I celebrate that key informants plan to work simultaneously on preparing students for taking standardized tests and to develop HPFs. This requires from teachers creativity, imagination, and the courage to enact them.

**************************

Research question three.

This question relates to the changes key informants plan as a part of their professional development based on what they have learned. Answering this question, I focus on how
the key informants’ questions and statements of change relate to knowledge building and curriculum development based on socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories. I identified the topics and issues key informants pointed out of interest for them to improve themselves as teachers or they think they need to learn more or to know about. Bakhtin’s (2004) theory on authoritative and internally persuasive discourses was an invaluable tool to analyze data. The literature review allows arguing key informants have built their own discourses based on approaches like structuralism. According to Bakhtin (2004), these discourses could be the soil for change when in the zone of boundaries they enter into struggle with a persuasive discourse that begins to be internalized. Data show that from these discourses emerged questions and statements of change. For example, in structuralism’s theories on human development like Piaget’s stages of development are marked by age. Ms. A.’s concerns illustrate:

“How do I use dramatic inquiry with students at different ages?” (Ms. A)

“The big question I am pondering about T&L with drama is: how will I use these ideas with older children?” (Ms. A)

“How does successful dramatic inquiry look like in the adolescent classroom?” (Ms. A)

“How do I honor my older students’ need to be accepted by their peers, but get them to imagine and play with drama? (Ms. A)

I assumed key informants’ statements of change as evidence of their awareness of their own words. They are outcomes of decision-making process regarding the application of the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s assumptions and conceptualizations to new situations. For instance, data show that key informants plan to transform their
teaching practices to improve curriculum development and knowledge building processes. Accordingly, they plan to create new pedagogical environments suitable for those changes to take place. Following Bakhtin (2006), I assumed that underlying those decisions are subtexts that indicate key informants’ discourses entering into struggle with internally persuasive discourses in the zone of boundaries. I interpreted these subtexts from my reading of their questions and statements of change. I used this strategy throughout the analysis; however, in this report I only present examples to illustrate the process.

“The ability to choose in drama is a great strategy. Too often students do not get choices. I would much rather facilitate a group of children who have chosen what they want to do than ones who have been forced. This goes back to making the activity their "own." They will care about it and will be much more willing to participate” (Ms. K).

Subtext: She usually does not allow the students to choose.

My reflection was that she conducts her practice according to the dominant authoritative discourse; however, she is authoring her own discourse.

“If I want my students to be able to evaluate multiple perspectives I have to be committed to creating space for authentic, meaningful discussions. These critical conversations can transform understanding.” (Ms. S)

Subtext: In her classroom, there is only one point of view.

My reflection was that she is developing awareness of authoritative discourse and her own discourse.
“I will begin small and expand my use of drama in teaching and learning. It is okay if I am not comfortable with some aspects of it. It will get easier.” (Ms. K)

Subtext: She will allow herself to learn.

My reflection was that she has recognized herself as a teacher and a learner. She has assimilated and acknowledged socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories as internally persuasive discourses.

Regarding questioning, I adhere to Holquist’s (2004a) reading of Bakhtin’s work. Holquist says, “He argued early and late that what a person said was meaningful to the degree his or her utterance answered a question, and the particular set of questions he himself addressed may be understood as growing out of problems that confront anyone seeking to heed Socrates’ injunction to “know myself!” how could one “know?” (p. 12)

Data show that questioning is key to initiate a separation between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, provoke re-examination of pedagogical practices, and to begin to elaborate one’s own words.

Data show questioning is a way to initiate a separation between authoritative discourse and the decision to embrace persuasive alternatives. Dr. Edmiston offers participants a set of inquiry questions as a pedagogical strategy to promote reflection and authorship (See Appendix I). In this context, questioning does not expect answers but the formulation of more questions. In this sense, questioning is a learning outcome used as a discourse’s means of transmission for participants to author and make insights and discourses internally persuasive. Key informants selected the following questions from the handout:
Are you comfortable taking up the social positions of whatever characters the children identify with? (Ms. A), (Ms. K)

How comfortable are you using objects, your body, your voice, and/or words (as you read and/or pretend play) to project into imagined actions and to represent those actions with or for children? (Ms. A)

How skillful are you at listening to children and mediating conversation and negotiations with and among children? (Ms. A), (Ms. S)

How comfortable are you imagining and pretend playing with children? (Ms. S), (Ms. K)

Will you follow children/students where they want to go in an imagined world? (Ms. S), (Ms. K)

Key informants’ questions and statements of change illustrate the effect of an elaborated set of questions like those in the handout to promote reflection. The following key in formants’ questions and statements of change make this evident:

“How to enter the young child fictional world and actually enjoy it?” (Ms. S)

“I am interested in the whole notion of following the child’s lead and I’ll use inquiry in that way and how can I engage them in their various level of interest and how we draw from there instead of saying “OK we have these three activities we have to do.” (Ms. S)

“If it is truly something you care about doing there’s no doubt you’ll do your best. So why wouldn’t we agree that children feel the same?” (Ms. K)

Re-examination implies a separation between authoritative and internally persuasive discourse in the zone of boundaries for the person to elaborate his/her own word by authoring it (Bakhtin, 2004). However, the tension between these discourses is
experienced. Assimilating and acting according to socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories takes time. Ms. A.’s Carmen postings illustrate the struggle between these discourses and the transition a person goes through.

“It is a very real challenge to address all the needs of how a school is measured and evaluated, as well as the powerful curriculum that makes a school so special. I agree with Mariela that determining our goals in our planning would help to ease this burden, but I imagine that using drama will very likely redefine our goals as we see where the students take the story. I am sure as we begin to become better facilitators and questioners, the drama pedagogy will seem less indefinable and all will be chalked up (italics added) as steps on our path to master our teaching craft”  (Ms. A).

The subtext I read in this posting was that for her, pedagogy are steps to be followed without much variation and curriculum’s goals were the assimilation of contents as outcomes and not the development of HPF.

However, in a later posting, she includes creativity and imagination showing that she has began to re-conceptualize and to develop her own discourse:

“I have often had my students imagine, infer, or connect to the words on the page, but never the extent that I now can do with Dramatic Inquiry. I figured that was enough, but in reality, there was so much deeper meaning to be made. We often value and ask our students to be creative, yet we do not do any work in the classroom to help them develop that way of thinking. By using dramatic inquiry together and often, my students are going to be able to really access and apply their imagination.” (Ms. A)

The following Ms. K’s statements during the interview show that she has acknowledged some concepts of the socio-cultural-historical tradition as internally persuasive discourse. She said:
“The students in my district (Columbus) are lacking the higher level thinking skills...the predicting, analyzing characters, inferring, evaluating, discovering themes, etc. The activities we have done together this week have included all of these skills. They are bound to make kids better thinkers. I can’t wait to start trying them.” (Ms. K)

Data show that questioning is the way key informants began to elaborate their independent discourses.

“How do I make drama a natural occurrence instead of a staged performance?” (Ms. K)

“How to deal with hot/difficult topics?” (Ms. K) (Ms. A) Two key informants asked the same question.

“How to end a drama/play session?” (Ms. K)

“How to get the kids bought in?” (Ms. A)

“How do we get students to see things from another’s perspective, though?” (Ms. A)

It is important to note that during the workshop, questioning was lived in experience and reflected upon as an act of authorship:

“I think great questioning is an art and when we were working on the waterfall problem in the book, it seemed to click for me that I can direct the student involvement through questions. Obviously, there are no exact questions that apply for all situations.” (Ms. A)

“The questioning is the most important aspect of all. I have come to find out that I have to work hard at coming up with the right way to ask questions that require deep thinking.” (Ms. K)
“Instead of listening for answers that I want to hear or interest that I think should be there, I am now more aware of how I question and listen for answers. I will use the students’ answers to guide my questions, not the “correct” answer I want to hear. I really want my students to feel powerful, in charge, and engaged in their learning, so addressing even the smallest ways I communicate that will make a big difference in the classroom.” (Ms. A)

“How can I change waiting for answers that I expect?” (Ms. K)

“How do I select and tailor questions that mediate learning?” (Ms. S)

“I don’t want to be sitting there saying, “Uh hold on” and reaching for a list of questions to pick from. I think the questioning technique is something I will become better at with time and practice.” (Ms. K)

“That is such an interesting and inspiring way to look at inquiry. The goal is not necessarily obtaining the answer, but living with the “uncomfortable” process of searching, wondering, and questioning. As Brian mentioned, this quote truly does capture the long-term view of inquiry. When we send our students to explore and research their questions we know they have been successful when they have generated new questions and their initial inquiry question leads them in other directions. Perhaps we should stop focusing on “getting it right” and start focusing on “living the questions” (no matter how unresolved or uncomfortable we feel).” (Ms. S)

The number of questions and statements of change in data show that questioning was one of the topics key informants were more interested in. I summarize key informants’ inquiries about the art of questioning as follows:
- I need to develop the art of questioning according to my educational goals for it will allow promoting the students’ involvement.

- I need to develop through reflection the different dimensions of the art of questioning.

- How to ask to promote participation

- How to listen for questions and answers

- How to question based on the students’ questions and answers to have deep conversations.

Amongst the changes, it is worthwhile to note is the value key informants gave to theory as a cultural mediating device to guide pedagogical practices. During the workshop, some activities were addressed to this purpose. In them, key informants decided what theories were meaningful to them, shared with peers why, had the chance to change their minds about theories, and finally, by the end of the workshop they artistically represented them and enacted them. These experiences were crucial in the re-examination and interpretation processes.

Evidence:

“I’m also going to read more frequently so that I can become a teacher-student.”

(Ms. S)

“I think the space and time to reflect on my ten years of teaching is one of the biggest reasons I choose to pursue my masters. I knew I had taken my teaching as far as I wanted to go without more time to learn new ideas and have the time to really take stock of who I am, where I am in my skill set, what I want to continue to improve upon, and what areas need addressing.” (Ms. A)
In terms of *curriculum development*, the struggle between authoritative and internally persuasive discourses is evident. Ms. K illustrates the transition from one discourse to another in the following statements:

“Edmiston said, “They must feel deeply enough about the problem to want to explore it together in imagination.” This is the biggest lesson I am learning in this class, I admit it is the one I need to work the most. I know what I care about; however, I am not working hard enough to find out what the students care about.”

“I didn’t think of it this way before. I was worried about how to plan in the drama. If I start with it, I may be pleasantly surprised at how many connections take place. I guess my idea of planning will need to include the flexibility of moving back and forth among activities...not just following a plan that dictates doing 1-2-3 and ending up with a final destination.”

“I will get better at following the children’s lead instead of waiting for my own expectations.”

Cultural diversity is a topic of interest for key informants, in particular the discriminating aspects of authoritative discourses when developing curriculum. It is important to note that key informants express that not only subject-matter content should be a part of the curriculum. Ms K and Ms. A’s questions and assertion illustrate their concerns:

*How to teach children to deal with cultural differences? (Ms. K)*

“How do I avoid cultural stereotypes in the classroom? (Ms. K)

“Will I recognize when it’s a student’s culture that is shaping their interpretation of a certain situation?” (Ms. K)
“So, I think careful planning, facilitation, and reflection of the dramatic inquiry experiences will help our classrooms to be free of stereotyping, blaming, and making blanket statements about other people.” (Ms. A)

Key informants also recognized that values and power relations are part of the curriculum as texts or as subtexts.

Evidence:

“Will I be teaching my values?” (Ms. K)

“I have to believe that is worthwhile to follow the child’s lead even when it’s uncomfortable.” (Ms. S)

“What is the “shared power status” of my classroom?” (Ms. S)

“Am I comfortable with Ts---TS---tS?” (Ms. S) (T and t stand for teacher. S and s stand for student).

“Do I value sharing power with students? (Ms. S)

“I find that making room for choice and actually following the students’ choices is one way to share power in the classroom.” (Ms. S)

“I’m encouraged to monitor ways I create a learning environment that focuses more on dialogic and equal positioning.” (Ms. S)

Participants understood that planning with peers to pursue common goals benefits teaching.

“I think it definitely helps to have another person listening in.” (Ms. S)

Summary of findings from question three.

Key informants’ topics and issues of interest are drama, play, culture and cultural diversity and stereotypes, values in curriculum development, the art of questioning. They
expressed interest in inquiring about some topics. I summarize their questions as follows: How to approach topics from different perspectives? How to assume the student as an Other? How to follow the child’s lead; that is, the child’s interests and feelings? How to get students engaged in learning? How do we holistically improve HPFs?

Accordingly, they plan the following changes: Use drama even if it is not easy at the beginning. Key informants plan to allow themselves to improve. They plan to create spaces for authentic conversations; use questioning (inquiry questions) to get students engaged and to develop HPF; promote inquiry and reflection despite the official mandatory curriculum and the accountability educational policy; being flexible, not lineal, to follow the planned activities; and, be attentive and aware of the power relations in the classroom. They also plan to read and study theory to support their teaching practices.

Inquiry questions provoked key informants to re-examine their practices. It is re-examination mediated by reflection what lead to change; for example, as a result of the re-examination of their practices, they plan: to listen to students more than they tell them what to do; sharing power with them, and being respectful for their feelings and values.

In sum, key informants are interested in topics and issues related to the satellite concepts. Accordingly, they plan changes addressed to change the mechanism of maintaining the status quo or reproduce culture. They plan to use drama to create the appropriate environment for the development of HPF.

Data also show the burden of positivism in pedagogical practices and the burden of an authoritative discourse that does not recognize our humanity; for instance, key informants expressed their interest in topics and issues such as play, pretending, cultural diversity,
and questioning. These topics and issues are part of the everyday reality of the classroom because they are inherent to children’s natural behaviors like playing, pretending, and inquiring; in addition asking questions is a part of the teacher’s role. Data is also showing that knowing how to do teaching does not solve some educational problems. Often, problems emerged from social, cultural, and historical factors that affect the way to conduct education and the way to analyze it.

**Summary of Findings from the Three Research Questions**

The findings of this study warrant my claim that a dialogic approach to pedagogy and content knowledge favors the success of professional development programs for teachers. This approach facilitates the inclusion of factors usually ignored in addition to pedagogy and content. I dare to claim based on the study’s data analysis that the Bakhtinian notion of laughter expresses synthetically what needs to be included: our humanity. Thus, according to the key informants transforming education requires re-conceptualizing and to transform the discourses on the body. They involve essentially issues related to identity such as sexuality, gender roles, ethnicity, class, and the political factors and cultural values that determine the discourses people use to understand them and act. This shift in the approach will promote the development of education as a profession. It will form, eventually, the citizens that our future children need us to be at the present.

Promoting reflection and critical thinking through inquiry questions is vital to promote educational change. Re-examination of pedagogical practices implies and builds on re-conceptualization, which requires separation between one’s word and another’s and awareness of authoritative discourses and internally persuasive discourses. Awareness and separation of discourses are attained through reflection and critical thinking.
When participants begin a professional development program, they bring knowledge both academic and inside knowledge and their culturally built discourses on different issues. These knowledge and discourses are the entry point into the zone of boundaries. They are the soil to plant new ones; therefore, they should be valued as resources. It is upon them where questioning inviting to reflect have to be addressed. According to dialogism’s notion of text, this is what teachers are. The texts of their lives express their identities. These discourses are what professional development programs want to make the object of interpretation, discussion, evaluation, rebuttal, support and the like according to Bakhtin (2004). These processes lead participants to develop their own word (objectivation) as outcome of a free and creative variation of another’s discourse when applying it to new material, new situations, conduct experiments, formulating problems in a different way (Bakhtin, 2004).

Analyzing T&L 633 based on Bakhtin’s (2004) theory on authoritative and internally persuasive discourses, I found professor Edmiston uses his objectified word of the thinkers and scholars whose works are basis for his ethical education’s theory. He makes artistic representations by using hybridization, dialogized interrelations of languages, and dialogue (as means for creations) to provoke processes of reprocessing, reformulating, and authoring. This is where he exerts his pedagogical praxis at the microgenetic level of activity. He provokes maximal interaction with another’s word (theories, discourses, and practices) in a caring environment that facilitates participants to have lived experiences, give and receive assessment, and make meaning (learning) understood as an act of authorship.
Chapter 5

Implications

As stated in previous chapters, the notion of teachers’ professional development, originally developed in the US by the Holmes Group in 1986 to make education and teaching true professions, was adopted at international level in 1990 along with the educational reform that took place worldwide under the name of “Education for All.” Since then, teachers’ professional development has been a major concern for scholars and policy makers for two reasons: it is crucial and studies have shown that professional development programs are ineffective (Bork, 2003). The literature review shows that these programs’ curriculum development (design and implementation) are framed in the positivist paradigm. They are focused on teaching skills and subject-matter’s content. In general, they use traditional instrumental means like lecturing, demonstrations, peer observation, mentoring, and coaching to do teaching. Scholars agree its ineffectiveness is due to a lack of knowledge and research on how to plan and conduct them (Glickman, et al., 2004; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). This study is an effort to contribute to fill that void.

The purpose of this case study was to learn from T&L 633 as a professional development program for teachers to develop curriculum from a dialogical perspective. It was expected to co-create meaning with participants around the way they interpreted this experience and used it to re-examine their pedagogical plans and practices. The study focused on the pedagogical strategies and epistemological concepts that this
seminar/workshop offers to its participants and how these can be understood as authorship. I was interested in how its content, context, and process were represented to them and built by participants in interaction. Content, context, and processes are the axes of analysis of teachers’ professional development programs (Villegas-Reimers, 2003). In this chapter I take into account these criteria; however, the literature review and data indicate that in dialogic pedagogy these factors are intertwined in such a way that content and processes are part of the context. Therefore, I will focus on them but not in isolation.

I summarize the findings of the three research questions to bring to light what I have learned from T&L 633 to develop curriculum for professional development programs for teachers. Based on these findings, I make recommendations and present the significance of the study for future dialogic research and practice. Finally, I present a set of suggestions that are open for discussion and further development applying Frank’s (2005) principle of perpetual generation: a dialogic study cannot specify conclusions because as long as we are alive we can never claim any last word, we “can only look toward an open future” (p. 967).

Theory was a permanent referent to interpret the findings and to make decisions throughout the whole research process. The findings are the outcomes of zeroing on three key informants. However, all participants in the seminar/workshop were taken into account in the structured observation and other sources of data like Carmen postings and “What do you mean by…” series. It is important to keep in mind that the case under study was T&L 633 as a whole event. I will highlight the findings’ theoretical and practical consequences in terms of possibilities based on Bakhtin (2004). He argues that when dealing with another’s discourse it is important that the seed is planted for one day
it will grow. Dialogism is a paradigm of hope relying on human beings’ capacities of authorship and imagination. He highlights the role of imagination in the creation of history by imagining possible futures. He sets as condition that imagination should have an ethical purpose and should be driven by our humanity that he metaphorically synthesizes with the notion of “laughter”. The ethical purpose is necessary because “Violence does not know laughter” (Bakhtin, 2006, p. 134). The history of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty first bear witness of mankind’s imagination in the service of war.

**Summary of Research Questions’ Findings: A Rhizomatic Analysis**

In this section I summarize the findings from the research’s questions pointing out connections and articulations that I analyzed and brought to light by using Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizomatic analysis. This model of analysis is inspired in the structure of the root of a tree to create transgressive and transformative works contrasting with the Western dominant ways of thinking. Rhizomes are horizontal networks that cut across borders and build links between preexisting gaps. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) point out their dynamic: Rhizomatic formations are always constructed in the struggle between stabilizing forces (lines of articulation) and destabilizing forces (lines of flight). The lines of articulation connect and unify different practices and effects; establish hierarchies; define center-periphery relations; and create rules of organizations. The lines of flight disarticulate non-necessary relations between and among practices and effects; open up contexts and possibilities; disassemble unity and coherence; and de-center centers and disrupt hierarchies. Comparing the qualities of these forces with Bakhtin’s notions of
“centrifugal forces that seek to keep things apart, and centripetal forces that strive to make things cohere” (Holquist, 2004b, p. xviii) I argue they are equivalent.

Rhizomes operate according to six fundamental principles that agree with the epistemology of this study’s theoretical framework. The rhizome’s principles listed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) are: connection, heterogeneity, multiplicity, asignifying rupture, cartography, and decalcomania (in Koh, 1997). Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) and Koh (1997) explain them as follows: Connection and heterogeneity: any point of a rhizome can be and must be connected to another. Multiplicity: a rhizome comprised of multiple nodes and connecting lines that have to be taken as a whole. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) state “Multiplicity celebrates plurality and proliferative modes of thinking, acting, and being rather than unitary, binary, and totalizing modes” (, p 126). Asignifying rupture: “A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines” (Delleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 9 in Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 126). Koh (1997) points out that the concept of “becoming” is the key in the application of this principle. In becoming we continue to be what we were in the past but in a continuum flux transform or grow toward the future in the present. For example, participants in T&L 633 are learning to become better teachers. The last two principles are decalcomania and cartography. I see in these two principles as analogous with Bakhtin’s (2004) notions of centrifugal and centripetal forces. While decalcomania makes reference to a copy according to a generative reproductive model like official curriculum, cartography or mapping makes the rhizome productive like Edmiston’s (1998) view of curriculum as cocreated meaning. Kamberelis & Dimitriadis (2005) argue a map is an open system that is contingent, unpredictable, and productive. It
can be adapted, reworked, to “create possible realities by producing new articulations of disparate phenomena and connecting the exteriority of objects to whatever forces or directions seems potentially related to them (p. 126). I will point out the presence of these principles as I present the connections between findings.

Results show connections between the key informants’ understandings, interpretations, statements of change and questions regarding teacher’s professional development and the satellite concepts’ functions. These functions are: Creation of possible worlds and futures; development of basic HPF to create societies, cultures, and history; and, establishment of mechanisms to maintain the status quo or reproduce culture. In terms of the principles of connection, heterogeneity, and multiplicity, key informants brought to light sensible issues like: emotions, feelings, values, power relations, gestures, assessment, and the art of questioning. The findings point out that their topics and issues of interest as well as their planned changes are addressed to create fictional worlds where possible past and future worlds can be critically analyzed and re-created. They are also addressed to develop HPFs, particularly reflection and inquiry. These changes represent a fissure in the mechanisms to maintain the status quo that lead to uncritically reproduce culture.

Findings related to research question one respond to the questions: How authorship could be promoted? What events and pedagogical practices foster its development? Data show that living the struggle between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse in the zone of boundaries as a feasible way. In this zone, the presence of the asignifying rupture principle takes place in the artistic representations of discourses through activities addressed to promote inquiry and reflection to visualize multiple
possibilities. Some of them were in-class developments that facilitated learning by acting. In-class developments required deep conversations nurtured by theory that, as another’s discourse, served as reference for participants to unveil their own discourses and to develop independent thinking. In addition to those in theory, a profusion of examples were presented through experts invited to the workshop. Other activities were independent practices outside the classroom where self-assessment was a part of the process of reflection and learning. These practices gave homework an approach different from reinforcement. These practices seek independent work: participants reflected, made decisions and meaning, self assessed their work, learned from their successes and shortcomings.

Another strategy to promote authorship was the introduction of theories according to internally persuasive discourse’s means of transmission and representation. Data show that these discourses become internally persuasive when activities involve the study of theories through lived experiences in a safe environment. It is important to note that this environment was not only appropriated for the development of the activities but also represented what theory says about its importance and ways of creating it. This requires a careful selection of criteria and ingenuity when developing curriculum at the micro-level of the classroom.

For all the above to take place, a community of learners was built. In this community participants felt safe and free to talk, move, and not afraid of being wrong or to change their minds. On the contrary, their shortcomings were welcomed, analyzed to learn from them. Building a safe environment was favored by the room’s set-up, the activities, and constant assessment of processes. A simultaneous application of the asinifying rupture
and cartography principles took place by inviting participants to shatter some ways of thinking and behaviors and create new ones based on the knowledge they are building. It was made clear for them that they are in the process of becoming better teachers; thus, nobody was punished for making mistakes.

The findings of research questions two and three tell about how the promotion of authorship leads to educational change. They show that a way to promote authorship is leading participants to be aware of their own discourses (authoritative or not). This awareness was facilitated by activities that allowed participants, teacher leader included, to get to know the Other’s discourses. The way to get to know one’s own word is critically analyzing it by comparison with another’s word (Bakhtin, 2004).

In sum, findings support that key informants’ re-conceptualization process involved reflection within a safe environment, separation between one’s own discourse and another’s, and development of their own discourse. In the process authorship and imagination were crucial. They re-conceptualized according to socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories by embodying them through activities. The course’s package of reading supported the process. In general, the readings informed participants about different theories on: teaching, learning, curriculum development, and evaluation. Some readings focused on strategies and/or topics like the art of questioning, power relations, social justice, feelings and emotions. None of the assigned readings was theoretical or specific about dialogism or Vygotsky’s theories. Instead, these theories’ fundamental concepts and applications in education were introduced through readings on drama pedagogy (nearly half of the readings) introducing exemplars of how enacting it. Therefore, the way theory was introduced represents a balance between lines of
articulation and lines of flight. It is this balance which actually allows the construction of knowledge around teaching, its development as a speech genre, and the professionalization of teaching.

The analysis of findings shows articulations between the outcomes of the three research questions. Articulation is a form of connection that “makes a unity out of two different elements under certain conditions” (Hall, 1986 in Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 123). Articulations unify discourses and social forces that are not necessarily connected but under certain particular historical conditions such as ethnicity and poor learning. Under natural conditions (societal) human beings have the potential and capacities to learn: language, imagination, and authorship. Social markers are socio-culturally-historically created. However, they are used in formal education to justify discriminating practices that ignore the political-economical reasons underlying such practices. Key informants’ utterances re-articulate human being’s natural capacities (phylogenetically given and ontogenetically developed) with the effect of social markers by making them the topic of inquiry in deep conversations. These articulations can only be done in group. Thus, working in group is a fundamental teaching practice to transform education and promote social change. Another important articulation is that the authoritative discourse that promotes lack of freedom, not listening to students, and hold teachers and students accountable for poor academic achievement does not connect silence with poor academic achievement. Key informants made that connection.

Based on my analysis of the readings; of the evaluation procedure and its outcomes through the key informants’ portfolios; and the evidence from other sources of data like interviews’ transcripts and structured observation, I claim that this study’s results are due
to T&L 633’s curriculum development (design and implementation). They are favored by participants’ initial attitude of being willing to change their practices. In addition, I found not substantial difference between participants’ contributions in terms of age, years of teaching experience, and school level they teach. T&L 633 is not addressed to any subject-matter or grade level in particular. This seminar/workshop’s purpose is to improve teaching by focusing on improving learning.

What I Learned from T&L 633

I have learned from T&L 633 as a professional development program ways to make connections and articulations between socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories and pedagogical practices. I made these meanings by inquiring and reflecting on the applications that in T&L 633’s curriculum development are made between those theories and dialogic pedagogy’s basic assumptions, pedagogical principles, and praxis. In this section I highlight the interpretations I consider relevant for my own professional development as a curriculum developer of professional development programs for teachers.

I have learned that re-conceptualization is crucial to attain educational change; for instance, inquiry emerged in this study as crucial to transform education. The art of questioning is central to use inquiry as a pedagogical strategy. When the teacher asks questions and expects “the right answer” there is no true authorship but a response to a stimulus. The art of questioning consist on asking a question that provoke the creation of possible answers. This is a difficult issue for teachers because the authoritative discourse that has dominated education for centuries has asked for the right answer; for example, Wee, Shepardson, Fast, and Harbort (2007) studied how much teachers who participated
in a professional development program focus on inquiry-based teaching implement what they learned. They found that those teachers’ practices did not reflect such learning. According to their research report, inquiry was not re-conceptualized. Teachers reported confusion on the meaning of inquiry and its role on pedagogy and assessment. They thought of inquiry as scientific inquiry; thus, they argued that inquiry is too expensive and almost impossible according to the school’s resources. The description of the methodology used in these teachers’ training makes evident that they were taught the steps of scientific inquiry. The difference “between doing science and doing science’s activities” (p. 64) was not made clear. In short, the program instructed in “know how” to do science but they did not live the experience of using inquiry as a tool for learning.

*I understood the relevance of the purposeful inclusion of imagination in developing curricula as the heart of strategies like drama pedagogy and dramatic inquiry.* An important feature of drama pedagogy is that it does not require high financial investment for its main tools are imagination and HPFs; in other words, its main tools are human beings’ potential and actions: authorship and imagination. In this sense, the essential resources to use drama pedagogy have been within mankind throughout its historical development (Bronowski, 1974; Bruner, 1986, 1996; Edmiston, 1998, 2006; Greene, 2000; Leroi-Gourhan, 1993). This feature allows *designing activities dealing with big and complex problems associated or studied in real life situations using imagination and the resources at hand.* Studying complex problems calls for an interdisciplinary approach which increases the amount of content knowledge covered in an integrated way that foster the meaning making process.
Another feature of drama pedagogy is that it *recovered forms of communication different from oral and written. It uses non-verbal language in the form of gestures that express feelings and emotions. It also uses iconic representations and props/artifacts as a way to represent ideas.* This facilitates the development of basic HPFs (imagination, reflection, and inquiry), which in turn, facilitate the creation of fictional and figured worlds. From this particularity of drama pedagogy, I realized *that to improve teaching and learning the positivist dichotomy mind-body has to be overcome.* Furthermore, since drama pedagogy opens the space for reflection on possible worlds, created upon and beyond the current socio-cultural resources, it becomes a powerful tool for socio-cultural change and transformation following Bakhtin (2004, 2006) and Volosinov (1986).

I have also learned that in developing curriculum for professional development programs for teachers *authorship should be simultaneously goal, means, and outcome.* Authorship as a goal leads teachers to awareness of their discourses on education. It implies as a means no passive roles but lived experiences. In addition, if the activities are artistic representations of the theories supporting the curriculum development, the lived process becomes an exemplar. When authorship is a part of the loophole formed by goals and means, it becomes an outcome. For example, T&L 633’s participants were asked, as a part of their final portfolio, to write postings for “Drama Matters in Teaching and Learning”, a hypothetical website to promote drama pedagogy. These postings are artistic representations that summarize what they have learned, their understandings, and interpretations.

Another example of the value of authorship in teachers’ professional development is reported by Seidl (2007). She states that coursework readings on race and racism are not
enough to prepare teachers to face the challenges of diverse classrooms. She claims that when prospective teachers used theory to understand, interpret, and make decisions working in a democratic interaction with an African American church’s community they were able to build knowledge on culturally responsive teaching.

Bakhtin (2004) claims “an independent, responsible and active discourse is the fundamental indicator of an ethical, legal and political human being” (pp. 349-350). I understand these features (*independent, responsible, and active*) as indicators of the act of authorship. I think this should be an aim for formal education and a long-term purpose or horizon for the curriculum that is developed day after day in the classroom. Accordingly, *authorship should be a topic in curriculum development for professional development programs*. When developing teachers’ professional development curricula focused on the development of authorship, it should be taken into account *that authorship is a centrifugal force and curriculum is a centripetal force*. Nevertheless, activities as chronotopes of possibilities could set them in a dynamic equilibrium allowing imagination to flow.

Developing curriculum for teachers to build their own discourses has some implications. Curriculum’s developers should know in-depth both the discourses they expect participants to assimilate and acknowledge and those they expect them to reject. Regarding internally persuasive discourse, I have found in the literature I reviewed that researchers usually quote or cite Bakhtin (2004). However, from my reading they focus on authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse’s definition by features, explain key concepts, and present an overview of the process followed with the students, but omit to describe in detail the processes of transmission and assimilation that Bakhtin
(2004) introduces (e.g., Borg, 2004; Smith, 2007). This description is important because discourses do not become internally persuasive because of their intrinsic quality or contents. Any dialogic theory, even Bakhtin’s work, could be transmitted in an authoritative way. Perhaps this is what has happened with Vygotsky’s notion of ZPD that has become fossilized. It has to be kept in mind that when authorship is not the goal, it is difficult for the student to use the content as a tool to solve problems in different context (e.g. see Seidl & Friend, 2000 and Seidl, 2007). They perform what Bloome, et al. (1989) call “procedural display”; consequently, the expected change or outcome will not come about. *This study shows that it is the process of transmission and ways of representation of discourses to students that makes the difference.*

Curriculum developers should be knowledgeable in the discourses that are expected to be rejected too. These discourses might be strong theories like Piaget’s genetic epistemology, Saussure’s linguistics, or constructivism as a paradigm. These discourses need to be analyzed from an interdisciplinary perspective with epistemological tools like poststructuralism; for example, NCLB and Education for All as constructivist proposals need to be critically analyzed from economics, sociology, history, and linguistics amongst other disciplines. Data show that a well informed analysis leads to making better decisions. By better decisions I mean dialogical decisions, that is, those that overcome conflict by proposing alternatives. I think of these alternatives as practical and necessary; for instance, the amount of time, money, human effort that educators have spent criticizing and protesting against these two major educational policies, although justified, is overwhelming (Wang & Odell, 2002).
Data show that knowing well both discourses, authoritative and internally persuasive, allows leading teachers identifying their manifestations during the in-service professional development activities and make decisions along the way. For instance, according to this study’s findings, at the beginning of the seminar/workshops the presence of participants’ authoritative discourse was evident in their texts (gestures, oral, and written). The transition to a dialogic way of thinking having socio-cultural-historical traditions’ theories as tools was evident in their doubts, questions, and assertions. And the recognition of those theories’ concepts as internally persuasive discourse or at least as a discourse that opens possibilities to solve their educational concerns was evident in their final portfolios. Therefore, knowing in depth both authoritative discourses and internally persuasive discourses allow leading teachers constant assessment of the program’s implementation and setting realistic expectations; for instance, some elements of authoritative discourse that are a part of the teacher’s ideological becoming (identity) could be re-conceptualized but won’t disappear; instead, they are approached from a double consciousness; that is, ethically. This is the case of teachers becoming able to recognize they should respect the students’ beliefs and behaviors associated with religious values and dress codes although different from theirs. Thus, professional development programs’ leaders should, ideally, be not only theoretically strong but also to have practical teaching experience (Seidl & Friend, 2002; Seidl, 2007).

Data also show that professional development should be designed in stages or phases for teachers to have the time to make the transition to the internally persuasive discourse. For example, T&L 633 is an introductory course to drama pedagogy. Participants’ great accomplishment is that they valued dialogic ways to do teaching. However, in some in-
class developments they expressed the learned content by making references to activities they have performed during the seminar/workshop. Comparing these developments with the final portfolios for which they had two weeks to reflect after the in-class portion of the seminar/workshop, it is noticeable how much the key informants have learned from this experience. They expressed in their own words the meanings they have made as outcome of the processes of reflection, critical analysis, and inquiring attitude. They also expressed the changes they project to do in their pedagogical practices.

One of the relevant meanings I made is that authoritative discourse could be fissured through actions that alter beliefs deeply rooted in Western culture like not to recognize or talk about the body’s physiology in public. Apparently, simple actions like pointing out the bathroom’s location or the leading teacher sitting on the floor contribute to make participants to feel comfortable in a safe environment that recognizes their humanity. These actions are ways to set authoritative and persuasive discourse into tension and struggle in the zone of boundaries.

Finally, I want to share a set of inquiry questions that I formulated during the research process. I wondered: Is authority given by knowledge? What would make a teacher the leader despite his/her lack of knowledge in a particular topic? What is the role of teacher as professional? What is the essence or the deep meaning of being a teacher? How to develop curricula for natural sciences to promote authorship? I think as a crucial question to improve teaching: what radical changes have to be made in teachers’ preparation programs?


**Recommendations: The Dialogic Inquiry-Based Model to Promote Authorship**

Within the literature review on professional development programs for teachers I wondered, what is the model T&L 633 follows as a professional development program? While I identified it follows the dialogical orientation, I could not find a model to frame it. Instead, I realized T&L 633 used components of different models within the dialogic orientation. Therefore, I concluded T&L 633 is a model in itself. Based on literature review and findings I called it a *dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship*.

The inquiry-based model to promote authorship is about building relationships between events that express a professional position to transform education. Model is understood as a cognitive artifact that we create to represent to ourselves and to Others what we do, imagine, or hope for (Wartofsky, 1979). Models are basic for reflective thinking because they allow us to imagine connections and articulations in the system they represent as well as to envision outcomes and consequences for other systems. This notion of model allows heteroglossia between different programs that are a part of a social movement to transform education. Amongst these programs, I highlight T&L 633 itself for in-service teachers, LEADS for prospective teachers (Seidl & Friend, 2002; Seidl, 2007), and Reggio Emilia for children and teachers (Rinaldi, 2006). In this section I make recommendations for this model.

The quality of formal education world-wide is in crisis at different degrees depending on each country as it is reported, amongst other sources, by UNESCO in its website (http://www.portal.unesco.org)\(^3\). There is agreement that professional development programs for teachers are crucial to get out of this crisis. Traditional forms have proven to be inefficient to improve teaching and learning. Wee et al. (2007) found that most

---

\(^3\) UNESCO has the most complete and up-dated information about education worldwide.
professional development opportunities “do not provide experiences that initiate a change in teachers’ beliefs and practices.” (p. 66). This study’s findings show that the use of an inquiry-based model to promote authorship to develop curricula for professional development programs has the potential to promote educational change as long as theory is not only informed but embodied. This is T&L 633 salient feature. In other words, these programs should not be on inquiry (traditional methods) but on and through dialogic inquiry.

The literature review supports this recommendation. For instance, Baker and Smith (1999 in Villegas-Reimers, 2003) found that when professional development focuses on ways of doing rather than on content, they may change the superficial features of instruction but since teaching and learning are not re-conceptualized their essence is not altered. At the same time, programs that are too theoretical or conceptual in nature, and do not present any teaching techniques as models are the least effective to persuade teachers to embrace new methods. But, programs that included, in addition to teaching techniques, a cognitive-conceptual component “tended to triple the effect of programs that merely trained practitioners in new techniques” (Showers et al., in Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p. 62). Taking these research findings into account, it could be argued that curriculum development for professional development programs for teachers should present a dynamic equilibrium and coherence between theory and practice. This study’s findings show that in T&L 633 theory and practice are always intertwined in: activities, reflecting on activities, and reflecting on reflections. In other words, praxis is a feature of this dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship.
Based on dialogism, I cannot claim that socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories are the only alternative discourses to promote educational change. That would be against dialogic paradigm. However, this study’s findings show that these theories are a good alternative discourse to break with monological inefficient patterns. This has to be done with another discourse as a referent (Bakhtin, 2004). These should be discourses that are expected teachers internalize and interpret according to the aims of education looking toward the future. The dialogic paradigm is both theoretically strong and grounded on research. It offers guidance to design educational praxis. For example, according to these theories and this study’s findings, professional development programs should be designed to be implemented in the context of a ZPD. Findings show that by authoring their own discourses and visualizing possibilities for their praxis teachers become willing to change. Whether they will do it or not, is not in the hands of professional development program’s curriculum developers. They can only assume their ethical responsibility to develop curricula where tools for change are built with teachers. According to Frank’s (2005) reading of Bakhtin it would be unethical claiming “that the other has not, cannot, and will not change, that she or he will die just as she or he always has been” (p. 966).

Designing professional development for teachers from a dialogical perspective requires taking into account that socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories have been circulating in the Western world for around forty years. Terms such as ZPD, voice, activity, and action are known and are a part of the ‘jargon’ of professionals in education. Nevertheless, it seems the concepts expressed through those terms are still to be understood in-depth for teachers to be able to interpret and play with them. The lack of this understanding has led to fossilization of the practices associated with them (Moll,
Following Bakhtin (2004) lived experiences are the best way to assimilate and to acknowledge discourses’ conceptual frameworks to overcome or slow down the always present threat of fossilization. Volosinov (1986) makes clear that to have an experience is to understand and interpret the meanings of our actions. He states that in an experience our individuality as a natural biological specimen is the material reality where our socio-ideological second nature is realized. Language is the material this second nature is made of (Volosinov, 1986, pp 25-41).

Volosinov’s (1986) view of language and this study’s findings led me to identify that the dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship relies on imagination and authorship breaking with the traditional view of resources as ‘the things out there’. Adhering to this insight, I recommend that in addition to the physical material resources, professional development programs should include as a part of the resources cultural artifacts created through language such as bodies of knowledge (theories and traditional wisdom), and mankind themselves as producers and outcomes of culture. In this way, they open the space for reflection on possible worlds created upon and beyond the current socio-cultural-historical material conditions such as: neoliberalism, globalization, extreme poverty, and women’s illiteracy. Professional development programs could become powerful artifacts to improve education and promote socio-cultural-historical change even in the lack of high financial resources. History teaches that human beings are the most essential resource.

Taking into account that Vygotsky and followers as well as this study’s findings have shown that it is at the level of microgenesis that educational change could be promoted, the dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship becomes a tool to promote
educational change. Accordingly, research on/for professional development programs should be conducted from a poststructuralist perspective to bring to light discourses’ “invisible” details. Kumashiro (2000) argues if classrooms’ transformation is the target, “poststructuralism (and other marginalized approaches) can be helpful to educators trying to engage in anti-oppressive education.” (p. 41). He argues that educational research illuminated by these approaches and making use of them in the classroom is needed. It not only would help educators to rethink their current practices, but also would suggest “where future research might explore.” (p. 42). It seems to me that dialogism is one of those marginalized theories from mainstream research. In his TSP, Edmiston calls for microethnographic discourse analysis, and critical discourse analysis of school and classroom’s events to develop drama pedagogy as a field of study. Assuming drama as a metaphor to promote reflection, imagination, and critical and ethical thinking Edmiston’s call could be extended to dialogic educational research.

In fact, the literature review makes evident that professional development programs framed within the socio-cultural-historical tradition as an area of research is in its inception. Drama is an area that has already begun to make this path. Professor Edmiston is one of the leading scholars in teachers’ professional development addressed to dialogic teaching (Dorion, 2009). However, possibilities with drama and different from drama are an open scenario to be imagined. For instance, professional development programs for experienced teachers should assist them to understand the attitudes, values and pedagogical practices of novice teachers. In this sense, models of professional development inspired in dialogic processes are urgent. They would contribute to solve major needs regarding teachers such as: the shortage in number and the retention of new
ones. Thus, instead of making novice teachers to increase the number of those abandoning the teaching profession, they would get support to dare to write with their students the many novels of education that are still to be written because mankind is always in the process of becoming (Bakhtin, 2006).

I identified in Villegas-Reimers’s (2003) literature review on professional development programs the following factors should be taken into account when planning, implementing, and assessing teachers’ professional development. They are: a culture of support, the role of context, school system stages of development, time, financial resources, stages in professional development, the use of technology for teaching, the role of unions in teaching professional development, the role of teacher-educators (pp. 119-140). These factors are also important designing professional development programs framed within a dialogic inquiry-model; however, they are approached from a different point of view. Since context is one of the criteria to develop and to analyze professional development programs and, in a dialogic sense, it involves the others, I illustrate the difference between traditional and dialogical approaches with this concept.

According to the literature review and this study’s findings I claim that professional development programs for teachers should be enacted in “neutral spaces” where “freedom” from the direct pressure of authoritative discourse could be possible. There is a recent tendency to consider the needs of the school and communities when planning professional development programs. In fact, in many countries professional development programs are offered by the schools with positive results; however, research findings also show that the project and not the teachers’ professional development are prioritized (Villegas-Reimers, 2003).
Following Bakhtin (2004) and Edmiston & Enciso (unpublished)’s idea that stepping outside the events facilitates reflecting on them and visualizing diverse possibilities, I argue that taking care of the schools’ needs does not mean necessarily they have to be conducted in their venues. In this way, the context could be assumed as a referent to identify topics and issues that are worthwhile to study during the program to promote educational change and improve teaching and learning. From a dialogic perspective, the context where teachers work and develop their role everyday is taken into account not adjusting the program to that context but critically analyzing it and visualizing improvements. The dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship focused on the classroom’s interactions within layers of contexts such as: educational, scientific-technological, and economical-political. In this model there is not a sharp division between internal and external contextual factors. The dialogic inquiry-based model takes these factors into account to bring them for discussion and critical analysis into the zone of boundaries. The purpose is to figure out creative solutions. The ideal is that teachers leave the professional development program with insights on proposals for change authored by them.

The dialogic inquiry-based model to promote authorship sees formal education as an area of mankind’s ideological creativity that is both mediating and mediated by the other areas like: science, art, ethics, and religion expressed as a series of discourses (Bakhtin & Medvedev, 1991). I argue that those discourses should be the target of professional development programs. Therefore, curriculum development like Bakhtin’s novel should include a diversity of languages such as scientific, poetic, literature, traditional wisdom, and teachers’ inside knowledge. Curriculum should be, according to Bakhtin (2004), “an
intentional and conscious hybrid” (p. 366). I suggest including in professional
development programs’ content how these different languages approach teaching and
learning. Taking this into account, curriculum should be designed as macrostructures or
macro-guides that allow flexibility to develop participants’ insights.

Implementing these macro-structures, intense interaction with another’s word should
be present in different instances. Bakhtin (2004) asserts these instances are: lived
experience, ethical life, and ideology in the semantic sense. They happen at once in the
act of authorship. In dialogism ethics is the art of living as truly human, that is, always in
the process of becoming, thanks to the interaction of language and imagination.
According to dialogism our learning process is greatly affected by another’s word. The
other’s judgment and recognition in all realms of life and creative ideological activity
enters as utterances in our self/other in a never ending struggle with other’s words
(Bakhtin, 2004).

**Significance of the Study**

This study makes a thick description of how T&L 633’s curriculum development is
enacted focused on the notion of authorship. This is an important contribution because as
Dr. Edmiston asserts during the development of this seminar/workshop, there is almost
nothing written about how to promote authorship in the classroom where the student is
actually assumed in praxis as a multidimensional being. In this sense, I have followed
Futtrell (2010). She states the aim of qualitative research is “to transform the “object” of
their study into multi-dimensional and lively representations of lived experiences, social
processes, and complex webs of meanings and values.” (p. 160). Unfortunately, research
reports usually make emphasis on other aspects to fulfill the requirements of current academic authoritative discourses (Honan, 2009).

For instance, educational research reports usually describe in detail methodological procedures and emphasize the results but briefly describe the procedures followed during the in-service program; for example, Yamagata-Lynch (2003) makes a thorough analysis of a professional development program on the use of computer technology in the classroom using the lens of activity theory; however, she does not report how participating teachers were instructed. Villegas-Reimers (2003) mentions the components of different models of professional development but she does not describe implementations procedures either. Research reports that describe in detail teaching-learning procedures are abundant but they are addressed to students not to teachers. In addition a great deal of these reports is focused on composition (e.g. Borg, 2004; Capucho, 2005; Smith, 2007; Ward, 1994).

The findings and recommendations of this study could serve as a referent to design educational projects from the point of view of authorship for children that are disenfranchised and disengaged. This is relevant because at present over 80% of humanity lives under the poverty line (http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats). Besides, the statistics on academic achievement in the public sector does not show any significant improvement. The notion of authorship as the base of democratic educational projects lead to change the conceptualization, strategies, and practices related to axis concepts in education such as curriculum development, evaluation, teachers’ role, and administrative organizations; for instance, the notion of teachers’ accountability is replaced by the assessment of their commitment and
achievements with the whole child not by test scores’ results. These types of projects depend more on human potential than on the financial capacity to access high technology. In addition, such projects have as one of their purposes to transform the socio-cultural-historical conditions that promote inequity (Macedo & Freire in Freire, 1998).

I illustrate the possible application of these projects with a real life situation. On April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2008 one of the headline news on TV was the overwhelming dropout rate of African Americans and Latino students. They are not graduating from high school. The “news” provoked me to question: What needs to be done for students being willing to stay in school and actually learn? I think the research question should not be why are children dropping out? We know why. This question put the negative aspect at the center. The “why” has been studied by scholars within Latino critical theory and critical race theory. Researchers have proposed some solutions. However, they also claim that more work needs to be done with in-service teachers (Reyes & Halcon, 2001).

\textit{Inquiry-based models to promote authorship like T&L 633 are spaces where teachers can create alternative solutions.} They come up with ideas by reflecting on their practices and in so doing they become willing to afford change despite the struggle involved in the process. In T&L 633 change is not see as an external factor but both internal (myself as teacher) and externally as a complexity integrated in the curriculum development by: the syllabus, the arrangement of the physical space, experiencing different interpersonal power relations, and different approaches to teaching-learning processes, knowledge, evaluation and assessment that are lived in the figured world that Dr. Edmiston and participants create as a community of learners.
This dissertation is a step in the long path ahead developing a theory on professional development programs for teachers based on socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories. The development of dialogic pedagogy has consequences for professional development. I highlight two: One, teaching would be one of the most demanding professions in terms of teachers’ preparation. The other, professional development in general should overcome the duality subject matter-pedagogy and connect them with theories on human development and theories on knowledge. They should include in the subject-matter’s content the disciplinal internal and external history, that is, its epistemological development and the socio-cultural-historical factors that led the discipline toward the development of that knowledge and not other one (Klein, 2001).

After assessing this study following Maxwell’s (2010) check list for validity test, I realized that the fact that in dialogic pedagogy there are not right or wrong answers brings along implications for educational research’s methodology and validity’s standards. It is worthwhile to note that this study’s findings allow claiming that within the frame of educational research, validity emerged as an area to be developed. Some validity’s criteria developed by poststructuralist researchers such as: long-term involvement, rich data, and intervention can be fulfilled. However, respondent validation and the presence of discrepant evidence and negative cases are criteria that need further development because the radical application of dialogism would render them impossible otherwise (see Bakhtin, 2006, pp 103-131 and pp. 159-172).

Last but not least, I point out an epistemological contribution that came out of this study. I projected in the research proposal to conduct a rhizomatic analysis to connect the research questions’ findings between them and with global contexts. In this way, T&L
633 as a complex event could be understood and interpreted within economical, ethical, political, and aesthetical contexts. As I deepen in my understanding of dialogism and the rhizomatic analysis, I realized that their epistemologies are coherent. The findings show the presence of the rhizomatic model’s principles in the process followed during T&L 633. Therefore, from my experience in this study I would suggest this model to design the research methodology for future research projects.

It is worthwhile to note that the use of rhizoanalysis and rhizo-textual-analysis is steadily increasing. For example: Alvermann (2000) re-examine the findings of a previous study, “Read and Talk Club”, conducted from the critical discourse analysis perspective using rhizoanalysis. She highlights the connections she made by extending the text analysis beyond the conventional modes of interpretation. Honan (2009) uses concrete cases to illustrate her application and reflections on rhizo-textual-analysis that she encourages to be used approaching teaching, research, and educational policies. I note that Honan’s reflections on teachers’ professionalism and research’s validity are similar to this dissertation’s. Koh (1997) explains the rhizomatic analysis’ principles by analogy with Internet. I find his work “Internet: Towards a holistic Ontology” an important contribution to re-conceptualize predominant views of the world. Finally, it is worthwhile to mention that in the introduction of Carlina Rinaldi’s essays on Reggio Emilia’s school, Dahlberg and Moss (2006) use Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of rhizome to explain Reggio Emilia’s philosophy of education and knowledge (see pp. 7-8).
Open-Ended Suggestions

The focus of this study is professional development programs for teachers. As a case study had as purpose to understand and interpret what could be learned from T&L 633 to illuminate future professional development programs from a dialogic perspective. Appling Frank’s (2005) principle of perpetual generation a dialogic study cannot specify conclusions because as long as we are alive we can never claim any last word, we “can only look toward an open future” (p. 967). Therefore, my intention with the content of this section is to promote and continue deep conversations and to promote dialogue on these issues.

According to this study’s findings the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories are an alternative framework to develop curriculum for professional development programs for teachers. Their basic assumptions and foundational concepts serve as heuristics to promote the changes needed to improve the quality of education. Both literature review and this study’s finding suggest that living in experience authorship and dialogue in activities that promote reflection and critical thinking bridged by imagination is a condition to attain such an improvement.

In this section I summarize what the study’s findings suggest to develop curriculum for professional development programs for teachers into three sub-sections: curriculum development; a template inspired in professor Edmiston’s structure for using drama; and the changes that having authorship as aim of formal education, purpose for curriculum development, and goal of activities bring along.
Curriculum development.

In terms of curriculum development (design and implementation) I have summarized what the study’s findings suggest into: basic assumptions, format, purposes, context, content, and implementation. They are elaborated under the assumption that the leading teacher is theoretically strong. The literature review of dialogic scholars’ works shows that in essence their successful experiences are outcomes of theoretically informed reflection on the discourses that underlie pedagogical practices and not only changes in procedures. Rinaldi (2006) and Shepel (1995) highlight that theoretical frameworks provide tools to rethink and re-design pedagogical practices as long as they are used as cultural artifacts and not as strict frames that limit teachers’ imagination of possibilities.

Basic assumptions.

I find Shepel’s (1995) conceptualization of professional development recognizes authorship. She states:

“The teacher’s professional development is a self-directed process of becoming a subject/agent of learning professional activity. The social situation of development should provide various educational alternatives for a teacher to make choices. The teacher in his or her ontogenesis learns through making decisions, choosing among profound and ethically valuable alternatives… Professional status is shaped in the decision-making processes.” (p. 439)

According to dialogism’ epistemology professional development programs for teachers can only offer an environment for maximal interaction with different discourses on education, learning, teaching, curriculum development, evaluation, and social, cultural, and historical factors that affect the pedagogical act. Meaning making as an act of authorship although socially, culturally, and historically framed is an individual act because no one can author Other, we author ourselves.
In professional development programs dialogism’s methodological principle that there are no recipes for success to conduct research but guides becomes a pedagogical principle.

Teachers as students are assumed in their whole humanity both in terms of their phylogenetic (physiology and authoring potentiality) and ontogenetic development (as a social, cultural, and historical event). This involves recognizing their bodies as socio-cultural-historical chronotopes that have a multidimensional identity and perform multiple roles: teacher, citizens, father, mother, friend, students, and so on.

These programs should be highly demanding, guided by what Gutiérrez, et al. (1997) call “rigorous curricula”. Nevertheless, they should be enjoyable meaning the teacher could experience the joy of knowing, of making meaning, of learning from shortcomings, of growing as professionals. In sum, professional development programs should allow teachers experiencing teaching as a constant process of learning.

Professional development programs for teachers should be designed based on a theory and participants should be informed about this. However, this does not mean that the program has as purpose to teach that theory. Even when focused on a particular theory, professional development programs for teachers should include different theories on learning. According to Bakhtin (2004) the best way to assimilate a discourse is analyzing it from another discourse. This study’s findings show that the heteroglossia of discourses favors learning.

Professional development programs for teachers should provided epistemological tools for participating teachers being able to nurture their practices with existing theories, regardless of their framework’s paradigm. This implies for teachers to be able to apply a
discourse to a new or different situation. As O’Neill (1996) argues if we ignore the built knowledge we are at risk of re-invent the wheel.

**Format.**

Teachers could improve as professionals when professional development programs are offered as seminar/workshops where theory and practices are intertwined in praxis (Shepel, 1995). Praxis should be a conscious hybridization of languages in what Vygotsky (1978) calls “task situations” meaning concrete historical events where people confronted with real problems in real or “as if” contexts are led to an act of learning.

**Purposes.**

Professional development programs should have as purposes: Lead teachers to explore, using their imagination, to create different possibilities of being. Activities and content should lead the teachers to the awareness that contingencies do not determine us, that as human beings we are society, culture, and history makers. Therefore, professional development programs should have as one of their goals to help teachers to visualize ways they can be greater than obstacles like educational policies and financial shortages. Reading human’s history as a novel serve as referent for reflection. It would lead to the recognition that humankind’s development has not been an easy path and that it could have been different. This would give sense and meaning to our present existence and teacher’s work (Bakhtin, 2004; Freire, 1998). In short, professional development programs should be chronotopes where teachers become aware of their roles beyond the classroom, as citizens of the world, and create, accordingly, their ethical political educational projects.
**Context.**

Professional development programs for teachers should be caring and safe environments where everybody’s word deserves respect and everybody become aware of their own word and build new ones based on arguments. The context should allow teachers the “outsideness” they need to look at themselves and their pedagogical practices. This reflective process would lead them to understand and interpret such practices from a poststructural dialogic perspective. Since this reflective process is more productive when carried out working in groups, professional development programs’ context should be spaces for collective creation.

**Content.**

Professional development programs for teachers should begin and end with questions that serve as basis for further professional development for both the leading teacher and participants.

Professional development programs for teachers should identify participants’ discourses at the beginning of the seminar/workshops and propose a discourse. Understanding discourse as a set of values, beliefs, and knowledge on a particular topic or issues expressed through a form of language (spoken, written, graphics, gestures, mathematics, and so on). The proposed discourse does not have to be always opposite like in the case of an authoritative discourse like positivism and a persuasive discourse like dialogism. It could also be a progression for example in learning a theory on learning or a research methodology. In any case, is important taking into account teachers’ needs and interests ideally expressed through inquiry questions or stated as a big problem.
Professional development programs should listen to teachers’ needs. Under a dialogic approach, listening to the learner’s needs has pedagogical and epistemological implications. Since the student is assumed as an authoring person, he/she is asked to retell in his/her own words (Bakhtin, 2004). Thus, the teacher has to adapt the pedagogical environment for the students to feel safe enough expressing their questions, difficulties, doubts and to reflect and imagine possible solutions. Therefore, listening to students needs is connected with building community to learn together. In this sense working at the meta-level like in T&L 633 model is important for the teacher to experience being in the student’s position.

Professional development programs should be designed under the conception that being professional involves the challenge of being theoretically strong and to dare to act (thinking and doing). In this sense, they should lead teachers to value theory as a cultural artifact that could serve as mediator or as heuristic for inspirations. A single topic and issue could be axis to develop around it others by making connections and articulations nor foreseen; for example, using imagination, inquiry, and dialogue in mathematics and natural sciences from a dialogic perspective.

Professional development programs for teachers should provide myriads of examples where teaching skills and content knowledge are involved.

Professional development programs for teachers should be spaces to discuss the aesthetic experience as an act of creation par excellence that is social, cultural, and historically created and determined; that is, in depth, beyond the superficial conception of art.
Implementation.

Professional development programs should be a significant different experience for teachers. They should be spaces to share and to create pedagogical innovations; however, innovations should be understood as changes in discourses and points of view and not be reduced to new ways of doing teaching. Professional development programs should work simultaneously at meta-level and microgenetic level meaning that while activities are exemplars of ways to promote the development of HPFs participants will reflect not only on the activities but on their own mental processes such as reflect on their reflections, reflect on their critical thinking, reflect on their imagination and inquiring process. They will make these processes visible to Others through deep conversations, and artistic representations like diagrams, writings, and drama enactments. Imagination should be the bridge between HPFs; for instance, imagining how the IS (reality) could be IF we: change, include, exclude, apply in a different context, and so on. It is worthwhile to ask participants to artistically represent their creations to make their discourses visible to Others. Bakhtin (2006) following Goethe argues that any idea could be made visible.

Professional development programs should be experiences where through reflection, critical thinking participants bring to light what lies behind and beneath cultural discourses on issues such as: educational policies and socio-cultural-historical created markers such as: age, gender, race, class, ethnicity, and level of intelligence like those measured through test.

A rhizome-like structure facilitates curriculum flexibility to make connections and articulations not foreseen in the curriculum design. In this sense, flexibility is understood
as to be open to exploration, creation and discoveries. Edmiston’s (1998) notion of curriculum as co-created meaning is an invaluable tool.

Homework and assessment should be learning experiences and opportunities to re-conceptualize to build knowledge.

**Edmiston’s structure for drama as a template for curriculum development.**

It is my interpretation that Edmiston’s structure into phases for drama enactments could be used as a template to develop curriculum for professional development programs for teachers. These programs should be based on socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories and have authorship as their goal. Based on my study of Edmiston’s work I argue that this structure could be applied in a fractal-like to curriculum’s macro and micro levels; that is, the whole program, the lesson plan, and the activities could follow the same structure. The application I foresee would be:

*Introduction phase.*

Emphasis is made in the creation of a safe environment as a necessary condition to promoting authorship. This implies, for example, designing activities addressed to build community and the initiation of the re-conceptualization process of some concepts such as body, assessment, and discipline.

*Warming-up phase.*

During this phase information to contextualize the content within the socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories would be provided or shared. This information would be analyzed through inquiry questions. The strategy of having deep conversations would be used by inviting participants to step inside and outside their pedagogical practices to re-
examine them. The suggested theories’ salient characteristics, previous knowledge, and imagination would be the mediating devices for re-examination and interpretation.

*Intense participation phase.*

Application of socio-cultural-historical tradition’s theories through activities where participants reflect on their reflections on concrete activities related to different subject-matters.

*Closing phase.*

Making connections and articulations and envisioning possibilities for application in their own pedagogical practices.

**Authorship and Educational Change**

This study’s findings allow claiming that authorship as the aim of education lead to the following changes in education:

*Promote the formation of human beings able to authoring themselves; that is, to be independent, responsible, and active in their own process of learning.* Instead of reciting by heart information, this individual is an ethical person who understands his/her existence as a shared event and think about the consequences that his/her acts (mental and physical actions) have for Others and the world.

Accordingly, *authorship changes the focus from content to processes.* Being independent, responsible, and active requires and develops HPFs in a loop-like process being inquiry and reflection crucial. This has salient implications: One, it *changes the focus from expecting the students to give answers to expect them to elaborate questions.* Questioning is both means and outcome of authorship because by elaborating questions the student becomes aware of his/her own words and the meaning they have made.
Therefore, questioning is a better way to bring to light the built knowledge. Two, it changes the use of evaluation from a mechanism of control, follow-up, and selection to *assessment as a component of the learning process that improves learning*. Three, it *change the power relations within the classroom and along with it the division of labor between teachers and students*. Power relations change from top-down hierarchical relations of domination and control to truly democratic one. Understanding democracy, as Freire (1998) and Greene (2000) do, as an act of creativity and imagination.

To develop pedagogical strategies and practices that, as those of drama, seek to promote reflection and action moving back and forth in time with the aid of imagination. Having authorship as an aim for formal education, a purpose of curriculum development, and as goal of activities *bring uncertainty into the pedagogical act* even though in a dialogic approach, as it is in drama, everything should be selected and planned according to an educational goals, purposes, and aims (for a distinction between these three concepts see Hass, 1987).

**Coda: My Reflections on the Novel of Education**

The novel of education in Bakhtin’s time was a novel of the re-creation of mankind. It was the novel about becoming aware that human beings can create and re-create themselves and the world (reality). The chronotope of this novel began with the Renaissance, went through the Enlightenment up to the middle of the 1930s when the authoritative discourse, afraid of multiple possible futures, violently took Vygotsky and Bakhtin’s voices out of the scenario; fortunately, not for ever. Today, the novel of education has as characters dialogic scholars who promote the use of imagination to provoke reflection, ethics, aesthetics, justice, and equity in education. Within this novel,
mankind has to recover the consciousness that reality could be transformed by human beings who, by learning from their past to imagine the future, struggle to transform the present.

My chapter in this novel of education deals with professional development programs for teachers focused on a chronotope that for convenience I call classroom, in a broad sense, but it is not reduced to a room with four walls, some windows (hopefully) and a door. My reflections led me to think in relation with what I have learned from T&L 633 that any possible version of the novel of education at this historical moment should respond, following Bakhtin (2006), to problems of reality and problems of necessity. One of the problems of reality is the deficient quality of education and the professional development programs for teachers that are provided. Accordingly, one of the necessities is the development of professional development programs that address the problems of authorship. In this way, it is expected to prepare teacher that foster the kind of education we need as species in cultural evolution; that is, teachers able to contribute to the development of human’s potential and creative initiative to “become a new unprecedented type of human being” (Bakhtin, 2006, p.23).

This new mankind will lead the attainment of sustainable development. Scholars like Jickling (1994), Langhelle (1999), and Lyon (1995) agree that education addressed to form people able to think ethically and critically is essential for the attainment of a sustainable future. They will have to face the challenge to figure out ways to promote a worldwide dialogue including not only the absolute past, the present, and the predetermined future but by stepping outside strive to reach agreement between alternative possible past and from there create alternative possible futures. The reference or concrete
historical evidence for this dialogue are the voices of the historical third expressed through the different forms of languages, art forms, tools, artifacts, traditional knowledge, indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, high-tech devices that can be read and interpreted as texts.

Following Bakhtin (2004) I became clear that in this research study, T&L 633 has provided me the concrete historical material to reflect. My big and complex problem today is: how to develop curriculum to make the classroom a figured world that serves as transition point of two different epochs (neoliberalism and sustainable development) to facilitate mankind’s process of becoming?
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## Appendix A. Dr. Edmiston’s Drama Teaching Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drama Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student consent</td>
<td>Invite and get students consent to enter into the drama. Without students’ consent any drama is fated to fail (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different forms of group organization.</td>
<td>Pair work and small group work and whole group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the classroom’s floor</td>
<td>Edmiston often uses the classroom’s floor to sit, to draw, to write, etc. (Edmiston &amp; Wilhelm, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To steep inside and outside of texts.</td>
<td>Drama does not have to be used over long periods of time but as needed to promote students’ engagement with reading texts. Rather, the process goes: drama-reflection/meaning making (knowledge building) – drama. Edmiston &amp; Enciso (unpublished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become other people to create alternative scenarios/worlds.</td>
<td>“In drama, students take action as if they have become other people”. (Edmiston, 1998a, p.60). This allows them to create “alternative worlds and world views to explore in dialogue” (Edmiston, 1998a, p. 64) “as if they are elsewhere.” (Edmiston &amp; Wilhelm1998, p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-conceptualize</td>
<td>Creating conditions that allow looking at one event in a new way. Edmiston often uses artifacts as pivots to assist students to re-contextualize. In addition, since re-contextualization requires information this strategy facilitates the acquisition of new information and building new knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableaus</td>
<td>Elaboration of tableaus where the relationships amongst elements are represented. This facilitates critical thinking and reflection Edmiston (1998a).This strategy is helpful to assist students to imagine possible relationships and possible futures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>Comparing the values that underlie two situations that apparently are not related to each other. This facilitates critical thinking and reflection. (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write diaries</td>
<td>To write diary entries from different points of view, from different points in time (past, present, and future) or a combination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-enact historical episodes</td>
<td>Re-enacting historical episodes to be analyzed and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resisting students’ arguments</strong></td>
<td>Resisting the students’ arguments in order to press them to explain themselves further and to provoke intense ethical dialogue (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ventriloquate (in the Bakhtinian sense of the word)</strong></td>
<td>Ventriloquate (repeat statements the student has made before in regard to a situation) current beliefs on an issue and students’ previous expressed strong opinion to be the object of critic. (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switch from being object of actions to be the subject of actions.</strong></td>
<td>Those who had been the objects of the actions become the subject of new actions and dialogue from this position. This strategy can be used in combination with others like writing diary entries from different points of view, from different points in time (past, present, and future) or a combination. (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imagining different scenarios.</strong></td>
<td>Asking the participants to imagine different scenarios (past, present, future, worst, best, possible, including or excluding some elements, and so on). As Langer, 1953, 307 in Edmiston, 1998a, p. 80) argue “A present filled with its own future” is the unique dramatic experience (Edmiston, 1998a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Use of key questions** | Key questions are questions that are addressed to provoke critical thinking. They are:  
  - “Engaging questions” those that invite the students to be in possible worlds or situations; for example, “what if I were…? (Edmiston & Enciso, unpublished.)  
  - “Exploring questions” those that invite the students to look for reasons and make arguments. (Edmiston & Enciso, unpublished.)  
  - “Authentic questions” those formulated by the students out of their curiosity that usually are not contemplated in the official curriculum. (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998) |
Appendix B. Description of the Study to Participants

Teaching and Learning with Drama: An Alternative Program for Educators’ Professional Development

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patricia Enciso, Associate Professor -School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.
Co-Investigator: Mariela Herrera, Doctoral Student - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE

Description of the Study for Participants

Rationale: Today the improvement of the quality of education is a major concern worldwide. Educational scholars and policy makers consider teacher training as crucial to attain this goal. In general, professional development program are characterized by their focus on teaching skills development and they use traditional instrumental means like demonstrations, peer observation, and trainer coaching (Glickman et al., 2004; Bork, 2003). Glickman et al., (2004), Hoffmann (2006), and UNESCO (2000) suggest to shift the focus of teachers training from the “know how” toward human development’s four pillars of learning: Learning to know, learning to be, learning to live together, and learning to do.

As an educator I have been interested in finding ways to promote the transformation of pedagogical practices in classrooms. In the summer of 2006 I took Dr. Brian Edmiston Ed. IT&L 633 workshop “Teaching and Learning with Drama”. Since then I became interested in Professor Edmiston’s scholarship. I decided to study T&L 633 as a professional development program to identify with the collaboration of participating teachers ways, topics, and issues T&L 633 might contribute to design professional development programs that overcome some of the shortcoming identified by scholars and researchers.

This is the first study on T&L 633 from this perspective. It constitutes an important part of my future dissertation. During the week-long workshop I will do the research’s fieldwork. To attain this goal I need to:
- Distribute a survey to make a criteria based selection of key informants from the whole group so the volume of data will be manageable and will gain in-depth analysis.
- Video record some segments in order to make transcriptions of non-verbal language, and review class sessions for interpretation.
- To download Carmen postings. They are important because through these postings, the participants make connections between the class readings, their
experiences as teachers, elaborate knowledge, and connect T&L 633, with their classrooms, and the world.

- To conduct interviews with the key participants. This will allow me in a face-to-face conversation to deal with particular topics of interest to you and to the focus of my research.

All the materials that record the data – written texts and video – will be kept in a locked cabinet in my home-office. Anonymity is guaranteed through the use of pseudonyms and codes to identify the key participants. In addition, absolute impartiality with regard to the course evaluation and grades is guaranteed. Key participants portfolios will be collected after the grades have been posted.

I thank Dr. Brian Edmiston for allowing me to share this experience with all of you. I thank you all in advance for your cooperation.
Appendix C. General Consent Letter

Teaching and Learning with Drama: An Alternative Program for Educators’ Professional Development

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patricia Enciso, Associate Professor - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.
Co-Investigator: Mariela Herrera, Doctoral Student - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.
Protocol # 2007E0405

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

“General Consent Letter”

I consent to participating in research entitled: Teaching and Learning with Drama, An Alternative for Educators’ Professional Development Program.

Dr. Patricia Enciso, Principal Investigator, or her authorized representative Mariela Herrera has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. I understand that the researchers need to select key informants, that by signing this form I am authorizing them to consider me as a possible one. I also understand that T&L 633 “Teaching and Learning with Drama” class sessions are going to be audio-video recorded and by signing this form I authorize them to audio-video-record my participation. I also understand that Carmen postings are part of the data of this study, and that my postings could be selected; by signing this form I authorize the researchers to download and print such postings. Possible benefits of the study have been described and anonymity is guaranteed through the use of pseudonyms and codes to identify the key participants.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: __________________________  Signed: ____________________________________ (Participant)

Signed: __________________________  Signed: ____________________________________ (Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Signed: __________________________  (Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)

Witness: __________________________

HS-027E Consent for Participation in Exempt Research
Appendix D. Survey Format

Teaching and Learning with Drama: An Alternative Program for Educators’ Professional Development

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patricia Enciso, Associate Professor - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE. Co-Investigator: Mariela Herrera, Doctoral Student - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.

Rationale: This survey is a part of the implementation of a research proposal I am conducting to develop my dissertation. The purpose of the research is to examine T&L 633 “Teaching and Learning with Drama” as a professional development program that offers an alternative to traditional approaches to teacher’s professional short-term education.

Purpose: The purpose of this survey is to gather information to identify participants in this workshop who might serve as “key informants” according to the research design. You are free to decline to answer this questionnaire. The provided information will be absolutely confidential. I thank you for your cooperation.

Contact information:
Name: ____________________________ e-mail: __________________

Gender : Male ___ Female ___ Age: ______
Your School level is: Bachelor ____ Master ____ PhD____
What is your major area? _____________________________
Number of years of teaching experience: ________ years
Are you currently teaching? Yes _____ No____
What school level are you teaching? ________ grade.
What subject matter are you teaching? _____________________________
Will you teach next academic year? Yes____ No _____
Have you attended at least one in-service workshop or course? Yes ____ No ____
Do you have previous experience with drama as pedagogy? Yes ____ No____
What are your expectations from this workshop?
Appendix E. Key Informants Consent Letter

Teaching and Learning with Drama: An Alternative Program for Educators’ Professional Development

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patricia Enciso, Associate Professor - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.
Co-Investigator: Mariela Herrera, Doctoral Student - School of Teaching and Learning, CEHE.
Protocol #2007E0405

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

“Key Informant Consent Letter”

I consent to participating in research entitled: Teaching and Learning with Drama, an Alternative for Educators’ Professional Development Program.

Dr. Patricia Enciso, Principal Investigator, or her authorized representative Mariela Herrera has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. I understand that the researchers have selected me as a key informant, that by signing this form I agree to cooperate with them by: providing copies of my midterm and final portfolios elaborated as partial and final requirements in T&L 633 “Teaching and Learning with Drama”; authorizing them to download my Carmen postings; and to having an interview with them. Possible benefits of the study have been described and anonymity is guaranteed through the use of pseudonyms and codes to identify the key participants.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ________________________________

Signed: ____________________________________________

(Participant)

Signed: ____________________________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)

Signed: ____________________________________________

(Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness: __________________________________________
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3 CORE TERMS IN FICTIONAL DRAMA

ROLE
Fictional role is a person you (and/or students) pretend to be in events that you (and/or they) imaginatively project into and enact.

FRAME
Fictional frame is a person’s point of view or perspective on events (that includes his/her values) which s/he uses to understand those events. Different people interpret events differently because they frame events differently. Different professionals frame the same events differently (e.g. a journalist, a police officer, a criminal, a victim, a counselor, a ballistics experts) because of their professional assumptions about what’s important to pay attention to in order to make sense of events.

SOCIAL POSITIONING
Fictional social positioning is how the person you are pretending to be positions other people as s/he interacts (each of whom may frame events very differently)
- Giving him/herself higher/equal/lower authority to act/interpret events
- Using power over/with/for others
THESE TERMS CAN ALSO BE USED IN THE “SOCIAL DRAMA” OF EVERYDAY LIFE

ROLE
Everyone plays different social roles as they interact in everyday life e.g. teacher, student, parent, child, etc.

FRAME
Frame is your point of view or perspective on events (that includes your values) which you use to understand those events.
Different people interpret events differently because they frame events differently.

SOCIAL POSITIONING
Social positioning is how you position other people as you interact with them
- Giving yourself higher/equal/lower authority to act/interpret events
- Using power over/with/for others
Teachers and students are always socially positioning each other as they interact. When A interacts with B, A socially positions B with higher, equal, or lower authority to act (and interpret) the situation they are in. Social positioning happens in everyday interaction in the everyday world + in every interaction in a socially imagined world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher authority relative to the children/team – e.g. as if you are a leader</th>
<th>Equal authority relative to children/team members –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You now have the authority (within the fictional space) to give directions and make reasonable demands on the children (as team members).</td>
<td>Position yourself as if you are one of the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are able to be a colleague (within the fictional space).</td>
<td>You are now able to position them to take more responsibility (within the fictional space).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower authority Relative to children/team members – position yourself as if you are a helper or someone who is new to the team and doesn’t understand much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIAL POSITIONING AND THE POWER CONTINUUM

(NOTE: when we use drama ... we can explore what might happen IF we were positioned like this)

**Oppositional positioning**
Is one person using *power over others*
To force them to act (or reflect) in a way they may resist or refuse + people accepting this positioning.

**Dialogic positioning**
Is using *power with others*
to dialogue and negotiate new ways of acting (or reflecting) that are mutually agreed

**Equal positioning**
Is using *power for others*
to assist them to act (or reflect) in a way they have already chosen + people accepting this positioning
Appendix G. Sample of Open and Structured Observation’s Narrative

The structured observation describes what happened in relation with the three major categories considered in this study as important to develop curriculum for teachers’ professional development programs. They are: verbal, non-verbal or body language, and contextual. By verbal I understand what participants express in oral or written forms of language. By body/non-verbal language I understand within a broad notion of body everything that involves gestures, physical movements, behaviors. By context I understand aspects, factors, or features of the environment that create conditions for the participants to participate in a certain way. Thus context is not just refers to the objects but also to observable behaviors. One of the findings or major observation is that in these categories are so intertwined that to talk about them in isolation from the other two would not be an accurate description of what happened during 633. Instead, I used a narrative style. Clock time will be highlight when it is important for the narrative to make meaning, otherwise I will use the notion of lived time. In consequence, it is difficult to sharply distinguish between verbal and body/non-verbal languages and between them and the context because they mutually determine one another. For example, noise, laughter, messiness go together and are an important part of the context.

These descriptions will serve to better understand what happened during the workshop to answer research question number 2 and to project implications for further professional development programs. These categories are also parts of the theoretical frame (chapter II). As a researcher I consider important to make clear that in this source of data Dr; Edmiston may look as having a protagonist role. However, the fact of the matter is that he is assumed as the leader, and what I really was interested in highlighting was the way he handle the issues of body language, movement, and physical context of the room, the messiness and chaotic environment that can be observed toward the end of the workshop as an outcome of pedagogical strategies implemented through dramatic inquiry. In addition, I took into account that participant voices are present in the other sources of data.

NON VERBAL – BODY LANGUAGE

At the beginning the classroom was quite, only Professor Edmiston’s voice was heard. Everybody, but him, was sat down on chairs. Participants are invited to get to know each other. However, instead of the traditional introduction where people say one by one their names and, usually, the place they work. Dr. Edmiston shows a faster way and invited them to come to the center of the classroom. They formed a line according to the grade level they teach from K to college. With this activity participants go to a place in the classroom according to an event of their personal history and not stand up where they are told.

Professor Edmiston illustrates by moving around the room, through his family history, the different roles he plays as student, teacher, father how there is not a fixed
position on the line for anyone but that context and contingencies make us move. He also shows that his everyday life has many things in common with the rest of the participants. He is creating a safe environment to build community.

He proposes activities that make people to move around the room according to their personal history and knowledge like for example to make groups according to years of teaching experience, geographical place of origin.

I highlight that in these types of activities it can be observed how physical movement facilitates the creation of a safe environment and building community. By pointing out the bathroom location and the foreign accent that some of us have, recognition and respect of the body in two instances that are usually left aside in the classroom are shown; these are body’s physiological functions and body as the event where society, culture, and history take place generating differences. (June, 11, 2007, two hours have passed after the class has began)

WRAP-UP: Edmiston asserts: “we always have a community in every group. The big problem is the quality of the interactions.” (June, 14, 2007).

After two hours that the whole workshop has began, participants are invited for the first time to sit on the floor; however, it is made clear that is not an obligation. Professor Edmiston sat on the floor, some participants do as well, and others sat on chairs.

It is important to note how tradition can be disrupted with body language and gestures like a teacher – a faculty sitting on the floor!!!. Sitting on the floor is an issue in western societies. The first activity using drama as teaching strategy is about to begin. Participants are visible perplex, afraid, stiff, and the like. Dr. Edmiston calmed them down by saying “I am not going to ask you to do anything that you do not want to do, so do not worry about that”. In the interview one of the key informants shared with me that she had no idea what to expect from this class, but she was so bored and frustrated with traditional pedagogy that she needed something new, something different.

In the afternoon of the second day of workshop (June 12, 2007), I observed that participants’ desks were crowded with handouts, working sheets, package of readings, notebooks, post-its, papers, bottles of water, and food. By June, 14, 2007 I observe that participants feel more comfortable “jumping in role”; for example, without been told they picked up props and use them. The room was messy...Life was going on. Jackets were thrown around the room, and there were backpacks and purses everywhere. This is an example of how non-verbal language and context, and verbal intermingle creating an environment.

CONTEXT

When Dr. E. started the workshop – first day – he did not proposed any dramatic experience right away. He just changed the customary way of the classroom’s physical arrangement in rows and of “getting to know each other”

During one of the activities used to make the introduction to one another at the beginning of the course, participants are asked to tell something positive about their students that they think the other participants should know or that they want them to know. Professor Edmiston proposed: “Talk with the people of your age-group about something that the other might not know because this is your age knowledge”. I found this activity as a way to show that their teaching experiences and the pedagogical knowledge and wisdom they
have developed are valued. It also is a collective knowledge-building event. It is very likely that such a valuable knowledge is not written anywhere. It is important to note that with this activity participants began to talk and to laugh. I would say to laugh more than talk.

“Tell us something about you that you would like us to know but that most people don’t know or guess” and “Don’t assume that students know…this applies even in college”. He is also breaking the myth of age in relation to the development of skills and human needs by highlighting that what changes are the behaviors like the use of scissors at age five and research methodology at the Ph.D. level.

Participants are discussing about the meaning of “strategy” and creating charts in long pieces of papers (I have those charts). At this point (day fifth- June, 15, 2007) it is evident that although he has accompanied the participants in the development of their charts, both in their presentation and elaboration the participants (teachers) as students are taking the floor or the leadership. However, whenever necessary, professor Edmiston jumped in with comments and clarifications. Charts all around the room are growing in the number of post it.

It is important to note that teachers’ experiences and shortcomings “we’ve got stocked” plus what Professor Edmiston says push participants forward and helps them to stretch the ZPD. The strategy is: first, expand – then, narrow, then expand, and then narrow. The teacher narrows to focus to help that learning takes place. Edmiston makes clear “I’m assessing your learning not your answer”. He explains that when we focus on the assessment of learning we think more about evaluation and when we focus on assessment for learning we are concerned with the improvement of our teaching practices and knowledge building.

The activity continues and participants are able to provide explanations, reasons, rationales, and arguments.
Appendix H. Summary of Themes and sub-topics dealt with through Carmen Postings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes/Proponents</th>
<th>Topic Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The value of playing with children (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Following the child's lead (25 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play and literacy learning (5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play - Drama (14 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (and students?) as firefighters? (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Learning about values (9 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment and evaluation (17 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Suitable for older students (11 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>What has to be learning + What the children are in... (2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning from the children's point of view (4 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' questioning (no responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions from the gaps in texts (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and engagement (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Intrinsic motivation and caring (12 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep engagement (no responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies (3 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating Activities (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Adults mediating student interactions (14 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials and artifacts mediating (12 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodies and voices as mediating meaning (7 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Protection (Dr. Edmiston)</td>
<td>Distance from events (1 response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not dividing the group against itself (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatic Inquiry (Dr. Edmiston)</strong></td>
<td>Inquiry as an organizing principle (13 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why dramatize inquiry?</td>
<td>(7 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom communities (Dr. Edmiston)</strong></td>
<td>Teachers' role in building community (42 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overlap with imagined communities</td>
<td>(9 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming an excellent teacher</td>
<td>(5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>(5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action + Reflection (Dr. Edmiston)</strong></td>
<td>Making meaning (3 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue among positions</td>
<td>(6 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABC of Drama (Dr. Edmiston)</strong></td>
<td>A - (6 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B - (9 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C - (5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions/Answers: How do I select and tailor</td>
<td>How to select questions (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions that mediate learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions/Answers: How can I change waiting</td>
<td>Changing waiting for answers (4 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for answers that I expect?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I engage all children?</td>
<td>Engaging all students (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I teach students to be critical thinkers?</td>
<td>Dramatic inquiry and critical thinking (17 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Mediation: How do I mediate when</td>
<td>Mediating across differences (5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students are so different?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Mediation: How do I mediate</td>
<td>Roles and values (5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students taking on roles not consistent with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their values?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Mediation: How do I mediate</td>
<td>Mediating taking up positions/frames/roles (8 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children taking on roles/frames/positions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Mediation: How do I mediate both</td>
<td>Mediating emotional + curricular learning (5 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep emotional learning and broad curricular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge within the time constraints of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom? (Participant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/Mediation: How do I better</td>
<td>Better facilitation of learning (7 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilitate learning? (Participant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/Pedagogy: How do I make drama a</td>
<td>Making drama more natural (11 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural occurrence instead of a staged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance? (Participant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture: How do I recognize when culture is shaping interpretation? (Participant)</td>
<td>Culture shaping interpretation (2 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture: How do I get students to value other cultures/differences (Participant)</td>
<td>Valuing differences (10 responses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture: How do I avoid cultural stereotypes? (Participant)</td>
<td>Cultural stereotypes (11 responses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I. Questions to Ponder About Teaching and Learning Activities

- What values guide how you participate in building classroom community? How important is it to build a classroom community?
- How much do you want to control what is learned and how learning happens?
- Do you value sharing power with all children?
- How often do you learn alongside children? How often are children teachers?
- Which questions that children ask will you explore with them?
- How important is that you care about and are interested in what you do in the classroom?
- How important is that the children care and are interested? do you expect to have to motivate them?
- Are you comfortable when children are more of an authority and more competent than you?
- How skillful are you at listening to children and mediating conversations and negotiations with and among children?
- How skillful are you at using verbal, non-verbal (e.g. gesture), or other "languages" (e.g. visual art, movement, or music)?
- How much do you value children going beyond learning known meanings (e.g. recalling factual information) to construct new ideas?
- How much do you value reading texts with children that raise “big” (substantive or controversial) questions about social, cultural, and/or ethical issues?
- How much do you mobilize children’s energies and cultural resources (what the children know, can do, care about, and are passionate about)?
- In the classroom, how much do you mobilize your energies and cultural resources (what you know, can do, care about, and are passionate about)?
- What questions are you currently pondering about teaching and learning?

Jot down responses to some of the questions and then choose 3 or more to respond to in more detail. Choose at least one where you belief you have some competence and at least one where you want to stretch your comfort zone to become more competent. You will not be required to share your responses with classmates.
Questions to Ponder About Teaching and Learning with Drama Activities

- When you imagine you are elsewhere (when you read, watch movies, or pretend), where can you “go” (or not go) and who can you imagine you are (or are not)?
- How comfortable are you imagining and pretend playing with children?
- How comfortable are you using objects, your bodies, your voice, and/or words (as you read and/or pretend play to project into imagined actions and to represent those actions with or for children)?
- Where are your comfort boundaries in terms of what children might do when they pretend play?
- How comfortable are you imagining and pretend playing with children?
- Are you comfortable when children pretend/imagine to be more powerful than you?
- Will you follow children/students where they want to go in an imagine world?
- Are you comfortable taking up the social position of whatever characters the children identify with?
- How open are you to imagining positions that are different from the ones that are usual in your everyday life? What about antisocial positions?
- Are you able to be in two spaces at once: participating in an imagined space + watching and listening in the everyday space?
- How competent and flexible are you as mediator of children’s meaning making (as you “make a difference” in classroom activities?)
- What questions are you currently pondering about teaching and learning with drama?

Jot down responses to some of the questions and then choose 3 or more to respond to in more detail. Choose at least one where you belief you have some competence and at least one where you want to stretch your comfort zone to become more competent. You will not be required to share your responses with classmates.
## Appendix J. Satellite Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Related concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Creation of possible worlds and futures | Fictional worlds  
Dreamed worlds  
Figured worlds |
| Basic HPF to create societies, cultures, and history | Freedom, consciousness, imagination, reflection, inquiry |
| Mechanism to maintain the status quo or reproduce culture | Power management (over, with, for).  
Control: time management, surveillance, fear, parental pressure.  
Corporeality: body language, silence, absence, emotions, feelings, values.  
Artifacts.  
Formal education:  
Classroom culture, teachers’ role, students’ role, type of community |

For example, key informants make the following statements and questions:

- “How to teach children to deal with cultural differences?”
- “How do I avoid cultural stereotypes in my classroom?”
- “So, I think careful planning, facilitation, and reflection of the dramatic inquiry experiences will help our classrooms to be free of stereotyping, blaming, and making blanket statements about other people.”
- “Will I be teaching my values?”
- “What is the “shared power status” of my classroom?”
- “Do I value sharing power with students?”