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Abstract

Drama in education has received considerable attention in the discourse on foreign language education and practitioners plead for its implementation in the classroom as well as in teacher training programmes (cf. Even, 2003; Haack, 2010; Schewe, 1993; Stinson & Winston, 2011). Although there are numerous reports on drama’s valuable contribution in educational contexts, evidence about its effect on second language learning is still sparse. This thesis investigates the effect of drama-based teaching on foreign language learning and hence contributes to bridging the gap between theory and practice. More precisely, it postulates two main research interests. First, the research aims to evaluate if drama grammar is an effective approach to teach conditional clauses to young adolescent English language learners. Second, it seeks to investigate other potential effects of drama-based teaching. For this purpose, an experimental case study, using a mixed-method, pre- and post-test design, was conducted at an upper secondary school in Dornbirn, Austria. Based on Even’s (2003) drama grammar approach, one class was taught using drama-based methods. Another class received teacher-centred instructions. Quantitative and qualitative data was collected through a grammar test, external observation reports, a questionnaire on drama-based methods and a teacher’s journal.

Results from quantitative data suggest that drama can be an effective instrument for learning grammar. Qualitative data supports this finding and further demonstrates that students associate positive learning experiences with the work of drama, including fun, better understanding, longer retention, self-confidence and positive group dynamics. Nevertheless, some challenging factors accompanied the drama intervention including time and space constraints as well as enhanced noise levels of participants, agitation and confusion in the beginning. Based on these results and theoretical background knowledge, the thesis concludes that drama practitioners and learners need to get accustomed to this distinctive way of learning and find suitable approaches for the respective learner group and setting in order to benefit from the resources drama offers. In this respect, the thesis promotes the implementation of drama pedagogy in teacher training programmes to prepare future teachers for using drama techniques in their language classrooms and hence offering students a holistic, communicative, motivating and successful language learning.
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</thead>
<tbody>
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<td>CEFR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>SC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiE</td>
<td>Theatre in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I: Drama and Foreign Language Learning

1 Introduction

Language education is a field of studies that has occupied researchers and practitioners for decades, and the existing amount of empirical research and the development of new disciplines highlights its increasing importance (cf. Hallet & Königs, 2010). Different language learning and teaching theories have been introduced, ranging from very instructive and teacher-centred approaches to more learner-centred and active methods. Considering the inconclusive evidence regarding their effectiveness, the search for the “ultimate” language teaching method is still on-going and might never be answered due to the high complexity of human beings and their language learning processes (cf. Even, 2011, p. 299).

Nevertheless, more contemporary theories, dating from the last decade of the 20th century, focus on a communicative language approach, where learners are in the centre of attention and immediately turn into language users (Piazzoli, 2011, p. 557). A rather new learning experience or way of promoting language learning has developed out of this approach and has been introduced in the field of language learning research, namely drama in education.

Drama in education uses means and techniques from the field of drama for teaching and learning languages with the aim of fostering communicative competence. While using drama for general educational purposes has already existed for many years, its potential for the foreign language classroom increasingly developed in the 1980s and 90s with publications by Kao & O’Neill (1998) and Schewe (1993). Next to the main aim of teaching about language, literature and culture, competences concerning personal, affective and creative learning are equally addressed in this performative teaching approach. Learning grammar through drama is one concrete example of fostering linguistic competences, grammatical competences in specific. Even (2003) is one of the pioneers of this approach and she published an extensive work about theoretical and practical approaches to teaching grammar via drama, called “Drama Grammatik”.

To date, the substantial number of publications around drama-based teaching and learning show a wide interest in using drama in the language classroom. The opinion that applying drama in the classroom enhances language learning and fosters other
social and personal competences is widespread (Even, 2003; Fasching, 2017; Kao & O’Neill, 1998; Kindl, 2016; Piazzoli, 2011; Schewe, 1993; Stinson & Winston, 2011; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013; Weber, 2017). However, reporting on the beneficial role of drama is mostly based on subjective impressions and personal experience in the language classroom, but a methodological observation of how drama influences second language learning is frequently missing (Fasching, p 167, Kao & O’Neill, 1998, Hawkins, 1993, p. 60). Therefore, authors stress the importance of conducting research in the field of drama-based teaching and learning, including discussion about research methodology itself (Huber, 2003; Lutzker, 2007; Schewe, 2007; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013).

In respect to drama grammar, the lack of quantitative data reflects uncertainties about the influence of drama-based teaching on learners’ grammatical ability. However, finding out about increased language proficiencies would be an essential piece of information about the effects and values of the drama grammar approach. Due to these reasons, this thesis aims to systematically investigate and evaluate the role of drama in education, thereby contributing to the lack in research. Within this general goal to understand more about drama in foreign language education, this thesis postulates two main research interests. First, it aims to evaluate the drama grammar approach in regard to students’ knowledge of English conditionals. Second, it seeks to find out about effects of drama-based teaching on learners.

For this purpose, a mixed-method study was conducted to investigate learners’ linguistic performance and their reaction towards drama in the classroom within the frame of drama-based teaching. The interventions took place in an upper secondary school during two weeks and included a treatment and drama group. The outcomes were measured through a methodological triangulation, including quantitative and qualitative data: a grammar test, a questionnaire on drama-based teaching, external observation reports and a teacher’s journal. The gained information should help to verify hypotheses and discuss effects of drama-based (grammar) teaching. In this respect, this thesis should contribute to a more systematic discussion about drama-based foreign language education, which has remained a research desideratum.

The opening section of this paper draws on existing literature in the field of drama-based research and discusses different definition attempts to show the complexity and variety of this performative teaching approach and to guarantee a common
understanding of terminologies. It specifically reflects on those aspects that are relevant for the study. In a further step, the compatibility between drama and principles of foreign language teaching is analysed to justify the implementation of drama in the foreign language classroom. Chapter 4 then presents practical implementations of drama in the foreign language classroom. More precisely, it looks at different activities and techniques and shows how drama-based (grammar) lessons can be structured. Furthermore, to properly evaluate the use of drama in the language classroom, possible benefits and challenges are outlined. These considerations are important for the research design and reflections on the effects of drama-based methods. The second part of this thesis then focuses on the empirical study and starts off with the research design and methodology. Outcomes are presented in the chapter on results before moving on to the discussion and limitations. The thesis concludes with a summary of findings and an outlook on future research.
2 Literature Review

This chapter captures the amount of research that has been conducted so far and specifies terminologies that are frequently used in discussions about applied theatre in education. First of all, a brief historical review of drama in educational contexts is outlined before defining performative teaching and learning. The performative teaching approach is then discussed from three different perspectives, starting with general pedagogical considerations, going over to the subject-specific field of foreign language education and finally ending with one concrete language aspect, namely grammar. This funnel-like approach from the more general to the more concrete seems appropriate regarding the fact that the three concepts overlap in methodological considerations and basic assumptions of drama-based teaching. Simply put, drama serves as a vehicle for educational purposes, be it for general, subject-specific or topic-related issues. Finally, all the approaches and authors mentioned are visually summarised in a figure and further outlook is given.

2.1 A Brief Historical Review of Drama in Educational Contexts

The first link between drama and education can already be traced back to ancient history. In ancient Greece or Rome, theatre had an educational function, whether it was watching a play with a moral message or reciting and performing important poets. In Rome, for example, the great orators, who especially focused on rhetoric skills, were regarded as role models (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 20). In the Middle Ages, theatre lost its importance as educational value because it was regarded as sinful by the Church. Adopting another role would deny the role God gave to the people. During the Renaissance, which is known for the renaissance (re-birth) of literature, the theatre and its function for educational purpose became relevant again (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 20).

It was not until the second half of the 20th century that serious discussions about the application of theatre in education emerged (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 20). Contributions to this field increased considerably and the impact of drama on the learner was more closely examined. As outlined in Schewe (Schewe, 2015, pp. 22–23) Bolton, Slade, Way and Heathcote are important authors who initiated and promoted the use of drama as a teaching method for different subjects. Discussions about terminology and definitions emerged and gave rise to a new approach to applied theatre in education. For example, distinctions between Drama in Education
(DiE) and Theatre in Education (TiE) were made in the context of applied theatre (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 20). Furthermore, the idea that drama could be used as a method for foreign language teaching and learning emerged at that point in time. Authors, such as Kao & O’Neill (1998) and Schewe (1993) gave new impetus in this field. It is especially with Schewe that drama methods were applied in the foreign language classroom and were no longer regarded as single, incoherent exercises but as a teaching method in foreign language education (Even, 2003; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013).

2.2 Defining Performative Teaching and Learning
The existence of numerous terms that describe different drama-based approaches in educational contexts creates confusion among researchers and practitioners. Authors might refer to similar or the same concepts while using different terms or use identical terms while meaning different aspects of drama in education.

In writing about the use of ‘theater,’ ‘drama,’ or ‘performance’ in L2 learning/teaching, researchers and practitioners might refer to such wildly different endeavors as the rehearsal and staging of a Shakespearian play for public performance, the writing of an original play by students, or the involvement of students in brief in-class improvisations or games, to name only a few (McGovern, 2017, p. 5).

The lack of clarity in terminology necessitates transparent definitions and researchers’ position in the conceptual frame of drama pedagogy (cf. McGovern, 2017, p. 5). For instance, at the Scenario Forum Conference in Cork, Ireland, organised by the editors of the drama journal Scenario, the need for a uniformed glossary was addressed; nevertheless, this glossary will take further discussions before being published (Crutchfield, Even, Piazzoli, Stinson, & Weltsek, 2017). The term performative teaching was frequently used as global term for the concept of teaching through drama-based methods. A new book published in 2016 by Schewe and Even with the title “Performative Teaching Learning Research” tries to introduce the term performative to characterise the interplay of pedagogy and the performing arts. Schewe makes an attempt at defining performative teaching: “Einer performativen Fremdsprachendidaktik ist daran gelegen, das Formenpotenzial der Künste pädagogisch zu nutzen” (Schewe, 2015, p. 31) [Performative foreign language teaching and learning aims at using the arts for pedagogical purposes, translation by KH]. Apart from the inconsistency concerning terminology, there is consensus about the fundamental characteristics of performative teaching. Ulrike
Hentschel, professor of theatre pedagogy at the University of Berlin, author of various books concerning drama pedagogy and co-editor of the journal “Zeitschrift für Theaterpädagogik. Korrespondenzen”, mentioned these characteristics during her presentation in Cork (Hentschel, 2017). She drew an interesting and engaging comparison between drama pedagogy and a ginger root: Drama pedagogy anchors the formative character of education and the aesthetic character of the arts. Those two dimensions are not always equally distributed or hierarchically arranged; they are more “randomly” intertwined. Sometimes the aesthetic character is more visible, where the voice or the body could be in the focus of learning; sometimes the formative character is prevalent, where drama is used to achieve an educational purpose such as learning a grammatical structure.

2.3 Drama in Education
Drama in Education (DiE) is a learning and teaching approach that uses drama techniques for educational purpose. This means that dramatic activities, including role play, storytelling, still images, and many more are developed and performed to gain competences in different areas, such as linguistic, aesthetic, personal, emotional, creative, etc. DiE takes place in different subjects and in both first- and second-language programs. What’s more, it is often specifically connected to language learning as performing implies working with body, voice and gestures. For instance, Schewe (1993) defines DiE as a way of „staging language“:

Mit Hilfe von Methoden, die sich aus dramatischen Kunstformen ableiten lassen, werden im Unterricht fiktive Kontexte geschaffen, in denen Lehrende und Lernende sprachlich und nichtsprachlich in intensiver Weise handeln ─ die fremde Sprache wird ‘inszeniert‘ (p. 5).
[Through methods that derive from drama, fictive contexts are created in the classroom in which teachers and learners can intensively act linguistically or non-linguistically ─ the foreign language is performed, translation by KH].

In a further paragraph, he specifies the use of language in dramatic activities by indicating learning factors that are often neglected in the language learning process but are well supported by drama: motor, creative, aesthetic, emotional and empathetic factors (Schewe, 1993, p. 14).

DiE as defined in the previous paragraph has its roots in different approaches. For example, Slade (1954) initiated the idea of child drama in the 1960s. His approach sees children at the centre of learning, who take part in informal and self-created theatre productions. Drama should enrich personal self-awareness and support
children’s development. These principles are closely connected to Piaget’s work on the cognitive development of children: drama activities imitate real life situations and prepare children for such situations. Later in the 70s and 80s another approach to drama was introduced by Heathcote and Bolton, who are often referred to as parents of DiE (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 24). Hallet & Surkamp (2015) also mention their role as initiators:

Heathcote puts the focus on content and knowledge and not only on the personal development of children. However, children are still in the centre of her work and seen as creative learners who have knowledge and experience that is elicited through drama activities. Drama is created and improvised through personal experiences and everyone participates in the dramatic action, even the teacher (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 23).

DiE is also often put in connection with process drama, which is a frequently used term in the US and Australia. Kao & O’Neill (1998) and Stinson (2012; 2006) are representatives of this teaching and learning approach, through which imaginative situations and characters are created over a longer period. All students put themselves in a different role and are involved and participate in finding ideas, negotiating and creating imaginative worlds that help to discover different topics and especially solve problems (Eigenbauer, 2009, pp. 62-63). An important point of process drama is the open and creative planning of school lessons; almost nothing is predictable, which requires a lot of flexibility (ibid.). Some authors use the term process drama synonymously with the more general term DiE (cf. Even, 2003, p. 149; Kao & O’Neill, 1998; McGovern, 2017).

Definition attempts of DiE additionally include the comparison with a similar but different approach called Theatre in Education. The latter one is often associated with the performance of plays by professional actors (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013). The connection to pedagogy is established by the fact that plays contain pedagogically
valuable contents and students may meet the theatre group and its play through workshops or additional pedagogical material designed for schools. An example for this is the company Vienna’s English Theatre that performs in different lower and upper secondary schools every year. The plays performed are provided as booklets with pedagogical material for teachers in advance. Hence, pupils might work on the content of the play and improvise certain scenes themselves, which is a first approach to theatre activities. Although this explanation of TiE seems far from the concept of DiE, there exist others which are more closely connected to DiE. Indeed, TiE is also used to describe performances of students themselves. Compared to DiE, which focuses more on the learning process within the play, TiE is mainly connected with the final performance of a play.

In schools, drama usually refers to informal, improvised enactment of which the goal is not presentation but the experience and satisfaction of the participant. Theatre indicates the more formal study of the techniques of acting and stagecraft, often culminating in a performance in front of the audience (O’Neill, 2006, pp. 31–32).

The paragraph reveals that in TiE, the product, the spectacle itself, is more important than the process of learning, which is prevalent in DiE. In both forms of applied theatre, TiE and DiE, students develop an understanding of theatre semiotics, such as creating tension, developing a sense of space and time, playing with focus, gesture and language (Eigenbauer, 2009, pp. 62-63). Schewe (2015) introduces two terms that basically represent the concepts of DiE and TiE. He distinguishes between performative Kleinformen, which are similar to DiE, and performative Großformen, which stand for TiE projects (2015, pp. 27–28).

Referring back to Hentschel (2017), one could conclude that TiE is more connected to the aesthetic part while DiE looks at specific pedagogical and educational goals that are achieved through performative teaching. No matter which approach is applied, aestheticism and pedagogy are combined and both affective and cognitive components of learning are addressed. In this paper, I will use the terms “drama in education”, “drama pedagogy”, “performative teaching” or “drama-based teaching and learning” to describe the implementation of drama-based methods in the classroom.

---

1 For more details see: http://www.englishtheatre.at
2.4 Drama in Foreign Language Education

Contributions concerning the implementation of drama in the foreign language classroom are numerous and originate from teachers or practitioners from all over the world. Topics vary from teaching cultural, aesthetic, linguistic, interpersonal, or personal aspects. There are many articles and books that discuss the concept of drama-based teaching in general, give concrete examples of drama-based methods and speak about the beneficial role of drama for language education (Eigenbauer, 2009; Even, 2003; Kalogirou, 2016; Kao & O’Neill, 1998; Piazzoli, 2011; Ralph, 1997; Schewe, 1993; Stinson & Freebody, 2006; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013; Weber, 2017). Next to these publications, a large number of topic related journals and conferences about performative teaching demonstrate an increasing interest in implementing drama methods in the foreign language classroom. In addition, a two-year-long research project, called DICE (Drama Improves Lisbon Key Competences in Education), tried to measure the impact of educational theatre and drama. Twelve countries and a dozen of educational drama practitioners participated in this project between 2008 and 2010. All these important contributions demonstrate that drama has received considerable attention in foreign language education. Schewe (2007, p. 165) therefore argues that drama in education becomes an independent approach to the subject-specific pedagogy of foreign language learning.

Schewe (1993) is undoubtedly one of the most important pioneers of drama in the foreign language classroom. He counts drama in foreign language learning and teaching as one of many disciplines of applied theatre. The principal aim is to teach about language, literature and culture (Schewe, 1993, p. 14). Schewe contributes to serious scientific discussions and studies about drama-based methods in the 90s with the publication of “Fremdsprache inszenieren” (Schewe, 1993) and “Towards Drama as a Method in the Foreign Language Classroom” (Schewe & Shaw, 1993). With “Fremdsprache inszenieren”, he is one of the first researcher who systematically observes his own drama-based teaching over years and proposes drama pedagogy as an independent learning and teaching principle or approach (Schewe, 2015, p. 24). Not only does he provide a theoretical well-grounded explanation of drama in foreign language learning but he also gives specific examples of teaching different

2 For more details see: http://www.dramanetwork.eu/about_dice.html
language aspects through drama. For instance, in chapter IV, part 4, he describes how language exercises, such as “Aussprachübungen”, “Wortschatzübungen”, “Grammatikübungen” etc. can be adapted to drama pedagogy (Schewe, 1993, p. 169). Moreover, he presents two lessons oriented towards drama pedagogy, which include practicing all four skills (listening, reading, writing and speaking) next to more content-oriented goals. For instance in the second lesson, called “Ist Graunsel die Insel der Deutschen und Grünsel das gelobte Land?” interculturality and the notion of home is intensively discussed (Schewe, 1993, p. 352).

In order to find out about (improved) language skills of participants, he used feedback sessions after his drama lessons. Students commented on the questions how much they acted in the foreign language and which language skills were especially addressed. The results were captured in a small chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geübte Tätigkeit</th>
<th>Grad der geübten Tätigkeit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HÖREN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRECHEN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERSTEHEN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHREIBEN</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEICHNEN</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESEN</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schewe, 1993, p. 391

This chart is a product of a self-evaluation of participants, who had to assess themselves on the language skills they especially practiced in those drama lessons. Although the chart provides a small overview of the skills used and practiced, there is no clear evidence in which dimensions those skills were trained and improved. Furthermore, it is not clear what is meant with “verstehen”, which makes the interpretation of these results more difficult.

At the end of the 20th century, Kao and O’Neill (1998) contributed a valuable publication to the research field of drama in the foreign language classroom with “Words into Worlds: Learning a Second Language through Process Drama”. They refer to Drama in Education as process drama and describe its development and

---

3 students had to identify how far they practiced different language skills (Hören, Sprechen, etc.) by putting a cross (*) in one of the three scales: little (wenig), average (mittelmäßig), a lot (viel).
characteristics in the first few chapters. Then they look at the psycho-social impact of drama on learning, including interpersonal, relational and communicative impacts. With respect to language skills, only oral production or communication is explicitly mentioned. Nevertheless, useful guidelines for teachers are provided in chapters five and six, where planning and assessment are described. In regard to the evaluating of effects of drama-based lessons they agree that an unsatisfied number of instruments exist (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 135). Therefore, tests that are used in a general communicative teaching and learning approach, including all language skills, are used. In this respect, grammatical competences, for instance, are mentioned to be useful for being evaluated (p. 135). This notion is valuable for the case study presented in this paper, which evaluates grammatical competences of students developed in a drama-based lesson.

Apart from the monographs described, a fair number of journals, including Applied Theatre Researcher, Drama Research Journal, Research in Drama Education, Youth Theatre Journal, Scenario, Drama Australia Journal, and Zeitschrift für Theaterpädagogik started publishing articles concerning performative arts and pedagogy. Topics are versatile and deal with issues such as diversity, human rights, emotion, anxiety, empathy, critical thinking, communication, dance, music, poetry etc. Describing all those valuable contributions would go beyond the scope of this paper. Podlozny (2000) provides an overview of studies and research projects about the correlation between drama methods and verbal skills, including reading, oral language proficiency, and writing that were conducted over the last 35 years. She reports on 200 experimental studies. The link between drama methods and language acquisition is well demonstrated in the majority of research projects; nevertheless, concerning research methodology or research design a clear lack of evidence or transparency is to be found. There is no consistency in methodology or even in the use of terminology (2000, p. 239).

2.5 Drama and Grammar
Using the performative power of drama to teach grammar is one of many approaches used in drama-based pedagogy. The basis is drama in education in general, as there does not yet exist any drama pedagogical learning approach for grammar lessons (Even, 2011, p. 53). Even (2003) summarises three points that should be included for
a successful teaching of grammar via drama: (1) drama should not be a single and additional method but an integral part of the lesson, (2) drama activities should not be too regulated but still provide freedom and open situations without neglecting the grammatical phenomenon, (3) the use of drama for grammar learning should be discussed on a meta-level (2003, pp. 64–65).

Approaches that fulfil these demands are provided by Schewe (1993) and Even herself (2003). In his book “Fremdsprache inszenieren: zur Fundierung einer dramapädagogischen Lehr- und Lernpraxis”, Schewe demonstrates, for instance, different drama scenes that concern a specific grammatical phenomenon. His example deals with learning the passive voice, the imperative and subordinate clauses in German as a foreign language. The language learners imitate parts of a fantasy machine through still images and talk about their respective function by using specific grammatical structures. One example could be “Ich bin der Hauptschalter. Wenn ich gedrückt werde, wird die Maschine mit Strom versorgt und fängt an zu brummen” (Schewe, 1993, p. 178) [“I am the main switch. When I am being operated, the machine will be provided with power and will start to drone”, translation by KH]. Although the single steps are clearly mentioned, the descriptions lack an explanation about the acquisition of the grammatical structure in the first place. Schewe describes how grammatical structures, such as the imperative or the passive voice are used in context or practiced, but not how students learnt them (1993, p. 177-180).

A more guided and formal approach to grammar teaching through drama is adapted by Even herself (2003). She is one of the most important pioneers of this teaching approach, who argues for a new perspective on grammar teaching that combines cognitive knowledge with practical action or communication. In this book, she provides a very detailed overview of foreign language teaching, grammar and drama in education. More specifically, she provides examples of different “Inszenierungsformen” and “Inszenierungstechniken”, which are very useful for novice teachers to drama-based teaching. In chapter six and eight, two concrete examples of drama grammar lessons are described. Similar to Schewe, she structures her drama grammar lessons according to six stages and therefore refers to the concept of drama grammar as “dramagrammatische[s] Unerrichtsphasenmodell” (Even, 2003, p. 175). An important point that stands out
compared to other publications is the fact that she describes her research project in detail. This means that not only the planned lessons are precisely described, including the course material, but also instruments for the data collection are shared. More precisely, her study was conducted with 12 German students of the second academic year at the University of Leicester in Great Britain. The study period ran for two semesters in 1998 and 1999 (Even, 2003, p. 70) The starting point of her research was the following hypothesis: “Dramapädagogischer Grammatikunterricht kann eine wirksame Verarbeitung fremdsprachlicher grammatischer Phänomene gewährleisten” (p. 69) [Drama-based grammar lessons can guarantee an effective processing of grammatical phenomena in the foreign language, translation by KH].

She tested her hypothesis with two concrete action research projects described in her book. The first one dealt with the parts of speech (Wortklassen), which were discussed on a meta-linguistic level through personifying characteristics and functions. The grammar structure of the second unity, consisting of three consecutive lessons, was the second conjunctive (Konjunktiv 2). The lessons were more oriented towards active language use, as the grammatical structure was realised in different contexts and language situations. To evaluate the effectiveness of those lessons, she made use of a methodological triangulation, which included her own perspective (Eigenperspektive), those of the participants (Teilnahmeperspektive), and those of other teachers observing her lessons (Fremdperspektive) (p. 72). The results she gained from her empirical study were diverse and promising. From her empirical data, she inferred nine theses that underline characteristics of teaching grammar through drama. Among those are, for example, active, social, creative and holistic learning (Even, 2003, pp. 233–234). She combines those theses with personal reflections of students and receives an image of the psychological impacts regarding, for instance, reduction of anxiety, willingness to take risks, or motivation. Concerning language competence, no clear statements about an increased language proficiency are made, but Even points to the fact that attitude towards grammar learning changed into a positive direction and that students mentioned the use of different learning strategies. She summarises the impact of those lessons in the following way:

In this respect, Even (2003) specifies in her conclusion that further empirical research regarding the effectiveness of drama grammar needs to be done (p. 295). As she does not measure increased language proficiency, her study lacks evidence about the efficiency of drama-based methods on linguistic competences of students.

Different adaptations of drama grammar, based on Even’s model, have been realised in various (classroom) contexts (Bryant, 2012; Fratini, 2008; Kindl, 2016; Monyer, 2010). Kindl (2016) for instance translated Even’s approach into a two days’ workshop with eight German learners of different age and origin where she taught the German “Abtönungspartikel” (mal, doch, ja, denn) through drama methods. Although Even’s stage model was used as a starting point, Kindl adapted this approach due to feedbacks gained in the pilot study. Participants had to fill out a pre-test “Partikeltest” beforehand at home, consisting of seven scenes, which were partly performed during the project. After the interventions, participants were requested to perform the test once again; however, only three of them carried this request out and hence there is no statistical proof about improvements made. Although the author stresses the value of drama for visualising abstract grammatical phenomena in context-specific situations, her qualitative results are only based on participants’ feedback and personal observations and hence do not allow for informed conclusions about the effect of the drama grammar approach on learners’ linguistic competences.

Bryant (2012) reports on a German language camp in Tübingen, Germany, in which theatre pedagogical methods were used to teach German as a foreign language. 66 elementary school kids, who attended the camp for nine days, were divided into different groups according to their language proficiency. Every child had to write a text before the camp started and an oral assessment was conducted upon arrival (Bryant, 2012, p. 31). The author wanted to combine explicit and implicit grammar teaching and therefore used Even’s drama grammar approach (Bryant, 2012, p. 29). One group, for example, was taught the indirect speech through a court’s scene (e.g. “Die Richterin sagte, dass…”) [“The judge said that…”, translation by KH]. The lessons were not identically designed after the five stages of Even, but were modified to meet the expectations and challenges of elementary school children and to
provide an incentive for kids to use the structure. Results show that the kids improved significantly in written and oral skills, using for instance subordinate clauses or prepositions of place more often (Bryant, 2012). Thus, the author pronounces her optimism concerning the drama grammar approach and claims the integration of theatre pedagogy in the normal school curriculum (Bryant, 2012, p. 50).

Other practitioners tried the drama grammar approach and mainly reported on positive effects. (e.g. Fratini, 2008; Monyer, 2010). However, they stress that drama grammar cannot entirely substitute grammar lessons and that the explicit and cognitive teaching of grammar is desirable for an effective learning (Monyer, 2010, p. 26). Such concerns about teaching grammar through drama are legitimate; nevertheless, these statements are purely based on personal experience and lack empirical evidence.

2.6 Summary

This literature review has pointed out the most important contributions to the field of drama in education, drama in foreign language education and drama grammar in specific. The following chart summarises the authors mentioned in this review and gives an overview of performative teaching and learning approaches:

![Figure 1: Performative Teaching and Learning](image-url)
3 Drama and Principles of Foreign Language Education

Using drama for educational purposes might be perceived as incompatible with principles of foreign language teaching and the demands of various school curricula as drama is often associated with extracurricular activities. However, drama pedagogy and principles of foreign language teaching actually overlap in many aspects. In fact, drama pedagogy has become an important matter in the academic discussion of foreign language education, especially because of its action-oriented approach.

[Die Dramapädagogik] ist in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten insbesondere deshalb zu einer wichtigen Bezugsdisziplin für die Fremdsprachendidaktik avanciert, weil sie, ausgehend von theaterpädagogischen Einsichten und Konzepten und anschließend an fremdsprachendidaktische lerner- und handlungsorientierter Ansätze, Sprache nicht bloß als Text, sondern als Ereignis und performativen Akt ansieht (Hallet & Surkamp, 2015, p. 6).

[Drama pedagogy has become an important discipline in FLE, because based on drama pedagogical ideas and learner- and action-oriented approaches of FLE, it does not only regard language as text, but as action and performative act, translation by KH].

In order to justify an implementation of drama-based methods in language classrooms, the following Section 3.1 will look at educational directives and discuss how drama fits into the communicative approach to language learning and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

3.1 Drama and the Communicative Language Approach

Drama pedagogy reflects basic principles advocated in the communicative language approach as its goal is to develop and promote communicative competence in the foreign language. „Das Sprachkonzept der Drama-Methode lehnt sich an die sprach- und kommunikationstheoretischen Prämissen des kommunikativen Ansatzes an“ (Ortner, 1998, p. 140) [The concept of language of the drama method is based on language-related and communicative premises of the communicative language approach, translation by KH]. Schewe (1993, p. 221) substantiates this perspective with a graphic that shows the theoretical building of drama in education: the communicative approach forms the ground of the building, drama is located on the roof, supported by four columns that represent methodologically relevant components. These components are “action-oriented”, “experience-oriented”, “alternative” and “interactive” methods.
The notion of communicative competence became important in the 1960s and 70s, when foreign language teaching experienced a paradigm shift that is known as "kommunikative Wende" (communicative shift) and is still relevant today: teaching principles moved away from attaining native-like accuracy and aimed at students' communicative competences (Decke-Cornill & Küster, 2010, p. 85).

The American sociolinguist Hymes (1972) coins the term communicative competence and describes it as acting linguistically, socially and culturally appropriately in concrete communicative situations. His contemporary colleague Piepho (1974) recognizes the potential of this concept for the foreign language classroom and introduces the term in the academic discourse of foreign language teaching in his book Kommunikative Kompetenz als übergeordnetes Ziel im Englischunterricht (Decke-Cornill & Küster, 2010, p. 87). The understanding of communicative
competence in an educational context encompasses different teaching and learning principles, including considerations about methodology, social forms, learners' and teachers' roles (Surkamp, 2010, pp. 138–139). Main principles of the communicative approach in language education are (1) focus on content, (2) communicative activities, (3) flexible teaching materials, (4) dialogical social forms, and (5) opening the classroom to the outside world (cf. Surkamp, 2010, pp. 138–139).

The first principle “focus on content” means that language is presented in meaningful contexts and that successful communication is more important than language accuracy. In other words, expressing an intention is prioritized over a linguistic correct utterance. This principle also suggests that communication does not only include verbal but also para- and non-verbal aspects, such as voice, intonation, gestures and facial expressions. Drama pedagogy meets these expectations because it puts the learner and his/her performative actions at the centre of attention. This performative approach gives students the freedom to use any communicative strategy they need to bring across their communicative intentions. Mistakes become a trivial matter in this approach unless they hinder communication.

In order to stimulate communicative actions, suitable communicative activities should be provided (see principle 2: communicative activities). Communicative activities are embedded in authentic and stimulating situations and contexts which give students the possibility to develop communicative strategies (e.g. ask, correct, stress,...) (Surkamp, 2010, p. 138). Examples of activities that are based on real world communicative needs are role plays, simulations, discussions, debates, or short dialogues. Drama makes use of such situations as learners can act authentically in dramatic realities (as-if-situations), for example when role playing a shopping tour at a grocery store or imitating a phone conversation between two friends. “Der allgemeine Gegenstand eines dramapädagogischen Fremdsprachenunterrichts sind Situationen, die das Leben schreibt und schreiben könnte [...]” (Schewe & Shaw, 1993, p. 5) [The main body of a drama-based foreign language class are real life...].
situations, translation by KH]. Producing language in such meaningful contexts is a link between the communicative approach and drama pedagogy, as Kao & O'Neill point out in the following paragraph:

[Drama pedagogy] shares most features with the current notion of 'communicative language teaching,' in that both stress the importance of learning and using the target language in a meaningful context, and emphasize that learning the descriptive aspects of the target language alone is unlikely to lead to satisfactory communication in real life ((Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 123).

The third principle of the communicative classroom is concerned with teaching materials. They should exceed the range of exercises and tasks offered in school books and by using a variety of different text genres, media types, etc., a rich learning environment should be created. Teachers might know from their experience that school books do not always offer materials that meet the requirements for a drama-based teaching approach. This critique is also pronounced by Schewe & Shaw (1993), who denounce the authenticity of dialogues in many textbooks (Schewe & Shaw, 1993, p. 9). Hence, when using drama-based methods in the classroom, teachers are automatically required to add additional material, which could be, for instance, plays, scenes, video clips or stimulating pictures. Drama pedagogy puts no limit to the variety of inputs.

The fourth principle prioritises dialogical social forms, such as pair or group work, over teacher-centred instructions. Such classroom activities are more likely to reflect real-life conditions and hence, practicing language in pairs or within a group provides students with skills for (linguistically) managing the outside world. The social dimension addressed in this paradigm shift constitutes a significant factor in drama pedagogy. Planning, rehearsing, presenting and reflecting scenes or whole plays require collaboration with others. In fact, Ortner (1998) describes collaborative social forms as prevalent in drama-based foreign language learning. „Dramaorientierte Lehrtechniken sind per definitionem Paar- und Gruppenaktivitäten“ (Ortner, 1998, p. 143) [Drama-based techniques are pair and group activities by definition, translation by KH].

The last principle states that the practice of the foreign language is not limited to the classroom, but includes language actions in the outside world, such as watching movies in the foreign language or corresponding with native or heritage speakers. An
example of the role of drama pedagogy in this “opening process” is the collaboration with external companies, such as Vienna’s English Theatre, which was briefly introduced in Section 2.3. Through this initiative, students experience how written plays are realised first-hand and they might develop a more pronounced understanding of this literary genre or culture in general. Furthermore, when working with drama in the classroom, the interest for this cultural form might be increased and students get in touch with theatre-related issues outside the classroom as well.

The concept of the communicative classroom also includes competences that students need for successful communicative actions. These competences and skills are described in detail in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).

3.2 Drama in the CEFR
The following section elaborates on the CEFR and points to possible connections between its scales and descriptors and drama pedagogy. The section first looks at the language user and clarifies competences before describing the use of language with regard to all four language skills. This overview will help to clarify that drama has a legitimised function in the foreign language classroom.

The CEFR is a policy instrument for languages that sets standards for language learning, teaching and assessing in Europe (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 25).

The CEFR was developed as a continuation of the Council of Europe’s work in language education during the 1970s and 1980s. The CEFR ‘action-oriented approach’ builds on and goes beyond the communicative approach proposed in the mid-1970s […] (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 25). Its action-oriented approach sees learners as active language users, who need different competences to master successful communication. “The view taken is that, in an action-oriented approach, competence exists only in action” (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 138). The CEFR differentiates thereby between general competence, such as knowledge of the world, socio-cultural competence, or intercultural competence and communicative language competence (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 29). The framework assigns linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence to communicative language competences (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 29).
With its wide range of activities, techniques and (free) choice of topics and texts, drama pedagogy provides a solid basis for developing general competence. For instance, personal, social or intercultural competences are addressed in creative exchanges with others, when presenting oneself, preparing a debate or creating skits. “Jedes szenische Spiel, jedes Rollenspiel hat damit einen Doppelcharakter, indem es Kompetenzen für Lebenswelt und Unterricht gleichermaßen entwickelt“ (Hallet, 2010, p. 11) [Every performative act, every role play has a dual character by equally promoting competences for the real world and the class, translation by KH].

Students are required to collaborate with each other and they get to know and understand the other (the other as a social, cultural or intercultural construct).

Next to general key competences, drama can also be a vehicle for fostering communicative language competences, which includes linguistic competence. Linguistic competence is concerned with mastering the language on a lexical, grammatical, semantical, phonological and orthographic level (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 109). With its wider range of plays, creative stories, or communicative activities, drama offers situation for enriching one’s personal vocabulary, actively producing language in performative acts and training pronunciation or intonation. In this respect, drama provides a frame where language is not only learnt but directly applied: “Fremdsprachliche Kenntnisse (u.a. in den Bereichen Wortschatz, Aussprache oder Grammatik) werden im Spiel nicht nur vermittelt, sondern kommen auch gleich zur Anwendung“ (Hallet & Surkamp, 2015, p. 8). Fostering linguistic competence through drama activities is especially devoted to strongly directed forms of performing (see Section 4.1 for more details).

To convey effective meaning, learners are not only asked to master accurate forms of language, but also to know which form is appropriate in which social situation. This is referred to as sociolinguistic competence (Alptekin, 2002, p. 58). Sociolinguistic competence empowers someone to act appropriately in different social or cultural
circumstances, which includes knowing about politeness conventions, register differences, dialects or accents (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 136). Alptekin (2002, p. 58) mentions that social contexts automatically contain a cultural dimension, including norms, values or beliefs. In this sense, sociolinguistic awareness is an interesting interplay between linguistic, social and cultural knowledge; components which define and are defined by one another. Therefore, when addressing sociolinguistic competence, it seems logical to present language in a meaningful context that mirrors sociolinguistic situations. The most obvious contexts are probably dialogues or conversations by different members of society, which express socio-cultural realities (e.g. child with mother vs. child with teacher vs. child with a friend from a foreign country). The examples mentioned use a different category of language or jargon, such as different registers or politeness conventions. For instance, the child probably talks less formal to his mother or friend than he does to his teacher. Such dialogues exist in every school book and at the same time they reflect dramatic performances: dialogues are not only read but realised on the classroom stage. As an example, Hallet (2010, p. 5) cites a family dialogue from an English textbook (Green Line 3, p. 51) between two parents and their three children, who argue that they are old enough to stay at home on their own. Here is a little extract from the text:

“Mum: We’re leaving now to see Grandpa. Will you be OK by yourselves? (Mel and Amy go on playing cards.) I said . . . (shouts) WILL YOU BE OK BY YOURSELVES? Jake: You needn’t shout, Mum. I’m 16, remember?”

Such a dialogue can be used as a basis for a dramatic realisation: it can be interpreted, re-written or staged in various ways. What is more, to intentionally demonstrate sociolinguistic differences, a counterpart to this social context (e.g. dialogue between Jake and his teacher) could be added or written by students themselves.

Pragmatic competence is concerned with the accurate and effective language use in specific situations or contexts, meaning that the speaker can successfully express intended functions (e.g. wishes, questions, concerns, etc.), organise and structure a coherent text or be fluent in the target language (cf. Council of Europe, 2017, p. 138). Pragmatic competence is always context-related and thus should be trained in
context-specific situations, which provide the frame for a functional language use. Such goal-oriented speech situations are given when asking for directions, clarifications, help, when ordering in a restaurant, when putting forward a proposal, request or complaint, etc. All these speech acts can be realised in performative activities and hence drama pedagogy offers a perfect ground for realising pragmatic competence.

In addition to learners’ competences, the CEFR defines four language skills: **speaking, writing, listening** and **reading** (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 57). All four skills are covered in dramatic learning processes albeit some skills receive greater attention than others (Ortner, 1998, p. 143; Schewe, 1993, p. 168). For instance, speaking is key element of drama pedagogy and required in different scenic productions (e.g. role plays, improvisations, storytelling, hot seating etc.). “Die Entwicklung und die Förderung der Performativen Kompetenz im Fremdsprachenunterricht erfordern vor allem einen deutlichen Akzent auf der Mündlichkeit und auf der 'Inszenierung' von Interaktionssituationen [...]” (Hallet, 2010, p. 15) [Developing and fostering performative competence in the foreign language classroom especially require a focus on oracy and the ‘performance’ of interactive situations, translation by KH]. Writing, on the other hand, has a more marginalised role than speaking because performances are generally realised orally. Nevertheless, writing skills are still needed for producing texts that serve as basis for plays, dialogues, creative writing activities (e.g. creating characters, writing-in-role, etc.) or reflective papers on working with drama. In this sense, writing serves a specific purpose in the dramatic context:

> **Das Schreiben erfüllt immer eine bestimmte Funktion innerhalb des jeweiligen fiktiven Handlungskontextes**, d.h. entsteht aus der Notwendigkeit, das dramatische Handlungsgeschehen zu reflektieren bzw. voranzutreiben (Schewe, 1993, p. 187). [Writing has always a specific purpose in fictive contexts; this means that it derives from the necessity of reflecting or developing the dramatic action, translation by KH].

When it comes to receptive skills, listening is an integral part to almost all activities: listening to colleagues when they perform a scripted or improvised scene or conversation (see descriptor “understanding interaction between other speakers” (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 56)) or following the performance or presentation of others (see descriptor “listening as a member of a live audience (Council of Europe,
Kao & O'Neill (1998) specify that listening is key for dramatic interactions:

In a true dramatic interaction, there is a need to determine, interpret, and respond to the kinds of role being played by others and to cope with any potential interactional ambiguity. This ambiguity is a perfect reinforcement of the need to listen (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 11).

Finally, practicing reading skills is also compatible with drama in education as this skill is essential for understanding scripted plays, task descriptions or texts that are used for further dramatic work.

Die Textdetails werden nicht isoliert (linguistisch) analysiert, sondern werden zu Impulsen für Inszenierungsformen, die nur dann gelingen können, wenn die "Textdetails" lesend verstanden wurden. Der Text löst sich auf, wird zum Sprungbrett (Schewe, 1993, p. 186). [Text details are not analysed in a (linguistically) isolated way, but they are used for performances, which can only succeed if the 'text details' are understood. The text disperses and becomes a springboard, translation by KH].

Furthermore, Chang (2012) views drama as a context for reading: through dramatic processes readers are more engaged with texts because they enter into the fictional world for example by experimenting what it is like to be a character of a story. In other words, drama offers access to abstract written words and helps to construct meaning through experience (p. 10).

Apart from the competences and language skills described, the CEFR devotes section 4.3.5 to “aesthetic uses of language” and explicitly mentions drama-based tasks (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 56). This section justifies the implementation of creative, imaginative and artistic activities in the language classroom. It lists activities, such as “performing scripted and unscripted plays” or “the production, reception and performance of literary texts, e.g.: reading and writing texts (short stories, novels, poetry, etc.) and performing and watching/listening to recitals, drama, opera, etc.” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 56). These activities clearly correspond to drama pedagogy.

Overall drama is only mentioned in section 4.3.5 of the CEFR but not specified or assigned to any competence scale. Thus, Schmenk (2004) criticises the marginalised role acknowledged to drama in the CEFR. She states more clearly that specifically aesthetic, personal and intercultural dimensions that come along with drama pedagogy are neglected in the framework (Schmenk, 2004, p. 21). However,
discussion in this section about the competences and skills defined by the CEFR demonstrates that they are transferable to drama pedagogy. Furthermore, the CEFR provides enough justification for a drama-based language classroom and therefore the following statement lacks credibility: "[…] drama elements appear to be barely compatible with the CEFR" (ibid., p. 17). It should be reviewed that the role of this framework is to set standards, define language proficiency levels and provide a transparent, comprehensive and neutral basis for language learning, teaching and assessment. It is not its major goal to specify any language teaching approach, or method, such as drama pedagogy. This would endanger the objective position of the framework and exceed its function as a policy instrument. In fact, the CEFR even comments on this issue in the following paragraph:

One thing should be made clear right away. We have NOT set out to tell practitioners what to do, or how to do it. We are raising questions, not answering them. It is not the function of the Common European Framework to lay down the objectives that users should pursue or the methods they should employ (Council of Europe, 2017, p. 26).

In total, this section has demonstrated that drama pedagogy reflects basic principles advocated in the communicative language approach and the CEFR, which justifies its implementation in the foreign language classroom. Küppers and Surkamp’s (2010) reflections once more underline the compatibility between drama and foreign language education:

In accordance with established principles of foreign language teaching such as student-activating, action-oriented approaches, task-based learning, cooperative methods and, above all, inter-/transcultural learning, drama pedagogy embraces a holistic understanding of the individual as well as the personality development of foreign language learners (as intercultural speakers) (Küppers & Surkamp, 2010, i.) (quote from the foreword of issue 1, 2010).
4 Practical Implementations of Drama in the Foreign Language Classroom

This chapter provides a theoretical overview of how drama pedagogy can be implemented in the foreign language classroom. It looks at different forms of performing, drama techniques and activities, which reflect principles of the drama-based teaching approach and demonstrate the multi-faceted spectrum of drama pedagogy. Furthermore, for a practical realisation of a drama-based (grammar) lesson, Section 4.2 presents three models and provides structural guidelines. Finally, this chapter summarises the advantages and challenges that are related to drama work in the classroom. These reflections should help to capture important dimensions involved in drama-based foreign language teaching and provide ideas for its realisation.

4.1 Drama Approaches, Techniques and Activities

Drama techniques and activities shape the drama-based classroom. Their substantial number and variety reflect the multi-layered dimension of drama pedagogy. In general, Kao & O'Neill (1998) provide an overview of the spectrum of drama activities and techniques, which range from very closed to open forms. They distinguish three categories on a continuum of freedom of decision-making and the teacher’s involvement in directing the dramatic learning process: (1) closed/controlled, (2) semi-controlled, and (3) open forms (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6). Even (2003) makes the same distinction, while calling those forms (1) strongly directed (2) partly directed and (3) mostly undirected forms (Even, 2003, pp. 157–160).

Strongly directed forms include drama activities such as language games, scripted role plays, or dramatized stories (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6). Those activities have in common that roles and contexts are fixed and the discourse is already scripted or instructional (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6). Students do not have to create something themselves, they just reproduce given structures. Therefore, the focus lies mainly on the accurate use of language in a dramatic frame. Although the outcome of strongly directed forms is almost predictable and thus a lack of authenticity can be accused (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6), they still elicit communicative behaviour and can be suitable for beginners or for teaching new linguistic structures: “Von daher eignen sich stark gelenkte Inszenierungsformen besonders für den Anfängerunterricht bzw. zum Umsetzen unvertrauter sprachlicher Strukturen” (Even, 2003, p. 158).
The first example of strongly directed forms – language games – can be defined as follows: “Language games are exercised-based competitions which often require participants to use some pre-determined sentence patterns or structures to complete some tasks” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 5). For example, the game *I packed my suitcase* requires students to complete the pattern and build a sentence chain of items that belong in that suitcase. It can be adapted to any kind of situation and combined with matching movements. Sambanis et al. (2013) propose an adapted form of this game as warm-up activity, where one student completes the phrase “After I woke up, I …”; with an activity e.g. “after I woke up, I stretched”, and simultaneously imitates the movement (e.g. stretching). The next person continues the chain and repeats the previous sentences and movements (e.g. “After I woke up, I stretched and then I danced to the bathroom”).

Scripted role plays are “[…] a kind of informal performance with no audience, costumes and props” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 5). The role, context and conversational patterns are provided, for example through dialogues, and students are expected to perform in this situational frame. School books typically contain many of these dialogues that are often purposefully designed to drill a specific linguistic structure (e.g. items needed for asking for direction, etc.). Indeed, Kao & O’Neill (1998) specify that “[t]hese techniques may be designed to encourage students to perform particular linguistic structures, practice particular idioms, or recite lines according to pre-written scripts using certain items of vocabulary” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6). The problem with such role plays is that they often remain on a surface level because of a lack of resemblance to an authentic situation and a lack of preparation phase, which should help to identify with the role and define the context (Schewe, 1993, p. 166).

The third example of strongly directed forms is working with dramatized stories, which means that students rehearse certain scenes or an entire play and finally show it in front of the class. The plays or scenes are already scripted and students are asked to *perform* the text. For instance, an extract of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* could be the basis for a dramatic performance. The challenge of this method is that it requires a performative competence that resembles the work of actors. Students might lack this competence and feel reluctant to perform in front of their peers. Therefore, it is very important to prepare students well for such situations, which could include suitable warm-up acts or previous work with drama.
Partly directed forms provide a context to students, but the course and the end of the interaction are open and not predictable (Even, 2003, p. 158). Compared to strongly directed forms, the focus lies on communication and social interaction, not on linguistic accuracy (Even, 2003, p. 159; Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 11). Furthermore, these approaches generate a more dynamic interaction with greater authenticity (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 9). Students have more freedom of choice in creating roles and defining situations. For instance, they might receive cue cards that elicit ideas.

Validating the students’ own themes and ideas is fundamental to this way of working, and gives them a measure of control over the content of the circumstances as well as a sense of empowerment (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 11).

The student’s measure of control evokes a certain unpredictability of the emerging performances and consequently increases the authenticity of the whole situation. Improvised role plays and simulations are examples of partly directed forms (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 6).

In improvised role plays students fulfil communicative tasks in straightforward social situations like for example “ordering in a restaurant”, “making a complaint”, or “doing a job interview”. In other words, they imitate reality. These plays include pre-defined roles and perhaps hints about the situation but the text is not yet scripted.

Simulations are closely related to role plays and sometimes even used synonymously (cf. Even 2003, Kao & O’Neill 1998) although some authors differentiate in the degree of complexity and adaptation of a (foreign) role (cf. (Ladousse, 1987; Thiesen, 2013).

It is probably neither possible, nor very profitable, to make fine distinctions between role play and simulations. Clearly however, simulations are complex, lengthy, and relatively inflexible events (Ladousse, 1987, p. 5).

Kao & O’Neill (1998) specify that in the basic format of simulations or role play, no other role other than one’s own needs to be assumed (p. 7). However, to enhance more dynamic encounters, roles can also be expanded in the sense of adapting a more fictive character with other attitudes or characteristics. In this paper, no further differentiation between role play and stimulation is made because they are regarded as equal concepts.

Mostly undirected forms resemble partly directed forms to a certain degree as they contain a challenging situation that requires accurate communicative behaviour in
order to solve a problem or achieve a goal (cf. Even, 2003, p. 159). “It does not proceed from a pre-written script or scenario, but rather from a theme, situation or pre-text that interests and challenges the participants” (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 15). Kao & O'Neill name scenarios and process drama as examples of mostly undirected forms.

Scenarios provide challenging, communicative situations, in which people have to purposefully use language as an instrument to reach a communicative goal. The focus is therefore not on language accuracy, but on the transmission of a message or intention. “Scenarios are always composed of people in a particular relation to each other, achieving goals that are motivating, linguistically challenging and culturally and personally meaningful” (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 10). In this respect, the notion of tension becomes relevant in choosing or designing such communicative situations. For example, a person receives two promising invitations for the evening; he or she has to choose with whom he or she wants to interact and create a “play”, which they are then going to perform (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 10). Objectives of such activities are to increase language fluency, authenticity and confidence in speaking (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 11).

Besides that, process drama as another example of mostly undirected forms is more complex and usually contains long-term projects, different drama phases, series or episodes of scenes (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 15).

Unlike brief improvisation exercises, process drama is concerned with the development of a wider context for exploration – a dramatic world created by the teacher and students working together within the experience (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 12).

Therefore, in process drama, the identification with roles is more intense and an emotional and cognitive endeavour (Even, 2003, p. 160).

Mostly undirected forms represent open-ended challenges, which means that an openness towards the learning outcome is given through less structured guidelines. For instance, creative texts can serve as stimulus for communicative actions, where the outcome is unpredictable (e.g. re-interpreting the story, translating the story in a modern context and performing it, inventing a different ending, etc.). Improvisation is considered a key-element in open-ended challenges, where spontaneous actions are performed (Ortner, 1998, p. 142). This sort of “open-end” is what Schewe (1993) and
Ortner (1998) describe as essence (core element) of a drama-based teaching approach:


[Basically, drama-based teaching and learning contains all forms of performing (in the sense of acting in imaginative situations), but the core of a drama-based foreign language class is the (open) form of performing, in which elements of other (rather closed) forms can be integrated, translation by KH].

Schewe (1993) specifies on several occasions that a holistic understanding of drama-based teaching, which he refers to as *gestaltete Improvisation*, implies the construction of meaning and the creation of something *new* (in contrast to the reproduction of reality that often takes place in standardised role plays). The main idea is not to imitate pre-given scenes, but to develop a new reality through scenes. Therefore, he also refers to role plays and simulations as closed forms of performing (Schewe, 1993, p. 281).

For the study described in Part II of this thesis, mostly directed and partly directed forms were applied, because it was the students’ first encounter with drama and the main goal of the lesson was to teach a new grammatical structure. The freedom provided by mostly undirected forms is certainly an enrichment for learning the foreign language. However, working with these forms would have overtaxed students and exceeded the time frame. Still, ideas that originate from more open forms influenced the drama work. For example, emphasis was laid on providing authentic contexts and opportunities for personal involvement and decision making when it comes to creating scenes or dialogues in order to generate dynamic encounters. Also, the notion of *tension*, which is mentioned as an important factor for drama-based learning by several authors (cf. Kao & O’Neill, 1998; Schewe, 1993) was taken into consideration. For instance, a language teaching technique called *loops*, which consists of elements from directed but also from undirected forms was used in this study. “Loops are short dialogues that can be repeated over and over without stopping because the first line of the dialogue can also function as a reaction to the last line” (Dockalova, 2011, p. 28). As an example, the following pattern can be repeated, adding different moods, expressions, intonations, gestures and hence creating a meaningful communication out of a drill:
A: “I really have to go now.”
B: “Wait.”
(Dockalova, 2011, p. 28)

It is important that loops are ambiguous, so that the context, characters, mood etc. can be created by students themselves. “The more decisions they can make about the dialogue, the better chance there is that the lines will become their own” (Dockalova, 2011, p. 29). Furthermore, it is important that the loops have a certain dramatic tension in order to elicit curiosity and personal involvement (Dockalova, 2011, pp. 29–30). Dramatic tension is, for example, given when the characters involved want something from each other, disagree with each other, or are in the middle of a conflict. Such loops can be used to introduce and practice new or already known lexical items and grammatical structures (Dockalova, 2011, p. 29).

Loops allow for an intensive, focused, and engaging practice of narrowly selected language points, and they provide an easy start for improvisation and creative writing activities. The essence of loops lies in combining dramatic play with language drills in the form of repetitive dialogues (Dockalova, 2011, p. 28).

All these notions and characteristics demonstrate the technique’s ambiguous position between directed and mostly undirected forms of performing. On the one hand, the conversation is already given and students are expected to repeat the drill, consisting of a selected linguistic structure. On the other hand, loops are open to subjective interpretations because the characters and context are not given. Hence, students are required to create the role and context in which they think the conversation could take place. In this respect, these kind of de-contextualised dialogues can represent open-ended challenges and meet the expectation of a drama approach in the spirit of Schewe’s gestalteter Improvisation (Schewe, 1993, pp. 136–137).

4.2 Planning a Drama-based (Grammar) Lesson

After having discussed some main drama techniques and activities (the what), this section looks at the context in which they are implemented (the how). Different models of the structural frame of drama-based lessons are presented, which offers practitioners ideas for the methodological planning of such lessons.
The following Table 1 shows three existing models of drama-based lessons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phase of sensitisation</td>
<td>1. Preparation phase</td>
<td>1. Awareness-raising phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Phase of contextualisation</td>
<td>2. Drama scenes</td>
<td>2. Context-finding phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dramatic play phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Presentation and reflection phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Different models of drama-based teaching

The models provided by Schewe and Kao & O’Neill serve well for general drama sessions, whereas Even’s categorisation is specifically dedicated to the teaching of grammar. Model one and two both divide a drama-based lesson into three categories, but they differ in terms of the semantical development of the phases.

Schewe (1993) starts off with the phase of sensitisation, in which participants are introduced to this new teaching and learning approach. This phase claims to reduce a heterogeneous group with different learning experiences, expectations and language levels to a common denominator so that basic conditions for the drama work are created. Isolated and interactive activities and games are used to create a good learning atmosphere, to introduce the students to each other and demonstrate a holistic approach to learning (Schewe, 1993, pp. 51–52). Kao & O’Neill (1998) also stress the importance of providing participants with background information about drama in the preparation phase, but they do not pay too much attention to establishing a group dynamic or creating a good atmosphere. Instead, they use the initial phase for the activation of background knowledge and language items useful for the ensuing drama work(Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 118). In this sense, it is very similar to a preparation phase of a “conventional” language classroom.

Activities or techniques suitable for the phase of sensitisation defined by Schewe (1993) are, for example, any kind of creative games that make use of the room or include movements, gestures, and voice to get to know other participants and the
environment (e.g. name-learning games, physical warm-ups, trust work and group-dynamic-building exercises, vocal warm-ups, still images that represent a certain topic, etc.). In this respect, this phase resembles Tselikas’ preparatory stage, in which a transition from the daily reality into the aesthetic reality of drama takes place through the activation of the body and voice (cf. Tselikas, 1999, p. 24). Indeed, she proposes starting drama work with movements, then working with the voice before finally adding language (cf. Tselikas, 1999, p. 24).

After this introduction phase, a more intense work in the fictive context takes place in phase two, defined by Schewe (1993) (phase of contextualisation). Here, students gradually create a meaningful context, in which they identify with fictive situations and roles and act out communicative tasks. Schewe (1993) for instance provides an example of how to work with a text (e.g. diary entry of Max Frisch) in the spirit of the drama-based approach. Instead of using the unfamiliar text as point of departure for language production, he twists the sequential order and consequently creates a performative activity; he lets students draw a picture of a room, which should trigger the creation of an individual text (diary entry) and a performance, which in turn should help to understand the unfamiliar text (cf. Schewe, 1993, p. 304). Dramatic work together with the text and corresponding preparatory activities are the focus of the contextualisation phase. An example for a preparatory activity is the creation of fictive characters that occur in the text through guiding questions (e.g. how old is the character, where does he live, what does he want, etc.) and a hot-seating phase (a person sits on a chair in front of the class and answers questions as fictive character) (Schewe, 1993, p. 161). Kao & O’Neill (1998) do not specify the second phase, but the name “drama scenes” is already revelatory and suggests a similar approach described in Schewe’s phase of contextualisation.

The third phase described by Schewe, phase of intensification, is added when participants have already worked with drama for some time or the circumstances (e.g. time frame, infrastructure, constellation of participants, etc.) permit a dramatic intensification. In this phase, students are confronted with unexpected and challenging situations, in which performative competence is decisive for successful learning moments. Learners, for example, become authors of creative texts or scenes that are developed after a performance or are used as stimulus for a
performance. What is more, they are expected to spontaneously act in a specific situation, such as doing dramatic improvisations. In this respect, Schewe’s last phase is still very much concerned with the performance in fictive realities, whereas in the last phase described by Kao & O’Neill (1998, pp. 118–119) students already step out of their dramatic role and reflect the learning process on a meta level. In fact, they propose a short reflective time after each drama intervention, in which new acquired linguistic or sociolinguistic components are discussed (cf. p. 118). This phase includes reflections about the learning process and follow-up assignments like writing a letter to a character created in the drama process.

Even (2011) divides her drama grammar sessions into five phases: (1) awareness-raising phase, (2) context-finding phase, (3) linguistic phase, (4) dramatic play phase, and (5) presentation and reflection phase (Even, 2011, pp. 307–308). Unlike Schewe (1993) Kao & O’Neill (1998) or Tselikas (1999), her approach does not include a preparation phase described in the previous paragraphs. There is no stage for the exclusive work with body, voice or movements, where no language is yet required. Instead, the first phase already starts off with the foreign language: participants encounter the grammatical phenomenon in question for the first time. This can happen through language games or short exercises, in which the need for using the grammatical structure is demonstrated. For instance, in her lesson about German conjunctives used in polite forms, students pass on a scarf with different movements and later add polite forms of request: “Könntest du mir das abnehmen?” (Even, 2003, p. 268) [“Could you please take that from me?”, translation by KH]. The linguistic structure is contextualised in a further step. Even (2003) proposes short dramatic improvisations or verbalised still images for embedding the structure into a bigger context (p. 174). For example, polite requests are realised through scenes at a train station, at work or in a foreign city (Even, 2011, p. 308).

The dramatic phase is paused in stage three, where students discuss the grammar topic on a cognitive level. Teachers provide structured input and guide learners to discover rules, forms and functions of the grammatical structure. The reason for placing the linguistic phase not at the very beginning is the importance of contextualising the linguistic phenomenon. Learners “[...] have already experienced the need for using certain structures, and their focus on grammar is now deliberate and purposeful” (Even, 2011, p. 308). In this sense, the approach resembles the
learning principles of constructivism proposed by Glaserfeld and Förster (cf. Decke-Cornill & Küster, 2010).

The last two stages (dramatic play, presentation and reflection) overlap with ideas from the dramatic stage of Schewe (1993) and Kao & O’Neill (1998). Participants create short dramatic scenes using the grammatical structure in focus. After the presentation in front of their peers, a reflective phase rounds the lesson off. Even (2003) states that a drama grammar session does not always have to end with a presentation; other suitable activities are desired as well (Even, 2003, p. 175). Furthermore the number and succession of the different phases can vary, depending on class dynamics and topics (Even, 2011, p. 307).

The lessons conducted for the empirical case study presented in this paper are loosely modelled after Even’s modular approach but also include ideas of the other two models. For instance, the first lesson starts with a phase of sensitisation (see Schewe’s model), including a creative drama activity that should help students to get to know each other and the context they are going to work in. After this first habituation phase, the five stages proposed by Even are added. The exact course of the lesson is described in more detail in Part II of this paper.

4.3 Benefits and Challenges of Drama-based Teaching
This section aims at providing an objective and holistic perspective on drama in education, including benefits and challenges. Theatre is an art form that offers a lot of freedom and space for creative development. It provides a safe frame, in which social conventions, prejudice, judgements and fears are left behind and something new can be created (Almond, 2005, pp. 10–11). At the same time, it is a distinct way of expression that might not be appealing to everyone. Put in a nutshell, drama must be regarded from both sides of the coin. Chapter 3 already demonstrated drama’s beneficial role in FLE by linking principles and expectations raised by the communicative approach and the CEFR to drama in education. The mentioned benefits in this section exceed the frame of foreign language education and thus the section looks at drama as an artistic form of learning that can contribute valuable aspects for personal and linguistic development but at the same time includes challenges and dangers. This summary should help teachers interested in drama in
education to correctly evaluate this approach and be aware of possible risks in order to develop right teaching strategies.

**Benefits**

The drama classroom represents a safe environment, in which nobody is judged or evaluated on one’s personal performance (of language). „When using drama in class, teachers invite students to experiment with changes of status, attitudes, speech style, vocabulary and physicality in a safe place and without judgments about being wrong“ (Stinson & Freebody, 2006). In this context, the fictionality of the situation, the as-if-situation, offers students the possibility to act as “someone else”, which encourages them to take more risks and reduce anxiety. Students are less anxious to perform in the foreign language and make mistakes because in fact, it is the “character” that speaks or acts and not themselves. In this regard, Schewe (1993) mentions that students have less fear in oral language production when performing in a role: „Der Aspekt, daß in der fremden Rolle (Aus-) Sprechbarrieren abgebaut werden können, ist ein gewichtiges lernpsychologisches Argument für die Anwendung drampädagogischer Methoden“ (Schewe, 1993, p. 170). There are several studies that discuss the role of drama in reducing anxiety (Piazzoli, 2011; Ralph, 1997; Stern, 1980; Weber, 2017). Indeed, through a mixed-method study, Weber (2017) found out that students from the treatment group showed a reduced speaking anxiety after the drama intervention, compared to the comparison group.

The reduction of anxiety and development of a good atmosphere can also be related to the fact that drama-based methods are fun and motivating. Such positive emotions can have a positive effect on the L2 development (cf. Sambanis, 2013, p. 27). For example, Bournot-Trites et al. (2007), who conducted a mixed-method study with a drama and control group, noted significant differences between the two groups, with the drama group having a higher motivation and desire to learn French (p. 19). Even (2003) formulates in one of her theses that learning and fun are closely connected in drama grammar lessons, which results in a higher motivation for learning (2003, p. 233). Furthermore, Ralph (1997) and Giaitzis (2007) are especially concerned with the motivation and engagement of students in the French language classroom. Ralph (1997) for instance noted a rather negative attitude towards learning and actively using the foreign language in his class. Therefore, he experimented with drama-
based methods to increase students’ engagement. He noted that during short skits, students made use of their feelings and their body to communicate, as their oral proficiency was sometimes not sufficient for conveying the intended message. He argues that the use of this emotional support lead to a reduction in anxiety and previous negative attitudes towards the learning of French (1997, p. 275). He furthermore discovered that the motivation and positive attitude towards the language course increased when students designed, produced and reviewed their own language projects (Ralph, 1997, pp. 277–278). Interestingly, positive effects were not only found on the side of the student, he also reported on an enhancement of his “own educational credibility and reputation among [his] students, as well as with the rest of the school” (Ralph, 1997, p. 282).

Next to providing a safe and appealing environment, drama in education views learners in a holistic way – learning does not only happen in the brain, but in the whole body (see Pestalozzi’s concept of learning with *head, heart and hand*). There is evidence that using gestures and body movements have a positive effect on the learning process (Kurowski, 2011; McCafferty, 2002; Sambanis, 2013). For example, neurolinguistics studies have proved that new learning contents are better retained when combining linguistic elements with movements (Sambanis et al., 2013, p. 77). These findings can be connected to the beneficial role of drama in education, as in drama activities, linguistic units are combined with meaningful gestures. In other words, drama offers a holistic learning with head, heart, hand and feet (cf. Schewe, 1993). Furthermore, as soon as emotions are part of the learning process, which is the case with theatre performances, more connections are created in the brain, which in turn guarantees a better retention (Sambanis et al., 2013, p. 78).

**Challenges**

Apart from these benefits, there are certain risks inherited in working with drama in an educational context. First, drama-based teaching requires adequate premises, such as enough time and space. In fact, time constraints are often mentioned as challenge that learners and teachers have to come to terms with when working with drama in the language classroom.

One of the reasons why teachers hesitate to use drama-based activities in the foreign language class is that these activities need a lot of time. Drama-based teaching is regarded as
time-consuming in terms of the single teaching units as well as in terms of the objectives contained in the syllabi and curricula (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 51).

Although a lack of time is a big issue, when students and teachers get used to the work with drama, all participants will get into it more quickly and learning processes can be more effective and fluid (Schewe, 1993, p. 306; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 51).

Concerning space, Tschurtschenthaler (2013) notes the following: “The ideal space for a drama session is an empty room without desks and only a few chairs along the wall” (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 51). A standardised classroom setting does not fulfil this condition. As teachers do not often want to devote too much time to arranging an adequate setting, drama-based methods come up short.

Second, another challenge is that drama is not appealing to everyone; many students object to drama in the language classroom (cf. Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 51). Drama requires a lot of openness, acceptance, creativity and engagement from students, who represent a heterogeneous group with differences in motivation, proficiency, and learning styles. For some it is fun and a chance to grow to be in someone else’s shoes, whereas for others this represents a big challenge (cf. ibid., p. 53). “The reasons for obstructing the activities may range from being shy and feeling uneasy to regarding the activities as a waste of time” (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 52). Schewe (1993) reminds that especially novel teachers and students must get used to working with drama so that a feeling of fear and resentment towards this approach gradually fades away (1993, p. 420). As prerequisite for working with drama in the language classroom, he enlists a group with less than 20 participants, who are willing to embark on a new learning approach, and a teacher who’s conviction of this approach is visible in his actions (Schewe, 1993, p. 418). This also signifies that members of the group already know each other and have a good working relationship. Indeed, Borge (2007) reports on resentment towards the drama approach because of an unfamiliar learning environment and hence she stresses the importance of introducing new teaching and learning methods at an appropriate time, when students have already got to know each other (2007, p. 6).
In regard to the teacher's perspective, there are other challenges. Teachers have to cope with and manage challenging situations that come along with employing drama in their teaching, which requires different competences and roles. “The role of the teacher in the language classroom that uses drama differs greatly from that of the teacher in the traditional language classroom” (Borge, 2007, p. 3). Roles vary considerably concerning the type or forms of performing. Whereas strongly directed forms require a huge methodological effort from teachers, more open forms demand flexibility and spontaneity. Acting spontaneously and finding suitable drama techniques are for instance concrete challenges that can be related to drama-based teaching because the unpredictability of situations and outcomes in dramatic learning processes prevent teachers to stick to well-structured and fixed lesson plans. For partly directed forms, Di Pietro proposes that “[…] the teacher’s functions should go far beyond that of instructor and should include those of guide, counselor, consultant, coach, observer, evaluator, commentator, and discussion leader” (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, pp. 10–11). These multi-faceted roles demand a lot of different competences and strategies from teachers: they must be flexible, open-minded, motivated, willing to take risks, spontaneous, sensitive, creative and much more (cf. Schewe, 1993, p. 420; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 53). This flexibility and sensitivity is especially necessary when coping with students for whom the open frame of the drama class represents a threat.

It is the teacher’s responsibility to know or rather to sense who of the participants can cope with exposing themselves in another role in the other language to the rest of the group (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 53).

All these mentioned benefits and challenges demonstrate that applying drama to the language classroom can be a chance, as well as a risk. It is left to the teacher to develop a feeling for the group and decide when to use which techniques and activities. In this respect, “[i]t seems evident that not everybody can teach through drama, not everybody can learn through drama, as not everything can be taught through drama” (Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 53).
Part II: The Influence of Drama-based Teaching on Foreign Language Learning: A Case Study at an Austrian Upper Secondary School

5 Research Design

5.1 Aims of the Study and Assumptions
The primary goal of this study is to contribute to the research field of DiE by discovering the effect of drama-based methods on language learning, grammar in specific. So far, many researchers in drama in education have worked with qualitative measures, such as surveys, questionnaires, students’ portfolios, observational studies, teachers’ journal or collection of students’ attitudes towards performative approaches (Even, 2011; Fasching, 2017; Passon, 2011; Ronke, 2005; Tschurtscenthaler, 2013). In fact, Belliveau & Kim (2013) remarked that the majority of studies on drama-based teaching “[…] are limited to being descriptive reports based mainly on personal anecdotes, observations, and intuitive interpretations of researchers” (Belliveau & Kim, 2013, p. 16). Despite the rich theoretical and qualitative support for adapting drama-based methods for language education, the existing number of experimental or quantitative research is not sufficient to provide proof of the benefits of using drama in the language classroom. For example, Even’s (2003) study on drama grammar supports the use of drama pedagogy for grammar instructions. However, the lack of quantitative data causes uncertainties about the effects and impacts of drama-based (grammar) teaching. Hence, as scholars have pointed out, more experimental methodology is desirable, including the use of comparison groups and quantitative measures (Weber, 2017, p. 4). Due to these reasons, investigating pupils’ performance in a normal school context, using qualitative and quantitative measures, seems to be the next step to obtain answers for the effects of drama on learners’ grammatical competences.

Furthermore, drama practitioners and researchers have investigated the role of drama in language education; yet, their participants were mainly university students or a specific group outside school contexts (Bryant, 2012; Even, 2011; Kindl, 2016;
Liu, 2000; Miccoli, 2003; Piazzoli, 2011; Ronke, 2005; Schewe, 1993; Weber, 2017). These approaches neglect the reality of school contexts, including time and space constraints as well as challenges that come along with adolescents.

There is also a need for more classroom-based empirical investigation that specifically focuses on the actual impact of educational drama on classroom interaction and students’ L2 development (Belliveau & Kim, 2013, p. 17).

In regard to the target structure of this study – English conditionals – drama pedagogy may provide a rational approach to address and teach this grammar point. Conditional constructions represent a challenge for language learners due to their high complexity in form and meaning (Jacobsen, 2012, p. 125). Moreover, “[…] most ESL grammar books lack precise explanations of conditional meanings and usage contexts” (Jacobsen, 2012, p. 1) and “[…] the predominant methods of instruction do not provide a contextualized and usage-based representation of conditionals” (Jacobsen, 2016, p. 1). Yet the need for embedding conditional clauses in specific social situations, to reveal their semantic property, is essential. Drama pedagogy, which is grounded on a contextual and authentic language learning, can hence serve as remedy. In fact, Stinson (2012, p. 70) stresses the benefit of drama on second language learning through a contextualisation of language. To put it in Even’s words: “Im dramagrammatischen Unterricht wird das Verständnis grammatischer Regeln durch die praktische Anwendung in verschiedenen Sprachhandlungssituationen gezielt gefördert” (Even, 2003, p. 294) [In drama-based grammar lessons, the understanding of grammar rules is systematically supported by their practical application in different communicative situations, translation by KH].

Bearing this hypothesis in mind, the study departs from the assumption that drama is an ideal vehicle for learning and understanding grammatical structures. The author of this paper sees the potential of drama-based methods to reveal the semantic motivation behind conditional phrases and demonstrate their application in real-life situations through embedding the grammatical phenomenon in a specific context. The form-meaning connection of specific structures can thus be made more transparent for L2 learners.
5.2 Research Questions and Methods

This study addresses and analyses the following research questions:

1. Is drama grammar an effective approach to teach conditional clauses to young adolescent English language learners?
2. Which effects does drama-based teaching have on learners?

To explore the research questions this empirical study undertakes an experimental, mixed-method study at an upper secondary school in Austria. Using a mixed-method design is seen as suitable approach to gain holistic insight into learning processes.

Albert and Marx (2014) explain that the best method to validate or falsify the efficiency of a (teaching) method compared to others is in an experimental setting with two groups, learning the same content at the same time, but through different approaches (2014, p. 89). Bryant (2012) substantiates this perspective and proposes a pre- and post-test design for the evaluation of the method’s efficiency:

Hence, effects for L2 development of conditional constructions will be operationalised as performance on the pre- and post-test and put in comparison with the control group. Additionally, the results from qualitative data, e.g. questionnaire, external observation report, teacher’s journal, should help to clarify effects of drama-based methods on students.
5.3 Description of the Drama-based Project

5.3.1 Participants
The study was implemented in an upper secondary school in Dornbirn, Austria. It included two main groups, from different school classes, consisting of 35 students (12 male, 23 female), aged between 14 and 16. They had approximately a B1 language level, according to the school curriculum. Students at this school tend to be homogenous in cultural and linguistic background: they come from small towns or cities and have German as their mother tongue. While both classes participated as a whole, not all students were present for the pre-and post-test and the questionnaire. Hence, for the quantitative analysis, only students who had completed both were included, resulting in the final number \( n = 17 \) for the drama group (treatment group) and \( n = 14 \) for the control group (comparison group). The following table shows background information from participants in numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>drama group</th>
<th>control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total number</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean age (SD)</td>
<td>14 (0.6)</td>
<td>14 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first second language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- French</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Italian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Russian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Latin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| mean learning years  | 5 (0.7)     | 5 (1.4)       | of English

Table 2: Study participants

5.3.2 Teaching Format
Before describing the actual drama-based project, the piloting project and its relevance for developing teaching and testing material is discussed.
**Piloting**

Previous to the actual intervention, a pilot study was conducted in order to evaluate feasibility of applied drama-based methods and the grammar test. Two teenagers, aged 15 and 16 and an adult, aged 23, participated in this try-out in September 2017. First, participants were introduced to the research project and to drama in education in general. Second, some activities and exercises were tried out before they finally conducted the conditional test.

It became apparent that the pilot project was a very important step in developing material and preparing for the actual testing in school as some modifications and changes of activities and the test had to be done due to the feedback received from the participants. For example, according to participants’ feedback and test results, the last part of the conditional test was too difficult and incomprehensive. Therefore, this part was simplified: To avoid misunderstanding, the description of the task was formulated more precisely and the beginnings of the sentences were added in order to ease the construction.

**The Drama-based Project**

The drama group was taught the English conditionals during two drama grammar sessions (50 minutes each). They were based on Even’s drama grammar approach, but had to be adapted to fit the demands and interests of the treatment group. The comparison group received teacher-centered instructions and tasks on English conditionals. The main difference was the absence of (fictional) roles and interactive activities in the spirit of drama pedagogy. Both groups were given grammar tasks and exercises on English conditionals for homework to provide a common understanding of test formats. It should ensure that the control group had no advantages in performing the post-test because of being familiar with written test formats, compared to the drama group, who did not complete task or exercises in this format before. The detailed description of the drama and conventional grammar lessons are accessible in Appendix A – Lesson Plans.

**5.4 Data Collection**

The study period ran from week 39-49, covering the English conditionals in both classes. In order to gain insight into the effects of drama activities in a foreign language classroom, different models for data collection were used. In the first week,
all participants completed a questionnaire regarding their language background (see Appendix B) and the pre-test. The questionnaire aimed at prompting information about the variety of languages and the respective proficiency levels present in each group. The two consecutive drama lessons in the treatment group and the ‘conventional’ grammar lessons in the control group took place in the second week. Each lesson was observed by an external teacher, who reported on findings after each lesson. The last session was reserved for the post-test. Additionally, the treatment group filled out a questionnaire on the drama-based teaching approach. The full study design is available in Appendix C.

In the following, different instruments for data collection are discussed in more detail.

5.4.1 Grammar Test
Students filled out a pre-test (see Appendix D) to ensure that there were no major differences in the prior level of mastery of English conditionals. The post-test was administered at the end of the second week to measure relative gains that happened in the course of the intervention. The post-test only differed from the pre-test in the arrangement of test formats and items that were randomised within blocks. Each test took approximately 35 minutes to be completed.

The test was designed by the author and informed by English grammar books (Eastwood, 2006; Foley & Hall, 2012; Murphy, 2004). It consisted of three parts (multiple choice, gap fill, sentence construction) with a total of 30 items. The reason for this variety of test formats is the lack of appropriate tests for testing the effects of the drama grammar approach. The idea was therefore to provide different methods that should be equally suitable for both groups. Moreover, the gained results should also help to identify differences in performance between the two groups on the basis of different formats. Accordingly, information about correlation between a certain group and a certain test format might be detected, which could help to develop suitable test instruments for evaluating the effects of the drama grammar approach. The following sections explain the choice of the different test formats.

Multiple Choice
Multiple Choice is a common test format, which is used in different test situations. It is for example an acknowledged format in testing the receptive skills, listening and reading, as well as testing grammar (cf. Carr, 2011, p. 29). Bearing in mind the
versatile usage of the format and its acceptance in different testing situations, it is suitable for both, the intervention and the control group.

Considering various theoretical assumptions about drama grammar, the author of this thesis assumes that teaching conditionals with the drama grammar approach especially aims at understanding the grammatical phenomenon, understanding the underlying meaning of each structure and thus knowing when to apply which structure. As the dramatic phase dominates the whole teaching and learning process and fades the linguistic phase, the focus is put on meaning instead of form. In other words, pupils might still have troubles in producing a correct conditional sentence, for instance, having problems building the past perfect of a given verb. Nevertheless, they might understand the difference of the three forms and know in which context which form to use. Therefore, a multiple-choice test seems to be a suitable format because it already provides solutions from which pupils can choose; so they do not have to form the structure themselves. If, for example, a student knows that the third conditional is required for a specific sentence, but he or she produces a mistake by writing the wrong past participle of the verb (e.g. *I had build, instead of I had built*), the sentence is considered as being wrong and he or she would not receive any points. The fact that the student has understood that the third conditional has to be applied, is not taken into account in this situation. Hence, multiple choice can counter this challenge by focussing on the construct of knowledge.

Only testing understanding would nevertheless be negligent; pupils, should be able to build a correct conditional sentence, using the correct tenses and structures. Therefore, the other two formats require students to put the correct forms in the spaces provided.

**Gap Fill**

The gap fill exercise is a suitable test format for both groups for multiple reasons. First, the items are embedded in a concrete context, namely in a coherent story about a music student who is annoying his landlord by playing the trumpet too loudly. This specific context is close to a real-life situation, which students can identify with. Second, the story could be part of a theatre play and thus resembles the activities done with the intervention group. The control group is equally familiar with such
dialogues from previous activities in school books. Hence, there is a similarity between what is taught during the course and what is tested.

**Sentence Construction**

This format is semi-open and requires students to write a conditional sentence. However, the context is provided through given sentences that communicate a specific meaning and therefore it is made clear which conditional to use. The format demands the students to imagine the situation, to acquaint oneself with the specific situation and to put oneself in somebody else’s role. This process very much resembles acting or performing, which is at the core of drama-based teaching and learning. Hence, the contents taught in the intervention group relates to the test. This format is not a specific drama grammar test, but is found in common teaching materials, such as the *Oxford Practice Grammar*. As it does not aim at a specific learning group but dedicates itself to intermediate grammar learners, it is suitable for all kind of learners, including the students from the control group.

**5.4.2 Questionnaire on Drama-based Methods**

Students were asked to fill out a questionnaire on drama methods consisting of 11 questions (see Appendix E) Most of these questions are based on 6-item Likert scales to avoid the “golden middle”. More precisely, the 6-item scale requires students to decide if they (rather) agree (1-3) or (rather) disagree (4-6), but there is no neutral option “either or”. Additionally, the survey includes four open questions on personal received advantages and disadvantages of drama-based teaching as well as likes and dislikes. Most of the questions aim to find out if the applied drama-based methods are perceived to be useful to learn a grammatical phenomenon and to gain competences in other language areas (listening, speaking, reading, writing). Furthermore, it was also a request to elaborate personal opinions and experience with drama-based methods and give answers to questions such as “are drama-based methods motivating for students?” or “do students perceive possible challenges or disadvantages?”.

The questionnaire was in the native language of most participants, namely German, in order to erase any obstacle to the flow of students’ reflections possibly caused by language barriers. The reason for carrying out stimulated recalls and feedback in written form is based on time and resource related issues. The data was gathered
during the four lessons at the author’s disposal for the drama-based case study. Given this relatively tight organisational schedule the written format allowed for the inclusion of all students’ feedbacks in a relatively short time, compared to interviews, for instance. Furthermore, the questionnaires were filled out anonymously, to build a safe situation for students to express criticism or negative feedback more probably (cf. Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 132). A negative aspect of such written format is the fact that it is not possible to raise a query in case of uncertainty. Nonetheless, including students’ contribution does not only improve research findings, but it also enables students to reflect on their personal learning processes and experiences.

[...] there is growing acceptance within the SLA [Second Language Acquisition] community that learners’ feelings and reflections on their learning process, language use, and changing identity offer valuable insights in aspects traditionally overlooked in SLA (Dewaele, 2005, p. 369).

5.4.3 External Observation Reports

Qualitative data was collected during and after the interventions. Both classes were observed by external teachers, who received a pre-designed questionnaire, which should help to direct their attention to three variables: (A) students’ performance, (B) teacher’s performance, (C) applied methods (for more details see Appendix F).

The first section (A) focused on the students and their communicative behaviour during the intervention. Points of interest were students’ motivation, attention, interaction, and oral fluency. For example, one question aimed to find out if students behave differently in a drama-based lesson, compared to a conventional lesson, including participation, attention, noise level, etc. The notion of language fluency was a major point of interest, as literature often points at improvements in oral proficiency through drama-based teaching (Freebody, 2013; Miccoli, 2003; Stinson, 2015; Stinson & Freebody, 2006). Therefore, the observers were asked to have a look at fluency. Although the observation was very small scaled and derives from subjective interpretation, if big differences were to be observed, it would be an important result and point of interest to be further looked at in another research project.

Section B of the observation sheet concentrated on the teacher’s performance. Teacher’s instructions represent a context factor that can influence learning processes and outcomes and hence distort the effects of an applied method (cf. Purpura, 2004, p. 30). The observers were thus asked to find out if the teacher was
able to communicate the content and grammar points clearly and in a comprehensive manner and if the sequences were logically planned and coherent. The last section of the observation sheet (C) looked at content and methods itself. It is especially relevant for the drama sessions because it aimed at evaluating practicability and effects of drama-based methods.

5.4.4 Teacher’s Journal

After each session, the researcher took notes on what happened in the classroom and reflected upon these observations. As the lessons were not recorded, the course of the lesson and students learning process were captured solely in this way. Gathering information through such a personal perspective and analysing these substantiate subjective theories, which parallel scientific theories in some ways: “[Subjektive Theorien] haben […] ähnlich wie wissenschaftliche Theorien die Funktionen, Prognosen zu entwickeln, Handlungen zu planen, diese zu erklären und zu rechtfertigen” (Arras, 2010, p. 171) [Subjective theories have – similar to scientific theories – the function to make a prognosis, to plan actions and explain and warrant these, translation by KH]. The validity of subjective theories accordingly derives from subjective experience (cf. Arras, 2010, p. 171).

5.5 Data Analysis

The following section discusses data analysis methods applied for each data source: grammar test, questionnaire, external observation reports and teacher’s journal. The last two sources are put together in a single paragraph since the same analytical method was applied.

Grammar Test

Data from the grammar test was analysed statistically via SPSS 23.0 (Statistical Package for Social Science). Data sets were only included in the analysis if all items of both pre- and post-test had been fully completed. In a first step, the data results were checked for normal distribution and a correlation coefficient was administered for pre- and post-test results. Descriptive statistics were applied for test scores and describing the two groups (drama and control group). Through inferential statistics, differences between the two groups were revealed. More detailed, a t-test for dependent samples was conducted to evaluate mean differences in pre- and post-test scores of both groups. Furthermore, a t-test for independent samples using gain
scores was conducted find out about differences between the groups. “A one-tailed test (reflecting a directional hypothesis) posits a difference in a particular direction, such as when we hypothesize that Group 1 will score higher than Group 2” (Salkind, 2013, p. 138).

The means for the variables of the test were measured using the coding 0 to 2, with 0 being “wrong”, 1 being “semi-correct” and 2 being “correct”.

**Questionnaire on Drama-based Methods**

The questionnaire consisted of open and closed questions and hence two different methods of data analysis were applied. First, for closed questions, a descriptive approach to the data was adapted: results are represented in frequency tables, using Excel. Open questions were analysed thematically by scanning for likely categories and choosing representative comments and contrary voices. This approach resembles Mayring’s (2015) qualitative content analysis, which aims at the systematic discussion of communicative material. He differentiates three main categories of the qualitative content analysis: a summary of the analysis, the explanatory and the structured content analysis. For the respective data, the summary version was considered being the most appropriate, because the focus is on content. The summary version applied in this data analysis follows Mayring’s approach, but limits itself to collecting, summarising and classifying the content.

**External Observation Reports and Teacher’s Journal**

Data from external observation reports and teacher’s journal was not systematically analysed but used for additional insight into the effects of drama-based teaching and learning. Hence, the feedbacks from external teachers were summarised according to the three categories pre-defined in the observation sheet (students’ performance, teacher’s performance, applied methods). The personal notes made after each intervention were also summarised and categorised according to conspicuous themes that caught the observer’s attention. Additionally, representative quotes from the journal were chosen to underline these themes. Both external observation reports and the teacher’s journal especially served as recalls and stimuli for discussing and evaluating the applied drama grammar approach in Chapter 7 (Discussion).
6 Results

This chapter presents results from qualitative and quantitative data. Each result section is arranged according to the data collection method. First, outcomes regarding the first research question concerning the drama grammar approach are outlined by presenting results from the grammar test. Thus, the focus is on improvements made between pre- and post-test and differences between the two groups by looking at total test scores. Furthermore, the question whether test results vary across group members based on gender differences is answered. Second, results from the questionnaire give insight into the drama grammar approach and address the second research question about effects of drama-based teaching. Finally, external observation reports and the teacher’s journal are summarised for likely categories, which provides additional information about the use of drama in the foreign language classroom.

6.1 Grammar Test

The data of the pre- and post-test are normally distributed with a value of Sig.=.82 for the pre- and a value of Sig.=.13 for the post-test, according to the Shapiro-Wilk test. In order to measure the reliability of the test, a correlation coefficient between pre- and post-test was computed. The average score of the pre-test was 29.23 and 39.13 in the post-test. The correlation coefficient between the two sets of data was r=0.44. (df(31), p<.05), which represents a moderate relationship between the two test results (cf. Salkind, 2013, p. 92).

On an overall comparison between the pre- and the post-test means of both groups, a paired sample t-test revealed that there is a significant difference, t(30)=−5.32, p<.001. Cohen’s d 1.02 suggests a large effect size. At the beginning of the program, grammar achievement scores of all participants were on average 29.23. At the end of the intervention, they scored significantly better with a result of 39.13. Regarding the groups individually, both groups experienced a significant difference in their post-test performance. The result of the treatment group is t(16)=−4.24, p<.01, and the result of the control group is t(13)=−3.15, p<.01. Regarding the control group, Cohen’s d= 0.89 suggests a large effect size. The effect size of the drama group is 1.12, which equally presents a large effect size. These significant results in both groups show that the interventions – both drama and teacher-centred instructions – had an impact on
learners’ knowledge of English conditionals: both groups learnt the English conditionals significantly better.

An independent sample t-test on gain scores revealed that there were no significant differences between groups \( t(29) = -.68, p > .05 \). However, a post-hoc paired sample t-test showed that – on average – the pupils from the drama group performed slightly better in both tests \( (M=35.53, SD=8.29) \) than the control group \( (M=32.54, SD=8.18) \). Furthermore, the mean difference of pre- and post-test is higher in the treatment group (see Table 1 and Figure 1 for the descriptive data).

![Table 3: Descriptive data: pre- and post-test results](image)

**Figure 3: Mean grammar scores in pre- and post-test**

Furthermore, a paired sample t-test was conducted to compare the pre- and post-test means of the two groups in the different test formats. The drama group showed significant results in all three tasks. In the multiple-choice test, the results were
In the gap fill task they achieved a result of \( t(16) = -2.63, p < .05, d = 0.70 \) (large effect size), and significant results were also achieved in the sentence construction test with \( t(16) = -4.57, p < .001, d = 1.14 \) (large effect size).

The control group, on the other hand, only achieved significant results in the multiple-choice test with \( t(13) = -3.26, p < .01, d = 0.90 \) (large effect size), and in the sentence construction test with \( t(13) = -4.13, p < .01, d = 0.78 \) (large effect size). However, there were no statistically significant differences between pre- and post-test means in the gap fill task. The summary of means across the different test formats of both groups is presented in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Format</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap Fill</td>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Construction</td>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Descriptive data: pre- and post-test results of the different test formats

Nota bene: *\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \), ***\( p < .001 \)

Concerning gender specific results of the treatment group, no statistically significant differences were to be observed on a comparison of means between male and female participants (post-test results: \( t(15) = -9.30, p > .05 \)). However, the female participants achieved significant results between pre- and post-test means with \( t(13) = -3.97, p < .01, d = 1.18 \), whereas male participants did not (\( t(2) = -3.05, p > .05 \)). Moreover, the female participants achieved significant results in all three tasks, which is not the case for male participants. Looking at the control group, no statistical difference between males and females was found (post-test results: \( t(12) = -1.22, p > .05 \)); both girls and boys as a separate group did not achieve significant differences in the pre- and post-test. Furthermore, the female participants of the control group did not show significant results in any testing task, whereas the boys
achieved significant results in the multiple-choice ($t(7)=-2.42, p<.05, d=0.81$) and sentence construction task ($t(7)=-4.82, p<.01, d=0.85$).

Participants were asked to evaluate their knowledge of the three different conditionals before and after the intervention. Figure 4 shows that students of both groups did not indicate that their knowledge of the first conditional increased. In fact, the control group rated their knowledge before and after the intervention equally with 2.07, whereas the drama group even felt that their knowledge slightly decreased. However, regarding the second and third conditionals, both groups had the impression that they understood these structures slightly better. In total, the marginal difference in sets of scores, from 2.33 to 2.19 in the control group and from 2.51 to 2.27 in the drama group, suggest that students felt only little improvement in their competence on English conditionals.

![Figure 4: Personal evaluation of knowledge of English conditionals](image)

Comparing these personal evaluations with students’ performances in both tests reveals a possible correlation between the two sets of data. The results of the pre-test and the indicated grammatical competence show no correlation coefficient with $r=-.14, df(14), p>.05$ for the control group and a very low correlation coefficient with
The negative correlation indicates that the better the learners scored (more points), the better they evaluated their competence (lower points). Similar results are to be observed for post-test results and personal evaluation on conditionals after the intervention (control group: \( r = .27, \, df(14), \, p > .05 \), drama group: \( r = -.18, \, df(17), \, p > .05 \)).

### 6.2 Questionnaire on Drama-based Methods

Students agreed on average that they learnt the conditionals via drama (2 strongly agreed, 7 agreed, 7 rather agreed, 1 rather disagreed). Only two students strongly agreed that other methods would have been more useful to learn the grammatical structure in focus. Additionally, 3 agreed, 4 rather agreed, 3 rather disagreed and 5 disagreed on this point. The following figure visualises the approval or disapproval of drama as a method for learning the English conditionals.

Figure 5: Approval or disapproval of drama as a method for learning the English conditionals

Concerning different language skills, the average (\( \bar{\Omega} \) 9 pupils) found that they had improved (well) in different language skills through drama-based teaching. Good improvements were especially linked to grammar, listening and pronunciation. Writing was considered being the skill in which least improvements were made. Only one person remarked that there were no personal improvements in reading and speaking. The following graph demonstrates the language growth in the different areas:
Figure 6: Personal evaluation of language improvements

Apart from language skills, the questionnaire aimed to find out how students evaluated drama activities in general. Learners were required to evaluate different qualities. The following graph shows the different responses.

Drama activities are...

Figure 7: Personal evaluation of drama activities, 1.1

Figure 5 shows that students especially associate fun and motivation with drama activities. For instance, 8 out of 17 strongly agreed and 6 agreed that drama activities are fun. Only a few students rather disagreed on this issue; however, no one strongly
objected to it. There was also broad agreement on drama activities being a valuable contribution in the foreign language classroom (4 people strongly agreed, 8 agreed and 3 rather agreed). The majority disagreed on negative qualities of drama activities, such as being a waste of time or being inappropriate for many students. However, regarding the point “inappropriateness”, answers are not clearly set at any end of the scale: the majority rather disagreed or agreed on this point, only two people strongly disagreed and one person strongly agreed.

Qualities concerning group dynamics, creativity and self-confidence were generally rated very positively.

Figure 8: Personal evaluation of drama activities, 1.2

Drama activities support...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>rather agree</th>
<th>rather disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...group dynamics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...creativity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...one’s self-confidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows that all students (rather) agreed that drama activities support group dynamics. Only one person rather disagreed on the notion of drama activities supporting one’s self-confidence. The approval is also high for “supporting creativity”, with only two people (rather) disagreeing.

Apart from pre-given answers concerning qualities of drama activities, participants were asked if they recognised any personal advantages of drama-based teaching. 13 out of 17 answered with yes, additionally underlining their response with the following statements:
Advantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it’s fun</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it improves one’s self-confidence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it improves pronunciation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you remember things better</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you understand grammar better</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it improves speaking skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it improves listening skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it improves creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it’s easier than learning by heart</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you learn to speak in front of the class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you learn to speak with emotions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 students also mentioned disadvantages and best of all that speaking in front of the class can be unpleasant (3 hits). Furthermore two learners indicated that spelling is neglected in drama-based teaching and learning. Finally, one student repeated that “it’s a waste of time” and another one pointed to the time-consuming aspect of drama activities by saying that “more time is needed to learn something”.

Apart from evaluating advantages and disadvantages of drama-based teaching, another aim of this study was to find out how students dealt with offered drama activities, how they felt during the intervention and if they could imagine that drama-based methods were implemented more frequently in the foreign language classroom. The majority of the participants felt (very) comfortable during the interventions, apart from one student, who felt rather bad. Only positive feedback was given concerning the class atmosphere, with 5 hits for “very good” and 10 for “good”. Hence, 11 participants agreed (8 out of them strongly agreed) that they could imagine that drama activities were applied more often in their language class. Again, one student strongly disagreed on this question.

Finally, the last two questions were open ones and specifically addressed to likes and dislikes of the two concrete drama lessons. Some participants (4) remarked once again that acting was fun, two of them additionally named the applied drama activity bibidi babidi bob (for more details see Appendix A – Lesson Plans). Not only acting was associated with fun, but also learning itself. Furthermore single voices described the drama intervention as “relaxing” and “interesting”. In this respect, one participant very much liked finding out about English conditionals through performing: “Mir hat gefallen, dass man bei den Theaterstücken herausfinden konnte welcher Conditional
der Richtige war” [“I really liked that we could find out what kind of conditional was appropriate in the different scenes”, translation by KH]. Dislikes concerned the fact that participants had to fill out a test (2 hits), that they had to act in front of the class (1 hit) and that there was not enough time for acting (1 hit).

6.3 External Observation Reports
The teachers (observers) of the two groups observed the interventions of their respective class and gave feedback to the author of this study. They received a questionnaire beforehand, focussing on pupils’ interaction, teacher’s performance and applied activities. These three categorise serve as a structure for the presentation of the reports. The first paragraph briefly outlines the feedback received for the interventions in the control group. The second paragraph describes in more detail how the observer of the drama group evaluated the drama interventions.

The feedback from the teacher of the control group, who observed the two lessons of this group, was in general very positive. She remarked that pupils were very concentrated, quiet and that participation was very high. Regarding the teacher’s performance, the observer noted that all pupils were involved in different activities and that instructions and explanations were clear and well structured. Another positive remark was made about the applied method, which consisted of the three Ps: present, practice and produce. This means that the grammar in focus was introduced (present), different tasks and activities were completed (practice) and finally learners had to write a short text using the grammatical structure (produce).

The feedback from the teacher of the drama group focused very much on the performance of the interventionist. She remarked that instructions were clear and that pupils could feel the positive and motivated attitude of the author of this study. Concerning pupils’ performance, the external teacher observed differences between the first and the second lesson. She noted that during the first lesson, pupils’ motivation was relatively low, which she especially ascribed to the late hour of the day. Furthermore, she described them as shy and remarked that they did not really know what was expected from them. During the second intervention, however, participation and interaction were higher and the lesson was generally more dynamic.
The teacher found the applied drama-based activities nice, but at the same time she mentioned the time-consuming aspect. She said that normally there would never be time to practice each grammar chapter to that extent. Although not said explicitly, she underlined that the effect was relatively low compared to the time and energy devoted to teaching the grammatical structure in focus. Furthermore, she expected slightly different activities compared to the ones done in the treatment group. She thought there would be more role-plays and more acting. In this respect, she noted that the three scenes of the second lesson were interesting but that one could have worked more intensely with the scenes and extended this dramatic phase. Also, there was a negative remark about the short time where some pupils had to wait in the classroom while the interventionist explained the scenes to the “actors” in front of the class. Concerning the last activity, where pupils had to write a phone dialogue and afterwards present it, the teacher noted that the ones who waited their turn to present started talking and got restless. As a solution, she proposed a shorter version of the presentation phase.

6.4 Teacher's Journal

In general, the teacher’s observation matched external observations reports. Three major topics were extracted from the journal, which will be outlined in this section and exemplified by quotes from the journal: (1) drama-based methods, (2) participation, (3) setting. The first person narrative will be used in this section.

*Drama-based methods.* In the first lesson, a lot of time was devoted to explain drama-based activities and students had difficulties to do them. The applied methods in the first lesson caused some confusion and reluctance. For instance, the *loop* activity aimed at acting out a dialogue (“If I see him, I will tell him”, “ok”) with specific emotions. Students however did not choose a specific emotion for themselves:

Almost all students of the first group just repeated the sentence without any emotion or situation in mind and they sometimes whispered or didn’t even answer. I had the impression that they felt reluctant and didn’t understand why we were doing this (extract from the first lesson, 02.10.2017, 14:05-14:55).

The second group, on the other hand, had less difficulties in performing the dialogue because they had already got an example of how it could work. In the second lesson, instructions were clearer and students were more willing to participate. The
performance of the volunteers who acted out three different scenes offered a basis for discussing the difference of the three conditional clauses. So, although the first lesson did not entirely run as expected, the second lesson proved that – after a short phase of introduction and habituation – drama-based teaching had an effect on learners.

This lesson was completely different compared to the first one: the students were attentive, they didn’t make fun of the method, they participated. I had the feeling that we worked together, we produced something. Maybe it was the hour of the day (morning) or the fact that they were more familiar with me and drama-based methods (extract from the second lesson, 03.10.2017, 07:55-08:45).

**Participation.** In general, at the beginning students expressed some reluctance in participating in performative activities. For instance, during some drama-based activities, there were three boys in the class who did not really participate. An explanation for this might be that the group was relatively new and students did not know each other well. In fact, sometimes they even asked each other’s names and were surprised when they got additional information about their colleagues. In the journal, I noted the following:

I think that this heterogeneous class, which consists of students who don’t even know each other, is a big challenge for teaching and creating group dynamics. But it is especially group dynamics that encourages drama-based learning processes because learners have to feel safe and be in a protected environment when they step out of themselves and role-play or imitate someone (extract from the first lesson, 02.10.2017, 14:05-14:55).

During the different scenes of the second lesson, however, the class engagement was generally high, students were very attentive and there was a positive learning atmosphere.

**The setting.** For the activity *bibidi babidi bob*, I chose to go outside because there was not enough space in the classroom to build a circle. Although there was enough space outside, it was rather cold and students had to go back and get their jackets. These logistical considerations caused time and energy. The physical constraints of the classroom space were also visible during other activities, which biased the fictionality and the effect of the drama activities. I noted in the journal that “it is difficult to create a stage or a different atmosphere in a room, where students are used to sit behind the school desk, be silent and do different tasks” (extract from the first lesson, 02.10.2017, 14:05-14:55).
7 Discussion

The aim of this study was twofold. First, I wanted to explore whether Even’s drama grammar is an effective approach to teach grammar in regard to the target structure of this study – English conditionals. Second, I wanted to gather additional qualitative insights (e.g. personal attitudes, learning preferences, etc.) about the effects of drama-based teaching on learners.

The effect of the drama grammar approach is measured with quantitative data from test performances. In addition, insights from qualitative data are added to approach the first research question. Previous studies and theory on drama grammar – especially referring to Even (2003) – are used to discuss the findings and substantiate reflections on teaching grammar through drama. Section 7.2 then looks at effects of drama-based methods, which are extracted from qualitative data (e.g. questionnaire, external observation reports, teacher’s journal) and supported by theoretical insights. Based on study results, implications for learning and teaching with drama are discussed in this section. Finally, limitations of this study are disclosed.

7.1 The Drama Grammar Approach

Through this study, it could be confirmed that the drama grammar approach was effective for teaching the conditional clauses to young adolescent English language learners. Regarding the conditional test, both groups (treatment + control group) performed significantly better in the post-test, but there were no significant differences among the mean scores of the two groups. The lack of significant differences between control and treatment group may have several reasons, among them length of intervention, number of participants, nature of the survey and the applied methods. In fact, researchers on L2 grammar teaching, learning and assessment continuously failed to prove the superiority of one method over another, which can probably be ascribed to the complex system of second language acquisition: “SLA [second language acquisition] is simply too complex to attribute L2 learning uniquely to method” (Purpura, 2004, p. 30).

Nevertheless, the drama group did significantly improve their grammatical competence and the mean gain score was higher in the drama group (10.06 for the drama group vs. 8.05 for the control group), which suggests a slightly bigger effect of the drama-based intervention. These results are in line with Even’s hypothesis (2003,
that drama-based grammar lessons can guarantee an effective processing of grammatical phenomena in the foreign language. Improved test results additionally hint to the fact that students were able to meaningfully connect declarative and procedural knowledge, which Even (Even, 2003, p. 295) defines as characteristic for the drama grammar approach.

Another observation regarding the drama group is that they significantly improved in all three test formats, whereas the control group did not have significant pre- and post-test results in the gap fill task. This notion is interesting insofar as it seems that teaching via drama is compatible with a variety of (standardised) test formats. In this respect, results suggest that different test formats which are based on the communicative approach are appropriate to evaluate learners’ language performance in drama processes, which is in accordance with Kao & O’Neill’s considerations of evaluation for drama-oriented classrooms (1998, p. 135).

Although the lessons strongly focused on oral skills – as presentations, role plays and dialogues were orally performed – a successful transfer to written skills was observable. This successful transfer was also visible in the sentence construction task, which required students to come up with a right sentence on their own. In this respect, Chang (2012) notes the following: “Talk in the drama world, on the contrary, can serve as an oral rehearsal for writing” (Chang, 2012, p. 11). It can be argued that the drama group had less difficulties in coming up with ideas for the conditional clauses, which might be related to the creative drama work. “Within a dramatic framework, students take on roles, interact with other characters and enact their situation in order to experience their dilemmas, feel the tension and share their happiness or sadness” (Chang, 2012, pp. 10–11). This kind of emotional and holistic engagement can be a catalyst for meaning making and writing (cf. Chang, 2012, p. 11).

Regarding the drama group, the format in which improvements were least significant was the multiple-choice task with an effect size of \( d = 0.7 \). Here, students did not have to actively produce language, but choose the correct form. A tenuous explanation for this rather low improvement could be the fact that students already performed rather well in the pre-test and that learning progress could hence not be that big, compared to the other two formats, which caused more troubles in the beginning. Furthermore, multiple choice’s focus on the construct of knowledge, which represents a rather
passive dimension of learning (cf. Schratz & Weiser, 2002, p. 39), is in opposition to the active engagement required in the performative classroom. Hence the test does not mirror the nature of drama-based teaching and learning. In this respect, the assumption that multiple choice is an ideal test format in a drama-based context because of its focus on understanding (see Section 5.4 for more details) could not be substantiated through the study’s outcomes. However, further tests using the multiple-choice format in the context of DiE would be needed to make clearer statements and provide more insight in this issue.

When looking at the control group, a rather different picture is presented. Among all three test formats, the effect size was highest in the multiple-choice task, with \( d=0.9 \). This result might mirror the applied teaching approach, which was mainly teacher-centred and less (inter-)active.

In sum, when looking at individual test formats and test results of both groups, a link between the nature of teaching approaches and test formats could be detected: while the (inter-)active drama group performed best in the more open formats that require active language production, the control group achieved best results in the test format that it set at the more passive end of the scale. The following graph visualises these links:

Figure 9: Connection between test format and test results of the individual groups
Although test results hint to a link between test formats and the performances of the individual groups, these results need to be interpreted with caution because of the manageable sized intervention group and the limited time frame. Further evaluations of different test formats in the context of DiE are required to find suitable testing and assessment approaches.

Apart from statistical results on improvements in mastering English conditionals, it is valuable to gather feedbacks from students on how they evaluated their competence and performance in regard to the applied drama-based methods.

Concerning participants’ self-evaluation of their knowledge of conditional clauses before and after the intervention, their feedbacks approximately mirror the actual test results: both groups indicated a slight improvement, which is also what test results show. However, as no or a very low correlation coefficient was detected between personal evaluation and test results (in both pre- and post-test), students of both groups tended to underestimate or overrate their knowledge of English conditionals (e.g. post-test, control group: $r=0.27$, $df(14)$, $p>0.05$, drama group: $r=-0.18$, $df(17)$, $p>0.05$).

Drawing on the three models for the implementation of drama-based lessons (see Section 4.2 for more details), Kao & O’Neill (1998, pp. 118–119) and Even (2011, p. 308) propose a reflective phase at the end of a drama session, where students reflect the learning process on a meta level. Even (2011) states more clearly that this phase is “a forum for language awareness and language learning reflection” (2011, p. 308). As test results do not suggest that the drama group evaluated learning outcomes more precisely compared to the control group, it does not seem that the reflective phase supported personal evaluation. Hence, no evidence about the efficiency or the effect of this last phase could be delivered through this study.

Next to the self-evaluation of possible improvements made, participants agreed in the questionnaire on average that they had the feeling of having learnt the conditionals more successfully through the drama grammar approach. More precisely, the majority (N=16) (rather) agreed that the method was useful for learning the conditional clauses and only two students strongly agreed that other methods would have been more useful. Additionally, two students indicated that the performative approach supported the understanding and retention of the grammar in focus. The
following three statements exemplify this notion: “Man kann es sich besser merken als wenn man es nur ein mal aufschreibt” [“You remember it better than when you only write it down once”, translation by KH], “Man versteht ein neues Thema leichter” [“You understand a new topic better”, translation by KH] and “Ich finde es ist leichter als das Auswendiglernen” [“I find it easier than learning by heart”, translation by KH]. These feedbacks underline the author’s assumption that drama’s value lies in offering concrete and authentic situations in which language is realised and hence the role and meaning of grammar is more traceable (see Section 5.1 for more details). Referring back to Even (2003): “Im dramagrammatischen Unterricht wird das Verständnis grammatischer Regeln durch die praktische Anwendung in verschiedenen Sprachhandlungssituationen gezielt gefördert” (Even, 2003, p. 294) [In drama-based grammar lessons, the understanding of grammar rules is systematically supported by their practical application in different communicative situations, translation by KH]. Furthermore, the factor understanding has been considered by Schewe (1993, p. 391) in his data collection on learners’ self-evaluated language improvements in a drama-based context. He found out that learners especially rated DiE as useful to support the dimension “understanding” (cf. Schratz & Weiser, 2002). Concerning the notion of retention, no well-informed conclusions can be made because the study did not observer the long-term effects of drama-based instructions. To evaluate the effects of drama regarding the retention rate, a second, delayed post-test administered to the study group would have been necessary.

When looking at gender, quantitative results do not suggest significant differences on a comparison of means between male and female participants (post-test results: t(15)=-9.30, p>.05). Regarding the two groups separately, the female participants achieved significant results between pre- and post-test means with t(13)=-3.97, p<.01, d=1.18, whereas male participants did not (t(2)=-3.05, p>.05). However, the meaning of these results is very limited, due to unequal distribution of male and female participants. For example, the low number of male participants (N=3) does not allow for significant results and hence it is difficult to make clear statements about the efficacy of the drama grammar approach regarding gender differences. Feedbacks from the external observer did not specifically address gender differences. The interventionist remarked that male pupils were less attentive,
participative and motivated than female ones in the first lesson. This observation mirrors Tschurtschenthaler’s critical consideration of drama-based methods, which – according to her – are not appropriate and appealing for everyone (2013, pp. 51–53). However, how the observed initial obstruction to performative learning is gender related cannot be answered through this study. The qualitative data of this study is insufficient to appropriately approach the gender debate in DiE. More participants and a more systematic observation would be needed to find out about gender-related differences in the context of drama-based teaching and learning.

When talking about effectiveness, it is important to additionally consider the whole context in which the drama practices were embedded, including variables such as time, space, teacher, learners and material. In this sense, feedbacks from external observers and personal observations are valuable for evaluating the relation between given circumstances, effort and effect, which is closely related to the issue of effectiveness. For example, the external observer pointed to the time-consuming aspect of DiE. According to her, the time needed for the instruction of English conditional clauses through drama exceeded the time she would normally devote to teaching a specific grammatical structure. In this respect, her feedback shares concerns about time and space with various authors (cf. Borge, 2007, p. 4; Tschurtschenthaler, 2013, p. 51). Considering the technical challenges of time and space, it is probably more realistic not to exclusively teach according to drama-based methods, but include single drama pedagogical elements or projects (which can also run as long-term projects) in the classroom. Still, Even (2003) reminds sceptical teachers that quality should be favoured over quantity:

[Drama-based grammar lessons treat a grammatical phenomenon over a longer period. Thus, fewer grammar topics are discussed, but a qualitatively more intensive work is ensured, translation by KH]

Linked to the intensive work with drama, practitioners stress the need to get used to the whole situation, the group, the teaching approach, etc. in order to appropriately react in specific situations (cf. Borge, 2007, p. 13; Schewe, 1993, p. 420).
Drawing on my own intervention, the external observer and the interventionist remarked that teacher and students needed some time to get used to each other and
the performative nature of learning before successfully approaching the grammatical phenomenon via drama. For instance, the first lesson was partly characterised by confused and agitated pupils whereas in the second lesson, applied activities and methods were successfully received and adopted. These observations and Borge’s report address the complexity and intensity of DiE, which must be considered when approaching grammar through drama. In this respect, researchers and drama practitioners have pronounced the necessity of implementing DiE in teacher training programmes to prepare future teachers for the application of drama practices in their language classrooms, and hence ensure DiE’s future use (cf. Haack, 2010; Unterthiner, in press).

7.2 Effects of Drama-based Teaching

**Inclusion of different language skills**

Results from qualitative data on language competence vaguely mirror Schewe’s (1993, p. 391) study results of participants’ self-evaluation on language skills: most improvements were made in spoken skills, such as speaking, “understanding” and listening. Participants of this study indicated most improvements in grammar, listening and pronunciation. The enumeration of grammar seems evident in regard to the subject of the study. Positive effects of drama-based methods on spoken skills were additionally highlighted in the open questions on advantages, where listening, speaking and pronunciation were again indicated. Additionally, participant S19 remarked “*Man lernt die Conditionals und die Aussprache und neue Vokabeln gleich dazu*” [“You learn the conditionals, pronunciation and new vocabulary all at the same time”, translation by KH]. This focus on spoken language is in line with the performative character of the drama grammar approach and the research desideratum of many drama practitioners (cf. Freebody, 2013; Miccoli, 2003; Passon, 2011; Stinson, 2015; Stinson & Freebody, 2006). For instance Chang (2012) remarks: “Drama is a way to maximise opportunities for pupils’ oracy, thus paving the way for developing their literacy” (2012, p. 8). Hence, this thesis is able to add to existing research out of an Austrian school context. However, considering the small scale of the study and the way of measuring these data via questionnaires, it is impossible to make absolutist statements about language improvements regarding the different language skills. More longitudinal and quantitative studies on specific skills with more students would be needed to gain more insight into this field.
**Self-confidence**
Apart from hard skills, data results suggest that drama can have a valuable contribution to soft skills, such as self-confidence. Next to this indication in the closed section of the questionnaire (5 hits for totally agree, 8 for agree, 3 for rather agree and 1 for rather not agree), the notion that drama in education improves one’s self-confidence was additionally listed in open questions by four students. For instance, participant S1 remarked the following: “Das ‘Theater’ spielen stärkt das Selbstvertrauen” [“Doing theatre supports self-confidence”, translation by KH]. The supportive role of drama on self-confidence is discussed in existing literature on many and various occasions. For example Chang (2012) states that “[p]articipating in drama activities can help develop children’s personal resources such as self-confidence, self-esteem, social skills, communication, emotional resilience, empathy […]” (Chang, 2012, p. 6). It can additionally be argued that an increased self-confidence can result in the fact that students feel less anxious. This assumption substantiates the perspective of many drama practitioners who noted a reduction of anxiety initiated by a performative teaching approach (Piazzoli, 2011; Ralph, 1997; Stern, 1980; Weber, 2017). In this study, reduced anxiety was only partly observed; while in the first lesson students were rather reluctant to participate, in the second lesson they were very motivated and interested and did not shrink back from performing in front of their peers. Referring back to challenges of drama-based teaching, Tschurtschenthaler (2013) notes that people might obstruct to this open and creative form of learning because they feel shy, uneasy or regard drama activities as a waste of time (2013, p. 52). For example, in this study, the fact that students had difficulties performing the loops with specific emotions underlines Even’s considerations of creative learning:

Dramagrammatischer Unterricht stellt eine Herausforderung an Lernende dar, sprachlich zu handeln und sich selbst als (fiktive) Person darzustellen. Eine solche Bereitschaft kann (zunächst) nicht bei jedem Lerner vorausgesetzt werden (Even, 2003, p. 234). [Drama-based grammar lessons represent a challenge for learners to act linguistically and play the role of a (fictional) character. (Initially), this kind of willingness cannot be expected from every learner, translation by KH].

**Enjoyment**
The notion of enjoyment is probably one of the most distinctive benefits of DiE. “The playful spirit of drama is what makes it enjoyable and this enjoyment can lure students into becoming more receptive to the target language and more willing to
make use of it” (Winston, 2012, p. 4). Indeed, almost sole agreement on drama activities being enjoyable, motivating and a valuable contribution in the foreign language classroom could be found throughout the group in this study. These feedbacks equal statements of learners and practitioners in other performative contexts (cf. Almond, 2005, p. 11; Bournot-Trites et al., 2007, pp. 27–28; Even, 2003, p. 325; Fasching, 2017, pp. 181, 204; Ralph, 1997, pp. 277–278). Moreover, connecting drama with fun is very much in line with the author’s perception of the interventions. While it was difficult to observe the effects of the drama grammar approach on hard and soft skills of learners, it was easy to recognise that students felt comfortable and had fun during the different drama activities. It was this kind of enjoyment that created a good learning atmosphere and a satisfaction on the part of the interventionist.

**Learning Atmosphere and Group Dynamics**

There was evidence from student data that drama supports group dynamics and creativity, which parallels some of Even’s established theses on drama grammar, such as social, creative, holistic and active learning (Even, 2003, pp. 233–234). In fact, almost all students indicated that they felt (very) comfortable during the interventions, and that the class atmosphere was good (15 hits). These reports already hint to the beneficial role of drama for creating a good learning environment.

The spirit that characterises such [drama] work at its best is that of the ensemble – where everyone supports everyone else for the benefits of the whole group. Such an atmosphere is necessarily founded on trust and co-operation and will, when achieved, encourage students to find their own voices, lose their inhibitions, contribute and speak out in class (Winston, 2012, p. 5).

Although students agreed on average on the supportive role of drama for class atmosphere and group dynamics and literature supports this view, the reality perceived in the classroom was somewhat more differentiating. For instance, during the first lesson, the external observer and the author of this study noticed a rather agitated, distracted and confused group. In the second lesson however, participation, interest and motivation seemed to be higher and participants were more focused on the learning contents, which had a positive effect on the learning atmosphere (see Section 6.4 for more details). The reason for this difference might be in the first place of logistical nature, such as time and space. For instance as pointed out in the results, the setting was not ideal for realising drama activities, which coincides with
Borge’s (cf. Borge, 2007, p. 9) report on the use of drama activities in teaching German. However, Tschurtschenthaler (2013, p. 51) underlines on various occasions the importance of adequate space for realising drama work. Second, the tense atmosphere in the first lesson might be ascribed to the fact that students did not know each other very well. In this respect, Borge (2007) notes: “Trust must be built within the group before attempting drama activities” (p. 11). Third, the novelty for pupils to meet a new teacher, a distinct learning approach and simultaneously to participate at a study certainly contributed to the difference between the two lessons. The role of drama in this context is therefore difficult to determine. However, as positive improvements were remarked between first and second lesson and as pupils’ feedbacks were in general very positive, it can be tenuously assumed that drama supported class atmosphere and group dynamics.

**Shift in Power from Teacher to Learners**

The interpersonal relationship between learners and teacher was perceived somewhat different than in standardised classroom situations. More specifically, being a drama instructor in this specific situation included various roles and caused a shift in power from teacher to learner. In the journal, this shift was described as a loss of control, which caused uneasiness on the part of the teacher.

I experience a shift in teachers’ role. I feel comfortable on the “island” of teacher-centred instructions because I control the situation. Drama-based teaching signified for me a loss of control because of the unpredictability of the situations’ outcomes. The unpredictability of the learning outcome is a fact that somehow stressed me. It was difficult to see what they understood and learnt (extract from the second lesson, 03.10.2017, 07:55-08:45).

The fact that it was not exclusively the teacher who controlled the situation did not mean that the messages didn’t reach learners. In fact, the positive test results and feedbacks proved that a learning process happened. Furthermore, the common and new experience and the power shift had a positive impact on the interpersonal relationship. In the journal, the following anecdotes were noted: “We developed together. We got to know each other better through this range of communicative activities. It was emotional. It was good” (extract from the second lesson, 03.10.2017, 07:55-08:45).

Hence, although perceived rather negatively during the intervention, the loss of control had a valuable impact on the power relation and consequently on the interpersonal relationship between teacher and learners: learners were
acknowledged more responsibility for their own learning processes. Stinson (2012, p. 70) enlists this power shift as one of many benefits of drama on second language learning.

7.3 Limitations
Results were derived from a random sample within the context of research in second language education. Due to this single case focus, it is essential to disclose the limitations of this study.

In general, research in social science includes a number of confounding variables, which can influence the outcome of an experimental design (cf. Albert & Marx, 2014, pp. 39–41). In this study, the test was administered at two different groups, which are not equal in number, age, (linguistic) background, gender distribution, etc. Hence, differences may be associated with characteristic differences between groups rather than to the intervention itself. Furthermore, external conditions including time and setting were not identical between groups, which also influenced test results. For instance, interventions took place on different days and different hours: while the treatment group received drama-based instructions in the 8th and 3rd lesson, the intervention in the control group was in the 3rd and 1st lesson.

Furthermore, in an experimental case study, results can already be forged through the fact that participants know that they are treated in a special way, through a new teaching method for example, also known as Hawthorne effect: “Jedes Sich-Einstellen der Versuchspersonen auf ihre Situation im Experiment kann ihr Handeln beeinflussen” (Albert & Marx, 2014, p. 91) [Participants’ awareness of their situation in the experiment can influence their behaviour, translation by KH]. Thus, the Hawthorne effect might have biased outcomes of the study. Additionally, as briefly mentioned in Section 5.4, the teacher itself can be a confounding variable that influences learning processes and distort outcomes (cf. Purpura, 2004, p. 30). For instance, the study participants might have performed differently with a familiar teacher.

Moreover, the same test was administered before and after the intervention, only changing the items’ distribution. This way of testing is problematic insofar as participants might have performed better simply because of the learning effect. “If you have subjects repeat the same task or test twice, they may do better the second time because of the learning effect” (Norušis, 1997, p. 223).
Limitations additionally concern the external validity of the study. In specific, the study results were derived within one specific school context and from a specific learner group. Due to this random sample, it is not possible to generalise conclusions. More precisely, other participants might react differently towards this drama-based teaching and learning approach. Likewise, the focus of the study lies on one specific grammatical phenomenon. The successful transfer to other grammatical structure and to other languages might be different and thus conclusions about the effect of the drama grammar approach are limited. In this respect, most studies are of qualitative nature and based on experience or personal observations (cf. Bryant, 2012; Fratini, 2008; Kindl, 2016; Monyer, 2010). Moreover, the time devoted to the whole study is relatively short to make directive conclusions about learning effects. This experimental case study is a mix of a cross-sectional study, which analyses a population at a specific point of time, and a longitudinal study, which measures change in behavior over a period of time (cf. Albert & Marx, 2014, p. 36). However, in order to gather validate information about the effects of the applied drama-approach an observation over a longer period of time, including a delayed post-test, would be needed. This limitation points to a research desideratum that has already been pronounced by many drama practitioners (cf. Bournot-Trites et al., 2007; Even, 2008; Stinson & Winston, 2011).

However, it seems imperative that more efforts be made by researchers and teachers to undertake systematic, long-term or longitudinal research in order to attain a fuller understanding of the possibilities, challenges, and complexities of second language learning through drama (Belliveau & Kim, 2013, p. 17).
8 Conclusion and Outlook

This thesis aimed to contribute to the research field of DiE by investigating two research interests: First, Even’s (2003) drama grammar approach was evaluated, extending it to a different grammar in focus, a different language, and another learner group and context. Second, the thesis focused on effects of drama-based instructions on young adolescent English language learners. An experimental, mixed-method study with pre- and post-test was conducted to answer the two research questions. More precisely, a methodological triangulation, including a grammar test, a questionnaire on drama-based methods, external observation reports and a teacher’s journal enabled a holistic perspective on the role of DiE in the English language classroom.

First, effects of the drama grammar approach were measured on students’ performance on English conditionals and put in comparison to a control group. These quantitative results represent an important information source to evaluate effects of DiE, which has so far been widely neglected in research on DiE. In other words, this thesis is able to fill a long-desired research gap in DiE and SLA. Insights from qualitative data (e.g. questionnaires, external observation reports, teacher’s journal) was additionally added to approach the complexity of the research desideratum in a holistic and informed manner. These pieces of information addressed the notion of time and habituation, as well as students’ personal responses to the drama grammar approach.

Put in a nutshell, although there were statistically no significant differences of test performances between the treatment and the control group, results from the quantitative data indeed suggest that drama can be an effective instrument for learning grammar: the treatment group did improve their knowledge of English conditionals, even slightly better than the control group. Students’ feedback additionally pointed to drama’s benefits, such as better understanding and retention of the grammatical phenomenon. However, personal observations and feedbacks from the external observer addressed the complexity of a drama-based class, which manifested itself in the fact that the interventionist and participants involved needed time to adapt themselves to the new circumstances.

Second, the research question on effects of drama-based teaching on learners was operationalised on students’ feedback, external observation reports and the teacher’s journal. Most students associated positive learning experiences with drama-based
teaching and recognised (personal) advantages of this learning and teaching approach, such as improvements in speaking and pronunciation, self-confidence, a good learning atmosphere and enjoyment. These feedbacks equal personal and external observations and support existing literature on the beneficial role of drama in educational contexts. Nevertheless, feedbacks from the external observers were also critical and did not suggest the superiority of drama-based teaching over traditional teaching approaches. Indeed, the intervention in the control group was very much praised, whereas the observer of the drama lessons noted an enhanced noise level, agitation and confusion in the class. However, this observation is partly traceable regarding the fact that drama activities are communicative and performative in nature, which automatically implies an enhanced noise level. In this respect, Even (2003) accordingly hints to the non-magical power of drama-based approaches: “Es handelt sich auch bei diesen Ansätzen ‘nicht um Wundermittel, sondern um rationale, nach bestem Wissen gestaltete Unterrichtskonzepte’” (Even, 2003, p. 177, originally Portmann-Tselikas, 2001, p. 36) [These approaches are no magic potion, but rational and well-informed lesson plans, translation by KH].

Regarding these outcomes, the author of this thesis concludes with an optimistic but slightly sobering perspective on drama-based teaching. There is great proof that one can learn or improve the second or foreign language via drama and that it can positively affect personal and social skills such as self-confidence and group dynamics. Furthermore, implementing drama in education can create a positive learning atmosphere, and elicit enjoyment through the motivating and playful spirit of drama activities. However, as an old saying goes, “practice makes perfect”, the author of this thesis argues that drama practitioners and learners need to get accustomed to this distinctive way of learning and find suitable approaches for the respective learner group and setting in order to draw on the plentiful resources drama offers. In this respect, it is important to repeat the necessity of implementing drama in teacher training programmes to prepare future teachers for using drama techniques in their language classrooms and hence offering students a holistic, communicative, motivating and successful language learning.

To conclude, while this study provides support for using drama-based methods in a teaching context, the research conducted is not sufficient for establishing the superiority of drama-based methods over “traditional” instructions. Additionally, future
research needs to examine how drama-based methods can be used for teaching other grammatical structures. Furthermore, studying the influence of drama on learners of other second or foreign languages, such as French, Spanish or Italian for instance, still remains a research desideratum. Particularly, it requires longitudinal research including quantitative and qualitative measures in different school contexts, and learner groups to achieve more significant conclusions about the role of drama in the second or foreign language classroom.
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## Lesson Plans Drama Group

**School Type:** Sport’s grammar school (upper secondary school)  
**School Level:** 9th grade  
**Learners’ year:** 5th year of English  
**CEFR Level:** B1  
**Target Group:** 19 students (5 male, 14 female)  
**Topic of the course:** English Conditionals through drama-based methods  
**Aims of the course:**  
- getting to know the difference between Conditional I, II, III  
- understanding the difference in form and meaning  
- applying the different structures in the right way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Time (min. )</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity / Procedure</th>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Social Form</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Introducing myself and talking about the topics and aims of the lesson.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Introducing drama-based methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Activation: Bibidi Babidi Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students build a circle, one person steps in the middle and says the pattern “bibidi babidi bob” very quickly to someone standing in the circle. The addressee tries to say the end (“bob”) before the person in the middle has finished the pattern. If the person in the middle is faster, they must switch places. After some time, gesture patterns are added: “James Bond” (the addressee imitates James Bond, the people on the left and right imitate a bond girl), “Toaster” (addressee jumps like a toast, the people on the left and right form a toaster, surrounding the toast with their hands), and “Firefighter” (addressee sings “bee-doo”, the people on the left and right put out a fire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral skills</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activating, concentrating, getting in touch with drama activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Awareness-Raising Phase: Loops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are divided into two groups. Group 1 receives the first loop (“scene”) that they are going to “perform”. The teacher writes it on the blackboard:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: A: If I see her, I will tell her. B: Wait. Students are told that everyone should think of an emotion for him or herself (e.g. anger, fear, hate, love, etc.), or a situation, where the following scene could take place. They should close their eyes and imagine a situation (teacher could give prompt questions: where are you, who are you, etc.). They should take notes for their situations. One person is asked to sit on a chair in front of the class, waiting for someone to arrive who will say: “If I see her, I will tell her”, combined with his or her assigned emotion. The person on the chair reacts to this statement by answering: “wait”. After the answer, the person on the chair stands up and leaves, whereas the person standing sits on the chair and awaits the next person, who will say the same first sentence but with another emotion. The same is done with the second dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral skills Listening skills</td>
<td>Plenum Blackboard</td>
<td>Introducing the grammatical structure (Conditional I + II). Raising awareness about the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. | 5 | Context-Finding Phase: Discussion | Oral skills  
Listening skills |
|   |   | One scene that was very clear is selected and the students are asked to perform this little scene once more so that we can discuss wh-questions (who, what, where, when, why, how). Students make assumptions about the scene and define the context together. The same is done with a scene from the CII group. | Plenum  
Embedding the structure into a context and understanding the “meaning” |
| 5. | 5 | Linguistic Phase: Explanation | Plenum  
Blackboard, Conditional Chart |
|   |   | The Conditional I and II are written on the blackboard (Conditional Chart) and discussed on a cognitive level. Students copy the structure into their conditional chart. | Capturing the grammar (form, function, examples) |
| 6. | 10 | Dramatic Phase: Inventing Creative Stories | Oral skills  
Pairs  
Practicing Conditional II |
|   |   | In groups of two, one student creates a fictional story about him or herself, starting with “If I were rich, I would…” The partner asks what would happen next, using the information of the sentence before and always starting with “What would you do,…” e.g A: If I were rich, I would buy a villa. B: What would you do, if you bought a villa. A: If I bought a villa, I would invite all my friends. B: What would you do, if you invited all your friends… Remark: Remind students to correct each other if they notice a mistake. |   |
| 7. | 3 | Homework announcement | Homework sheet  
Practicing Conditional I and II |
<p>|   |   | Conditional I and II. |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (min.)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity / Procedure</th>
<th>Competence(s)</th>
<th>Social Form</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5</td>
<td>Correction Homework</td>
<td>Students read out loud the correct answers of the homework.</td>
<td>Plenum</td>
<td>Homework sheet</td>
<td>Checking understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 5</td>
<td>Awareness-Raising Phase: <em>If we see Benny... Scene 1</em></td>
<td>3 volunteers exit the class, where they receive instructions, roles, and a few lines to memorise. The three volunteers play Lisa (role 1) and Mike (role 2), who are engaged. Today they are going to a party, where they will meet Benny (role 3), Lisa’s brother. Both are in their apartment, Lisa is dressing, her husband, already dressed, sitting in front of the TV. Lisa is very excited, looks at her engagement ring all the time, puts on one dress after the other because she doesn’t know what to wear. Benny is already at the party, chatting with someone (role 4) and drinking a cocktail. After a signal, the students enter the class and perform the role play. The other students are the audience.</td>
<td>Oral skills, Listening skills</td>
<td>Plenum</td>
<td>Script scene 1 Props: - ring - dress or scarf - “cocktail” - bow tie</td>
<td>Visualizing a Conditional I scene (understanding form and meaning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scene 1:**
* Benny is at the party, chatting with different people and drinking his cocktail.
* Lisa: Oh I am so excited, I can’t wait to see Benny and tell him the news (looks at her engagement ring)
* Mike: Mhhh... We should go darling; it’s already past nine.
* Lisa: Oh, okay...
4. **3**

**Discussion Context-Finding Phase + Linguistic Phase**

After the presentation, we discuss what happened:
- Where?
- Who?
- What was the big event, Lisa was talking about? Students make assumptions and the "actors" give feedback if the assumptions are right.

Then the right conditional is formed: The following words are written on the blackboard:
(If / see / Benny / tell / him / about wedding).

Recap why conditional 1 (possible future action, they are going to see Benny): *If we see Benny, l/we will tell him about our wedding.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral skills</th>
<th>Plenum</th>
<th>Blackboard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>Forming a right Conditional I (understanding form and meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **5**

**Awareness-Raising Phase: If we see Benny... Scene 2**

3 (or 4) other students leave the class and get instructions / roles / and some short sentences they should learn by heart:

**Scene 2:**

*Benny is sitting in front of his computer in his new office in New York, working.*

**Lisa:** Oh I am so excited, I can't wait to see all of them and tell them the news *(looks at her engagement ring).* But it is sad that Benny is not here.

**Mike:** Mhhh... We should go darling, it's already past nine.

**Lisa:** Oh, okay...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral skills</th>
<th>Plenum</th>
<th>Script scene 2 Props:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>Visualizing a Conditional II scene (understanding form and meaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- New York poster
- laptop
- ring
- scarf
- bow tie
### Discussion Context-Finding Phase + Linguistic Phase

After the presentation, we discuss what happened:
- Where is Benny?
- Will Lisa tell him the news?

Then the right conditional is formed with the same words as before,
(If / see / Benny / tell / him / about wedding).

Recap why conditional 2 (unreal present condition: Benny is in New York, they won’t meet him at the party):
If I/we saw Benny, I/we would tell him about our wedding.

### Oral skills Writing skills

### Plenum Blackboard

### Forming a right Conditional II (understanding form and meaning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Awareness-Raising Phase: <em>If we see Benny...</em> Scene 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The actor of Lisa of scene 2 leaves the class again and receives the script (she is allowed to read). Another volunteer from the class is asked to “play the mother”. Both can read from the script.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scene 3:</strong> Lisa comes home from the party, very tired, puts off the shoes, brushes her teeth, when suddenly the phone rings. It’s her mother.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |    | **Mother:** Hi darling, how are you?  
|    |    | **Lisa:** I’m fine, tired, I drank a lot, actually, I was about to go to bed.  
|    |    | **Mother:** I see, (reproachfully): I just wondered why you didn’t tell your brother about your big plans, you know you shouldn’t have secrets from family members.  
|    |    | **Lisa:** (annoyed): Mooom, he was not at the party, I couldn’t have told him.  
|    |    | **FREEZE – END** |

### Oral skills Reading skills Listening skills

### Plenum Script scene 3

### Visualizing a Conditional III scene (understanding form and meaning)
| 8. | 3 | Discussion Context- Finding Phase + Linguistic Phase | After the presentation, students are asked what Lisa could say in this situation, using a conditional sentence. Together we try to form the corresponding conditional III sentence: *If I/we had seen Benny, I/we would have told him about our wedding.* The conditional chart is completed with the form and function of Conditional III. Students add it to their existing chart. | Oral skills Writing skills | Plenum Individual | Blackboard Forming a right Conditional III (understanding form and meaning) |
| 9. | 10 | Dramatic Play/ Preparation Phase: The reproachful mother: “If you had listened to me…” | Students go together in pairs and write down 5 situations that went wrong when Lisa and Mike went on their honeymoon. They imagine Lisa’s perspective (I, we) e.g. “I forgot my passport”, “Someone stole our hand luggage”. In a further step, they imagine how things could have gone differently, if they had planned differently. They write from the perspective of the reproachful mother, who says her words of wisdom. E.g. “If you had checked your luggage before, you wouldn’t have forgotten your passport”, “If you had looked more carefully at your belongings, your luggage wouldn’t have been stolen” Context: After Lisa’s and Mike’s wedding, they went to Hawaii on their honeymoon. However, a lot of things went wrong and when Lisa calls her mother to tell her about what happened, her mother tells her how things could have gone differently if they had thought or planned differently. Students get some time to practice the dialogue. | Writing skills | Pairs | Practicing conditional III |
| 10 | 10 | Presentation and reflection phase “If you had listened to me…” | The pairs role-play the characters of Lisa and Lisa’s mother. One person is Lisa, telling her mother what went wrong. After each sentence, the mother says in a reproachful way what could have gone differently. We reflect together about the applied structure and learning processes. | Oral skills | Pairs | Practicing Conditional III |
# Lesson Plans Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type:</th>
<th>Sport's grammar school (upper secondary school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level:</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners’ year:</td>
<td>5th year of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEFR Level:</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Group:</td>
<td>16 students (8 male, 8 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic of the course:</td>
<td>Conditional sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Aims of the course: | - getting to know the difference between Conditional I, II, III  
- understanding the difference in form and meaning  
- applying the structure in the right way |

## Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (min.)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity / Procedure</th>
<th>Competence(s)</th>
<th>Social Form</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Introducing myself and talking about the topics and aims of the lesson.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Teacher-centered</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. 15      | PP Introduction Conditional I | Present two pictures and discuss them. Introduce the person on the picture and give the students the following sentence “If I study, I will pass the exam”. Ask students to which picture they would put the sentence and why. Ask them to build the right sentence for the second picture. The form, meaning and functions of Conditional I and II are then written on the blackboard and students copy it into their conditional chart. | Oral skills  
Writing skills | Plenum | Picture CI + II Conditional chart | Recognizing a Conditional I and II  
Knowing/Remembering form, meaning and function of Conditional I and II |
<p>| 3. 5       | Conditional Chain: Practice Conditional I | Make a conditional I chain, starting with “If I study, I will pass the exam”. Throw the ball to a student, who has to continue the sentence, starting with the end of the conditional sentence: “If I pass the exam, I will…” | Oral skills | Plenum | Ball | Practicing Conditional I |
| 4. 8       | Thought bubbles: Introduction Conditional II | Draw a picture of a person with thought bubbles of a house, a world mop and lots of money on the blackboard. Ask students what this person is doing and thinking (e.g. “If I had a lot of money, I would buy a big house”….. They should use the target language. | Oral skills | Plenum | Blackboard | Recognizing a Conditional II |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Learning Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Cue Cards: Practice Conditional II</strong></td>
<td>Students go together in pairs and receive some cue cards. They should build second conditional sentences that fit to the picture. One student asks his partner: “What would you do if…?” The partner answers. E.g “If I had a lot of money, I…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>If time travel was possible: Practice CII</strong></td>
<td>Asks students the following questions: - Supposing you could meet anyone you wanted, who would it be? Why? What would you say to him/her? - If you could live in another place and time in history, what would it be? Then they should brainstorm in small groups some endings for these sentences. The group chooses the best one and write it down. Then the groups read out their ideas and the whole class chooses their favourites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Skills Required</th>
<th>Activity Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
<td>Cue Cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listening skills</td>
<td>Practicing Conditional II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oral skills</td>
<td>Group Plenum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>Worksheet with if-clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conditional I and II.</td>
<td>Homework sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Seymour & Popova, 2004, p. 74)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (min.)</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity / Procedure</th>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Social Form</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 5</td>
<td>Recap Conditionals</td>
<td>Recap when to use which conditional and how to form them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plenum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Repeat the grammar rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10</td>
<td>Exercises Conditional I + II</td>
<td>Students do the 3 exercises individually and we go through the answers together.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Plenum</td>
<td>Worksheet</td>
<td>Checking understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 10</td>
<td>Introduction Conditional III</td>
<td>Present the picture and ask students what happened to Lisa. Did she pass the exam? Ask them to build the right conditional sentence (maybe give them clue words: If / I / study / more / pass / the / exam). Complete the conditional chart with form, meaning and function of Conditional III</td>
<td>Oral skills Writing skills</td>
<td>Plenum</td>
<td>Individual Picture CIII Conditional Chart</td>
<td>Recognizing a Conditional III. Knowing/Remembering form, meaning and function of Conditional III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 10</td>
<td>Harry’s story</td>
<td>Students write everything down that might have happened or not have happened if Harry had not made any mistakes yesterday. (Celce-Murcia &amp; Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p. 564). They read some answers out loud.</td>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>PPP Harry’s bad day</td>
<td>Practicing Conditional III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 8</td>
<td>What would have happened differently…: Conditional III</td>
<td>Students write down 3 decisions they made in their life (choice of their sport, choice of their school, choice of their summer holiday destination). E.g. When I was 10 I decided to play volleyball because my sister already played volleyball. And I decided to go to the Sports grammar school in Dornbirn because all of my friends went there. This summer I spent ten days in Portugal. - In a second step they write down how it could have gone differently: E.g. If I had not decided to play volleyball when I was ten years old, I would have probably started playing basketball, because I love that sport. If I hadn’t gone to the grammar school in</td>
<td>Writing skills Oral skills</td>
<td>Individual Plenum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Practicing Conditional III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lustenau. I wouldn't have met my best friend and if I hadn't gone to Portugal this summer, I would have probably gone to Italy. Some students are asked to read their story out loud.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Discussion of some sentences (PP)</td>
<td>Show students some sentences on the PP and discuss it together. Ask them to form a right conditional sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conditional Song</td>
<td>Student can listen to different songs where conditionals occur. They are asked which song they prefer and if they know other songs with conditionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Questionnaire Language Background

Fülle den Fragebogen in den dafür vorgesehenen Linien aus.

1. Schreib dein Kennwort hin, das du erhalten hast:

____________________________________

2. Geschlecht: O Männlich O Weiblich

3. Alter: _______

4. Nationalität: _________________________

5.1 Ist Deutsch deine Muttersprache?
   O Ja O Nein

5.2 Falls nein, welche dann? Notiere deine Sprache.

5.3 Falls du zweisprachig oder mehrsprachig aufgewachsen bist, notiere die Sprachen hier. Falls du denkst, dass du eine der Sprachen etwas besser beherrschst, markiere dies mit einem Sternchen.

6. Seit wie vielen Jahren lernst du Englisch? Gib deine Lernjahre an (Bsp: 5 Jahre)

7.1 Kreuze an: Hast du andere Sprachen gelernt außer Deutsch und Englisch?
   O Ja O Nein

7.2 Falls ja, welche? Notiere die Sprache(n) und gib die Lernjahre an (Bsp: Spanisch: 2 Jahre in der Schule)

Herzlichen Dank für deine Mitarbeit!
# Appendix C: Course Plan

## Week 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Control Group Pre-Test + linguistic background</th>
<th>Drama Group Pre-Test + linguistic background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 25.09.17</td>
<td>07:55-8:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 26.09.17</td>
<td>08:45-9:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 27.09.17</td>
<td>09:45-10:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 28.09.17</td>
<td>10:35-11:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 29.09.17</td>
<td>11:35-12:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:25-13:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Week 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</th>
<th>Drama Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 02.10.17</td>
<td>07:55-8:45</td>
<td>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 03.10.17</td>
<td>08:45-9:35</td>
<td>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 04.10.17</td>
<td>09:45-10:35</td>
<td>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 05.10.17</td>
<td>10:35-11:25</td>
<td>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 06.10.17</td>
<td>11:35-12:25</td>
<td>Control Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:25-13:15</td>
<td>Drama Group Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:15-14:05</td>
<td>Drama Group Post-Test Questionnaire drama-based teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:05-14:55</td>
<td>Drama Group Conditional I+II+III (external observation reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix D: Pre-Test

Heute möchte ich sehen, wie gut du die Conditionals schon beherrschst.
Der folgende Test besteht aus drei Teilen. Du hast 30 Minuten Zeit, um diesen Test auszufüllen. Viel Erfolg!

1. Choose the right form from the options below (1–13) and tick the right answer. Example (0) has been done for you.

0. If ……………………. my passport, I’ll be in trouble.
   a) I lose ☐        b) I’ll lose ☐        c) I lost ☐

1. I’m not tired enough to go to bed. If I ……………………. to bed now, I wouldn’t sleep.
   a) go ☐           b) went ☐           c) would go ☐

2. If I were rich, ……………………. a yacht.
   a) I’ll have ☐    b) I had ☐         c) I would have ☐

3. The view was wonderful. If ……………………. a camera with me, I would have taken some photographs.
   a) I had had ☐    b) I would have ☐    c) I would have had ☐

4. Kate’s got two young children and a part-time job. She wouldn’t be able to work if her mother ……………………. the children for her.
   a) didn’t look after ☐   b) doesn’t look after ☐   c) hadn’t looked after ☐

5. Could you look for some more chairs, please? If more people arrive later, we ……………………. enough.
   a) wouldn’t have ☐    b) won’t have ☐    c) don’t have ☐

6. If you ……………………. someone famous that you really admire, what would you say?
   a) meet ☐          b) met ☐            c) had met ☐

7. Our hotel room was nice, but it would have been better if it ……………………. a balcony
   a) would have ☐    b) had had ☐        c) has ☐

8. If I ……………………. Helen what I really think of her boyfriend, she would never speak to me again.
   a) tell ☐           b) would tell ☐      c) told ☐

9. I’m afraid I didn’t notice Nicola at the party. Of course, I would have seen her if ……………………. my glasses, but I don’t often wear them.
   a) I would have been wearing ☐     b) I had been wearing ☐     c) I hadn’t been wearing ☐
10. Would you have taken the job if they …………………… it to you?
   a) had offered □       b) would have offered □       c) offered □

11. If you …………………… this question correctly, you would have passed the exam.
   a) answered □       b) had answered □       c) answer □

12. The government …………………… lost the election if they hadn’t put taxes up.
   a) won’t have □       b) hadn’t □       c) wouldn’t have □

13. Where would you go if you …………………… a holiday next year?
   a) will have □       b) have □       c) had □

2. Adam is a music student. He rents a room from Mr Day. Put in the correct forms (1–10). Example (0) has been done for you.

   Mr Day: Can’t stop that trumpet? You’re making an awful noise.
   Adam: Well, if (0) I don’t practise (I / not practice), I won’t pass my exam.
   Mr Day: But why at night? It’s half past twelve.
   If (1) ………………………………………………………… (you / play)
   it in the daytime, (2) ………………………………………………………… (I / not / hear)
you because I’d be at work.
   If (3) ………………………………………………………… (you / tell) me about this trumpet when you first came here,
   (4) ………………………………………………………… (I / not / let)
you have the room.
   I’m afraid it’s becoming a nuisance (Plage). If (5)
   ………………………………………………………… (you / not / play) so loud, (6)
   ………………………………………………………… (it / not / be) so bad.
   Adam: I’m sorry, but you can’t play a trumpet quietly.
   Mr Day: If (7) ………………………………………………………… (I / realize)
a year ago what you were going to do, then (8) ………………………………………………………… (I / throw)
you out long ago. If (9) ………………………………………………………… (you / go) on making this noise at night, (10) ………………………………………………………… (I / have)
to complain to your college.
3. What might you say in these situations? Complete the beginnings of the conditional sentences (If...), using the words given in the sentences (1–7). Example (0) has been done for you.

0. You think Emma should book a seat on the train. The alternative is having to stand

If Emma doesn’t book a seat on the train, she’ll have to stand.

1. You didn’t know how unpopular Jason was when you invited him to her party.

If you

2. Warn your friend not to put too many tins into the plastic bag or it’ll break.

If you

3. In a bookshop yesterday Daniel saw a book he really wanted. The only problem was that he didn’t have any money.

If Daniel

4. You don’t have a pen, so you can’t write down the address.

If I

5. On Sunday the guests had to have their lunch inside. Unfortunately it wasn’t warm enough to have it outside.

If it

6. You can’t play tennis because your back is aching.

If my back

7. Nick likes ice hockey, but he didn’t have a ticket of the game last week, so unfortunately he wasn’t able to get in.

If Nick

Sources: Eastwood, 2006; Foley & Hall, 2012; Murphy, 2004
Persönliche Einschätzung deiner Kenntnisse zu den Conditionals

1. Die Struktur **Conditional 1**, z.B. „If I lose my passport, I’ll be in trouble“, verstehe ich (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 5=schlecht)
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. Die Struktur **Conditional 2**, z.B. „If I were you, I would ask a lawyer for some advice“, verstehe ich (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 5=schlecht)
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

3. Die Struktur **Conditional 3**, z.B. „If Johnson had played, we would have won the match“, verstehe ich (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 5=schlecht)
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Appendix E: Questionnaire on Drama-based Methods

Der folgende Fragebogen ist Teil meiner Diplomarbeit über Theatermethoden im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Ich versuche herauszufinden, ob Theatermethoden ein effektives didaktisches Werkzeug zum Lehren und Lernen von Fremdsprache bzw. in diesem Fall eines Grammatikkapitels sind. Die Auswertung erfolgt anonym, daher bitte ich dich die Befragung gewissenhaft und wahrheitsgemäß auszufüllen.

Schreib deine Kennzahl hin, die du erhalten hast:

**Fragen zum Thema Theatermethoden:**

4. Hast du das Gefühl, dass du die Conditionals mit dieser Methode verstanden hast? (kreuze an. 1=sehr / 6=gar nicht)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Glaubst du, dass du die Conditionals mit einer anderen Methode besser gelernt hättest? (kreuze an. 1=sehr / 6=gar nicht)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Wie sehr hast du in folgenden Bereichen durch die Theatermethoden dazugelernt? (kreuze an)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sehr gut</th>
<th>gut</th>
<th>eher gut</th>
<th>eher schlecht</th>
<th>schlecht</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sprechen, Sprachflüssigkeit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Aussprache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Schreiben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Lesen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Hörverstehen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Wortschatz / Vokabeln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Grammatik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Wie sehr stimmst du folgenden Aussagen zu? (kreuze an)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatermethoden sind...</th>
<th>stimme stark zu</th>
<th>stimme zu</th>
<th>stimme eher zu</th>
<th>lehne eher ab</th>
<th>lehne ab</th>
<th>lehne stark ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ... spaßig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ...motivierend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ... ein wertvoller Beitrag für den Fremdsprachenunterricht.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ... eine Zeitverschwendung.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ... für sehr viele SchülerInnen unpassend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatermethoden fördern...</th>
<th>stimme stark zu</th>
<th>stimme zu</th>
<th>stimme eher zu</th>
<th>lehne eher ab</th>
<th>lehne ab</th>
<th>lehne stark ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. das Selbstvertrauen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Erkennst du für dich Vorteile von Theatermethoden?
   Ja □ Nein □
   Wenn ja, welche?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

9. Erkennst du für dich Nachteile von Theatermethoden?
   Ja □ Nein □
   Wenn ja, welche?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

10. Wie hast du dich während diesen 3 Unterrichtseinheiten gefühlt (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 6=sehr schlecht)
    1   2   3   4   5   6

11. Wie war für dich die Stimmung in der Klasse? (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 6=sehr schlecht)
    1   2   3   4   5   6

12. Könntest du dir vorstellen, dass Theatermethoden öfters in deinem Fremdsprachenunterricht eingesetzt werden? (kreuze an. 1=sehr gut / 6=gar nicht)
    1   2   3   4   5   6

    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________

    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________

   **DANKE für deine Teilnahme!**
## Appendix F: External Observation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datum: _____ Klasse: _______ Anzahl SchülerInnen: _______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A. SchülerInnen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Etwas</th>
<th>Nein</th>
<th>Genauere Beschreibung / Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Machen die SuS mit, sind sie motiviert?

Wie ist die Interaktion in der Klasse?

Gibt es irgendwelche Auffälligkeiten? (z.B. zum Thema Redeflüssigkeit, Aufmerksamkeit, etc.)

**Weitere Beobachtungen und Kommentare:**

### B. Lehrperson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Etwas</th>
<th>Nein</th>
<th>Genauere Beschreibung / Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Werden die Inhalte und Anweisungen klar und verständlich kommuniziert?

Sind die Handlungsabläufe stimmig?

**Weitere Beobachtungen und Kommentare:**

### C. Methoden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Etwas</th>
<th>Nein</th>
<th>Genauere Beschreibung / Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sind die Methoden und deren Ziele stimmig?

Welchen Effekt haben die eingesetzten Methoden?

**Weitere Beobachtungen und Kommentare:**
Eidesstattliche Erklärung

Ich erkläre hiermit an Eides statt durch meine eigenhändige Unterschrift, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbständig verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel verwendet habe. Alle Stellen, die wörtlich oder inhaltlich den angegebenen Quellen entnommen wurden, sind als solche kenntlich gemacht.

Die vorliegende Arbeit wurde bisher in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form noch nicht als Magister-/Master-/Diplomarbeit/Dissertation eingereicht.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
Datum                                         Unterschrift