THE JOURNAL OF DRAMA AND THEATRE EDUCATION IN ASIA
THEMED ISSUE: DRAMA AND LANGUAGES

ISSUE EDITORS: MURIEL YUEN-FUN LAW AND DORA LAI-WA PRATLEY

亞洲戲劇教育學刊
專題：戲劇與語文

專題編輯：羅婉芬、杜麗華

The Journal of Drama and Theatre Education in Asia
亞洲戲劇教育學刊

Volume 8
第八卷

Themed Issue: Drama and Languages
專題：戲劇與語文

December 2018

2018年12月

Hong Kong Drama/Theatre and Education Forum

香港教育劇場論壇

The Journal of Drama and Theatre Education in Asia
Vol.8, December 2018, 113-137

The Integration of Drama Education in the Subject of Modern Greek Language in Greek Primary Education

Simos Papadopoulos
Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini

Abstract

The use of dramatic conventions for educational purposes has a long history. However, in the Greek educational system it is only during the last decade that a clear-cut effort has been actually made to incorporate dramatic methods into the teaching of various subjects and in particular into the subject of language. The present study examines ways and approaches of incorporating dramatic methods into the subject of language in the elementary education in Greece. All student activities that are included in school books and involved elements of dramatic expression have been identified and analyzed. Analysis results have shown that despite the definite reference in the curriculum to the use of dramatic methods in the subject of language, these methods are rather few, fragmentary and quite simplistic activities of bodily expression that do not incorporate the methodical and inquiry process necessary for the effective and complete dramatic expression of students. Relevant suggestions of incorporating more dramatic methods are discussed at the end.

Keywords: drama education, primary education

Email: sypapado@eled.duth.gr

Language in Primary Education

Language, as a means of thought, interpretation and comprehension of the world, provides an outlet for expression and communication. In this respect, language teaching is considered of the highest priority.

The interactive communicative approach perceives linguistic competence (knowledge of grammar and syntax) as a means to develop communicative competence (Anderson, 2012; Widdowson, 1990). From this perspective, it lays emphasis on: (a) the application of language as communicative act; (b) the use of oral language (Anderson, 2012); (c) the transactional and affective power of speech (Widdowson, 1990); (d) the involvement in authentic, unpredictable situations (Anderson, 2012; Even, 2008); (e) the comprehension through the multiplicity of visual angles in the group (Hardie, 2007); (f) the co-inquiring learning through observation, reflective dialogue and presentation of personal and collective attitudes and perceptions (Short, Harste, & Burke, 1996); (g) the sociocultural and geographical environment (Anderson & Chung, 2010; Brash & Warnecke, 2009); (h) the appropriateness of speech in every social and communicative circumstance (Cunico, 2005; Kempe, 2003); (i) the study of social conditions and the context as wider linguistic units of the sentence (Fillmore, 2006); (k) the language acquisition through correction, revision and improvement (Charalampopoulos & Chatzisavvidis, 1997); (l) the learning process of social interaction through self-reliance (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997; Schiffler, 1991); (m) the interests, the needs, the knowledge and the existing experience (Montgomerie & Ferguson, 1999); (n) the functioning of the group and the co-inquiring and facilitating role of the teacher (Brash & Warnecke, 2009; Hardie, 2007); and (o) the assessment of students' learning and the teaching instruments of the teachers (Mitsis, 1999; Silvern, Taylor, Williamson, Surbeck & Kelley, 1986).

In Greek primary school in the subject of language, the teaching methodology, as prescribed by the curriculum, aims in the growth of communication competence, that is to say language fluency. Therefore, in order to make students fluent speakers of their native language, emphasis

should be given to the organization of interactive activities in various social and communicative situations.

Drama Education: Its Position in Modern Language Teaching Methodology

In the methodological context of the application of communicative approach to language teaching, emphasis is placed on using authentic material and making the best of participatory processes, including role-playing (in different social environments and different social roles) with feedback from the teacher (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Drama education seems to acquire a more substantial role in the context of modern language teaching (Papadopoulos, 2004), based on what has been mentioned. The "material" of drama education can be described as multimodal since it is, on occasion, a form of cultural product, which contains and combines more than one semiotic modes, such as written and spoken word, images, photography, designs-sketches, layouts, music, sound, rhythm, gestures (Jensen, 2008; Zhu, 2007).

The student comprehends text messages (from the school textbook or a film, graffiti, an advertisement, etc), which are structured with language (written and oral), images, kinesthetic actions (gestures, movements, poses, handling objects). The multiple note of the same message allows the development of a multimodal rhetoric so that *with the increase of redundancy in speech and image*, both in verbal and non-verbal elements, its transmission to be more secure (Koutsousimou-Tsinoglou, 2000). Drama education can contribute effectively in the conquest of this literacy as it frames the communication circumstance for the configuration of which it is used and at the same time displays it in the broader social environment by performing representational, interpersonal and textual functions (Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

The student progresses from a traditional reader to a participating person that acts, since multimodal texts require a different approach: reading, viewing, doing.

Language teaching can be supported efficiently by the methods and conventions employed by the Theatre Pedagogy (Anderson, 2012; Mages 2008), which establishes each existing fictional environment from a social or imaginary reality. David Booth (1994) considers language "the heart of the drama process" and stresses that "drama may be the most appropriate means of providing the types of speaking/listening situations that good teaching now demands from teachers" (p. 91). These are provided for the production of speech - communicative, emotional and informative - in a theatrical role and out of role suitable for the various fictional-social-communicative circumstances. Thus, as children assume different identities in a given situation, they are able to reach both the scientific as well as the poetic-aesthetic type of language. The elements of dramatic form—dramatic context, role, focus, dramatic tension, time, space, expressive means, symbols (O'Toole, 1992)—and the techniques of dramatic text—dialogue, action, plot, conflicts, circumstances, characters, and dramatic conventions (Neelands, 1984; Neelands & Goode, 1990)—contribute towards the aforementioned direction. Dramatic conventions include categories: (a) virtual, expressive representation (Still image, Role on the wall, Images from the life); (b) reflective inquiry (Detection of thought and social situation, Written texts, Reading and writing in a role, Collective character, Perspective, and Conflicting thoughts or advice); (c) research (Monitoring, Chair of revelations, Interview, Mantle of the Expert); (d) improvisations (Improvisation, Forum Theatre, Role play, Meeting, and Narration) (Butler-Kisber, Li, Clandinin, & Markus, 2007); (e) symbolic representation (Signs, Analogy and Ritual); and (f) mask and pantomime theatre (Mask and Pantomime) (McCaslin, 1999). Also, the convention "Teacher in role" and questions from both the teacher and the children in theatrical role constitute a fertile dialectical process that fosters creativity of thought and speech in children (Morgan & Saxton, 1988).

Verbal expressions of thoughts and feelings such as narration, reference, description, instructions, counseling, negotiation, justification, persuasion, argumentation, assessment with the formulation of judgment and conclusions, dilemmatic position, self-reflection, formulation of opinions, questions, admiration, etc. ensure production of and exposure to meaningful speech in stories and representational situations (Booth, 1994); those situations are unique in their

non-repeatability and the specific mental and emotional load given by the roles, which evolve as both speakers and listeners (Kempe, 2003; Littlewood, 1983) in complex linguistic and para-linguistic environments, where discourse together with physical movement and stillness, the gestural approach and intonation (McGregor, Tate & Robinson, 1977; Osmond, 2007) develop the communicative, social, dialectic and political skill of the participants.

Several studies have shown the positive influence of drama as a learning method in children's language development. Wagner (1998) states that educational drama has a positive effect on language in various forms, such as development and improvement of listening, the organization and development of stories, the heuristic function of language, the oral communication and the increasing complexity of syntax and semantics. Another research (Fleming, Merrell & Tymms, 2004) demonstrated the positive impact of the dramatic expression, which pupils in the first four grades of primary school experienced, regarding their self-understanding and linguistic expression.

The introduction of theatre education in Greek primary schools takes place in 1990 accompanied by a relevant teacher's book. Nonetheless the introduction of theatrical methods and techniques in the curriculum for the teaching of Language and Literature does not follow a specific structured model. The only reference that is being made begins with the 2003 curriculum (GPI, 2003), which makes general reference to the use of dramatization, theatrical play, theatrical dialogues and school theatre, by the teachers of the subject of language, without however giving them special instructions and feedback.

Research Questions

In the current curricula of Language and Literature (GPI, 2003), which formed the basis for the writing of primary school language textbooks, it is mentioned that theatrical techniques can be used in the learning process of the linguistic cognitive subject to achieve various objectives.

In particular, among others, theatrical techniques are intended to accommodate:

- Experiential engagement in various forms of verbal communication (dramatization, theatrical game, role-playing);
- Familiarization with expressive ways and vocabulary, use of varied types of texts, processing and conversion of narrative and theatrical text, development of dialogue and narrative skills as well as alternative ways of expression depending on the circumstance of communication, by assuming roles from everyday life and using codes for dramatized presentation.

This research study aims to highlight the way of integrating Drama education in the cognitive subject of Language in Primary Education in Greece, as it appears in the corresponding student textbooks. What types of theatrical actions are proposed, what kind of interconnection is there with the cognitive linguistic objectives, in what presenting context and in what form of theatrical representation?

In particular, we addressed the questions:

- What types of drama activities are proposed to the students by the school textbooks?
- In which grades and with what frequency in each grade?
- What learning objectives are these actions seeking to meet?
- What type - presenting or workshop - are the activities?
- How do they involve the groups of students and the teacher?
- What provision do students have for the visual points?
- What expressive means do they utilize?
- Where is their content derived from?

Method

In order to identify the responses to the above research questions, the technique of content

analysis was used, in all schoolbooks for the subject of language in all six grades of primary school. It concerns 17 official textbooks, which are from School Book Publishing Organization of the Ministry of Education (2 for the first and second grades and 3 for grades third to sixth), 12 workbooks and 3 literature anthologies (1 for the first two grades, 1 for the next two grades and 1 for the last two grades). The above books comprise the total amount of students' schoolbooks for the language course in all six grades of primary school.

The first step was to identify all the proposed activities or questions contained in all books, which were based either on the theatrical action context or included some element of stage action and experiential communication that could shape a theatrical action context for students (For example: "Perform a dialogue with your parents so as to convince them to recycle paper, too." or "You are travelling with your senses in the poem. What do you hear? What do you touch? You are talking loud.") Those activities were then indexed and analyzed according to the categories shown in Table 1, suggesting the way they were integrated in the language subject as actions of theatrical reference:

Table 1 *Categories of analysis*

Categories	Observed indicators
1. Main objective of the activity	a) linguistic b) dramatic c) mixed
2. Main cognitive objective in the context of the subject of language	a) oral language b) grammar/syntax c) reading comprehension d) communication e) writing

Categories	Observed indicators
3. Kinds of drama action	a) dramatization b) body expression c) improvisation d) writing workshop e) preparation actions f) assuming roles
4. Types of drama action	a) workshop b) presenting d) communication
5. Expressive means of drama action	a) body language b) speech c) body language and speech
6. Use of visual points	a) yes b) no
7. Nature of students' involvement	a) self-acting b) active c) passive
8. Students' group proposed structure	a) individually b) in pairs c) small groups d) whole classroom
9. Participation of the teacher	a) yes b) no
10. Content source of the drama action	a) given text b) story c) daily experience d) stimulus e) instructions
11. Main dramatic abilities cultivated	a) textual b) presenting c) both forms d) none

1. The main objective of the activity is: (a) linguistic; aims, namely, directly at the cultivation of language competence through the use of story in stage environment; (b) dramatic, if it aims directly at the development of dramatic competence, especially in the cultivation of body, vocal and verbal expression and communication; (c) mixed, when it aims at the development of both linguistic and dramatic competence.

2. The main cognitive objective in the context of the subject of language is: (a) oral language: the production of oral language in the communicative competence context; (b) grammar/syntax: engagement and comprehension of morphosyntactic phenomena in the Greek language; (c) reading comprehension: comprehension and processing of written texts; (d) communication: production of speaking and writing in a communicative context; (e) writing: production of written texts.

3. The kinds of drama action are: (a) dramatization: scenic representation of a preexisting written text; (b) body expression: using the body as an expressive means in each scenic representation; (c) improvisation: improvised scenic representation of story without the condition of a preexisting written text; (d) writing workshop: collaborative creation of drama text in group environment; (e) preparation actions: impromptu, inquiring activities of scenic representations or even writing; (f) assuming roles: inquiry and scenic representation of each drama role.

4. The types of drama action are: (a) workshop: inquiry of drama roles and circumstances without the presence of audience; (b) presenting: staging a drama action with the presence of audience.

5. The expressive means of drama action are: (a) body language, when the body constitutes the main means of dramatic expression and communication; (b) speech, when speech constitutes the main means of dramatic expression and communication; (c) body language and speech, when both body and speech constitute major means of dramatic expression and communication.

6. Use of visual points: Scenic configuration of space, use of stage instruments, costumes, make-up, music, sounds, lighting, suitable logistical and digital infrastructure.

7. The nature of students' involvement: (a) self-acting: the participants take initiatives; (b) active: active involvement of participants; (c) passive: assigning tasks to participants without requiring their active engagement.

8. Students' group proposed structure: (a) individually: undertaking individual action; (b) in pairs: undertaking action in pairs; (c) small groups: undertaking action in small groups; (d) whole classroom: undertaking action with the whole classroom.

9. Participation of the teacher: Active engagement of the teacher either in role or as drama animator or not.

10. Content source of the drama action: (a) given text: pre-existing text that constitutes the basis for the development of action; (b) story: fiction that constitutes the basis for the development of action; (c) daily experience: everyday social experience of the participants, which constitutes the basis for the development of action; (d) stimulus: verbal, audio-visual or other material for the mobilization of the participants' mood for action; (e) instructions: instructions that the drama animator gives for the development of action.

11. Main dramatic abilities cultivated: (a) textual: writing competence cultivated in the writing workshop; (b) presenting: expressive competence cultivated on stage during representational acts; (c) both forms; (d) none.

The above categories emerged from the theoretical model of the inclusion of dramatic techniques in various school teaching subjects, as described and analyzed by Papadopoulos (2004 & 2010), aiming at the complete and effective use of the theatrical activities in the teaching-learning framework of other subjects. These categories control the type and form of the applied technique both in relation to the teaching objectives and the requirements of dramatic art.

The author and researcher of this study, who, in addition to his academic relation with

the course of theatrical education, has a twelve years professional experience as a teacher of the language subject in various classes of primary school, initially made coding. Instructions in schoolbooks addressed to students were located and instructions for teachers were also used in the respective Ministry manuals. To ensure that no mistakes have been made in the entire process and to check results reliability, coding was also requested by an educator who had had 21 years of service in all primary school classes and had taught language schoolbooks. In identifying the theatrical activities and coding of most categories there was an absolute agreement between the two. Nonetheless, there were four cases (in three activities on the category: *expressive means of drama action* and one activity on the category: *content source of the drama action*) in which there was disagreement. In these cases, the investigator asked for the opinion of five more experienced teachers and proceeded with coding based on their responses.

Results

Grade and Type of School Textbook

In all textbooks of the six grades, a total of 55 proposed activities were found as seen in Table 2. From those, 37 (67%) were identified in the books of Language and 18 (33%) in Literature Anthologies. As for the books of Language, in the First and Second grades 1 activity was identified (2%), in the Third 16 activities (29%), in the Fourth 11 (20%), in the Fifth 3 activities (6%), and in the Sixth 5 activities (9%). In Anthology for the First and Second grades there were 5 activities (9%), in Anthology for the Third and the Fourth there were 8 activities (15%) and in Anthology for the Fifth and the Sixth grades there were 5 activities (9%).

Table 2 *Distribution of theatrical activities per class*

Grade	Number of activities
1st	1
2nd	1
3rd	16
4th	11
5th	3
6th	5
Anthology 1st-2nd	5
Anthology 3rd-4th	8
Anthology 5th-6th	5
Total	55

Objectives of the Activities

All the activities were indexed in respect of three categories of analysis regarding their objectives: (a) if the main target is of theatrical or linguistic nature; (b) what type of cognitive-linguistic objective each action serves; and (c) what type of dramatic skills - textual or presenting - they cultivate. Table 2 shows the results.

In 11 out of 55 actions (20%), the objective is mainly linguistic, in 27 (49%) the objective is mainly of dramatic expression, while in the remaining 17 (31%) activities the objective is mixed: both dramatic expression and cultivation of some linguistic phenomenon, without favoring either one in particular.

However, all these activities emanate from the need to meet some cognitive objective concerning the language subject: In 6 (11%) activities the cognitive objective concerns the cultivation of oral expression, in 2 (4%) the objective is the practice of a particular grammatical

phenomenon, in 10 (18%) activities the objective is reading comprehension, 22 (40%) activities aim at the cultivation of oral language in given communication contexts, while in 15 (27%) activities the objective is the production of written language.

Finally, in 15 (27%) activities students practice mainly textual dramatic skills, in 30 (55%) they practice presenting skills, in 9 (16%) both types of skills, while in one action they do not practice any of the two types.

Table 3 *Frequencies of dimensions observed in each category*

Category							Total
Main objective	Linguistic 11	Dramatic 27	Mixed 17				55
Cognitive objective	Oral language 6	Grammar/syntax 2	Reading 10	Communication 22	Written language 22		55
Drama skills	Textual 15	Presenting 30	None 30	Both 9			55
Kinds of activities	Dramatization 16	Body expression 11	Improvisation 16	Writing workshop 16	Task preparation 3	Assuming roles 3	55
Types of activities	Workshop 39	Presenting 16					55
Expressive means	Body language 13	Speech 24	Both 18				55
Visual points	No 48	Yes 7					55
Engagement	Self-action 37	Active 37	Passive 1				55
Group structure	Individual 11	Pair 10	Small group 27	Whole class 7			55
Teacher's role	No 54	Yes 1					55
Contents	Given text 33	Story 7	Everyday experience 1	Stimulus 2	Instruction 1		55

Kinds and Types of Activities

16 from them (29%) were simple dramatizations, 11 (20%) were body expression activities, 16 (29%) were improvisations, 5 (9%) were writing workshops, 4 (7%) were task preparation activities and 3 (6%) were activities of assuming roles. Regarding the types of the activities, 39 (71%) were workshops and the remaining 16 (29%) were presenting actions.

Expressive Means and Visual Points

Table 3 shows that 13 (24%) of the activities require the students' extensive or exclusive use of body language during dramatic expression, 24 (44%) activities ask students to express themselves theatrically using speech, while in the remaining 18 (33%) activities the students are asked to use equally body language and speech. In 48 (87%) activities there are no visual points proposed or provided, while only in 7 (13%) actions there are similar provisions.

Form of Engagement, Group structure

Table 3 displays that 37 (67%) activities student participation requires self-action, 17 (31%) activities require the students' active participation and only in 1 (2%) activity the participation is passive. As to the structure of the groups, 11 (20%) are individual actions, in 10 (18%) teaming up in pairs is proposed, in 27 (49%) actions cooperation in small groups is proposed, while there are 7 (13%) activities which engage the whole class in common action. As to the participation of the teacher, only 1 (2%) activity is provided for his/her participation in the theatrical event.

Activities Content

Finally, Table 3 presents how the source of the activities content was analyzed, as well as the basic aiming of action with regard to whether it practices textual or presenting skills. In 33 (60%) activities there is a given text which the students are asked to dramatize, in 7 (13%) activities the

source of content is story, as the students are asked to create the content using their imagination, in 12 (22%) actions it is urged that students make use of their everyday experiences, in 2 (4%) actions the content is manufactured by an initial stimulus, while in 1 (2%) activity the students are called to give instructions.

Language – Literature

As presented above, 37 out of 55 activities were found in Language textbooks and the remaining 18 in Literature Anthologies. We thus proceeded to examine any differentiations between the actions proposed by the Language and those proposed by the Anthologies regarding the remaining categories of analysis-variables. The cross-checking of the variables (Pearson Chi-Square) showed a statistically significant correlation of the type of book (Language or Literature) with the desired objectives of each activity ($x^2 = 7.09$, $p < 0.05$), the type of each activity ($x^2 = 15.38$, $p < 0.005$), the expressive means ($x^2 = 7.10$, $p < 0.05$) and the dramatic skills that students cultivate ($x^2 = 9.79$, $p < 0.05$).

Further investigation of the findings in the cross tables produced the following remarks in particular: The objective of the activities included in Language books is mainly linguistic-cognitive, while in Anthologies the objective is mainly dramatic. Additionally, the actions in Language books are primarily improvisations and bodily expression activities, while in Literature they are mainly dramatizations. As for the expressive means, the actions of the Language books mainly require the use of speech, while those of the Anthologies require the use of both body language and speech. Finally, the activities of the Language books mainly cultivate textual dramatic skills, while the actions of the Anthologies are intended to practice both presenting and textual skills.

Learning Objectives of the Activities

In order to examine whether the targeting of activities is associated with other categories of

analysis, a cross-checking of the findings with the Pearson Chi-Square control took place. As a result, statistically significant correlations were found of both the central objective of the action (dramatic or linguistic) with the kind of action ($x^2 = 34.70$, $p < 0.001$), the expressive means ($x^2 = 18.42$, $p = 0.001$) and the dramatic skills ($x^2 = 33.91$, $p < 0.001$) as well as the specific target language with the same three variables mentioned above (respectively: $x^2 = 44.02$ with $p = 0.001$, $x^2 = 19.12$ with $p < 0.05$ and $x^2 = 28.55$ with $p = 0.005$).

In particular, the study of the cross tables showed the following: Activities having a linguistic main objective are improvisations and writing workshops, require the use of speech as expressive means and cultivate textual theatrical skills, while those having a theatrical objective are mainly dramatizations, require the use of both body language and speech and cultivate presenting skills. Also, the improvisations were mainly used for actions aiming at oral expression and grammar while dramatizations for actions aiming at reading comprehension and writing. As regards the means of expression, actions aiming at reading comprehension and communication mainly require the use of body language and cultivate presenting dramatic skills, while those practicing oral and written expression require the use of speech and cultivate mainly textual skills.

Analysis of Findings

As highlighted in the results, language books utilize mostly improvisations and simple body expression activities while Anthologies mainly utilize dramatizations. However, it is evident on the one hand an extensive lack of relative activities in the books of First and Second grades, while on the other hand a total lack of any provision for the use of visual points. The activities in both cases adopt an unsophisticated type of improvisation and dramatization in which theatrical expression and communication are not subject to rules of methodical inquiring of re-enacted situations. Indeed, the term dramatization does not refer to models with specific description and reference in relative bibliography. Additionally, the absence of theatrical techniques in the first two grades deprives the possibility of creative expression and use of imagination which is

intensively developed at that age. The use of dramatic techniques in pre-school education is considered to be of the utmost importance as far as children's linguistic and communicative development are concerned (Connolly & Doyle, 1984; Davidson, 1996).

Thus, in the two types of dramatic expression, what students are asked, based on the teacher and student books, is the simple use of their expressive means (body, voice, speech), without being given any specific instructions concerning the development of scenic action or the chance to prepare and use additional theatrical techniques. Moreover, teachers are not systematically trained in the application of specific dramatic methods and techniques that would enable them to plan and carry out appropriate dramatic environments by taking into consideration dramatic, pedagogic and artistic criteria for the development of dramatic experience (Giannouli, 2016).

Based on the above observations, the limited use of dramatic methods (improvisations, dramatizations, etc.) makes the results unsafe in terms of the linguistic and theatrical objectives. For example, the choice of improvisation or dramatization, in cases where the teacher is not supposed to use other techniques and integrate them in a context of inquiry, does not ensure the basic requirement of a methodical planning which would guarantee the achievement of the objectives. In such conditions, students re-enact snapshots and situations in a spontaneous and often verbose way. It is at that point that they need guidance from the teacher, who with specific techniques each time should be able to control and meet the objectives, by directing the scenic action and making sense out of it (Grammatas, 1997).

The use of speech and textual skills is given priority in creating activities of grammar and writing that share a linguistic objective, as opposed to body expression and the scenic-presenting skills used to develop activities of reading comprehension and communication that share a theatrical objective. Also, body as an expressive means is the basis for the students' presenting skills, while speech is the basis for the textual. Although the above priorities are a given, they do not ensure, as mentioned elsewhere, the qualitative organization of planning, development and evaluation of the functions of body and speech, since both expressive means are not in effect

inquired in an effective way with the use of specific theatrical and textual techniques (Booth, 1994; Walker, 1999).

Based on speech are also the workshop activities, unlike the presenting activities that require both the use of speech and body language, which allows us to conclude that any potential workshop activities would use speech as a means of practice. So, although they do not aim at any form of performance, they do not cultivate body language, which is a fundamental part of oral expression and brings out the qualitative characteristics of speech (Booth, 1994; Kempe, 2003). At the same time, a total lack of provision for the organized use of textual techniques in a writing workshop, cannot guarantee that, even when speech is given priority, it is still developed in dramatically valid ways (Grammatas, 2003).

The activities in student books and workbooks are based on speech, while in Anthologies both on speech and body language. Moreover, individual activities are based mainly on speech, while group activities do not have a specific orientation. This particular reality leads to the conclusion that, on the one hand the activities are eminently verbal without the necessary use of specialized techniques to organize a writing workshop as well as verbal improvisations and dramatizations, while on the other hand there is an evident difficulty of accepting body language as a primary source of individual action.

Discussion – Educational Implications

The development of communicative competence is the main purpose of language teaching so that students can become fluent speakers of their mother language. The practice of language through a variety of social and communicative circumstances is necessary to include speech production through exchange of meanings. In this environment, students as speakers should realize the conditions of communication, their social and communicative purpose, the needs of the audience, while as listeners they should take into consideration the speakers' intentions,

the attitudes and perceptions and the wider sociocultural environment (Littlewood, 1983; Sam, 1990).

To achieve the above goals it is required to give priority to:

a) The bodily and expressive potential of speakers and listeners and in particular, gestures, body posture and movement, facial expression, appropriateness of style and intonation. Thus, the expressiveness can contribute to the completeness of the produced and received speech, as it enhances the meanings through emotional engagement. That last one controls the students' body expression in each psychosocial context of the classroom. In this way speech is subject to the dynamics of the existing mood. In such an environment spontaneity, which leads to self-expression, stands out, while the physical, emotional, verbal, and mental aspects of speech come to life. Emotions are somatized and formed into verbal expression with subtle stylistic qualities. Various representations occur as the spontaneous expression, physical and verbal, complement each other and are realized and strengthened, as pointed out by Dorothy Heathcote, through stillness, movement, silence, sound, darkness, light (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984). At the same time, they facilitate communication and the reflective nature of thought that broadens the understanding of the human experience and expertise.

b) Students' self-expression in order to express their emotional and intellectual richness by communicating spontaneously in a variety of physical and verbal representations (Faure & Lascar, 1988; Tsiaras, 2012) and students' interpersonal development through the experience of enjoying the play.

c) Reflective dialogue on the experienced fictional and social reality (Edmiston & Wilhelm, 1998), empathy and intercultural communication (Gay, 1999).

d) The community feeling in the group, where students can coexist as theatrical persons and as such to cooperate developing their dramatic and language competence along with speech as dramatic environment (McInnes, 1985; Davidson, 1996).

e) The transformative function of creative imagination that gives birth to fictional worlds and the creation of improvised and spontaneous action environments, which are

organized based on students' imagination and verbal responses (McCaslin, 1999).

e) Stage action as a means of inquiring and comprehending the dramatic environment and the exploration of theatrical roles and situations for the reconstruction of attitudes, perceptions and practices in everyday life (Booth, 1994; Landy, 1996).

g) The dynamic and comprehensive approach of human experience and eco-society (Papadopoulos, 2010) hence the cross curricular and interdisciplinary character of each activity.

It is thus evident that the use of dramatic techniques in the language subject as learning activities must follow requirements put forward by the art of theater itself so that they are ultimately authentic communicative expressions with validity and therefore effectiveness.

This study investigated all the opportunities given to teachers and students by the formal curriculum and the schoolbooks on the use of theatrical techniques. However, it did not investigate first whether or not teachers either choose or can implement them, and secondly, whether and to what extent there are teachers who use dramatic techniques other than those proposed by the formal curriculum to teach the language course. Another limitation of this study is the inability to deeply investigate the specific relationship of the theatrical techniques with the type of language objective (listening, speaking, reading and writing) of each activity. Having said that, the content analysis findings in the current study has no doubt highlighted the condition of theatre education as shaped by the formal curriculum for the Greek primary school.

References

Anderson, A. (2012). The influence of process drama on elementary students' written language. *Urban Education, 47*(5), 952-982.

Anderson, J., & Chung, Y.-C. (2010). Community languages, the arts and transformative pedagogy. *Race Equality Teaching, 28*(3), 16-20.

Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. M. (1997). *Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analyses* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brash, B., & Warnecke, S. (2009). Shedding the ego: Drama-based role-play and identity in distance language tuition. *Language Learning Journal, 37*(1), 99-109.

Booth, D. (1994). *Story drama: Reading, writing and roleplaying across the curriculum.* Markham: Pembroke Publishers.

Butler-Kisber, L., Li, Y., Clandinin, J., & Markus, P. (2007). Narrative as artful curriculum making. In L. Bresler (Ed)., *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education* (pp. 219-234). The Netherland: Springer.

Charalampopoulos, A., & Chatzisavvides, S. (1997). *Teaching of functional use of language: Theory and application.*[in Greek]. Thessaloniki: Kodikas.

Connolly, J. A., & Doyle, A.-B. (1984). Relation of social fantasy play to social competence in preschoolers. *Experimental Psychology, 20*(5), 797-806.

Cunico, S. (2005). Teaching language and intercultural competence through drama: Some suggestions for a neglected resource. *The Language Learning Journal, 31*(1), 21-29.

Davidson, J. (1996). *Emergent literacy and dramatic play in early education.* Albany, NY: Delmar.

Edmiston, B., & Wilhelm, J. (1998). Repositioning views/reviewing positions forming complex understandings in dialogue. In B. J. Wagner (Ed.), *Educational drama and language arts: What research shows* (pp. 90-117). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Even, S. (2008). Moving in(to) imaginary worlds: Drama pedagogy for foreign language teaching and learning. *Die Unterrichtspraxis / Teaching German, 41*(2), 161-170.

Faure, G., & Lascar, S. (1988). *Theatrical play* (A. Stroubouli Trans.). Athens: Gutenberg. (Original work published in 1979)

Fillmore, L. W. (2006). Language in education. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA* (pp. 339-360). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fleming, M., Merrell, C., & Tymms, P. (2004). The impact of drama on pupils' language, mathematics, and attitude in two primary schools. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 9*(2), 177-197.

Gay, G. (1999). Drama modes, meanings, methods and multicultural education. *Stage of the Art, 10*(3), 19-28.

Giannouli, P. B. (2016). Theatre/Drama and the development of the Greek curriculum: coercion or liberty? *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 21*(1), 90-92.

Grammatas, T. (1997). *Theatrical paedeia and training of teachers.* [in Greek]. Athens: Typothito.

Grammatas, T. (2003). *Theatre and Paedeia.* [in Greek]. Athens: Self-edited.

Greek Pedagogical Institute (GPI). (2003). *A Cross-thematic curriculum framework for compulsory education (DEPPS)* [in Greek]. Athens: GPI. Published in Official Gazette, B(303/13-03-2003), B(304/13-03-2003). Retrieved from http://www.pi-schools.gr/programs/depps/

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context and text aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective.* London: Eduard Arnold.

Hardie, K. (2007). On trial: Teaching without talking – Teacher as silent witness. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education, 5*(3), 214-226.

Jensen, A. P. (2008). Multimodal literacy and theater education. *Arts Education Policy Review, 109*(5), 19-26.

Johnson, L., & O'Neill, C. (1984). *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama.* London: Hutchinson.

Kempe, A. (2003). The role of drama in the teaching of speaking and listening as the basis for social capital. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 8*(1), 65-78.

Koutsousimou-Tsinoglou, B. (2000). Polyphony and multimodality: indicators of speakers attitudes and the design of "an ordinary written piece of work". Preeducational analysis. *The Language Computer, 2.* [in Greek]. Retrieved from http: //www.melta.org.my/ET/1990/main8.html. (http: //www.komvos.edu.gr)

Landy, R. (1996). *Essays in drama therapy: The double life.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. (1983). *Communicative language teaching.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mages, W. K. (2008). Does creative drama promote language development in early childhood? A review of the methods and measures employed in the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(1), 124.

McCaslin, N. (1999). *Creative drama in the classroom and beyond.* New York, NY: Longman.

McInnes, J. (1985). The drama of reading. In J. Kase-Polisini (Ed.), *Creative Drama in a Developmental Context* (pp. 73-83). New York: University Press of America.

McGregor, L., Tate, M., & Robinson, K. (1977). *Learning through drama.* London: Heinemann.

Mitsis, N. (1999). *Teaching grammar.* [in Greek]. Athens: Gutenberg.

Montgomerie, D., & Ferguson, J. (1999). Bears don't need phonics: An examination of the role of drama in laying the foundations for critical thinking in the reading process. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 4*(1), 11-20.

Morgan, N., & Saxton, J. (1988). Enriching language through drama. *Language Arts, 65*(1), 34-40.

Neelands, J. (1984). *Making sense of drama: A guide to classroom practice.* Oxford, UK: Heinemann Educational Books.

Neelands, J., & Goode, T. (1990). *Structuring drama work: A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Osmond, C. R. (2007). Drama education and the body: "I am, therefore I think". In L. Bresler (Ed.), *The international handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 1109-1118). The Netherlands: Springer.

O'Toole, J. (1992). *The process of drama: Negotiating art and meaning.* London: Routledge.

Papadopoulos, S. (2004). *The use of drama and its implications in teaching in the course of language in primary school* [in Greek] (Ph.D. thesis). Department of Philosophy, Education and Psychology of the University of Athens, Athens, Greece.

Papadopoulos, S. (2010). *Theatre pedagogy.* [in Greek]. Athens: Self-edited.

Sam, W. Y. (1990). Drama in teaching English as a second language-A communicative approach. *The English Teacher, 19.* Retrieved from http://www.melta.org.my/ET/ 1990/main8.html.

Schiffler, S. L. (1991). *Pour un enseignement interactif des langues étrangères.* [*For an interactive teaching of foreign languages*]. Paris: Hatier-Credif.

Short, K. G., Harste, J. C., & Burke, C. (1996). *Creating classrooms for authors and inquirers.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Silvern, S. B., Taylor, J. B., Williamson, P. A., Surbeck, E., & Kelley, M. F. (1986). Young children's story recall as a product of play, story familiarity, and adult intervention. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 32*(1), 73-86.

Tsiaras, A. (2012). Dramatic play as a means of developing primary school students' self-concept. *The Journal of Drama and Theatre Education in Asia, 3*(1), 47-67.

Wagner, B. J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts: What research shows.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Walker, C. A. (1999). Playing a story: Narrative and writing-like features in scenes of dramatic play. *Reading Research and Instruction, 38*(4), 401-413.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zhu, Y. (2007). Theory and methodology of multimodal discourse analysis. *Foreign Language Research, 5*, 82-86.

Acknowledgements

This study was conducted in the framework of Thalis Programme, which is co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund – ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Programme "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) – Research Funding Program: THALIS - National and Kapodistrian University of Athens "The Theatre as educative-educational good and artistic expression in education and society".

此為上文摘要中譯

寓戲於教——在希臘小學教育的現代希臘語言科中融入戲劇教育

Simos Papadopoulos
科莫蒂尼·色雷斯德謨克利特大學

摘要

利用戲劇達致教育目的的傳統源遠流長，然而在希臘的教育體系中，戲劇教育僅僅自最近十年才開始正式融入以語言為主的各個科目之中。本研究審視將戲劇學習法融入希臘小學語言科的方法。本文識別出並分析了課本中所有包含戲劇表達元素的學生活動。分析結果顯示儘管在課程中有清晰提及在語言科課堂中使用戲劇學習法，但是這些指引稀疏而殘缺，主要提及簡易的肢體活動，缺乏系統性和探究過程，學生無法有效而完整地作出戲劇表達。本文的最後部分探討了融入更多戲劇學習法的有關提議。

關鍵詞：戲劇教育、小學教育

電郵：sypapado@eled.duth.gr

（翻譯：吳競敏）