University of Windsor
Scholarship at UWindsor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations | Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

2019

Enhancing Co-teaching Collaborations Through Drama Education: Exploring Challenges and Possibilities of a Drama Praxis Framework for Co-teaching

Zach Dougall
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

Recommended Citation
Dougall, Zach, "Enhancing Co-teaching Collaborations Through Drama Education: Exploring Challenges and Possibilities of a Drama Praxis Framework for Co-teaching" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 7699.
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/7699

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Enhancing Co-teaching Collaborations Through Drama Education:

Exploring Challenges and Possibilities of a Drama Praxis Framework for Co-teaching

by

Zach Dougall

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Faculty of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Education at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

© 2019 Zach Dougall

Enhancing Co-teaching Collaborations Through Drama Education:

Exploring Challenges and Possibilities of a Drama Praxis Framework for Co-teaching

by

Zach Dougall

APPROVED BY:

J. Worth
Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures

F. Cherian
Faculty of Education

C. Cobb, Advisor
Faculty of Education

May 29, 2019

Declaration of Originality

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

Abstract

Many colleges of education are adopting co-teaching as a strategy for teacher candidate field work. Drama education is a collaborative methodology, rarely taught in Ontario colleges of education, which may provide a framework for developing robust co-teaching skills among pre-service teachers in Ontario and elsewhere. This descriptive case study examines an undergraduate drama education program in Ontario which uses drama praxis methodology to teach collaborative skills to developing teachers and community leaders. The findings of this study show parallels between drama education skills and co-teaching skills, and provide teacher educators with a contextual overview of the ways in which drama can be used to develop and reinforce collaborative co-teaching skills. An examination of the structural components of the drama education program also allow teacher educators to adapt its strategies and frameworks for use in their own co-teaching programs.

Keywords: Co-teaching; drama praxis; pre-service co-teaching; drama education; pre-service education; student teaching; community of praxis; critical reflection

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Cam, for guiding me through what I can safely describe as a harrowing ordeal. I would also like to thank Mandy for supporting both of us and for helping me navigate a gauntlet of policies, procedures and administrative requirements. I would like to thank Finney, who pushes me forward, and whose questions I can never answer without first stopping to think. I also want to thank Jeremy for his enthusiastic help.

I want to acknowledge the patience and support of my friends and family–most particularly Katie. You were there for me every time I needed you, and you disappeared when I needed to focus. Special thanks to Anne, who helped me get my defence ready late the night before, and to my parents, whose support and encouragement got me this far.

I would like to give a special mention to Dr. Chu and the whole team at LHSC, who fixed my broken heart.

Finally, I would like to thank Tina and Gail. You were amazing role models throughout my formative adult years. You introduced me to my lifelong passion of co-teaching, and to the very concept of social justice. And you have continued to help me well after I left the program. Thank you.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Originality iii
Abstract iv
Acknowledgements v
Chapter 1 – Introduction 1
Pre-service Co-teaching and Drama Education in Ontario 2
Purpose of the Study 8
Research Questions 13
Defining Drama Praxis 13
Theoretical Framework 19
Importance of the Study 20
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study 20
Chapter 2 – Literature Review 22
Methodology 22
Article Data 23
Discussion of Article Pool 24
Issues of Praxis 25
Relationship Development 30
Supportive Practice 41
Conclusion 51
Chapter 3 – Methodology 52
Participants 52
Research Design 53
Questions for Semi-Structured Interviews 55
Data Coding 57
Trustworthiness 58
Interpretive Framework 61
Ethical Considerations 61
Chapter 4 – Summary of Data 63
Coding 63
Data Summary 65

Issues of Praxis 65

Relationship Development 74

Supportive Practice 81

Chapter 5 – Analysis and Discussion 96

Comparing DRED&C to Literature 96

Issues of Praxis 96

Relationship Development 99

Supportive Practice 105

Research Questions 110

Conclusion 116

Chapter 6 – Conclusion 117

Summary of Findings 118

Implications for DRED&C 120

Implications for Pre-service Co-teaching 121

Future Research 123

Conclusion 124

References 126

Vita Auctoris 134

Chapter 1 – Introduction

With the proliferation of inclusive classroom spaces, co-teaching has become one of the most widespread strategies for providing differentiated instruction in integrated classrooms. It has experienced tremendous growth in the United States in response to educational policy shifts such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2008; Parker, Allen, McHatton & Rosa, 2010). In Ontario, co-teaching has been adopted for programs like full-day kindergarten classes, where an Ontario Certified Teacher and a Registered Early Childhood Educator are jointly responsible for various aspects of student learning and development (Langford et al., 2018). According to Murawski (2006), the proportion of studies of varying types of co-teaching programs showing mixed results make it difficult to draw conclusions about the efficacy of co-teaching, and underscore the need for additional investigation into the development of co-teaching programs.

Before large-scale research into the efficacy of co-teaching can be conducted, however, more focus is needed on the development of consistently successful co-teaching partnerships. A review of co-teaching literature by Flujit, Bakker and Struyf (2016) which focused on team reflection found that co-teachers more often faced challenges relating to interpersonal issues than teaching skills. Co-teachers often select less-collaborative strategies wherein one partner teaches while the other acts as an assistant, an approach which is discouraged in the literature (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; Scruggs, Mastropieri & McDuffie, 2007). Langford et al. (2018) note that many Ontario educators working in full-day kindergarten classes experience this type of social inequity. A lack of collaboration skills may also be problematic for teachers who volunteer or are assigned to co-teach (Scruggs et al., 2007). Pre-service teachers often feel underprepared to

work in collaborative partnerships in inclusive settings. situations which they are likely to face even as general educators (Arndt & Liles, 2010; McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Parker at al., 2010). The development of robust co-teaching skills–such as effective communication, collaboration, relationship-building, and navigation of power dynamics–requires participant preparation time. Effective co-teacher relationships are built on a foundation of trust and respect, a foundation which takes time to develop (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2010). Among other things, robust communication involves honest sharing of ideas as well as proficiency in evaluating both verbal and non-verbal elements (Bacharach et al., 2008). Effective collaboration often involves idea-sharing as well, but also shared responsibility, shared learning and shared resources between co-teachers (Darragh, Picanco, Tully & Henning, 2011; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; Yopp, Ellis, Bonsangue, Duart & Mesa, 2014). Although both pre-service and cooperating teachers should receive instruction about co-teaching skills, initial teacher education is a convenient structure for the learning and development of communication and collaboration skills in a supervised setting (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2010). The ability of the education faculty to set certain requirements for their students, such as scheduling co-planning and reflection times between pre-service and cooperating teachers, also makes it an ideal setting for the development of co-teaching skills and balanced power dynamics (Bacharach et al., 2010).

Pre-Service Co-Teaching and Drama Education in Ontario

Although the neighbouring Canadian and American education systems are in many ways different, the substantial volume of research generated in the United States has an influence on the ideas and innovations which make their way into Canadian classrooms. The growing prevalence of co-teaching in the United States is of interest to Canadian educators, but it must be explored in a Canadian context if it is to be adapted for Canadian schools.

In this study, I examine a drama education program at a mid-sized university in Southern Ontario which utilizes co-teaching and drama praxis to prepare prospective teachers for careers as arts educators. This program is called *Drama in Education and Community* (DRED&C). Drama praxis is a teaching methodology which engages participants in inquiry-based learning, using theatre games and role-playing. Although graduates of DRED&C must still complete a two-year Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree in order to become qualified to teach in Ontario, there is a significant amount of overlap between this and B.Ed. programs. Many of these students enroll in B.Ed. programs in the fall after they graduate. In leading this study, I conducted a review of extant literature in order to discover which skills are necessary for the development of successful co-teaching programs. I also reviewed any applicable program policy documents and conducted interviews with current and past program developers to determine how co-teaching skills are being developed in the context of drama praxis. This investigation may provide additional insight into the development of effective pre-service co-teaching programs.

Defining co-teaching. While co-teaching is typically defined in the context of integrated classroom settings, the definition can vary and co-teaching does not necessarily involve the pairing of general and special educators (Mastropieri et al., 2005). Early definitions of co-teaching describe it as "an educational approach in which general and special educators work in a coactive and coordinated fashion to jointly teach academically and behaviorally heterogeneous groups of students in educationally integrated settings" (Bauwens, Hourcade & Friend, 1989, p. 18). Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain and Shamberger add that it is:

> the partnering of a general education teacher and a special education teacher or another specialist for the purpose of jointly delivering instruction to a diverse group of students,

including those with disabilities or other special needs, in a general education setting and in a way which flexibly and deliberately meets their learning needs. (2010, p. 11)

Co-teaching can be explored in other contexts. In English-speaking schools, students whose primary language is not English may attend classes designed to help them learn English. In Ontario, *English Language Learners* (ELLs) are defined as "students who are learning the language of instruction at the same time as they are learning the curriculum and developing a full range of literacy skills" (Ontario, 2008, p. 8). Such classes may be also referred to as *English as a Second Language* (ESL) or *English as an Additional Language* (EAL) classes, and are sometimes co-taught. Co-teaching can also be used as an alternative model for initial teacher education (Friend et al., 2010). In this study, I examine co-teaching through the context of teacher preparation for general educators. Darragh et al. (2011) suggest that the critical elements of co-teaching are transferrable to any general classroom setting as well as to the preparation of teacher candidates in initial teacher education programs. While I do not focus on special education for my investigation, the techniques used to develop co-teaching skills in such programs may be transferable to a variety of collaborative educational settings.

Co-teaching may be implemented using a variety of instructional models. Friend et al. (2010) describe six common models of co-teaching as:

1. *One teach–one observe*: One teacher leads large-group instruction while another gathers observational data on students or the class. This does not include circumstances where the second teacher is working on unrelated tasks such as grading work or planning another lesson.
2. *One teach–one assist*: One teacher leads large-group instruction while another provides individual assistance to students as needed.

3. *Station teaching*: Students rotate between instructional activities, two of which are facilitated by teachers. Additional stations involve self-directed activities.
4. *Parallel teaching*: The class is divided into two, with one teacher leading each half. Each teacher delivers the same material in different ways.
5. *Alternative teaching*: One teacher leads instruction for most of the class, while the other takes a small group aside for pre-teaching, assessment, enrichment, etc.
6. *Teaming or Team Teaching*: Both teachers share large-group instruction.

There are also a variety of partnership models which can be employed in pre-service co-teaching programs. Teacher candidates may form a co-teaching team with their cooperating teacher, who may adopt a mentorship role, or teacher candidates may form teaching groups under the supervision of a non-co-teaching cooperating teacher. In some cases, additional teacher candidates may be added to form groups of three or more co-teachers working together (Tobin & Roth, 2005). Darragh et al. (2011) argue that co-teaching does not include mentorship dynamics between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers, rotary partnerships where teachers swap classes but teach alone, or interdisciplinary lessons which are planned together but delivered separately. For the current study, co-teaching is defined as two or more educators jointly responsible for planning and teaching lessons to the same group of students in a shared learning space. I do not include rotary and interdisciplinary lessons in my definition of co-teaching. Although these partnerships do involve co-planning and reflection, each teacher works with a different group of students and in different learning spaces. Co-teaching mentorships, however, are included in this definition so long as they meet the above criteria. Situations involving teacher candidates who teach alone as well as within a partnership are also included if co-teaching accounts for a substantial portion of the experience.

Impact of American legislation on co-teaching. Although NCLB was repealed in December 2015 (Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, 2015) it had a significant impact on co-teaching while it was in effect in the U.S. One of the components of NCLB legislation was an emphasis on annual standardized testing. With school funding and teacher accountability tied to student performance on high-stakes tests, it became increasingly difficult to find experienced teachers willing to take on teacher candidates. Teachers who declined to mentor any teacher candidates were concerned that student performance on standardized testing was noticeably lower in classrooms where a student teacher provided a substantial portion of classroom instruction (Bacharach et al., 2010; Morton & Burky, 2015). Such fears have not been exclusive to the United States. King (2006) notes that teachers in the United Kingdom have been growing more reluctant to bring student teachers into their classrooms for fear that it will negatively impact their students' test performance. Part of the appeal of co-teaching in education programs in many areas has been the logistical benefit of requiring half as many supervising teachers.

Co-teaching has also been popular as a response to IDEA legislation. American schools were required to place students with special needs into the least restrictive environment, typically a general education classroom, and to give them access to the general education curriculum as much as possible (Arndt & Liles, 2010; McHatton & Daniel, 2008). The increasing diversity of classrooms, including students whose first language is not English, has had a similar impact on classroom integration and differentiated instruction (Cramer, 2010). The ever-increasing need for collaboration between general educators, special educators, and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers continues to reinforce the need for teachers to learn and practice co-teaching skills.

Although NCLB has been repealed, co-teaching continues to have a place in schools. With decreasing budgets and increasing access to online books and information, school librarians and reading specialists are struggling to remain relevant. Such specialists are turning to co-teaching as a means to collaborate with classroom teachers, making it all the more vital for prospective educators to receive instruction in collaboration and co-teaching skills (Loertscher, 2014; Parrott & Keith, 2015). This trend, particularly in response to the proliferation of technology, can also be seen in Ontario schools (Moreillon, 2016).

Drama education in Ontario and Canada. Drama education is unique for each student, despite certain commonalities across Canada. Although theatre educators know similar techniques and share certain ideologies, everyone experiences drama in their own way. In general, however, it is a process-based discipline which uses games and activities to help students explore their bodies, minds and voices as part of a community of learners. It emphasizes creativity, communication, community-mindedness and other 21st-century learning skills (Carter, 2014).

Common techniques used in classroom drama, such as *process drama*, show the capacity of drama as an educational tool for collaboratively exploring social issues and developing critical reflection skills.

> Another key characteristic of process drama is that it is based on the human capacity for empathy. By inhabiting a role, participants find themselves "walking in someone else's shoes", and this empathetic quality makes drama a particularly powerful tool for confronting social justice issues. Participants may inhabit a role, or a series of roles, where the perspectives are very different from their own. In this way, they may be challenged to reflect on the position from a new standpoint. (Kana & Aitken, 2007)

Drama, like many arts disciplines, has always struggled for a position in formal education programs. Strong advocacy from professional arts educators has kept a space for drama in the Ontario curriculum and in extracurricular and community programs. The current drama curriculum in Ontario encourages young people to engage in experiences which lead them to examine and question perspectives and to investigate issues of diversity, power and inclusion (Gallagher, 2016).

Drama is only occasionally taught in Canadian colleges of education. Teachers generally have little to no experience with drama education, and so it is rarely offered to elementary students by skilled educators. Recent advances in communication technology have helped to connect drama educators, who previously struggled to collaborate due to their frequent isolation from other theatre professionals (Carter, 2014).

Drama's capacity for teaching critical thinking skills and exploring issues of social justice may provide an ideal framework for the collaborative work of co-teachers in diverse classroom environments. The relative lack of drama courses in Canadian teacher education programs as described by Carter (2014) suggests that a drama education framework has yet to be thoroughly explored in the context of co-teaching, outside of certain specialized programs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the elements which are required in order to develop successful pre-service co-teaching programs and how those elements might be developed in the context of drama education. This information will help facilitate future research into the benefits of co-teaching. For this study, a pre-service co-teaching program was considered successful if it was perceived by participants and/or facilitators to be an effective alternative to traditional field placements where teacher candidates teach alone. This definition

was not intended to determine whether co-teaching programs are actually more effective than solo programs, but to discover which strategies contributed to or detracted from such perceptions. In future studies that do seek to address the efficacy of co-teaching programs, facilitators will be able to use this investigation to pre-emptively address common issues associated with co-teaching.

While many studies of co-teaching have identified perceived benefits for all participants, others have found inconclusive or mixed results (Murawski, 2006). Some reported benefits for pre-service teachers include: improved skills in problem-solving, teamwork, collaboration, organization, planning, management, and risk-taking; increased access to teaching resources, content resources, professional feedback, and formal and informal support from other teachers; fewer problems with discipline, *classroom management*, and feelings of isolation; more opportunities for engaging in critical reflection, observing different teaching styles, and developing as reflective practitioners; motivation to improve their teaching skills; and improved confidence, comfort in diverse classrooms, and performance on evaluations (Goodnough et al., 2009; Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017; King, 2006; Nokes et al., 2008; Scantlebury, Gallo-Fox & Wassell, 2008). *Classroom management* refers to the establishment of a quiet, calm environment wherein students can participate in meaningful learning and develop academically and socially (Postholm, 2013). Student co-teachers feel motivated to work harder so they can teach at the same level of proficiency and professionalism as their supervising teacher, while having opportunities to focus on improving their instructional skills while their partner manages student attention and behaviour (Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017)

Supervising teachers share many of these benefits, including increased risk-taking, use of a wider variety of instructional strategies, and support and advice from pre-service co-teachers

(Goodnough et al., 2009; Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017; Stairs et al., 2009). Supervising teachers perceive that they are covering content more quickly with a student co-teacher, and appreciate the chance to see new teaching styles and their students' reactions to those styles so that they can adapt their own methods (Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017).

Reported benefits for students in co-taught classrooms include: increased confidence and willingness to innovate; exposure to an enriched curriculum, multiple perspectives and models, a greater variety of instructional methods, increased productive learning time, increased individualization of instruction, and more one-on-one interaction with teachers; and improved attendance, confidence, engagement, assessment data, test scores, participation, and enjoyment (Goodnough et al., 2009; Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017; Nokes et al., 2008). Students have greater flexibility when seeking help and more opportunities to be re-taught material in a different way if they are struggling (Hurd & Weilbacher, 2017).

Many factors influence the success of co-teaching programs, and if key elements are missing or poorly implemented, it can be difficult to accurately measure the efficacy of a co-teaching program. For example, younger students in one study by Goodnough et al. (2009) reported some confusion about teacher roles in a classroom with three teaming co-teachers. While such issues could be the result of co-teaching in general, they could also reflect insufficient communication with students, an inappropriate choice of co-teaching strategy, or poorly-defined teacher roles.

Researchers and educators are continually seeking new strategies for the development of effective co-teaching programs (Murawski & Dieker, 2004; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). Nokes et al. (2008) found co-teaching to be an effective alternative to traditional pre-service models, but called for more investigation into how mentor teachers can learn more about collaboration and

their role within pre-service co-teaching. Stairs et al. (2009) suggested further research on how student co-teaching impacts the learning and practice of faculty supervisors. Although positive outcomes have been reported for both general and special education students, pre-service teachers generally feel underprepared for co-teaching (Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013; Parker et al., 2010). To address this concern, teacher education programs are beginning to develop opportunities for pre-service teachers to gain skills and knowledge in professional collaboration in inclusive classroom settings (Parker et al., 2010). Since teachers are often more impressionable while they are still engaged in pre-service classes and field placements, collaborative skills and attitudes emphasized in faculties of education are likely to have a significant impact on them (Subraminam, 2013; Sutherland, Howard & Markauskaite, 2010). For instance, the ability to work with others is not an inherent skill and it must therefore be explicitly taught. Postsecondary graduates and other adults are not necessarily fluent in communication and collaboration strategies, and must therefore be given opportunities to develop and practice such skills before they will be able to co-teach effectively (Ofstedal & Dahlberg, 2009). Given the importance of these skills to the success of co-teaching, and the high degree of control which university faculty can exert over initial education courses, pre-service programs offer an ideal environment for the development of co-teaching programs.

In a meta-analysis of co-teaching research, Scruggs et al. (2007) found that typical co-teaching dyads do not naturally exhibit the level of collaboration which would be expected for teachers in that role. The most commonly used co-teaching format was *one teach—one assist*, a model which sometimes discouraged collaboration and even forced special educators to adopt subordinate roles. While it was normal for co-teachers to adopt a variety of roles, including observation, partnerships where the general educator habitually adopted a lead role often made it

difficult for the special educator to participate as an equal. As this habit worsened, the general educators frequently neglected their joint responsibility to provide differentiated instruction to students with special needs, under the assumption that such a task was the exclusive responsibility of the special educator. Where such a division occurred, co-teaching offered little benefit to students. This trend reinforces the need for teachers to learn about co-teaching strategies and skills in flexible thinking, collaborative consultation and effective interpersonal communication.

Friend et al. (2010) identify a need for stakeholders to be better prepared to implement co-teaching. They suggest that while special educators are beginning to receive instruction in these areas, it is equally necessary for general educators to learn how to negotiate roles and use collaboration skills in a co-teaching partnership. Teachers are prepared for work in traditional classrooms, and must specifically become "professionally socialized to partner in classrooms and share in teaching" (p. 20).

Co-teaching is a complex practice which involves the integration of many different interpersonal skills such as communication, problem-solving and trust. Learning to co-teach is a challenging process which requires time and practice. Since practicing teachers are inundated with obligations, those who are particularly dedicated to co-teaching will be more inclined to make the time to focus on developing their collaboration skills. This limitation further underscores the relative ease of using pre-service education as a mechanism for preparing educators to co-teach, since university faculty have some control over students' schedules (Keefe, Moore & Duff, 2004; Murawski & Dieker, 2008). A reciprocal benefit to including co-teaching in initial teacher education is the promotion of active learning, drawing connections to

the wider context of teachers' work, and other aspects of professional development (Rytivaara & Kershner, 2012).

Research Questions

The need for further research into the structure and development of pre-service co-teaching programs, particularly the processes by which teachers are prepared for professional collaboration, is clear. For this study, I conducted an investigation of co-teaching in pre-service education by examining Drama in Education and Community, a four-year undergraduate education program at the University of Windsor in Southern Ontario. This program utilizes co-teaching for its field experience component. My review of relevant literature identified which skills are typically emphasized in pre-service co-teaching programs, which formed the basis for interview questions designed to explore how students in this program are prepared for co-teaching. Key research questions included:

- What elements are essential to the development of successful pre-service co-teaching programs?
- How does this praxis-based drama program promote the development of these elements?

Defining Drama Praxis

Drama praxis is a methodology which uses theatre techniques like *writing in role*, where students complete writing assignments from the perspective of a character, to help participants "reflect and act upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 2000, p. 51). It includes elements of praxis, community of practice, and drama-based learning.

Drama and theatre. Throughout the early and mid-20th century, drama educators pushed for a division of drama and theatre into separate acts; theatre was described as

performance-oriented, while drama work emphasized the value of the process. However, modern interpretations view drama and theatre as the same medium regardless of whether or not participants are concerned with performing for an audience (Taylor & Warner, 2006). Taylor (2000) says that "Drama is a collaborative group artform where people transform, act and reflect upon the human condition. In drama, people are the instruments of inquiry" (Taylor, 2000, p. 1). Boal (1995) defines theatre as "the passionate combat of two human beings on a platform" (Boal, 1995, p. 16):

> Two beings – not just one – because theatre studies the multiple interrelations of men and women living in society, rather than limiting itself to the contemplation of each solitary individual taken in isolation. Theatre denotes conflict, contradiction, confrontation, defiance. And the dramatic action lies in the variation and movement of this equation, of these opposing forces. Monologues will not be 'theatre' unless the antagonist, though absent, is implied; unless her *absence* is *present*. (Boal, 1995, p. 16)

Theatre is always a political act. It can be used either to subjugate or to liberate, and necessarily involves the struggle between oppressors and the oppressed (Boal, 1985). Drama is about social issues because it cannot be separated from the context of society. It is, for that same reason, necessarily collaborative.

Praxis. Praxis involves the ongoing relationship between theory and practice, and refers to the continuous cycle of thoughtful action, critical reflection, and equitable transformation of the world as people engage with one another (Freire, 2000; Leistyna, 2004; Taylor, 2000). Praxis in education involves *problem-posing*. In contrast with the historical banking model of education, in which knowledge is merely deposited by the knowing teacher into the mind of the unknowing student, *problem-posing* education acknowledges and explores the incompleteness or

unfinishedness of human beings and of reality. Such liberating education necessarily becomes an ongoing activity centred around transforming the world (Freire, 2000).

In order for pre-service teachers to find significant meaning in their teacher education program, the theory learned in education classrooms must be reconciled with the lived experience of teaching in the field (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). Learning about education must be a dialogic process, involving both action and reflection. It is these same dialogic processes–collaborative planning, critical reflection, and dialogue about shared experiences within a social context–which are necessary for effective co-teaching. Through co-teaching, praxis is brought to the forefront of the classroom. Through praxis, teachers can begin to transform schools into liberating spaces.

Community of practice. Communities of practice are based on the ideas of Lave and Wenger during the 1990's, who described them as "a group of people who are mutually engaged in negotiating a joint enterprise and developing a shared repertoire" (Zaffini, 2018, p. 38). The manner in which professional activities are exercised is integral to the way its members perceive the world, and the legitimacy of a task is defined by the community's perceptions. Communities of practice focus on the lived experience of negotiating meaning while developing knowledge, competencies, identities, and the exchange and interpretation of information. As novice teachers participate meaningfully in the learning community, they develop skills which allow them to take on greater responsibilities (Iyer & Reese, 2013; Yamagata-Lynch, 2001).

As new teachers enter the community of practice, they work to master their skills through participation in daily activities and interactions with other professionals. The relationships between novice and veteran teachers can experience tension as new teachers push to transform the practices which are prevalent in the community (Flores, 2007). The negotiation between

established practice and innovation can benefit the school community by both supporting new educators and adapting educational practice to meet the dynamic needs of students. A community of practice which explicitly adopts a praxis-based approach to professional development–in which practice is continually transformed through shared critical reflection–is also a community of praxis.

Community of praxis. The distinction between community of practice and community of praxis may not necessarily impact the development of pre-service co-teaching programs, but is important to note. It is informed by both Freirean understandings of praxis and Lave and Wenger's community of practice model. Community of praxis is not a widely-used term, and is in many ways interchangeable with community of practice. It is differentiated, however, by a stronger focus on the relationship between theory, reflection and action (Reich, Levinson & Johnston, 2011). In the community of praxis, both new and experienced teachers participate in the development of models, structures and pedagogies which attempt to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The emphasis on this reconciliation between classroom practice and the theoretical aspects of learning is what differentiates the community of praxis from the community of practice (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). The community of praxis takes the contradictions between novice teachers' recent theoretical learning and the established practice of experienced educators and uses them to transform the culture of the professional community. This may be of benefit to co-teachers–who enact praxis as part of the co-teaching process–by helping them extend deep conversations about praxis beyond their partnership to include the broader school and education communities.

Drama praxis. Drama praxis is a process by which educators use drama-based instruction for the purpose of helping participants transform, act and reflect upon the human

condition. Drama-based instruction is a general term for the use of improvisation, role-play and interactive games to help teachers and students become critically engaged in learning (Cawthon & Dawson, 2011). These instructional methodologies were developed throughout the 20th century and draw on the work of: well-known developers of modern pedagogy John Dewey and Paolo Freire; Brazilian theatre director and politician Augusto Boal; and internationally-acclaimed drama educators such as Peter Slade, Brian Way, Dorothy Heathcote, Winifred Ward, Gavin Bolton and Cecily O'Neill (Cawthon & Dawson, 2011; Davis, 2013; Dillon & Way, 1981; Jackson, 2012; Taylor, 2000).

In the 1920's and '30s, Winifred Ward advocated the importance of improvisational, child-centred play in education, which she called *creative dramatics* (Taylor & Warner, 2006). Peter Slade was a practitioner of and advocate for educational drama, children's drama and drama therapy from the 1930's through the 1950's. He played a significant role in the development of child-centred learning through the use of dramatic play (Jackson, 2012). Brian Way is well-known among drama educators for his plays for children and especially his practical and theoretical work in the development of improvisational drama (Dillon & Way, 1981). Each of these thinkers promoted a distinction between the presentational outcomes of theatre and the process-oriented goals of drama, which emphasized spontaneity, creativity, personal growth and self-expression (Taylor & Warner, 2006).

Later in the century, Dorothy Heathcote took existing techniques for improvisational work with children and transformed them into planned and structured dramatic encounters which used fictional interaction to guide students toward speculative and reflective examinations of their actions. Heathcote used her experience with drama to develop models for structuring democratized classrooms wherein students were empowered to speculate about and negotiate

ideas with their teacher (Davis, 2013). Prompted by Gavin Bolton, who had worked with Heathcote, Cecily O'Neill developed these structured interactions into a technique known as *process drama*. Process drama is a series of scenic units organically linked to explore a particular theme through improvisational activities. The teacher acts both in and out of role to guide students toward new outlooks without forcing a particular outcome (Taylor & Warner, 2006). David Booth, based out of the University of Toronto, developed *story drama* in the 1980's. This technique uses a text, such as a picture book, to frame students' understanding of an issue and then uses drama to explore that issue. It is considered more accessible to general educators than process drama. (Taylor & Warner, 2006).

Drama-based instruction uses problem-posing within a fictionalized context to help students explore an issue from different points of view. Heathcote's mantle of the *expert* role-playing technique, for example, gives each student a role as some sort of expert in a field relevant to the drama activity–such as that of a linguist on a shipwrecked crew of explorers who have encountered a local village. This imagined expertise distances the student from the issue and places them in a position of power, freeing them to more deeply explore whatever topic the teacher has introduced into the roleplay. The *teacher-in-role* guides the drama by acting as a character within it while also pointing out connections to students' real lives (Taylor & Warner, 2006). This reversal of power mirrors Freire's roles of teacher-student and student-teacher, and lies at the heart of drama praxis methodology.

Drama praxis methodology is rooted in the personal and cultural context of each student, making it an effective tool for liberation and the exploration of Freire's notion of unfinishedness. In this collaborative and dialogic style of education, teachers and students become jointly responsible for their growth as human beings (Cawthon & Dawson, 2011). Co-teaching, another

collaborative and dialogic process, has great potential to complement and be complemented by drama praxis. Like students, teachers can use drama praxis to examine their own agency within a professional context, to reflect on their roles as teachers, and to begin to enact systemic change within their schools and communities (Cawthon & Dawson, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

In this study, I chose to investigate the DRED&C program because of its emphasis on drama praxis as a guiding principle. A gap remains between the theory of teacher education lectures and the practical experience of classroom co-teaching, making this program an ideal setting for the development of co-teaching skills (Anderson & Freebody, 2012; Yopp et al., 2014). Collaboration, a necessary component of co-teaching, is both a process of inclusion and a struggle for social justice and human rights. Education which focuses on issues of social justice necessarily involves cooperation, collaboration and community (Duke, 2004). Issues of social justice are integral to drama praxis, and critical components of DRED&C. While the impact of drama praxis on the professional development of pre-service teachers has not been extensively researched, there are some benefits. In a study which examined social justice and drama education in a pre-service teaching program, Belliveau (2007) found increased development of cooperation, team-building and problem-solving skills, as well as increased confidence in teaching, openness to the ideas of peers and willingness to take risks.

I have pursued this research because my own perspectives on education have been largely shaped by principles of drama praxis. I was a student of the DRED&C program, which employs co-teaching within a drama praxis framework. My positive experience with this program led me to become curious about co-teaching and drama praxis. I noticed a similarity between the skillsets of drama educators and co-teachers, and decided to formally investigate how drama

praxis philosophy can contribute to the development of effective co-teaching skills. To gain a better perspective on how such programs are designed, I have conducted an investigation into the structure of DRED&C from the perspectives of those who administer it.

Importance of the Study

This study aims to explore the ways in which a drama praxis context facilitates the development of robust co-teaching skills for pre-service teachers. The primary purpose of this study is to describe the relationship between pre-service co-teaching and drama praxis, but there are additional benefits for volunteers. Participants in this study were asked to reflect upon various aspects of their education program, and had multiple and varied opportunities to think critically about program goals and how they relate to co-teaching.

After the final analysis has been completed, participants may potentially draw from recommendations from the study to further develop their co-teaching within the education program. This study provides new perspectives for future research into the development of pre-service co-teaching programs. It should serve, in part, as a synthesis of available research by providing a broader perspective on the skills and supports necessary for effective co-teaching. In particular, no meta-analysis of pre-service co-teaching programs was discovered in the literature search I conducted (see Chapter 2 for details). This review of the literature helps address that gap, while the qualitative study itself adds a new perspective to the body of literature.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Although case study methodology can be representative in some way of broader groups of cases, it offers limited generalizability and transferability to other settings (Pearson, Albon & Hubball, 2015). This study deals primarily with the context of a single drama education program at a mid-sized university in Southern Ontario, which may or may not result in findings applicable

to other co-teaching programs across the country and abroad. It may not provide wholly transferrable information about pre-service co-teaching in subject areas other than drama.

This study focuses on pre-service co-teaching, and does not intend to address in-service co-teaching, except where an experienced teacher is co-teaching alongside a teacher candidate. It does not examine programs outside Ontario. This study does not examine Brock University's drama education program because co-teaching is only an option in one course, which is taught sporadically (Joe Norris, personal communication, May 9, 2017)

The chosen methodology of descriptive case study, outlined in Chapter 3, does not provide analysis of the DRED&C program's efficacy. Such analysis is beyond the scope of the research questions. In addition, the study only describes the impact of certain streams of the DRED&C program, such as the health stream, when they are applicable to the co-teaching or drama praxis focus of the program. Faculty members who did not have at least several years' experience shaping the direction of the program, such as professors from other programs or guest DRED&C instructors, are not included in this study.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

The literature review for this study was conducted at the beginning of the research process. Several of the articles are dated up to 15 years prior to the completion of this work because of unforeseen delays during the research process.

Methodology

As co-teaching is often used as an inclusion strategy, it is most frequently discussed in journals of special education. My study is primarily interested in pre-service co-teachers in general education, so I have conducted my literature review using search engines. This will generate a greater breadth of articles than a hand search of special education journals. I have selected to search the ERIC, PsychINFO and EbscoHost Academic Search Complete databases because they draw on large pools of articles. I have included CBCA Complete for additional Canadian context. A search of each database for any of: co-teaching, cooperative teaching, or team teaching; and pre-service, teacher training, or teacher education resulted in nearly three thousand hits.

I first narrowed and then expanded the timeframe until I reached an abstract pool of about two hundred articles representing a timeframe of ten years. Each abstract was read to determine its relevance to pre-service co-teaching skills. Articles were included if they involved co-teaching by one or more teacher candidates and identified one or more features of a successful co-teaching program. Articles about co-teaching were also included if they directly addressed implications for teacher education. Discussion papers which did not address these implications were excluded. In order to ensure quality, only peer-reviewed articles were included in the search. Due to circumstances beyond the researcher's control, completion of this research proposal was significantly delayed. The timeframe was subsequently expanded to eleven years

to include more recent studies, using the same process. As a result of this extension, one additional article was included in the review.

Article Data

In the following few paragraphs I will briefly outline some descriptive aspects regarding the article pool generated in this systematic literature review.

Regional distribution. Twenty-one studies were found to meet the above criteria. Thirteen studies were conducted in the Eastern United States, two in the Northern United States, two in the Midwestern United States and one in the Western United States. Other studies were conducted in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Vietnam.

Study types. Studies were mostly qualitative in nature, with five ethnographies, four case studies, three ethnographic case studies, one historical narrative, one biography, and one naturalistic inquiry. Six studies used quantitative methodologies.

School data. Six articles described co-teaching programs in urban or inner city schools, one in a suburban school, and one in a rural school. Two studies included a combination of urban and rural locations, and eight studies did not specify the type of school. Four studies were conducted in the K-12 grade range, two in K-6, one each in 6-8 and 6-12, five in grades 9-12, one in postsecondary, and six did not specify a grade range. Five articles described both general and special education pre-service co-teaching programs. Five studies were conducted in science classrooms, two in social studies, and one each in mathematics, geography, English, and English as a Foreign Language. One investigation focused on both math and language classes. Three studies involved multiple subjects, and seven did not specify any particular subject.

Co-teaching partnerships. Six articles described co-teaching partnerships between two pre-service teacher candidates. Five described partnerships between a teacher candidate and

their cooperating or supervising teacher. Five studies involved co-teaching teams of three or more, generally including the cooperating teacher. Two studies involved pairings between two cooperating teachers. Three articles described a variety of teaching arrangements.

Co-teaching strategies. Ten of the studies employed a variety of co-teaching strategies, while six did not specify which strategies were used. Two studies primarily described one teach–one observe strategies, two described teaming strategies, and one addressed the one teach–one assist method.

Discussion of Article Pool

Qualitative descriptive methodology was used to provide an overview of the basic shape of co-teaching programs. Using codes generated from the article pool during data analysis, a descriptive summary of co-teaching programs was developed and organized into three thematic domains which best fit the data (Sandelowski, 2000). These thematic areas are: (a) Engagement in praxis; (b) fostering of productive relationships; (c) the inclusion of supportive practices. Each of these domains is composed of several intersecting elements which will be discussed in the following sections. These elements (see Table 1) are largely interrelated with one another and with elements from other domains, and tend to impact or be impacted by constituent elements from all three domains. The following sections discuss each of these elements and their respective domains.

Table 1

Elements of Successful Co-Teaching Programs

Issues of Praxis	Relationship Development	Supportive Practice
Critical Reflection	Parity	Community of Praxis
Co-Generative Dialogue	Collaboration	Stakeholder Attitudes
Shared Experiences	Communication	Stakeholder Expectations
Social Context	Tension Resolution	Stakeholder Roles
Co-Planning	Teaching Philosophy	Co-Teaching Strategies
	Co-Respect	Modeling
	Trust	Time
	Co-Responsibility	

Table 1

Issues of praxis. Elements of praxis were discussed in sixteen of the 22 articles reviewed. Several studies addressed the notion of praxis directly, while most simply described issues which can be considered components of praxis. For example, discussions about dialogue, reflective dialogue, and co-generative dialogue were grouped into the praxis category as co-generative dialogue. This specific term was used primarily by earlier researchers, such as Tobin and Roth (2005) and Scantlebury et al. (2008), but remains an effective descriptor for the type of equitable, shared reflection recommended by other authors (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Cramer et al., 2010). Although each individual article did not always reference praxis directly, the key ideas presented were closely related to the cycle of reflection, action and transformation. Each of these elements will be discussed in the sub-sections below.

Critical reflection. Six studies described the importance of critical reflection to the co-teaching process, and its impact on co-teacher relationships. Critical reflection is the mechanism by which co-teaching makes unconscious practices explicit (Scantlebury et al., 2008). It is this kind of critical reflection, not merely descriptive reflection, which makes useful connections between theory and practice (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). Co-teachers need to have plenty of

regular, meaningful opportunities throughout their practicums to reflect on their experiences (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Teacher educators must also expand student notions of reflective practice to include both self-reflection and team reflection (Cramer et al., 2010).

Engaging in discussion and feedback about issues of teaching practice strengthens the community of praxis and is more valuable to pre-service teachers than the actual teaching experience (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). Anderson and Freebody (2012) also argue that students learn about teaching through socially mediated relationships with their teaching partners, cooperating teacher, and university instructors in ways which are consistent with the Vygotskian principles underpinning the community of praxis. Co-teachers with a weak or dysfunctional relationship, such as those plagued by unresolved disagreements or overly-competitive attitudes, are not challenged to reflect upon teaching styles or methodologies (Stairs et al., 2009). When used prior to the field experience, critical reflection about teacher strengths and weaknesses can promote relationship-building conversations among co-teachers (Parker et al., 2010).

Co-generative dialogue. Six of the studies analyzed discussed reflective dialogue, with four using the specific term *co-generative dialogue*, as an essential component of co-teaching praxis. Roth et al. (2004) describe co-generative dialoguing as a process of discussing and theorizing the experiences of a lesson with the intent to facilitate improvements in teaching and learning by designing changes in the learning environment. Co-generative dialogues are open conversations in which participants engage in active listening, honest expression of opinions, and the acceptance of collective responsibility for the unfolding events of the classroom (Tobin, 2006). These dialogues provide opportunities for teacher candidates, associate teachers, administrators and faculty supervisors to reflect on their praxis and to focus on issues related to

the enactment of co-teaching, co-planning, classroom management, student motivation, program objectives, learning goals, assessments and parent interaction (Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Co-generative dialogues can have different characteristics, but the focus is always on the shared educational experiences of participants and the collective intent to improve student learning (Scantlebury et al., 2008). They may include small or large groups of students reflecting together with co-teachers on the successes and challenges of a recent lesson by drawing on their shared experiences (Tobin, 2006; Tobin & Roth, 2005). It is easier for students to support and anticipate change in the classroom when they are aware of what the teacher is attempting to change, and can play a role in that discussion (Tobin, 2006). Each participant should have an opportunity to voice their perspectives in order to inform stakeholders' emerging understanding of the patterns of activity which mitigate or contribute to collective accomplishments (Tobin & Roth, 2005).

Co-generative dialogues require mutual respect between co-teachers and shared responsibility for the co-teaching process (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Open dialogue between teachers and administrators is essential for engaging in professional development which meets the needs of collaborative teams (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012). Cramer et al. (2010) argue that adult interpersonal interaction, team reflection, and the integrity of instruction and student performance must become a part of reflective teaching practice. While co-generative dialogue affords participants the opportunity to negotiate goals, roles and resources among all stakeholders, it can also be used to recognize patterns of both coherence and tension within the classroom (Tobin, 2006). This examination of unconscious practices allows participants to critically reflect upon issues of tension and the power dynamics of the teaching partnership (Tobin & Roth, 2005). When participants are fully engaged in dialogue with the intent to reach

consensus, resolve tension, define and redefine flexible roles and goals, and accept co-responsibility for agreements, co-teachers can more fully benefit from their partner's experience and expertise (Tobin, 2006).

Shared experiences. Seven of the 22 studies in this review discussed the role of shared experiences in co-teaching. The act of teaching with a partner creates a shared experience, which leads to dialogue and reflection about what has occurred in the classroom. This generates shared investment and understanding between co-teachers (Nokes et al., 2008). Co-teachers are able to more easily engage in critical reflection and dialogue about their practice when the teaching experience is not kept private (Nokes et al., 2008; Stairs et al., 2009). Anderson and Freebody (2012) further suggest that reflection on shared experiences—driven by socially mediated relationships with peers—strengthens the community of praxis in a way which is consistent with Vygotskian principles. The additional knowledge gained from participating in co-teaching helps students contextualize their colleagues' reflections and generates advice which is more applicable to a particular classroom experience (Eick & Dias, 2005). The shared experience of co-planning, prior to co-teaching, gives teachers common understandings of classroom instruction and reduces the chance they will have divergent goals (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Tobin and Roth (2005) and Tobin (2006) argue that since observations of another teacher's method are markedly different from the lived experience of co-teaching alongside that teacher, researchers can obtain more dependable data about participants' experiences of praxis if they themselves participate in the shared experience of co-teaching.

Social Context. Six studies discussed the effects of social capital and hidden curriculum on co-teaching. Tobin and Roth (2005) found that, through mutual respect and co-generative dialogues, science co-teachers can build social and symbolic capital and interact effectively

across social boundaries of age, sex, ethnicity and class. Social capital and networking are fundamental to the development of communication, trust and respect between co-teachers (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Social networking promotes collaboration in the community of praxis and is developed in both formal and informal settings such as college lectures, co-planning sessions, carpools and social outings (Scantlebury et al., 2008). The social transactions generated through these socially mediated relationships place co-teachers within Vygotsky's *zone of proximal development* and are at least as valuable to teacher candidates as the practical teaching experience (Anderson & Freebody, 2012; Dang, 2013). Vygotsky is well-known in education for his theories on socially-mediated learning. The *zone of proximal development (ZPD)* refers to the difference between learning unaided and learning through social relationships, wherein a student's potential for learning is increased when they work with peers or are assisted by an adult (Dang, 2013).

In addition to their stated goals, the implicit functions of schools and university programs have an impact on student perceptions of the roles of co-teachers and co-teaching strategies (Arndt & Liles, 2010). When this hidden curriculum contradicts explicit program outcomes, pre-service co-teachers may become socialized in ways which undermine the goals of the co-teaching program (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Conflicts between social norms, course requirements, individual teaching styles and co-teacher beliefs regarding diverse learners can cause tension between partners which mitigate the effectiveness of co-teaching programs (Dang, 2013; McHatton & Daniel 2008). Teachers must work to address these contradictions between theory and practice (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Reflection is a useful strategy for helping co-teachers become more aware of the ways in which social factors impact collaboration (Dang, 2013).

Co-planning. Five studies directly addressed the importance of co-planning and its impact on other aspects of co-teaching. Co-planning is a professional development activity in which co-teachers share ideas, reflect on past experiences, and develop mutual understandings of practice (Scantlebury et al., 2008). It provides co-teachers with opportunities to discuss lesson plans and the roles each partner will adopt during the lesson (Parker et al., 2010).

Co-planning is a critical element of successful co-teaching (Bacharach et al., 2008). Collaborative planning skills should be taught in pre-service programs and reinforced through in-service instruction in order to help support effective co-teachers in both general and special education cohorts (Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). Without co-planning, teachers may hold such divergent goals for students and differing understandings of classroom instruction that they appear uncoordinated or even in opposition to one another. Unlike everyday tension, which stimulates discussion and reflection, this kind of disagreement can be disastrous (Scantlebury et al., 2008). When teacher candidates are not encouraged or required to schedule regular co-planning times, they miss opportunities for developing teaching practices, goal-setting, communication, and the negotiation of participant roles (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Parker et al., 2010). Students who plan and teach collaboratively engage in extensive talk about teaching practice, fostering an environment which is conducive to professional development (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

Relationship development. The second major category of co-teaching skills is relationship development. In this section, each element included in the relationship category relates to the connections, conflicts, and power dynamics between co-teachers. Eighteen of the 22 studies examined in this review described the ways in which these relationships are founded, developed and maintained. Some studies, like Nokes et al. (2008), paired participants at random

to both positive and negative feedback from participants. Many studies did not disclose whether participants were able to choose their teaching partners, but the literature generally supported the idea that partners needed time to get to know one another in order to be most compatible (Darragh et al., 2011; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; Parker et al., 2010; Scantlebury et al., 2008). This body of literature indicates that there are eight aspects to developing successful co-teaching relationships: parity, collaboration, open and honest communication, tension resolution skills, compatible teaching philosophies, professional respect, mutual trust, and co-responsibility for co-teaching. Each of these elements will be discussed in the following sub-sections.

Parity. Twelve of 22 studies describe issues of parity, equality, and power, and how these issues can affect the co-teaching process. Collaboration naturally involves some disagreements, but a power struggle between teachers presents a more significant challenge (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). An imbalance of power between co-teachers may be caused by competition between teacher candidates, perceptions of favouritism by cooperating teachers, a lack of content expertise by one partner, or a difference in authority between partners (Arndt & Liles, 2010; King, 2006; Stairs et al., 2009).

Competition between peers poses a challenge to collaboration, communication and critical reflection (Stairs et al., 2009). Goodnough et al. (2009) argue that one common concern for teacher candidates is the belief that they are being unfavourably compared against their partner by the supervising teacher. Another is the fear that their partner is perceived as the harder worker, a concern which is exacerbated in situations where there is a noticeable difference in teaching ability between partners. Scantlebury et al. (2008) suggest that these issues can be remediated by addressing cultural expectations through co-generative dialoguing.

General educators are often perceived as doing more work than special educators when there is a disparity in content expertise (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). When special educators with little knowledge of curriculum content are partnered with a content expert, such as may be the case in secondary school classrooms, they risk being perceived by students as an assistant (Arndt & Liles, 2010). When combined with the one teach–one assist model of co-teaching, special educators can easily be relegated to the role of a paraprofessional or volunteer (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). It is for this reason that Hamilton-Jones and Vail (2013) argue that the one teach–one assist model of co-teaching should be avoided in favour of more fully collaborative models, such as teaming. If parity is to be achieved, each member of the community of praxis must be equally valued and respected as a professional (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). It is important for co-teachers to share the belief that each is prepared to teach content to a diverse range of students, necessitating that special educators should seek to acquire competence in applicable content areas while general educators develop skills in differentiated instruction (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Special educators must also be assertive in their role as co-teachers to help ensure parity with their partner (McHatton & Daniel, 2008).

When a teacher candidate and cooperating teacher form a co-teaching team, the difference in authority and professional experience can hinder open dialogue, critical reflection, and honest communication (Stairs et al., 2009). For this reason, cooperating teachers should be reminded of the apprehension that pre-service teachers can experience and how that may impact their agency as teaching partners (Stairs et al., 2009). Being questioned by an experienced mentor teacher is fundamentally different from engaging in questioning with a peer (Nokes et al., 2008). When a mentorship pairing transitions from a co-generative to a hierarchical model, the teacher in a position of authority begins to influence the agency of their partner while also losing

that partner's respect (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Co-teachers must learn self-advocacy skills to help them develop as effective collaborators (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012). Co-teachers whose partners are failing to meet the requirements set by the community of practice may feel obligated to take on an authoritative role to ensure learning goals for students are met (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Cooperating teachers should also give teacher candidates opportunities to be assertive in their roles as authority figures so that both co-teachers can be perceived by students as being equally authoritative. When cooperating teachers take complete control over classroom management as they would in a single-teacher classroom, they take authority away from their more novice partners. This can be a challenge for teachers who are accustomed to having a high degree of control over how their classroom is managed. At the same time, teacher candidates must boldly establish themselves as equally-authoritative teachers even though there is a significant experience gap between partners. Co-teachers who acknowledge that classroom management is a shared responsibility will have a more equal relationship because they will each be involved in classroom activities:

> Co-responsibility occurred when each teacher assumed responsibility for all aspects of the classroom: the instruction, the students, and the teaching and learning outcomes. Co-responsibility incorporated equally shared authority, classroom preparation, instruction, and other aspects of management. Participants described a balanced "give and take" between co-teachers when co-responsibility for coteaching[sic] occurred. (Scantlebury et al., 2008, p. 976)

Co-teachers must have parity with one another if they are to effectively take co-responsibility for their classroom (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Effective co-teachers willingly share leadership roles, direct classroom activities as a coherent unit, and remain engaged in their

partner's lessons even while not providing instruction (Bacharach et al., 2008; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Co-teachers with more friendly, trusting and equitable relationships spend more time using fully collaborative models of co-teaching (Goodnough et al., 2009). Co-teaching programs must teach participants how to work as a team and to address issues of parity (Bacharach et al., 2010). Shared time with teaching partners, in education classes and during co-planning sessions, gives teachers an opportunity to clearly determine the roles each will take during co-teaching time, which may help mitigate any disparity between general and special educators (Parker et al., 2010).

Collaboration. Eleven of 22 studies examined discussed the importance and development of collaboration skills among teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and teacher educators. Co-teaching is a form of collaboration, but collaboration is not co-teaching unless it involves shared planning, decision-making, teaching, and accountability for all students (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). In order to develop successful collaboration and co-teaching experiences, both general and special education teachers need skills in classroom management, data collection, co-planning, communication, interpersonal interaction, differentiated instruction, and self-advocacy (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012). Shared learning, responsibilities and resources as well as implementing structured co-planning time contribute to positive co-teacher collaboration (Darragh et al, 2011; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Effective collaboration also involves the sharing of ideas between co-teachers (Yopp et al., 2014). To ensure parity between teaching partners, teacher candidates and cooperating teachers must have shared opportunities to develop and practice collaborative skills and dispositions and to reflect upon this process (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg 2010; Cramer et al., 2010; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Nokes et al., 2008; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). Teachers are

more likely to engage in collaboration in the future when they have trained together as teams (Nokes et al., 2008). Giving assignments to teacher candidates to complete with students other than their teaching partner reduces opportunities to develop collaborative relationships between those partners (Parker et al., 2010).

Collaboration can be challenging for both teacher educators and teacher candidates, and may require departmental support (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). Teacher educators can have difficulty using flexible groupings in inadequate classroom spaces, such as those with a small size, fixed seating, excessive noise, or poor temperature control (Parker et al., 2010).

Communication. Ten of the 22 studies discussed the role of communication in the development of successful co-teaching relationships. Communication involves the sharing of information between teaching partners. This information may include facts, insights, questions or concerns about their relationship, philosophies, co-teaching, students, and curriculum. Openness and honesty are necessary components of successful communication between co-teachers (Bacharach et al., 2008; 2010; Parker et al., 2010; McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Scantlebury et al., 2008). Effective communication involves honesty, active listening, feedback, sharing of ideas, parity between participants, deliberate use of communication strategies, and attention to body language and nonverbal cues (Bacharach et al., 2008). Such communication skills should be taught and reinforced in pre-service education for both general and special education teacher candidates (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013; Yopp et al., 2014). Communication between teachers and administrators helps collaborative teams engage in authentic professional development (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012). Prior to the field experience, goal-setting activities for both individuals and partnerships can help engage co-teachers in relationship-building conversations (Parker et al., 2010).

Open discussion between co-teachers, with a focus on learning from differences and disagreements, helps to maximize the benefits and minimize the challenges of co-teaching (Bacharach et al., 2010). Co-teachers must trust that their partners have the team's best interests at heart, while fostering the same trust for others. Each partner should understand that their role is to support their colleague, and that criticism must be directed toward strengthening the co-teaching relationship. Co-teachers are more likely to experience frustration or have a negative co-teaching experience when there is confusion about participant roles and poor or unclear communication between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers (Darragh et al., 2011). The structure of co-teacher schedules can have a negative impact on communication when partners do not have opportunities to discuss changes to lesson plans prior to co-teaching sessions (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Structural features of the university classroom, such as fixed seating and poor acoustics, can also hinder effective communication (Parker et al., 2010).

Tension resolution. Ten of the 22 studies examined in this literature review discussed the effects of tension, conflict and disagreement on co-teachers' ability to co-teach effectively. Tension is an expected feature of co-teaching which can arise from conflicts between the implicit and explicit social, cultural and professional roles of participants. Co-teachers can prepare to address tension by understanding that it is both normal and helpful when accompanied by effective communication and a commitment to working together as a team (Dang, 2013). Spending time learning about one another's experiences and perspectives on education can help co-teachers generate understanding about their partner's thought processes, enabling them to more effectively find solutions to disagreements.

Unexpected deviation from established lesson plans can be a source of tension, and should be addressed through co-generative dialogues (Tobin, 2006). This is an effective strategy

because conflicts between co-teachers are most effectively resolved when they are discussed openly among participants (Dang, 2013). Exposure to tension stimulates dialogue and reflection about teaching practice and improves co-teachers' planning, teaching and reflection skills (Dang, 2013; Nokes et al., 2008). Learning to teach is an ongoing, collaborative process. Problem-solving strategies should be directed toward generating a deeper understanding of teaching and learning for the team as a whole.

Co-teachers who avoid addressing issues of tension, or who perceive that such conflict negates their collaborative efforts, risk developing unrealistic definitions of collaboration and are more likely to have a negative co-teaching experience (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Tension can be more challenging to resolve in mentorship-oriented co-teaching relationships with a power differential compared to peer partnerships (Nokes et al., 2008). Even after faculty intervention, tension resolution skills may sometimes be insufficient to overcome conflicts between co-teachers. In such cases of severe unresolvable tension, reassignment to different partners may be required (Tobin & Roth, 2005).

Problem-solving, conflict resolution and self-advocacy skills should be taught to general and special education teacher candidates as well as cooperating teachers (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; King, 2006; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). Co-teachers are less likely to experience tension and more likely to develop strong communication skills when they are comfortable with one another (Darragh et al., 2011). Encouraging (and preparing) co-teachers to participate in the decision-making process of assigning teaching partners is one method for achieving this desired goal (Stairs et al., 2009).

Teaching philosophy. Seven studies in this review discussed the implications of conflict and compatibility between different teaching philosophies, styles and identities. Common

tensions between co-teachers can centre around conflicting values, work ethics, opinions, backgrounds, identities and personalities (Dang, 2013; Nokes et al., 2008; Tobin, 2006). Acceptance of different personalities and compatibility of teaching styles and philosophies are important elements in developing effective co-teaching relationships (Bacharach et al., 2008; Parker et al., 2010). Successful co-teachers view their differences as assets and opportunities for reflection, while unsuccessful pairings perceive differences as challenges (Nokes et al., 2008). Conflict between co-teacher identities can impact the way co-teachers cognitively and affectively perceive their experiences–the ways in which co-teachers think and feel about teaching shape and are shaped by their relationship with their partner (Dang, 2013). Co-teachers whose teaching styles are irreconcilably dissimilar may abandon co-teaching altogether (Nokes et al., 2008).

Teacher educators must carefully consider the ways in which teacher candidates might be grouped into teaching teams and placed in schools. Co-teachers who are familiar with one another prior to the field experience are more likely to perceive co-teaching as effective (Goodnough et al., 2009). In order to reduce the chances of incompatibility between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers, education students should be given opportunities to observe their future teaching partner prior to being placed in the field (Darragh et al., 2011). This observation period helps establish open communication between partners and allows teacher educators to assign different partners if compatibility appears to be poor (Darragh et al., 2011).

Co-teachers who find common ground with one another are better able to focus on effective collaboration and co-planning (Parker et al., 2010). Joint learning and planning time gives participants opportunities to develop their relationships and plan instruction based on each partner's strengths and weaknesses (Darragh et al., 2011).

Co-respect. Six of 22 studies discussed the importance of respect in co-teaching relationships. Co-respect is mutual respect between co-teachers which fosters communication, constructive criticism, collaboration of ideas, and productive co-teaching experiences (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Successful co-teaching relationships rely on mutual respect for teaching partners as professionals who can make valuable contributions to collaborative praxis (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2008; Darragh et al., 2011; Scantlebury et al., 2008). Co-respect is also essential to ensuring successful tension resolution between co-teachers (Tobin & Roth, 2005).

Co-teachers should be given opportunities and time to develop mutual respect prior to the field experience (Bacharach et al., 2010). Opportunities to develop co-respect include both formal events, such as co-planning sessions, and informal social gatherings, such as after-school drinks at a bar (Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Scantlebury et al. (2008) argue that tacit social and cultural expectations have an impact on co-respect. Teachers who choose not to arrive at school early or stay late for planning are perceived as having a poor work ethic, and can lose the respect of their colleagues. Cooperating teachers who exclude teacher candidates from decision-making or neglect to justify pedagogical choices may lose the respect of teacher candidates, while teacher candidates who fail to meet the expectations of the community of practice may also lose the respect of their mentors. Co-generative dialoguing can be an effective strategy for addressing such issues.

Trust. Seven studies in this literature review emphasized the importance of trust in developing successful co-teaching relationships. In order to achieve parity between co-teachers, each partner must trust in one another's professional capabilities (Arndt & Liles, 2010). They must also believe that their partner has a strong work ethic (Parker et al., 2010). Three studies

found that trust is an essential element of co-teaching for both teacher candidates and cooperating teachers (Bacharach et al., 2008; Darragh et al., 2011; Scantlebury et al., 2008). A foundation of trust must be developed at the beginning of the co-teaching relationship and then nurtured and maintained throughout the field experiences (Bacharach et al., 2010). Co-teachers who establish this mutual trust prior to the field experience tend to favour more collaborative co-teaching strategies (Goodnough et al., 2009). Finally, teacher educators who wish to foster a safe and trusting classroom environment should stress the importance of confidentiality. Breaches of trust, such as gossip about colleagues, can make co-teachers unwilling to share information with their partner. Co-teachers who feel compelled to discuss their conflicts outside the partnership should exercise careful discretion. Building a positive learning environment for teacher candidates requires safe spaces where they can share their experiences without fear of social or academic reprisals (Parker et al., 2010).

Co-responsibility. Six studies discussed co-responsibility between teaching partners. Co-responsibility occurs when each teacher assumes responsibility for all aspects of planning, instruction, classroom management, students, and teaching and learning outcomes (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Co-teachers share professional responsibility by making commitments to jointly educate students, prepare and present information on students in meetings, take responsibility for students with special needs, and uphold each teacher's responsibilities toward their students (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Co-responsibility for participation in dialogue and reflection are essential elements of co-teaching and co-generative dialogues (Scantlebury et al., 2008; Tobin & Roth, 2005). Co-teachers must also learn to share responsibility for differentiated instruction (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

Dialogue and reflection about the shared experience of co-teaching helps co-teachers develop shared investment and understanding (Nokes et al., 2008). Successful co-teachers must recognize that extra time and flexibility are required to establish social networks between individuals (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Focus can be diverted away from co-responsibility if teacher candidates feel they are being compared with or competing against their peers. When a co-teacher becomes concerned that others may perceive them as less hard working than their partner, they may feel obligated to take on greater personal responsibility at the expense of their partner's contributions. Faculty and cooperating teachers should take care to ensure that teacher candidate evaluations are relative to all co-teaching candidates and do not compare them solely to their partners (Goodnough et al., 2009). Arndt and Liles (2010) suggest that "co-teaching will only work when both teachers are willing to work together. There needs to be an understanding that there is no longer your classroom, my classroom; it's our classroom" (p. 19). Co-teaching partnerships can experience increased tension when participants do not assume roles with shared responsibility, or when one partner is perceived to be unprepared to take responsibility for content instruction. When a co-teacher feels compelled to take on extra responsibilities to ensure student learning goals are met, they become frustrated. A partner who feels their responsibilities are being taken from them may perceive their partner as selfish or unwilling to collaborate (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

Supportive practice. Co-teachers and students are not the only stakeholders involved in the co-teaching process. Cooperating teachers, school administrators, university faculty and researchers all contribute to the learning of teacher candidates. A school community which outlines clear goals for collaborative professional development will help support their co-teachers. Effective communication and collaboration between the university faculty and the

school will help to establish a network of professional support that teacher candidates can use during their field placements. Many aspects of co-teaching for which teacher candidates are not directly responsible fall under the category of support. Nineteen studies examined in this literature review discussed how the community of praxis, stakeholder attitudes, participant expectations, stakeholder roles, co-teaching strategies, modeling, and time constraints all contribute to or detract from effective co-teaching programs. Each of these elements will be discussed in the following sub-sections.

Community of praxis. Eleven studies discussed issues related to communities of practice or communities of praxis. Although not every article explicitly uses the term community of practice or community of praxis, many of the challenges they encountered were closely related to such structures. The goal of the community of praxis is to reconcile the theory developed in the university with the practice of everyday classrooms (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). Developing a community of praxis between the university and school administration helps ensure that the culture and practices of schools do not conflict with the knowledge and attitudes about co-teaching engendered by the university (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Maintaining supportive relations with professional education communities helps pre-service teachers train more effectively, gain an understanding of the relationship between theory and practice, and develop a greater appreciation for collegial relationships (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). The community of praxis provides teacher candidates with immediate opportunities to scaffold into reflective strategies, rather than delaying the development of those techniques until after the field placement has concluded (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). The professional feedback given to teacher candidates is perceived to be more valuable than the teaching experience, but since reflective practice is not

an inherent skill, it must be explicitly developed in teacher education programs (Anderson & Freebody, 2012).

Parker et al. (2010) warn that inadequate learning spaces can hinder the development of communities of practice. Disparity between pre-service cohorts, such as a separation of general and special educators, can also cause divisions within the community of practice (Parker et al., 2010).

Teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and university supervisors require ongoing support and professional development (Bacharach et al., 2010). University and school staff can work together to offer mutual professional development opportunities around co-teaching endeavours—and issues (Cramer et al., 2010). Program facilitators should continue to meet with cooperating teachers throughout the field placement to discuss experiences, assess progress, and provide intervention if necessary (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). Co-generative dialogues can involve all members of the community of praxis, including teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, program administrators, field supervisors and researchers (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Informal meetings between members of the community of praxis provide opportunities for participants to collaborate and take co-responsibility for student learning (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Teacher candidates should be encouraged to dialogue with co-teachers from other teams to get a sense of how other pairings are working together (Stairs et al., 2009). One tool which may be effective for collective reflection and sharing of knowledge is electronic journaling and dialogue (Eick & Dias, 2005). Team-building activities can be used to help teacher candidates become less anxious, address issues of parity, and begin to develop a community of praxis (Parker et al., 2010). Finally, teacher candidates tend to better

communicate, reflect and work collaboratively when the school culture emphasizes collaboration and open communication (King, 2006).

Stakeholder attitudes. Eight of 22 studies discussed the impact of stakeholder attitudes on effective co-teaching. In order for co-teaching to be successful, school and faculty administrators must be committed to supporting the co-teaching process (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Co-teachers must also be willing to work together (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Teachers who are currently co-teaching have more confident and positive attitudes about co-teaching than those not currently co-teaching (Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). The belief that co-teaching is too difficult or unrealistic may undermine or even disrupt the co-teaching process (Nokes et al., 2008).

Pre-service co-teachers with more experience, such as those with Masters degrees, are generally more likely to perceive co-teaching as valuable and successful (Yopp et al., 2014). Cooperating teachers' attitudes toward co-teaching are also shaped by their experiences with collaborative models of education. Teachers who have only experienced traditional models of education–where each teacher works alone and has total control over their classroom–tend to have fixed ideas about what co-teaching means, and frequently believe that solo placements are more realistic. This can result in situations where cooperating teachers advise their teacher candidates to abandon co-teaching altogether (King, 2006). If not explicitly addressed, the culture and practices of schools can undermine positive co-teacher attitudes (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

Arndt and Liles (2010) warn that both the manifest goals and the latent functions of education programs can influence the values, attitudes and practices of pre-service teachers. In response to incongruity between manifest curricular outcomes and the latent messages delivered by program structures, students may develop narrow perceptions of co-teaching which mimic

traditional educational frameworks. The latent messages delivered by the organizational structures of schools and universities should be examined to determine the ways in which teacher candidates are being socialized which may undermine the efficacy of the co-teaching program (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

A successful co-teaching program begins with outreach to gain the support of school and university stakeholders (Parker et al., 2010). Teacher candidates should be placed with cooperating teachers who value collaborative learning opportunities (Nokes et al., 2008). Cooperating teachers play an important role in shaping teacher candidate attitudes toward co-teaching, and those who favour collaborative planning have a positive influence on teacher candidate collaboration (Nokes et al., 2008). Opportunities to practice co-teaching, such as in-service professional development days, help cooperating teachers become more confident in their skills as co-teachers and the co-teaching process as a whole (Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013).

Stakeholder expectations. Nine studies examined in this literature review discussed expectations for teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and the co-teaching process. Confusion about teacher roles is a common frustration (Darragh et al., 2011). Each participant in a co-teaching program must be made aware of the requirements that have been placed upon them (Bacharach et al., 2010). In order to minimize confusion, maintain open communication, and better ensure that students are safe, expectations for co-planning and classroom procedures must be clearly outlined to teacher candidates at the beginning of the field experience (Darragh et al., 2011; Goodnough et al., 2009).

Co-teachers also need to be aware of their responsibilities for collaboration and differentiated instruction (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Cooperating teachers can play a role in negotiating expectations for teacher candidates (Nokes et al., 2008). When teacher candidates

fail to meet expectations, cooperating teachers may feel obligated to step into an authoritative role to achieve student learning goals (Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Teacher educators wishing to avoid conflict and complications must ensure that they have shared ideas about what constitutes best practices for co-teaching. For example, a constructivist approach is more appropriate for co-teaching than the banking model, because co-teaching is a collaborative meaning-making process. A Freirean approach to critical reflection and the use of the classroom as a transformative, liberating space would also be appropriate, given the complex power dynamics that co-teacher candidates must navigate.

If faculty members have different expectations for program goals or student learning, these conflicts must be addressed during the co-planning stage so that student teachers can have a thorough understanding of each (King, 2006; McHatton & Daniel, 2008). Learning goals for teacher candidates should be specific. When students have a clear understanding of faculty expectations, they can more effectively develop their practice toward those goals (McHatton & Daniel, 2008).

Stakeholder roles. Ten studies described the importance of having clearly defined roles for teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, general and special educators, and administrators. Teacher candidates and cooperating teachers may experience confusion about conflicting classroom management styles and policies if not addressed at the beginning of the field experience (Darragh et al., 2011; Goodnough et al., 2009).

Co-teachers should be given information about the roles they can play during the field experience (Bacharach et al., 2010). These roles should be revisited through co-generative dialogues based on the lived experiences of the co-teaching team and the needs of students and other participants (Tobin, 2006). Young students may also experience confusion when co-

teachers employ collaborative co-teaching models without first providing clear definitions of their roles (Goodnough et al., 2009). Co-planning time before and throughout the field experience gives each partner an opportunity to define and refine their roles in and out of the classroom (Parker et al., 2010).

Cooperating teachers need to understand that their role as a mentor co-teacher is fundamentally different than their role as a supervising teacher in a traditional field placement (Nokes et al., 2008). They should incorporate teacher candidates into classroom instruction on the first day of the practical experience (Bacharach et al., 2010). Cooperating teachers can also provide general education teacher candidates with information about the diverse needs and characteristics of their students which may or may not be visible (McHatton & Daniel, 2008).

Defining the role of a special education co-teacher is challenging in settings where the role of special education teachers is not clearly outlined (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). School administrators should also receive professional development about co-teaching to help them understand the role they play in supporting co-teachers (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012).

When time constraints limit the amount of co-planning time, there is a risk that one partner may be forced to accept a peripheral role while the other takes the lead (Tobin, 2006). Teacher educators should provide models of timetables and best practices to aid cooperating teachers in understanding the roles of teacher candidates (King, 2006). When a special education teacher plays a peripheral role in classroom instruction, students tend to perceive them as an educational assistant rather than a teacher (Arndt & Liles, 2010). When general and special education co-teachers assume their roles do not overlap, they can divide their labour in ways which limit the role of the special educator and make co-responsibility difficult (Arndt & Liles, 2010).

Co-teaching strategies. Twelve studies discussed co-teaching strategies. Co-teachers must have opportunities to learn about and practice a variety of co-teaching strategies (Bacharach et al., 2008; Cramer et al., 2010; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013; Yopp et al., 2014). Co-teaching and co-planning strategies should be incorporated into field preparation for both teacher candidates and cooperating teachers (Bacharach et al., 2010). Such preparation helps ready teacher candidates to take active roles during their field experience (Darragh et al., 2011). Teacher educators should be mindful of the ways in which implicit school structures and attitudes about co-teaching can influence participants' choice of co-teaching strategies (2010).

As co-teachers grow more accustomed to their partner's teaching style, they can more easily transition between different co-teaching strategies (Tobin, 2006). Successful co-teachers are flexible when choosing which co-teaching strategies to implement (Goodnough et al., 2009; Parker et al., 2010). Co-teachers should choose, adapt or discard strategies in response to the needs of students, the needs of other participants, and changes in the lesson plan (Dang, 2013; Goodnough et al., 2009). Teams with less experience tend to start by using more traditional strategies like one teach–one assist, while experienced teachers are more likely to quickly adopt and experiment with more collaborative models (Yopp et al., 2014).

Hamilton-Jones and Vail (2013) argue that the one teach–one assist model is a problematic co-teaching strategy because it often encourages special educators to accept roles normally given to paraprofessionals or even volunteers. Due to the power disparity inherent in one teach–one assist, where the assisting teacher is often perceived as less skilled or authoritative than the one leading classroom activities, more collaborative models such as teaming or parallel teaching may be better suited to co-teaching in diverse classrooms (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013).

Modeling. Four of the 22 studies examined discussed the importance of modeling co-teaching practices for the benefit of teacher candidates. Teacher educators must be explicit about the co-teaching strategies they are modeling (Parker et al., 2010). Arndt and Liles (2010) suggest that the way in which teacher educators model co-teaching influences teacher candidate dispositions and practices. They should be aware of instances where they are modeling poor co-teaching practices and try to discover gaps between their discourse about practice and their enacted practice (Arndt & Liles, 2010; McHatton & Daniel, 2008). Yet this can be a challenging task for teacher educators. In a 2008 study by McHatton and Daniel of English and special education pre-service co-teachers, faculty attempting to co-teach together for the first time discovered that they were just as prone to co-teaching mistakes as their students. Despite a deep mutual respect and extensive content expertise, they often caught themselves modeling poor co-teaching practices such as passively watching their colleagues teach. Videos of co-teaching in action can be a helpful tool for modeling both successful and unsuccessful strategies (Yopp et al., 2014).

Time. Finally, 11 of 22 studies described the need for administrators and teacher educators to give co-teachers sufficient time to plan, learn, teach and reflect with their partners. Co-teaching can be time-consuming partly due to the extensive talk about teaching practice that occurs during co-planning time (Nokes et al., 2008; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). Co-teachers use co-planning time to express, develop and evaluate different ideas, but also to engage in dialogue and reflection about teaching practice (Nokes et al., 2008). Co-planning is therefore a professional development activity in which teachers reflect on their practice by engaging in dialogue about lessons, individual students, classroom management, differentiation, program goals, learning outcomes, student artifacts, assessments, and past experiences (Parker et al.,

2010; Scantlebury et al., 2008). Teacher educators can use dedicated co-planning time to develop interpersonal relationships, clarify roles, and examine philosophical perspectives on program content (Parker et al. 2010).

Co-planning times need to be clearly established (Darragh et al. 2011). Regular co-planning times gives co-teachers opportunities to quickly address problems and concerns, develop roles for each partner, communicate with one another, establish learning goals, plan for differentiated instruction, and generally develop their relationship (Parker et al. 2010). Co-teachers should be encouraged and required to identify specific co-planning times, with teacher candidates spending some additional time preparing for their role during upcoming instruction (Bacharach et al., 2010; Parker et al. 2010). When co-planning time is limited, co-teachers are discouraged from pursuing fully collaborative teaching models (Tobin, 2006). Co-teachers without sufficient co-planning time have difficulty developing common understandings of classroom instruction and are likely to set divergent goals for students (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Electronic discussion boards may not be effective substitutes for face-to-face interaction when co-planning time is limited (McHatton & Daniel, 2008).

Parker et al. (2010) found that co-teachers who do not have time to teach together cannot engage in co-teaching. Participants must have sufficient time in their schedules to actually teach lessons together. Co-teachers with more opportunities to teach together tend to form strong relationships which effectively facilitate reciprocal learning (Parker et al. 2010). Teacher candidates need time to not only practice co-teaching skills but also to reflect on that process (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Yopp et al., 2014). Spending learning time together helps teacher candidates develop their relationships (Darragh et al. 2011). Longer relationships between

teacher candidates and cooperating teachers are more likely to be positive and feature strong communication (Darragh et al. 2011).

The structure of teacher candidates' schedules influences their agency by affecting their capacity to communicate with one another (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Teacher educators should limit the number of teacher candidates each cooperating teacher is responsible for mentoring and ensure that co-teachers have compatible schedules (Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Conclusion

Time was identified as a key factor in developing effective co-teaching practice. Giving co-teachers sufficient time to develop social networks within the community of praxis, practice critical reflection skills and engage in co-planning are essential for reducing tension, improving communication and developing mutual respect. Co-planning time is particularly critical because it is used not only to prepare lessons, but as a professional development opportunity involving shared dialogue and reflection about all aspects of teaching.

Parity between partners was another major issue. Program facilitators must be aware of how less-collaborative co-teaching strategies like one teach–one assist can impact parity, co-responsibility and co-respect. In partnerships between novice and veteran co-teachers, disparity of experience can cause tension and impact communication, honesty, open dialogue and critical reflection. Reflection about the shared experience of co-teaching should be shared with partner teachers who had the same experience, peers who had similar experiences, and faculty who can situate the experience in the context of educational theory.

Finally, understanding and addressing unconscious practices and implicit social structures are key to developing co-respect, critical reflection skills, dialoguing skills and equitable power dynamics as well as reducing tension between partners and within the community of praxis.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

How can drama praxis be used to promote the development of effective pre-service co-teaching skills? This study examines and describes how co-teaching in pre-service teacher education can be situated within the context of drama praxis. In general, it attempts to discover which elements are critical to the development of successful pre-service co-teaching programs. In particular, it investigates: (a) the ways in which drama praxis is used to develop effective co-teaching skills among pre-service co-teachers; (b) the ways in which the structure of a given drama-based program shapes collaborative philosophies; (c) how teacher educators can use drama to develop a community of practice in support of co-teaching.

Due to the contextual nature of the central research question and sub-questions, a qualitative approach was most appropriate for this study. Initially, both ethnography and case study were considered as methodologies for this thesis. An ethnographic approach in this instance would have ideally involved participation from both students and faculty to gain a sense of how program delivery is being perceived. Due to the temporal limitations of a thesis study, this process was deemed impractical. Therefore, this investigation has taken the form of a descriptive single-case study of DRED&C, a postsecondary drama education program in southwestern Ontario which employs co-teaching as a strategy for pre-service teacher education. The study includes two types of data sources. Written policy documents were gathered and examined, and semi-structured interviews were conducted and transcribed with several faculty members in charge of the development of the program.

Participants

The DRED&C program was selected in part because of its convenient geographical proximity to the researcher. The program has been running for nearly 40 years and is

collaboratively developed and delivered by several permanent instructors in conjunction with various guest educators. Two current full-time instructors and one former full-time instructor were selected as ideal participants due to their longtime and recent familiarity with program delivery and objectives. Their authority to make changes to the program and to determine which guest instructors are invited to teach made them logical choices for participation in this study. Each of these instructors had expressed enthusiasm for research in drama education in the past and were expected to be eager to participate in this study. When one potential participant was found to be unavailable, the program director was consulted in an attempt to recruit a third instructor with sufficient knowledge and current experience with the program. The participation of three instructors was preferred, but since this was not feasible, two instructors were considered sufficient.

After completing the Research Ethics Board (REB) process, participants were personally invited via email to join the study. The researcher had developed a positive rapport with these instructors in the past. This, combined with the collaborative professional relationship between participants, facilitated a quick and easy recruitment process. In anticipation of participants' demanding work schedules, interviews were scheduled as far in advance as possible with alternate interview dates in case of unforeseen complications. This strategy helped ensure that each volunteer could complete their interview without disruption.

Research Design

I elected to use a case study methodology for this investigation. Case study is appropriate for exploring situations where the boundary between the phenomenon and its immediate context is not entirely clear (Baxter & Jack, 2008). DRED&C embeds co-teaching within the larger context of drama praxis. Co-teaching is not the core focus of the program, though it is heavily

relied upon for most field placements. It is a collaborative process which is informed by the collaborative nature of drama, integrating it as a single facet of the overall program experience. This investigation was intended to examine and describe how the design of the program and the philosophy of the instructors has shaped the co-teaching aspects of the program. For this reason, descriptive case study was most appropriate for the study at hand (Baxter & Jack, 2008).

Case study methodology was also chosen because it is appropriate for open-ended inquiry involving questions of "how" and "why". It involves collection of data from multiple sources, allowing flexibility in the selection of data collection methods (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Pearson et al., 2015). For this study I used two data sources: First, I obtained and examined documentation which describes the goals, policies and guiding philosophies of DRED&C; Second, I conducted a series of interviews with each of the available program developers to describe how co-teaching is situated in the context of this praxis-based drama program.

Each interview was semi-structured to allow for follow-up questions based on participant responses. This approach to interviewing was important because each participant teaches different courses within the program, and may give more or less comprehensive answers for certain questions. Participants were asked to give written consent prior to scheduling their first interview, verbal consent at the beginning of each interview, and final written, or verbal consent after member checking had been completed. As a criterion for selection, participants were also asked to consent to be audio-recorded as part of the interview process. Participants were given a copy of their transcript after each interview session to review as a member check. They had an opportunity to make clarifications, amendments, additions or omissions to their responses. Additional interviews were scheduled until all questions were answered. Had a participant’s responses differed significantly after member checking, they would have been asked to reflect

about their reasoning for the changes. This information would have provided insight into how participants' perceptions of the program may change over time.

Interviews were held at times and locations convenient to participants. Current professors were most comfortable in their own offices. Participants who had retired would have been consulted about finding an appropriate space, possibly even on campus. In order to ensure that each question was answered thoroughly, and to allow participants time to reflect on their responses, interviews took place over multiple sessions. Each interview session was expected to take 45-60 minutes, but up to 30 minutes of additional time was scheduled in case it was needed to explore follow-up questions. Interviews were digitally audio recorded, and the researcher took supplementary field notes. Afterward, each interview was transcribed verbatim and shown to the appropriate interviewee for member checking. Raw digital data was kept password-protected. Raw physical data was kept locked. All raw data would be retained for five years after completion of the thesis or other published material, then destroyed.

Questions for Semi-Structured Interviews

A series of interview questions were developed based on the core research questions as well as each of the areas identified in the literature review. Each question was designed to elicit information about one or more aspects of the program from the perspective of its facilitators:

1. What is your role within this program?
2. How closely are you involved with student field placements?
3. What core ideas or philosophies inform your pedagogy?
4. How would you say drama helps students develop into reflective practitioners?
5. What sorts of opportunities do your students have to practice collaboration and communication skills?

6. What sorts of opportunities do your students have to practice teaching and lesson planning with a partner?
7. How are partners selected and how are partnerships formed, or nurtured?
8. How can drama help students develop effective interpersonal skills?
9. What emphasis would you say this program places on developing an awareness of social issues such as economic inequality and discrimination?
10. What would you say is unique about the environment of this program?
11. How would you say the unique environment of this program helps students develop equitable teaching partnerships?
12. What sorts of responsibilities and expectations are placed on students during the field experience?
13. In your view, what are effective collaboration strategies in a teaching and learning context?
14. In what ways do you try to model effective collaboration strategies for students?
15. What would you say are the main reasons why this program uses co-teaching for field placements?
16. What are some of the biggest challenges you have faced when sending students out for field placements?
17. How have you addressed some of those challenges?
18. Having encountered various challenges regarding teacher candidates co-teaching and going out on field placements, how has the program itself been adapted to proactively address those challenges?
19. What role would you say this program plays within the larger education community?

20. What would you describe as the most unique or appealing aspect of this program?

Data Coding

To ensure accurate analysis of interviews and program documentation, I used content analysis methodology to code the raw data. Content analysis is helpful in determining trends and patterns in documents, as well as for identifying policy changes over time (Stemler, 2001). Data was coded using an *a priori* method. This method draws upon research to inform coding categories, with allowances for revision of those categories if necessary (Stemler, 2001). Program documentation and interview transcripts were evaluated using the domains and elements of pre-service co-teaching identified in the literature review as guidelines. Coding units which did not match categories identified in the literature review were examined for common elements. When a new theme arose from this group, an additional coding category was generated.

Mayring (2000) suggests that data should be analyzed using a clear procedure for assigning categories to coding units. There are several different strategies for defining coding units which may be used depending on the type of data to be analyzed (Stemler, 2001). Coding for this study involved both interview transcripts and established program policy documents, so a flexible strategy was most appropriate. I used propositional units, which are assessed based on the discrete ideas they are presenting rather than defining coding units syntactically by sentence (Stemler, 2001). Utilizing propositional units was an appropriately versatile option for assessing both interview transcripts and program documentation.

To ensure reliability, the coding process should be replicable. The best way to ensure this is to develop explicit coding instructions which achieve the same results when repeated by both the same coder and by different people (Stemler, 2001). Coding for this study is described

in Chapter 4 using an example from interview transcripts. This example demonstrates how the coding process used study data to generate evidence in support of the research questions. For this study, coding units were categorized based on the twenty elements of effective co-teaching programs as described in Chapter 2. Each coding unit encompassed a single idea, and was assigned to only one category. Coding was assessed and revised throughout the analysis as necessary to ensure that categories were exclusive and exhaustive (Mayring, 2000; Stemler, 2001).

Triangulation is also important for ensuring the validity of qualitative studies (Stemler, 2001). This study used two sources of data, including program documentation and two sets of interviews.

Trustworthiness

Shenton (2004) outlines four constructs for ensuring the trustworthiness of a qualitative study: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility. Shenton (2004) outlines a number of provisions for increasing credibility. Of these provisions, five were most applicable to this study: (a) the use of established methodologies; (b) familiarity with the culture of the participating organization; (c) triangulation; (d) tactics to ensure honesty; (e) member checking.

Use of established methodologies. The data collection and analysis strategies used in this study are common in qualitative research. In conducting this study, I employed descriptive case study methodology as described in previous sections for data collection (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Pearson et al., 2015). Coding and analysis of data were conducted using content analysis methods, as previously outlined (Mayring, 2000; Stemler, 2001).

Familiarity with the culture of the participating organization. As a former student of DRED&C, I was familiar with the culture and philosophies of this community. I spent four years immersed in this environment as an undergraduate student, and had developed a good understanding of the roles each participant plays within this type of community.

Triangulation. To gain a more complete picture of the relationship between co-teaching and drama praxis, I conducted interviews with two of the current program developers. Each participant was asked to give multiple interviews and to respond to follow-up emails when clarification was needed. I also collected supporting data in the form of program documentation to verify details and address discrepancies between interview transcripts.

Tactics to ensure honesty. Participants were encouraged to communicate openly and honestly, and were assured that the data is completely confidential. To utilize interview time effectively, duplicate questions which would improve consistency were not included. As reflective practitioners and outspoken drama advocates, participants approach program development as an ongoing process. I believe that participants spoke honestly and openly about the successes and challenges they had experienced.

Member checking. Each participant was given an opportunity, either in person or via email, to review the transcript of their interview. They were able to make changes for clarity, or to redact answers with which they were no longer comfortable. This member checking process was intended to help ensure accuracy and clarity of participant responses (Shenton, 2004).

Transferability. Although the drama praxis-based approach to co-teaching is uncommon—and therefore a valuable target for study—transferability may be limited by certain contextual factors (Shenton, 2004). Practitioners in similar situations may be able to relate to this study's findings, but since the program is facilitated by so few individuals, those

practitioners are also likely to be situated in a unique context. The short length of the study may also limit transferability. This does not mean that this study is inherently untrustworthy, simply that it reflects a unique perspective on the phenomenon of pre-service co-teaching. Teacher educators seeking alternative philosophies to integrate into their own co-teaching programs may find this study useful regardless of transferability.

Dependability. In terms of dependability, the time constraints upon the researcher and participants did not allow for a variety of overlapping methods. While this does not easily allow repeated studies to achieve a similar outcome, Shenton (2004) describes several ways which can be used to improve dependability. In an effort to improve the dependability of this study, I have tried to be thorough in describing the design and implementation of my research. I took careful note of details during the gathering of data, and have continually reflected upon the effectiveness of my process of inquiry.

Confirmability. Shenton (2004) outlines the importance of confirmability, or the researcher's level of objectivity. In addition to triangulation, detailed methodological descriptions, and a recognition of a method’s limitations, a key strategy for addressing confirmability is to acknowledge researcher predispositions. I have participated in the DRED&C program as a student, and I acknowledge that my experience was overwhelmingly positive. I also recognize that no educational program is perfect, and that there is always room for improvement. I have offered recommendations for improving the co-teaching aspects of the program based on my findings, and generally desire that this program and its stakeholders continue to be successful. It is because of this desire to improve the program that I have endeavoured to describe the co-teaching phenomenon in as much detail as possible within the

context of drama praxis. I hope that the findings of this study will be useful for the program developers as they continue to make adjustments to the program.

Interpretive Framework

The data from this study was interpreted with the intention of developing practical solutions for some of the challenges associated with pre-service co-teaching. This framework draws from some of the pragmatic elements of grounded theory. Grounded theory methodology begins with no preconceived conceptual framework, but rather uses modifiable coding to generate and integrate categories throughout the analysis process while maintaining an openness to emerging concepts (Age, 2011).

According to Age (2011), a pragmatic approach to grounded theory is concerned with solving empirical problems more than with the accuracy of a theory: it seeks credibility by considering questions of validity, workability, relevance and modifiability. It asks: (a) How well do the generated concepts describe patterns in the data? (b) Do these concepts account for the concerns of the participants? (c) Are these ideas important to practitioners? (d) Is the theory continuously modifiable? By considering these questions, this study aims to provide solutions which may be practical for addressing challenges associated with pre-service co-teaching.

Ethical Considerations

This study underwent review by the University of Windsor Ethics Review Board prior to the recruitment of participants. The application for this review was filled out and submitted after the proposal for this study was assessed and approved by the Faculty of Education.

Each volunteer who participated in this study was a tenured university professor who had either been teaching in this program for many years, or had recently retired from such a position. When one potential participant was unavailable, the program director was consulted for advice

about interviewing a current guest instructor. In this case any applicable instructors would not have been tenured, and extra care would have been taken to ensure their anonymity. No instructors meeting these criteria were found.

Since the interviews were concerned primarily with program implementation and the roles of participants, it was deemed unlikely that any of their responses could be considered harmful to themselves or others. However, some participants had close working relationships with one another and with other colleagues. Many readers would have been able to recognize direct quotations even if pseudonyms were used. For this reason, it was determined that participants should approach interviews as though they were speaking in an official capacity, and that pseudonyms would not be used. In addition to ensuring confidentiality of transcripts, it might have been necessary to paraphrase any potentially controversial statements rather than quoting them directly. Participants were reminded during member checks that quotations might be published in case they wanted to make changes.

It was expected that the information outlined in program documentation would match the general descriptions of the program and individual courses, which were already publicly available. It was unlikely that the results of this inquiry would concern university administration, as the program had been operating successfully for multiple decades with a great deal of autonomy. Regardless, any conclusions which could be considered critical of the participants' university should be carefully worded to avoid causing conflict for volunteers.

Chapter 4 – Summary of Data

After conducting interviews, data were transcribed and divided into coding units. These coding units have been organized by category and formatted as paragraphs for readability, without additional analysis or commentary.

Coding

After each interview, recorded data were transcribed verbatim and a copy sent to participants for member checking. Both participants declined to review their transcripts. In addition to the two sets of interviews, the collected data includes a copy of the most recent internal review of the program. Each of these documents has undergone *a priori* coding based on the categories established in the literature review. In many cases, a participant's response to an interview question addressed issues relevant to multiple coding categories. For this reason, the text was initially divided into recording units of varying lengths depending on how many topics were discussed in each response. Then, each unit was broken down into a series of simple statements to better understand the underlying ideas within the data (Stemler, 2001). For example, this excerpt from one of the interviews in response to the question "What would you say are the core ideas or philosophies that inform your pedagogy?" includes several ideas relevant to the Philosophy category:

> Definitely I look at things from a critical pedagogy. I look at things from a social, socially constructed pedagogy, so people like Vygotsky, people like Dewey with progressive education, and then drama practitioners like Brian Way, Cecily O'Neill, you know, all of those fundamental–Peter Slade, which is going all the way back to the fundamentals of play and drama–so all of my pedagogy's informed by educational

> theorists as well as drama theorist-practitioners. So merging the two together. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

From this excerpt, four recording units are generated and broken down into these ideas: (a) The educational philosophy of faculty includes critical pedagogy; (b) The educational philosophy of faculty includes social constructivist influences like Vygotsky and Dewey; (c) The educational philosophy of faculty includes the work of drama practitioners like Brian Way, Cecily O'Neill and Peter Slade; and (d) Faculty try to merge socially constructed pedagogy with the work of drama theorist-practitioners. Each of these ideas was then categorized under Philosophy.

Stemler (2001) advises that the categories used in a priori coding should be revised as needed throughout the coding process to ensure mutual exclusivity and exhaustiveness. Several prominent ideas brought up in interviews were similar with existing categories, but not always different enough to warrant the creation of a new category. Therefore, one category was renamed to reflect the inclusion of these related elements and one new category was created. The Philosophy category was renamed to Philosophy and Teaching Identity to include stylistic teaching choices based on educational philosophies. Throughout the literature review, notions of physical space as a logistical obstacle were mentioned in several categories. The interview data generated enough recording units describing the impact of physical and social space on co-teaching to justify the creation of a new category: Space.

Recording units often described ideas which could be placed into multiple categories. For example, "Sometimes instructors even participate in performance-based community placements" could be categorized under Modeling, Community of Praxis, or even Stakeholder Roles. In all such cases, the PI considered the statement in the context of the paragraph surrounding the recording unit as well as the context of the question which was being answered.

Interviewees sometimes discussed ideas which were directly relevant to a different topic while being only tangentially related to the question being answered. In the above example, the interviewee was discussing their involvement with student field placements–specifically their role in relation to community placements. Considering that context, this recording unit shows how the interviewee acts as part of students' support network, and should therefore be categorized under Community of Praxis. This issue occurred frequently and could therefore have an undesirable impact on the reliability of the coding process. To help mitigate this impact, the context of each interview question was considered in a second round of coding to ensure that each recording unit was placed in the appropriate category.

Many of the recording units related multiple categories to one another, but each recording unit could be placed only in a single category. Some categories, therefore, have only a few recording units assigned to them–even though those categories are referenced by recording units found in other sections.

Data Summary

Below is a summary of the data from each coding category. This summary, organized as shown in Table 2 below, follows the same order as described in Table 1. The category of Philosophy has been changed to reflect the importance of teaching identity, and the new category of Space has been added to the end of the Supportive Practice super-category.

Table 2

Elements of Successful Co-Teaching Programs

Issues of Praxis	Relationship Development	Supportive Practice
Critical Reflection	Parity	Community of Praxis
Co-Generative Dialogue	Collaboration	Stakeholder Attitudes
Shared Experiences	Communication	Stakeholder Expectations
Social Context	Tension Resolution	Stakeholder Roles
Co-Planning	Philosophy and Teaching Identity	Co-Teaching Strategies
	Co-Respect	Modeling
	Trust	Time
	Co-Responsibility	Space

Table 2

Issues of praxis.

This section summarizes interview data and program review data relating to issues of praxis within the DRED&C program.

Critical reflection. DRED&C faculty emphasize critical pedagogy as a core philosophy, using questioning and problem-posing to help students develop innovative thinking. Drama is used as a vehicle for questioning, as well as for introspection and thinking about learning. Students who participate more in dramatic activities have richer introspective skills than their peers, and drama allows instructors to evaluate students' level of engagement with introspective thinking.

Reflective practice is central to each activity and assignment. Students practice critical reflection skills through the regular use of journaling, self-assessment, performance and discussions. During their field experience, students make connections between their assigned readings, in-class activities, and their practice teaching experiences by writing reflective journals. They also submit written reflections in the form of post-instruction notes on their lesson plans,

allowing instructors to directly compare reflections with students' lesson plans. Some reflections tell a visual story in the form of performance or even digital performance. Performance-based reflections provide different feedback from written reflections. Instructors can observe the intensity of students' reflections by watching recorded performances highlighting the challenges students have faced, what they have grown or developed, and what they have learned about themselves. Instructors also lead class or group discussions about every activity. It is important for students to understand not only the purpose of each activity, but how and when it can be used meaningfully in the classroom. Students are also asked to talk about what they took from the experience, and consider how they might incorporate this new knowledge into their practice. They are encouraged to make connections to themselves and to their past work.

DRED&C students are simultaneously students and practicing teachers. These student-teachers must think in different ways than they would as students, and the point of reflection occurs where these two roles meet–when students make connections between what they learn in the classroom and their development as teachers. Students discuss theoretical frameworks, engage in practical activities, and reflect about praxis in every class.

> So the curriculum, the design of courses, are balanced between academic and practical. So there's the research component in every class, because the practice means nothing if it's not rooted in, or informed by, earlier practice or theory or methodologies. So there's that. That is a big component of every class. And then the other big piece is putting it all to practice. Putting it all to practice happens in the field, of course, because they get field placement, but that's only a limited amount of time, because of course, they're undergrads, they're not at the faculty of education, so they get a little amount of time to

> do that. So what has to happen in the class is a big practical component which is very collaborative. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

Students are asked to consider how to incorporate the knowledge of drama theorists into their teaching practice, then to reflect about their practical experiences with their peers.

> Before we get to actually writing out the lesson plan, which is just filling in boxes, there's so much work that has to happen before and that's understanding why we have outcomes. It's understanding why the body needs to warm up, physically, creatively, and so on, in order to engage in creative and critical work. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

Students cannot gain more than a surface understanding of drama work unless they spend time connecting their practice to the theoretical work of drama practitioners.

> You can't embody [drama work] or understand how the students are embodying it or how we're embodying it if you don't understand how the work came to be and what the layers of the work really mean. So if we're working in role for instance, *teacher-in-role*, there are so many layers and preparation of working in role that there's a purpose for it. In fact, working in role is not about the teacher at all, and it's not even about the performance. The working in role is about leading the drama forward for students in role. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

The ubiquity of reflective practices in the DRED&C program essentially forces students to engage in introspective thinking. Students are encouraged to learn the underlying theory behind drama techniques and strategies rather than limiting themselves by focusing on the strategies themselves. Learning to understand the purpose and theory behind dramatic processes will help students develop and adapt their own techniques rather than copying activities from books or teaching drama by rote. Despite this emphasis, one of the challenges that faculty have

faced in the last 5-8 years is an apparent decline in students' willingness to reflect about–and understand the importance of–drama theory.

> It is a big issue and we can't let them get away from it because it's what's going to sustain them. I keep telling them all the time, you can keep going to activities and find recipes and find technique and strategy, and you will live in technique and strategy. If you learn it the other way and you understand process and you understand conceptually how these things work, you're set for life. Because you will never have to go to technique in the book. You'll be creating your own based on what the need is and what your theory is telling you. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Although DRED&C applicants are selected, in part, for their willingness to engage in critical reflection, instructors have increasingly needed to address and analyze theoretical readings for students before they can make connections to their practice. In response to this challenge, faculty have developed writing and critical literacy streams within the program. These streams begin with writing assignments in first and second year, leading up to a fourth-year research seminar, *Directed Studies in Drama in Education and Community*. In this two-semester course, students work through the process of writing a major research paper. Each student must practice their information literacy skills by completing a literature review with at least 10 scholarly sources, writing an ethics proposal for human research, collecting data, and analyzing their findings.

Co-generative dialogue. Each class ends with a debriefing. Students are encouraged to ask questions about what they are learning and discussing in class.

Shared experiences. Co-teaching is used so students can learn about failure and celebrate that failure together.

Social context. The DRED&C program has changed several times over the last 25 years in response to changes in the discipline, the needs of society, and societal implications such as the rise of social media:

> I think the steps we need to take are to expand the community portion because there are so many opportunities in the community to use drama and fewer and fewer opportunities to teach in the public school system. So I think, stressing the community aspect, we're working on an applied theatre stream within the program. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

The program is undergoing further changes due to the recent retirement of one of its faculty members, and the impending retirement of another. A new instructor with experience in applied theatre and drama education will work to strengthen the community work aspect of the program for students who wish to pursue careers outside the classroom. The long-standing educational focus of DRED&C will remain strong, and students who are certain they wish to teach may now choose to enroll in a concurrent education program. Students who are undecided or who wish to work in the community may continue to enroll in the four-year Honours program. DRED&C is constantly shifting in response to these and other identified changes in society while still retaining its uniqueness.

> We have the concurrent program now, so students who are coming into the program, we have ones that, who really want to teach are choosing the concurrent program, drama concurrent education, and then we have students who are choosing that they don't want to teach or don't know if that's what they want to do, so they're doing the four year Honours program in Drama in Education and so we're investing in more opportunity for applied theatre, applied work there. The program has gone through several changes over the past,

> I'd say, 25 years, has changed several times because we respond to societal needs, but also to the needs of the discipline as it dictates it. Applied theatre has been around for a long time, but it's also something that speaks more to the work we're doing, and it's not really in our name, but it's the work we do. So, trying to connect with more professional artists, is what we're hoping to do, more with theatre companies, trying to get students more internship opportunities. We would love to see more opportunity where there's global internship and see if we can carve that element out. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

The community stream of the program includes such core courses as *Theatre for Social Action*, *Undesirable Elements*, *Literacy in Action*, and *Drama and Disabilities*. Another course, *Drama and Community Applications*, offers students a wide range of opportunities to use drama as a vehicle for change in various communities. Outcomes of the community stream include raising awareness about social issues and enhancing student integration within communities.

The DRED&C program uses drama as a vehicle for social change. Drama is about walking in the shoes of someone else. It offers opportunities to step into someone else's situation, but students must decide for themselves how far they want to go and how deeply they wish to engage in introspection. Drama methodology is different each time because its participants are the ones who bring the content to the drama.

> For the most part, well, unfortunately, fortunately–it's just what it is–our students, our student body, is pretty homogenous. And where the diversity lies in our classrooms, in our classes, is mostly with the diversity in lived experience. There is not a whole lot of cultural diversity. Most of the students are Canadian-born, and a majority of them are coming from grandparents who immigrated from the West, European West, who've been

> raised in rural Southwestern Ontario. For many of them, coming to Windsor is their first urban experience, so, it takes them a while. Sometimes it's hard to get them into a place where they have to think about culture, and think about the impact of social issues around them. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

Faculty approach social context from a variety of entry points each semester. Several courses give specific attention to developing awareness of social issues, and each class ends with a debriefing to make connections to the world outside the classroom. These issues are explored through an examination of various texts. Published texts, both fiction and non-fiction, are reflected upon. Society itself is treated as a text. Students' interpretations and interactions with society, as well as the transformations those interactions undergo, are also treated as texts to be examined. One-off projects are used to attempt to redress issues of inequality, injustice, and social disenfranchisement. Students learn how they can address the needs of various individuals and groups through field work within those communities. Students learn how to give voice to communities who are not heard, and to give those communities the tools they need to continue the work on their own. Instructors also use play and improvisational techniques to examine social issues with students. They use students' own inquiries, and encourage students to disrupt the commonplace and challenge the status quo. Every class incorporates social justice education in some way. This focus is one of the appealing aspects of the DRED&C program.

When selecting co-teaching partners for field work in classrooms, instructors use various methods based on the social group dynamics they perceive within each cohort. Sometimes instructors allow students to choose their own partners. Some students prefer randomized pairings to alleviate the social pressure of finding a partner.

> Sometimes I'll let them choose their own, and they will base their decisions partly on their friends, which is not always helpful but sometimes is. And sometimes on just who has time to get together outside of class to rehearse and research. I sometimes do random groups, and I will sometimes make groups based on people that I want to see expand their horizons and work with different kinds of people. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

One instructor said that they usually only choose the pairings if there is a problem.

> If two people always work together and won't work with anybody else, I will separate them because they need to learn to work with other people. If there's a group of people in the class who are slackers, I might put them all together in the same group so they don't have anybody to take on the burden of work except themselves. So that's the only time I would hand-select–when there's a problem. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

Co-planning. Students learn about lesson planning while also learning, as students, how drama can be used as a vehicle for learning. Instructors discuss the technicalities of lesson planning, but their primary goal is for students to understand the purpose and importance of learning outcomes, physical warmups, creative warmups, and other elements of lesson planning. In class, students practice co-planning in small groups or with their teaching partners. They receive feedback from their instructor and make revisions together. Co-teachers are expected to plan for their lessons on their own time, but some class time is also set aside for this purpose.

Relationship development.

This section summarizes interview and program review data relating to the development of robust co-teaching relationships.

Parity. One of the outcomes of community-focused courses is personal empowerment. In terms of co-teaching, parity between partners plays a larger role in the longer-term second year fieldwork than in the short-term third-year placements.

Collaboration. Learning to negotiate ideas with a group is challenging, particularly at the undergraduate level. Group work and partnerships are not always successful, but collaboration is about working with and building upon imperfect relationships. Cooperative work in pairs or groups is necessary for most activities due to the size of the class, but also because of the nature of performance-based work. When asked how often their students have opportunities to practice communication and collaboration skills, one instructor replied:

> Every exercise in every class, every day. DRED classes tend to have a lot of group work. Part of that is because, in a class of 24 people, it's impossible to have everybody do a solo project and get through any amount of material at all. So people tend to work in pairs or small groups. But a lot of the work is group work. So when I'm teaching Theatre for Social Action, for example, a Forum Theatre group needs enough people to put on the play–that group needs at least five. So they have to find their way within a cooperative group to make that happen. (Interview Data, September 11, 2017)

Collaboration in DRED&C requires movement between different collective dynamics. In each class, students work in a variety of formations including independent work, pairs, small groups and whole-class activities. Instructors may assign and re-assign various roles within groups to give each student experience with leading, mentoring and challenging other group members. Communication is essential. Sometimes only a few people within a group are doing most of the work. When discussing readings in groups, each student is expected to bring at least one idea from the text. Instructors often use grouping strategies like jigsaw, where various

groups analyze different readings before breaking into new groups to teach others about that reading. Another common strategy is pairing students to reflect about a reading or activity before coming to the larger group for discussion. There are many individual strategies available for learning collaboration, and all the drama games used in class are collaborative in nature.

DRED&C offers many opportunities for students to grow into the challenge of working in groups.

> Let's say we've done a game, for instance–a drama game. And it was an intense one and a lot came out of it. Before I ask the group to open up about it I might say, find a partner, sit down for a minute face-to-face and share two things about that strategy, that exercise. And then we come to the bigger group. So that you're scaffolding. Scaffolding things. Collective work needs to be scaffolded in. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

The kind of drama work used in classrooms and communities is inherently collaborative because it involves a population.

> Any of the games, the drama games, that we work on, are all collaborative in nature and we always unpack those because we have to understand the purpose of them, and when we use them in our classrooms, and why and when we choose to use them. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Because community and educational drama are difficult to do in isolation, students are constantly making collective creations.

> Well, collaboration–it's not anything that's modeled as an aside. It's all integrated into my teaching practice. I guess I would describe it as: It's all collaboration. It can't happen if there's no community built and an understanding that this all has to happen collaboratively and collectively because we're creating things as a group, as an ensemble,

> a collective, in the class. If you're leading a story drama, or a process drama, you certainly can't do that just by giving directions and instructions. So you are immersed in the work all the time. In doing that, I always take time at different moments in the class to say: Okay, let's stop. What are we doing right now? What is it that we're doing? So that they can unpack the process, and they can see that the collaboration and the collective nature of the work is necessary. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Collaboration is integrated into all aspects of the DRED&C program, but it first requires that a community be built. Community is a first principle of collaborative practice. It requires the creation of a communal space and place, with consideration for how people will interact with and respect that space. Everyone is included in the community from the beginning, and understands that collective creation is inherently collaborative. It requires the work, creativity, input and perspective of everyone in the group. One of the goals of collaboration is to learn about different attitudes, values or beliefs from a new perspective. By creating a culture or atmosphere for collective work, instructors hope that students will continue to collaborate outside of class. Once community and co-respect are established, students must understand the reasons for collaboration.

Communication. Each activity is interactive, and requires students to negotiate ideas with one another. Afterward, students reflect together on the meaning of the activity and its application to practice. Instructors work to bridge conversations in large groups by asking students to comment on one another's ideas. During group discussions, instructors work to ensure that all voices are heard and that none dominate the discussion.

Tension resolution. Students are given lessons on group dynamics in first year, and are expected to continue using these skills throughout the program. As they engage in creative play,

students become more empathic about others' situations. They also work to improve their own general health and well-being as part of certain community-focused courses. When students struggle to resolve tension between themselves and their co-teaching partner, they are encouraged to reflect about the underlying cause of the tension. They are also encouraged to speak with their mentor teacher for advice.

Philosophy and teaching identity. The goal of DRED&C has always been to immediately put theory into practice and practice into theory. It is a blending of socially-constructed pedagogy with the work of drama theorist-practitioners. Augosto Boal's philosophy–that what one can rehearse in theatre, one can do in real life–is a core influence alongside critical pedagogy and social constructivism. The work and ideas of drama practitioners like Brian Way, Cecily O'Neill, Peter Slade, Dorothy Heathcote and David Booth also play a key role in the philosophies and teaching identities of DRED&C faculty. The practical co-teaching component in second year is another essential element of the program. It allows students to test theories and to discover what works in the classroom and in community spaces. It is the richest experience within the program and, as a vehicle for immediate practice, to remove it from the program would be considered negligent. DRED&C reflects the unique visions of its faculty, and intersects with a variety of disciplines including applied theatre, drama in education, theatre for social change, theatre for young audiences, arts therapy and arts for health. Applicants to the program must attend a workshop and interview with faculty before they can be admitted. Each cohort is constructed during this intake interview process to ensure that students who enter the program are compatible with the program's philosophies.

DRED&C uses drama as a vehicle for personal change. Faculty do not want students to become clones of their instructors; rather, they promote self-development in pedagogy and

activism while encouraging students to develop an appreciation for the work of drama theorist-practitioners. Drama all but requires active participation, but it also allows students to choose how involved they wish to become. By the time they graduate, students are expected to have developed and articulated their unique teaching identity. Good teachers regularly reflect about how and why their teaching identity changes over time, and students are encouraged to relate learned information to their signature teaching style. Digital reflections can be used to examine how these identities have transformed over time. Students are pushed to expand their lenses and to view their experiences in a decompartmentalized context. The university classroom is viewed as a laboratory for students' field experiences, and their field classroom is viewed as a laboratory for the real world.

Determining how students will be paired for co-teaching is not a scientific process, and logistical concerns tend to be prioritized. Students are encouraged to strengthen and learn from their partnerships even if they are not ideal. Instructors select partnerships on a case-by-case basis. Sometimes they allow students to choose their own partners, while other times they assign partners based on perceived skillsets. Neither method is consistently more effective than the other, and sometimes students even wish to teach alone. In all cases, instructors wait until the second or third week of the second-year placement course before co-teaching partnerships are determined.

In recent years, faculty have become concerned that student cohorts are finding it increasingly difficult to appreciate the value of research and the theoretical work of educators and drama practitioners.

> On my end, on the teacher's end, the challenge–and it's not so much of a challenge but it's just a direction that I have to take with the second-years all the time. And that's patience,

> and setting things up step by step. And what I've found the past couple of years, even in the last five years, I've had to water things down or I've had to go slower. And I've always tried to work on the premise that less is more, all the time, but my challenge is that because I want to give them more, I always go back to less. Give them less to they can have success with it, move on and go deeper. Less and go deeper. But I find that sometimes I'm having to go less and less, simply because of some of the issues and challenges they're facing, which really concerns me. Some of them have real anxiety going into the classroom. Anxiety with being successful, and expectations, and just keeping up with the workload that I have had to–and I think most teachers have, I think that this is not uncommon for us–but I find that challenging because I worry about the preparation and how ready they will be. So I pick and choose now what they really need. And I've had to let go of things that I normally wouldn't have in order to accommodate a class. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Students must return to theory if they are to understand certain fundamental concepts of drama methodology–but because that methodology is so deeply rooted in practice, they tend to forget how much theory went into the development of the techniques they are using in the classroom.

> I know I share this with my colleagues in the area and I know that this is common–I hear it from other colleagues in other disciplines. I'm finding that even in the last five years that the theory portion of the class, which comes to the literature and the research, and what informs the practice is harder to convince the students or to ensure that they are doing their readings and that they are getting the theory. Because the nature of the discipline is so rooted in practice and embodiment that's where they go. They forget that this work doesn't just fall from the sky, it doesn't just appear. It has been developed over

> years and years and decades and centuries. This work has evolved. It comes from somewhere, always bringing them back to the innovators. Bringing them back to Brian Way, the people who have their roots in educational drama. Brian Way, his principles. Looking at Dorothy Heathcote. Looking at the contemporary innovators like David Booth and Cecily O'Neill, all of the people that have made the work that they're capable of, that they're able to do, available to them. And that it's constantly in motion. I always have to bring the readings up in class, and I have to actually unpack those readings critically with them, and sometimes for them, for them to be able to see the connection. Whereas I would say five, eight years ago, students were doing that a little more willingly, or they understood that there was another component to this. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Co-Respect. In second year, students take on a significant commitment. Their field experience helps them develop a sense of professionalism. They are asked how they might look for and respect the ideas that their partner can bring to the table.

Trust. Students enroll in at least one core DRED&C course each year to help engender a strong familial bond with their cohort.

Co-responsibility. Students are equally responsible for the success of their partnerships. If one partner is not doing their fair share, instructors rely on mentor teachers to provide feedback so that they can use class time to assess and address the issue. Instructors become more directly involved in co-teaching relationships if only one student is doing all the work.

Supportive practice.

Community of praxis. The DRED&C program began in 1979 and has uniquely emphasized community practice through field work since it became DRED&C in 2002. Its

strength lies in its connection to the community, and many of the changes over the years have been in response to the needs of that community. Students have opportunities to work in local community organizations with diverse populations or in the DRED&C summer youth program with participants referred by a variety of social agencies. Students without community connections can take advantage of these opportunities, while students who do have a relationship with a community agency may choose to establish their own field work opportunities. In either case, students immerse themselves in the culture of the community where they are working, listen to their concerns, offer advice, and give the community the tools to find solutions to those concerns.

Within the program itself, there is a unique sense of community which students find appealing. Class sizes are strictly limited to 24 students, and each cohort is required to take at least one DRED&C course together each year.

> I think the other unique part is probably the most fun, and that's the sense of community. We are a small group, small program. We know our students. So I know my students so well after fourth year that I can picture them in a classroom. I can actually see and imagine and visualize their practice style in a classroom. Because I've seen their practice so many times in different ways. I think that's really unique for us, that we can see our students that way. It's almost like when they graduate, the faculty members here–that goes for all our programs in [the drama] department, by the way–that we almost have a profile for our students. I think that's really unique, and we're fortunate to be able to do that. But that also makes us who we are. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Co-teaching is used so students do not have to work alone, especially in the first semester. It provides students with a support in the form of a safety net, and gives them someone

they can consult with about their ideas. The placement classroom acts as a laboratory where students can interact professionally with practicing teachers. Outside of class, faculty make themselves available to discuss issues with co-teachers. They also establish opportunities to develop relationships between co-teachers and with each team's mentor teacher to help students become successful. Some instructors try to visit student field placements, which is exhausting but necessary work. One instructor described their involvement with student field placements:

> When I have taught the third-year high school placement I would go out and watch them teach. In Theatre for Social Action when they go out and do Playback [Theatre], Forum [Theatre] in the community, I go out and watch them perform. Sometimes I perform with them. So I'm pretty involved. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

The limited nature of the field placements requires coursework to include frequent collaborative practical components. Every class includes a research or theory component to bring meaning to previous and future practice. Curriculum and course design strike a balance between academic and practical learning. This balance of academic writing and research with practical fieldwork is what makes DRED&C unique.

Stakeholder attitudes. One instructor described the most prominent challenges they typically see students facing.

> So for them the challenge is believing that they can do this, and giving themselves permission to use this as experimentation and that they don't have to be perfect and in fact, they're not going to be so let's just accept that. And to not let fear drive them. The other big challenge is that Drama in Ed. students tend to get very cerebral about everything. Everything is in the head–what if I don't do this, and what if this doesn't work–that they put so many things in place that end up working against them. They'll

create plans that are so tight there's no room for flexibility and then they go in thinking, I have to deliver the plan. My goal is to deliver the plan. And that's just an early teacher, young teacher kind of–we've all experienced that, right? I've got to get the plan done. It's not until the end of the semester or even the second semester that they realize, I didn't get my whole plan done, and the students required me to change direction. That's where I want them to go. That's the biggest challenge for them to accept that I really mean that, and they're not going to be penalized for it. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

While it is a challenge to keep students feeling confident, instructors are also finding it challenging to be patient with students. This concern is closely tied to students' struggles in connecting theoretical literature with the practical work they do in class and in the field.

What I've found in the past couple of years, even in the last five years, I've had to water things down or I've had to go slower. And I've always tried to work on the premise that less is more, all the time, but my challenge is that because I want to give them more, I always keep going back to less. Give them less so they can have success with it, move on and go deeper. Less and go deeper. But I'm finding that sometimes I'm having to go less and less, simply because of some of the issues and challenges they're facing, which really concerns me. Some of them have some real anxiety going into the classroom. Anxiety with being successful, and expectations, and just keeping up with the workload that I have had to–and I think most teachers have, I think this is not uncommon for us–but I find that challenging because I worry about the preparation and how ready they will be. So I pick and choose now what I really need. And I've had to let go of things that I normally wouldn't have in order to accommodate a class. So I go year by year, sometimes I go class by class, what is it they need? I'm lucky enough to do that because I

have no more than, you know, top, 24 students in the class. So I can do that. (Interview data, October 20, 2017)

Stakeholder expectations. Faculty establish common rules and protocols among students and mentor teachers. It can be challenging to maintain contact with mentor teachers, so DRED&C instructors make efforts to visit field classrooms during placements to generate feedback about student performance.

Unlike associate teachers handling placements in B.Ed. programs, mentor teachers for DRED&C placements do not formally evaluate student performance. Instead, students are only assessed on the work generated from the field experience including lesson plans, field notes, reflective journals and reflective papers. Mentor teachers are expected to observe students and provide written feedback which the DRED&C instructor may wish to read, but this feedback does not include an evaluation of students as it would in a typical B.Ed. placement. Mentors are expected to help make students aware of the teaching profession and some of the challenges teachers face. They act as guides and mentors who offer a different perspective and help prepare students for teaching. They are also responsible for filling out a questionnaire and providing feedback to students and faculty. Before each practice teaching session, mentor teachers are expected to look over and sign students' lesson plans for that day.

Students may have had prior experience working with children, but the DRED&C field experience raises the bar. They are told that this placement is their first professional gig and that they must act accordingly. Student work is expected to be authentic and well-researched. Students must dress and act in a professional manner, and respect the field classroom as they would any learning environment. They must act professionally toward their mentor teachers, and toward the students within the field classroom. DRED&C students are expected to arrive

early instead of coming on time, and to review their prepared lesson plans with their mentor teacher prior to instruction. They are also expected to keep regular co-planning and co-teaching appointments with their partner. Students should be able to present up-to-date lesson plans to their instructor upon request, and are expected to make handwritten notes about their successes and challenges, in ink, on the hard copies of their original typed lesson plans. Instructors will sometimes give students questions to ask their mentors and bring back to the classroom for discussion.

Students achieve or exceed these expectations with varying degrees of success. The DRED&C field experience is partly intended to provide a comfortable environment for helping students decide whether they want to go into classroom teaching or pursue community-based work. Student expectations are tempered by the fact that they are undergraduate students having a new experience.

The University of Windsor in general and the DRED&C program in particular expect students to fulfil certain requirements to complete their degree. Students must have met the school's admission criteria before being admitted to the program. From a total of 40 courses, students must take 20 Dramatic Arts courses, as well as eight courses in any area of study, plus two courses each in Social Science; in Languages or Science; in introductory Philosophy; in introductory English; in introductory Psychology; and in any non-Arts area of study. At least three of the general Dramatic Arts credits must be skills-based courses in theatre production and performance. Students wishing to take Visual Arts courses must submit a portfolio to and/or attend an interview at the Visual Arts department in the winter term.

Most core DRED&C courses involve activity-based projects which exemplify major theoretical ideas from the discipline. Students are expected to develop and apply personal praxis

in various situations by making connections between learned theory and their own practice. Students in core DRED&C courses are assessed on reflective logs, critical responses to readings, and in-class projects. They are assessed on active engagement through commenting and questioning in class, and on research-based personal investigations delivered through academic papers and/or performance. Students engaged in field placements are assessed on performance reviews by outside reviewers for classroom and community placements. They must demonstrate suitable personal qualities and academic qualifications before being assigned field work.

Successful DRED&C students will: (a) design and deliver age, ability, and context appropriate drama/theatre experience and activities, taking into consideration the diversity of populations and the needs of the community; (b) employ and evaluate the skills, values, practices and approaches that will empower them to become agents of change and advocates in local and global communities; (c) practice educational drama methodologies, techniques, and critical pedagogy in classroom field work at the elementary and secondary school levels; (d) recognize how and where drama/theatre training and leadership practice merge and lead to entrepreneurship and innovation; (e) practice applied knowledge of critical pedagogy as it relates to the delivery of drama/theatre in classroom and community settings; (f) design and deliver programming that engages applied theatre techniques and methodologies; (g) assess and evaluate how drama methodologies and theatre practices are applied and integrated across disciplines; (h) explore how drama praxis informs and leads toward new and innovative practices; (i) practice critical and creative thinking to question and challenge constructs through dramatic and theatrical techniques across the classroom; (j) practice emotional literacy skills necessary for leading groups and individuals across a multitude of demographics; (k) demonstrate professional etiquette in all activities involving the classroom, studio, rehearsal spaces and production; (l)

explore and practice drama methodologies and theatre practices to challenge social and cultural constructs through shared experiences; (m) design, conduct and assess independent research projects; (n) work and learn independently; (o) demonstrate through field and classroom practice an applied awareness of the student's own identity that differentiates them as individual drama leaders and practitioners; (p) engage in productive teamwork and serve as part of a collective; (q) practice leadership and mentorship qualities; and (r) engage in creative play as an embodied experience and recognize that play is essential to all drama/theatre practice.

Stakeholder roles. Faculty from the DRED&C program argue that it is one of the best programs in the world. They receive requests to teach master classes by colleagues across Canada and internationally. DRED&C is one of two robust drama education programs in Ontario, with many parallels to the University of Brock's Drama in Education and Society program. DRED&C was originally designed to prepare students as elementary and special education teachers, but has since shifted its focus to training drama specialists to work in a variety of educational, community and healthcare settings. DRED&C progressively builds the skills and concepts that teach students how to use drama as a vehicle for change in educational, institutional, and community settings. Co-teaching in classrooms has been an integral part of the program for decades because the applied nature of the work only makes sense when it can be practiced. This focus on immediate practice is part of the appeal of DRED&C. The field experiences in both classroom and community settings play a large part in preparing future educators to work in these areas, and faculty feel confident that graduates are prepared for whatever next step they choose to take.

The teaching skills learned in DRED&C are equally applicable to classroom and community settings. Many people still view DRED&C as an education program despite the

inclusion of a community focus since 2002. More students are pursuing graduate education to work outside of mainstream classrooms, and DRED&C is designed to prepare those students for careers in a variety of developmental fields including drama consulting, play and recreation leadership, and theatre for young audiences. Over time, more and more graduates are finding meaningful independent and entrepreneurial work in a wide range of non-classroom settings. One graduate who develops community programming also used drama to revamp the disabilities curriculum in the Windsor-Essex school board. Another is a local theatre entrepreneur, while a third leads drama camps at the San Diego Zoo.

Yet another graduate trains cross-discipline awareness, community and learning at Queensland University. As employment opportunities shift from classrooms to community organizations, faculty have constructed the program's community stream to meet the increasing demand for community-based teachers. Now, DRED&C students act as catalysts for change in a variety of communities. Some of the courses available in the community stream include Theatre for Young Audiences, Museum Theatre, and Introduction to Clowning in Hospitals and Healthcare. The Production Problems course currently allows students to find internships and other fieldwork opportunities, but would ideally be replaced by a *Special Topics* course.

Faculty are challenged to give students the experience of being both students and teachers. They make efforts to observe field placements and community-based theatre directly, and remind their students to adopt an attitude that the more they know, the more they will realize they don't know. It is also challenging for young students to enter a professional setting for the first time. Students who wish to become certified as classroom teachers by the Ontario College of Teachers must pursue a B.Ed. program after completing their undergraduate degree. They are encouraged to consult with an academic advisor and take six courses in a second teachable

subject. Historically, most DRED&C graduates have gone on to become classroom teachers. They are highly sought-after by B.Ed. programs and considered to be well-prepared. Some students are over-prepared for the next step in their education, and those in B.Ed. programs often comment on the repetition of concepts they have already learned. DRED&C is designed for students pursuing careers in various educational fields including mainstream, special and theatre arts education. Graduates, having been given a foundation which they can build on as they choose, feel confident and well-prepared to take on teaching roles in a variety of settings. Faculty feel that the work graduates are doing shows that DRED&C contributes to the educational community.

Co-teaching strategies. Neither the interviews nor the program review documents mentioned the use of co-teaching strategies.

Modeling. Collaborative strategies are not explicitly modelled as an aside; rather, they are integrated into instruction. Instructors and teaching assistants frequently interact with students doing group work, asking questions and helping to keep them on task. Instructors participate in activities as needed. Some dramatic work requires their direct participation. Instructors use general discussions about class activities to lead students to think about collaboration rather than explicitly discussing collaborative strategies. They periodically stop the class to debrief students by asking them to reflect about the nature and necessity of collaborative work as it relates to their current activity, and to identify any collaborative strategies they were using. In second year, students work together with their instructor to develop lesson plans so they can understand the components of running a lesson or workshop.

Concepts are scaffolded across the four years of the program so instructors can reference activities that students did in previous courses, even if those courses were run by different faculty members.

> Well there are two placement classes in second and third year, of course, but we start even earlier than that, in the first-year course. In the first semester we do a lot of work with play and games, so I have them teach the class a game. Just them teaching us how to play a game. So that's their first intro to leading a class activity. And then in the second semester I ask them to, with a partner, to teach the class something–but not a drama class. So they get another little first step opportunity into how I would lead a class and make sure everybody's involved before they actually get out into a classroom. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

Instructors try to model collaboration and communication skills during classes.

> The other teachers and I spend a lot of time talking. I'm not sure the students are aware of that, though, so that might not be modeling behaviour. In my classes, I think I'm pretty easygoing and laid back, and I interact with the students when they're working in groups. So me, and also my [Teaching Assistants], because I train them to do that as well, would circulate when a group is working together and just sit and listen and watch and maybe ask questions to keep them on track or help them solve issues that might come up. So, it's interacting with them. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

Faculty also communicate with one another regularly, though students are often unaware until later in the program:

> And I think it's unique because we have careful crafted the structure of the program so that year two builds on year one, and year three builds on year two, and there's a through-

> line through all of the four years so each class–we know what each other does and we talk about what's going on. So [one instructor] can always say, remember in first year when you did this and this with [other instructor]? Now we're going to take that and we're going to do this with it. And they go, ohh! Because it's all building. So we scaffold our activities throughout the whole four years, not just within a class. (Interview data, September 11, 2017)

DRED&C faculty are described in program review documents as award-winning educators.

> Our faculty teaching within Drama in Education and Community are acknowledged across campus and by their peers and students as being exemplary teachers. Each of us receives requests to teach Master Classes [from] colleagues at other universities across Canada and around the world. In addition our faculty have received awards for teaching excellence. (Program review documents, 2014/2015)

Time. Instructors must now choose fewer concepts to cover during class time compared to previous cohorts. Unless it is pointed out by instructors, the structure of the program's critical writing arc generally goes unnoticed by students until they are in fourth year.

The critical writing arc begins in first year, when students learn about different types of scholarship by finding and presenting a primary and secondary source about a drama innovator. This project prepares them for future practice by introducing them to the theoretical drama work of major practitioners like Peter Slade, Brian Way, Cecily O'Neill, Dorothy Heathcote and David Booth.

In second year, students continue the critical writing arc by learning how to search for and evaluate content for teaching.

> In second year they look at, I'm researching this area that I want to deliver in the classroom, how do I go and research that? What do I need to know about that area, that part of history if I'm covering the history curriculum? Or if I'm covering this picture book that has historical or even political context. What do I need to go and do? So I start looking at research from a scholarly point but also from more of a global place. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

In third or fourth year, depending on how each student chooses to arrange their schedule, they must find sources for research on theatre companies that practice theatre for social action. They evaluate the quality of each source and consider why one might put on plays with social or political implications. Third-year students must also take *Literacy in Action*, an introductory course on critical literacy.

> Third year is where they do *Literacy in Action*, and that's where they start to look at things, we start to send them out and say, okay, now go and find some sources and critique them and bring them back. I might give them a source. So we just finished looking at some youth novels, for instance, and these youth novels all have political and social issues that have to do with youth. So they've extrapolated the themes and they're developing a theme development unit for it. So they have to know, they have to go and do some research on that theme in preparation to support their unit of practice. (Interview data, October 30, 2017)

Finally, in fourth year, students must enroll in the two-semester *Directed Studies* course. In this undergraduate research seminar, each student chooses a topic to research. They must evaluate and assess 10 pieces of scholarly literature on that topic and write a literature review. Students then prepare to gather data for their project, which may require them to apply for an

ethics review with the help of their instructor. By the end of the course, each student will have written and presented to their peers a major paper with which includes some form of original research.

Students are slowly introduced to the teaching of drama and other curriculum instruction in the first year, leading up to classroom placements in the second and third year courses and community placements in third or fourth year. Students must complete field placement courses in both elementary and secondary school settings. Once they are in fourth year, they may choose a non-classroom placement from a variety of community and healthcare settings.

DRED&C field placements are significantly different from B.Ed. fieldwork. After a few weeks of orientation and a brief classroom observation period, students in second year begin working with their mentor teachers in October and continue until their December exams. They return to the same classroom in January until their exams begin in April. Depending on the availability of their mentor teacher and placement classroom, students may teach for 2-6 hours each week. The typical 90- to 180-minute teaching block once per week is sufficient for undergraduate students using drama to deliver curriculum for the first time. The greatest difference between DRED&C and consecutive B.Ed. programs is that every week, students practice in the field classroom while also attending DRED&C classes on teaching methodology.

Students are often working in groups and with partners, making it a challenge to schedule projects and co-planning. They must balance their field placements with their own class schedules, and in some cases, those schedules limit students' choice of partners or even require them to teach alone. Coordinating student schedules with outside agencies is also a significant challenge. Many community placement agencies are excited to participate, but struggle to organize placement schedules.

Co-teaching also allows students to fill in for their partner if they become ill. If logistical constraints were not a concern, faculty would still prefer that students co-taught rather than work alone.

Space. The dramatic arts building at the University of Windsor is a space designed specifically for the teaching and learning of drama. Rather than using traditional classrooms, students work in various studio classrooms. Each of these studios has a specific purpose as well as certain expectations for how that space is to be used. Students are expected to be aware of and to respect the rules and purposes of each space. The overall availability and accessibility of the building creates a place for good work to happen, and faculty keep their office doors open for consultation with students. This physical space provides students with a rich sense of place.

DRED&C enrollment is limited to only 24 students in first year, keeping class sizes small and allowing course content to be tailored to match the needs of students. The small class size is part of the appeal of the program, and allows for significant instruction and consultation to take place in small groups or with individual students. Core DRED&C classes are held in a studio space designed specifically for that purpose. Collective creation through drama requires engagement and interaction between all participants. The physical space is used to establish community and to place the instructor as a navigator or facilitator of a democratic classroom.

> Our classrooms are studios, so they're not traditional classrooms. So the notion of body, space, is very relevant to us. Because we're always moving around, we're always interacting in different group dynamics–pairs, groups, so on. The teacher is not always central in that environment. The teacher may be central when it's time for instruction, the teacher moves in and out of the group, which gives the impression that it's an environment of equality. Of course we all sit on the floor, there's another physical

> element of it. And sitting on the floor in a circle has an element of, we can all see each other, we can all correspond with one another, talk to one another, and there's no real head of the group.

The physical place provides students and instructors with a rich sense of place. Even the storage room is filled with DRED&C signs and materials, and students are disappointed when scheduling conflicts move a core DRED&C class to a different studio space instead.

Co-teaching partnerships are limited by the availability of transportation and students' ability to physically travel to placements, but co-teaching also makes it easier to find placement classrooms. Meeting agencies face-to-face is effective for improving schedule coordination, and it is helpful for instructors to view a placement space in advance to get an idea of the environment students will be working in. When too many mentor teachers volunteer, students may choose to work alone if they prefer. Sometimes they work alone because there are an odd number of students in the class, or because they wish to teach in a French-speaking classroom and there are no fluent speakers available as partners.

Chapter 5 – Analysis and Discussion

All of the data drawn from the interviews and program review documents were summarized in Chapter 4. In this chapter, that data is organized by category and compared with the findings from the literature review.

Comparing DRED&C to Literature

Of all the elements of successful co-teaching programs identified in the literature, DRED&C incorporates nearly all of them. The program's heavy emphasis on praxis, combined with the use of drama education theory, subtly and seamlessly integrates these elements. Many of the coding units generated from interview and program review data describe relationships between multiple categories. In this section, each element from the data will be compared and contrasted with those found in the literature review.

Elements of praxis. Praxis is a core component of everything students experience within the program. They are led to understand the purpose, implementation and justification for each activity, and to consider how it relates to their past, current and future teaching practice. They take on the dual role of teacher-student, incorporating drama theory and practical experiences into their work as co-teachers.

Critical reflection. The ubiquity of reflective practice in the DRED&C program consistently gives students meaningful opportunities to practice critical reflection. By combining critical pedagogy with introspective drama techniques, instructors ensure that students can nearly always be engaged in critical reflection. In second year, the weekly scheduling of both practice teaching and classroom learning allows students to engage in shared reflection about their practice as teachers and as co-teachers. Dramatic activities encourage richer introspection, but each student must still choose for themselves how deeply they will engage with the material.

Anderson and Freebody (2012) note the supportive role that reflective discussion plays in strengthening the community of praxis. Both of these elements are heavily emphasized throughout the DRED&C program to develop Vygotskian socially-mediated relationships. Stairs et al. (2009) warn that weak co-teaching relationships do not challenge students to reflect about their pedagogy. DRED&C works to address these dysfunctional co-teaching relationships: (a) from the outset, by screening for compatible philosophies; (b) throughout first and second year, by ingraining reflective practice through regular journaling, self-assessment, performative reflections and discussion; (c) during the field experience, by making connections as a group between assigned readings, in-class activities, and the practice teaching experience.

Co-generative dialogue. The DRED&C program offers consistent opportunities for students and faculty to collectively engage in dialogues about issues of praxis. Several researchers noted that co-generative dialogues should ideally include all stakeholders involved in the co-teaching process (Roth et al., 2004; Scantlebury et al., 2008; Tobin, 2006; Tobin & Roth, 2005). Given the DRED&C program's unorthodox schedule, it would be logistically daunting to try to include school administrators, mentor teachers and elementary students in formal dialogues with DRED&C students and faculty. Students are, however, deeply immersed in a culture of both individual and collective reflection which they are implicitly encouraged to emulate in the field classroom.

Several pieces of literature discussed the importance of dialogue between faculty and administrators for effective professional development (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Cramer et al., 2010; Tobin, 2006). Since one of the program's instructors is also the current director for Windsor's School of Dramatic Art, faculty and administrators are easily able to engage with one

another as a team to track patterns among students and negotiate roles and resources amongst themselves.

Shared experiences. The collective nature of drama work naturally lends itself to creating shared experiences among participants. Not only do student co-teachers reflect about the experience of teaching with their partner, they also reflect with the class as a whole while still engaging in field work. Students can offer meaningful discussion with their peers about co-teaching because they have performed drama work together in the shared DRED&C space and have been exposed to the same core philosophies and methodologies.

Social context. The program's emphasis on community engagement is critical to helping students learn to interact with people across various social boundaries. Drama itself is used as a vehicle for social change, and students learn to tailor its use to suit the needs of specific communities, classrooms and individuals. In every course, students explore social context from multiple entry points.

The literature cautions program developers to consider the impact that conflicting social structures within a co-teaching program's structure can have on students. In an environment where students feel pressured to succeed, for example, they may focus more on technical proficiency and maintaining an orderly classroom than on developing their co-teaching relationship. If the goal of the co-teaching program is to use experimentation to develop a rich learning environment, students will struggle to reconcile the two conflicting sets of expectations. Conflicts between social norms, teaching philosophies and hidden and explicit curricula can all undermine praxis and the goals of the program (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Dang, 2013; McHatton & Daniel, 2008). DRED&C faculty address this issue by crafting learning streams based on the program's core philosophies and weaving them together across the four-year program. Each

course carefully builds upon concepts from previous courses, culminating in the fourth-year seminar which combines the education, community, arts therapy, social justice, applied theatre, and writing and information literacy streams. Each instructor brings their unique expertise in certain streams, but each course is tied together through the lenses of social justice and drama praxis.

When determining how DRED&C co-teaching partnerships are selected, social group dynamics play an additional role alongside factors of philosophy and teaching identity as they are discussed in the literature. Faculty can further inform their knowledge about social groupings by communicating with the instructors of the core courses in the previous year.

Co-planning. Co-planning skills are scaffolded throughout the first few years of the program as students are tasked with creating and teaching increasingly complex lessons with partners or small groups. Scantlebury et al. (2008) caution that poor co-planning can leave co-teachers with divergent goals and differing understandings of classroom instruction. Before engaging in co-planning for their field placements, DRED&C students are led to develop a shared understanding of the purpose, history and importance of the components of lesson planning.

Relationship development. Co-teaching programs can increase compatibility of teaching partners by giving them time to get to know one another (Darragh et al., 2011; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; Parker et al., 2010; Scantlebury et al., 2008). First year DRED&C students spend two semesters building a community together and getting to know one another before they begin co-teaching. In the first field placement course in second year, faculty give students several weeks to reacquaint themselves with their peers before selecting partners.

Parity. Common power-related concerns among co-teachers include competition, perceptions of favouritism, differing content or teaching expertise, poor self-advocacy skills, and unequal work ethic (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Goodnough et al., 2009; King, 2006; Stairs et al., 2009). DRED&C uses co-generative dialogues to address cultural expectations, which Scantlebury et al. (2009) suggest can remediate issues of parity between co-teaching partners.

The program's community-based courses include personal empowerment as a learning outcome, and every DRED&C class incorporates some form of collaborative work as a matter of course. This emphasis on collective creation creates an atmosphere of teamwork and equality between partners, and gives students the tools to address issues of parity should such issues arise. Co-teachers spend class time and co-planning time together, which, as Parker et al. (2010) suggest, gives them valuable opportunities to develop their roles within the partnership. The schedule of the second-year fieldwork includes a roughly equal balance of co-teaching and classroom learning each week, which allows instructors to assess ongoing issues of parity between teaching partners. When such issues arise, instructors can intervene in various ways during class time. They are also frequently available outside of instruction time for individual consultation.

Since DRED&C co-teachers are undergraduates within the same program, they possess similar levels of content expertise and classroom teaching experience to their partners. They are still in the process of learning about various general, special and drama education methodologies, so there is little disparity of content or teaching expertise. When students within a cohort display a significant difference in work ethic, one strategy that DRED&C faculty use is to pair students with low work ethics together. This helps prevent one partner from taking advantage of another

with a higher work ethic, and forces both to contribute to the partnership. Issues of power are more carefully addressed in the months-long elementary school fieldwork in second year, in contrast to the far shorter secondary school placements. DRED&C students are not expected to co-teach with their mentor teachers, so differences in authority or professional experience between co-teachers are non-issues in this case.

Collaboration. General educators must have skills in classroom management, data collection, co-planning, communication, interpersonal interaction, differentiated instruction, self-advocacy, sharing of ideas and resources, and structured co-planning time (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; Darragh et al., 2011; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; Yopp et al., 2014). DRED&C students have ample opportunities to practice most of these skills across all four years of the program. In particular, the Directed Studies seminar emphasizes data collection and research skills. Classroom management skills are not explicitly addressed–instead, students are given the tools to resolve conflicts and mitigate classroom management issues by developing a collaborative community space. This osmosis-style approach to collaboration skills is common throughout DRED&C. Faculty hope that the program's culture of collective creation will inspire students to work collaboratively outside of class, a notion which is supported by Nokes et al. (2008).

To promote rich collaboration, Brinkmann and Twiford (2012) recommend that general and special educators should each learn skills in the other's area of expertise. DRED&C students who plan to become general or special educators in classrooms will have learned how to differentiate drama instruction for diverse groups of learners through community-stream courses like Drama and Disabilities. They will be equipped to engage in collaborative work between general and special educators.

Some issues, such as inadequate classroom spaces, can negatively impact faculty's ability to design collaborative activities for student co-teachers (McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Parker et al., 2010). Administrative intervention is often required to address these issues. The DRED&C program is well-supported by department administration, and utilizes a studio space designed specifically for collaborative work.

Communication. DRED&C instructors use class discussions to model and develop communication skills by asking students to discuss their peers' ideas. They also promote equitable communication by holding discussions in circular seating arrangements and by drawing quieter students into group dialogues. Students who wish to discuss multiple ideas are often asked to wait to share more than one thought until each other student has had an opportunity to speak. Quieter students are asked for their thoughts, or prompted to follow up on something a classmate has just said, so that they have opportunities to participate. Bacharach et. al (2008) note the importance of body language and nonverbal cues in communication between co-teachers. Interactive drama work, which makes up a substantial portion of classroom time, relies heavily on nonverbal communication skills. Because drama is visual as well as aural, many drama games focus on muscular and sensory work, modeling, imagery and other nonverbal forms of expression (Boal, 1992).

The nature of DRED&C as a four-year undergraduate program allows students plenty of opportunities to observe and practice honesty, active listening, feedback, and other communication skills. Students' weekly co-teaching schedule affords them opportunities to communicate with one another between teaching sessions to discuss and revise their lesson plans.

Tension resolution. Co-teachers are better able to resolve conflict with one another when they have opportunities to grow to understand their partner's thought processes and engage in discussions about the challenges they are facing (Dang, 2013; Tobin, 2006). Students experiencing tension with their co-teacher are encouraged to speak with their DRED&C instructor, who can facilitate discussion and reflection about each partner's perspective. When students are struggling to address conflicts with their partner, their instructor can use feedback from mentor teachers, observations during class, written reflections, and periodic meetings with students to monitor their progress and intercede when necessary. The community-building work in the year leading up to the co-teaching placements gives students opportunities to grow comfortable with one another and consider which of their peers might become compatible teaching partners.

Philosophy and teaching identity. It is important for co-teachers to accept their partner's differing teaching style as an opportunity to develop and reflect on their relationship (Bacharach et al., 2008; Nokes et al., 2008; Parker et al., 2010). DRED&C students are encouraged to make the best of their partnerships, and to reflect about challenges and conflicts which arise. They are also expected to use the co-teaching experience to help develop their unique teaching identities. Major conflicts of values and personalities are pre-emptively mitigated through the intake screening process, and the full year of classroom learning time gives DRED&C students a shared understanding of the fundamentals of drama education. Students have opportunities to work with their teaching partner prior to the field placement, which allows each co-teacher to establish open communication, develop their team relationship, and plan lessons based on their partner's strengths–key elements of compatible teaching identities (Darragh et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2010).

A major element of DRED&C philosophy is an emphasis on praxis, including using drama praxis to expand students' worldviews, develop their teaching identity, enact social change, and understand drama and teaching methodologies. This philosophical foundation links other elements of co-teaching, such as critical reflection and social context, with students' identities as teacher-learners.

Co-respect. Respect is established over time, prior to the field experience, in both formal and informal settings (Bacharach et al., 2010; Scantlebury et al., 2008). DRED&C students study together as a cohort for a full year, then spend several weeks getting reacquainted with one another before being paired up for fieldwork. Throughout the program, the clear and consistent expectation that students will act in a professional manner includes respect for their teaching partners.

Trust. Students develop a strong bond with their cohort over the course of the program. The collaborative nature of drama work forces students to rely on one another to create, perform and reflect. Parker et al., (2010) stress that confidentiality and the creation of a safe space is crucial for the development of trust between co-teachers. The DRED&C studio, which is reserved almost exclusively for DRED&C classes, creates such a space. Students are free to experiment, and the air of professionalism discourages gossip about peers and other breaches of trust.

Co-responsibility. Two common concerns about co-responsibility are competition between co-teachers and an unequal division of labour (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Goodnough et al., 2009). DRED&C co-teachers are given feedback from their mentor teacher, but unlike in a college of education, mentor teachers do not directly evaluate students. Students are also accustomed to collaborative drama work, wherein competition is antithetical to the purpose of

the activity. In circumstances where these elements are insufficient to curtail competition, faculty can intervene based on feedback from the mentor teacher. This sort of intervention can also solve issues of unequal work ethic, although faculty make efforts to choose co-teaching pairings that will challenge both partners. If a student has a history of sitting back and allowing other students to do group work, one strategy that instructors use is to assign them a similarly apathetic partner, requiring them to take on more responsibility for their group's success. If feedback from their mentor teacher shows that they are not pulling their weight during practice teaching, instructors will take additional steps to address the issue.

Supportive practice. DRED&C faculty experience logistical issues similar to other co-teaching programs. The program's emphasis on community-building helps mitigate some of these issues.

Community of praxis. Compared to the concentrated three- to five-week placements in B.Ed. programs, the DRED&C fieldwork involves far fewer classroom hours. It takes substantial effort to develop a community of praxis in partnership with a placement school, so DRED&C faculty work to create a community of praxis within the university classroom instead.

In a typical B.Ed. co-teaching placement, the community of praxis provides students with opportunities to scaffold into reflective strategies without needing to wait until classes resume (Anderson & Freebody, 2012). In DRED&C, students have roughly equal time in their core DRED&C class as they do working in the field each week. This balance allows faculty to provide the necessary scaffolding for their students. The community of practice should have access to adequate learning spaces (Parker et al., 2010), which the DRED&C studio space provides. Students are better at communication, reflection and collaboration when they are exposed to a culture which exemplifies these skills (King, 2006). This kind of exposure is a core

aspect of the DRED&C philosophy, which seeks to immerse students in a culture of collaboration and praxis.

McHatton & Daniel (2008) recommend that faculty should regularly meet with mentor teachers. Although this level of face-to-face contact is not always practical, DRED&C faculty make efforts to solicit feedback from mentor teachers throughout the placement period so that any issues can be promptly addressed.

Stakeholder attitudes. DRED&C seeks volunteers to mentor student co-teachers, and makes it clear from the outset that placements are different from traditional B.Ed. fieldwork. This process is important because it helps ensure that schools and mentor teachers are committed to the success of co-teaching (Arndt & Liles, 2010; King, 2006; Nokes et al., 2008). On a broader level, the local school board is an ideal environment for this type of placement because several schools utilize co-teaching in, for example, ESL classrooms.

Yopp et al. (2014) suggests that stakeholders with more teaching experience are more likely to consider co-teaching successful, while Arndt & Liles (2010) warn that hidden curriculum and the culture of traditional education can influence stakeholder perceptions of the value of co-teaching. Although DRED&C students are just beginning their journey as educators, the program strives to help them read the world through a critical lens and examine the unconscious practices of school communities. By developing these skills, DRED&C students are expected to become aware of the influence of traditional practices on their own attitudes toward co-teaching.

Stakeholder expectations. The co-teaching process involves students, faculty, cooperating teachers and school and university administrators. These stakeholders must clearly understand the goals of the program (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). DRED&C program goals and

expectations are outlined for university administrators in documents such as the cyclical program reviews.

Expectations and responsibilities for all stakeholders must be clear (Bacharach et al., 2010; Darragh et al., 2011; Goodnough et al., 2009; Nokes et al., 2008). DRED&C faculty ensure that mentor teachers understand that they are expected to provide feedback and formative assessment for students, rather than evaluate them. The reflective nature of assessments–whether they are journals, lesson plan analyses, or performances–reinforces the expectation that students are critically analyzing their experiences and making connections between the field experience and theoretical work.

Students are also made aware of their responsibilities at the beginning of the term and prior to the field placement. The most strongly-impressed of these expectations are professionalism and preparedness.

> I always tell them, this is your first professional gig. And having said that, there are certain things that go with that. And the accountability of being, not on time, but arriving before, being prepared. Always being prepared. Communicating with your mentor teacher regularly, keeping regular appointments with your teaching partner for your planning and execution of your work. Your work remains authentic, well-researched, and your interaction with students is professional, your interaction with your teacher is professional, and treat the classroom space like we would treat any space that is a learning environment. (Interview data, September 1, 2017)

Faculty use mentor teacher feedback throughout the placement to address circumstances where students are not meeting expectations.

Stakeholder roles. Co-teachers should be made aware of their roles prior to the field experience, and be given opportunities to develop and practice those roles (Bacharach et al., 2010; Darragh et al., 2011; Goodnough et al., 2009; Parker et al., 2010). DRED&C begins addressing group dynamics and collaborative roles in the first year of the program, as well as offering students opportunities to work on projects with their teaching partner as they are beginning their second-year fieldwork.

DRED&C emphasizes that classroom teachers should act as mentors for student co-teachers, as recommended by McHatton & Daniel (2008) and Nokes et al. (2008). Co-teachers are encouraged to learn from their mentor teacher about the diverse qualities and needs of the students in their field classroom.

Co-teaching strategies. Bacharach et al. (2010) and Darragh et al. (2011) recommend that co-teachers should have opportunities to learn about co-teaching and co-planning strategies prior to the field experience. They also suggest that faculty should be aware of how the implicit social structure in a school may influence students' choice of teaching strategies. At the beginning of the DRED&C field placements, students are expected to use the collaborative methodologies they have learned in the studio to teach dramatic arts. Since students are accustomed to doing drama work as a collective, it is expected that they will continue to collaborate as co-teachers in a more traditional school environment. DRED&C students spend significantly less time in the classroom each week compared to typical B.Ed. placements, and attend regular DRED&C classes for the duration of the fieldwork. This schedule allows students to reflect about and address the implicit structures which may influence the co-teaching strategies they use in the field classroom.

Modeling. Maintaining good co-teaching practices can be a challenge for faculty who choose to model co-teaching for students (McHatton & Daniel, 2008). DRED&C faculty model critical reflection, collaboration, communication, and other co-teaching skills by participating in drama work and group dialogues. They do not explicitly model co-teaching.

Time. Co-teaching requires sufficient planning, learning, teaching and reflecting time (Nokes et al., 2008; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013). The structure of the DRED&C program and its field placement allows students plenty of opportunities each week to co-plan lessons and reflect about their experiences as partners, with peers, and with instructors. A typical weekly schedule for undergraduates at the university consists of five three-hour classes (often split into two 90-minute sections). With only 15 hours of class time, most students should be able to find a few hours each week for lesson planning. Barring that, students are sometimes given class time to prepare lessons. Teaching partners meet once or twice each week in class, which gives them frequent opportunities to discuss their latest field experience with peers and faculty. Faculty continue to hold office hours during the placement, so they remain accessible to students. The duration of the fieldwork, wherein students teach in the same classroom for up to seven months, allows co-teachers to develop strong relationships with excellent communication (Darragh et al., 2011, Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Space. The interviews for this investigation took place in the dramatic arts building where DRED&C classes are held. The building entrance is cozy, but opens into a communal area shared by various the drama-based undergraduate programs. On the second floor, faculty offices are separated from the noise of the communal space by large glass windows. Parker et al. (2010) suggests that students in co-teaching programs should have safe spaces to share experiences without risking social or academic reprisals. The design of the building, from the

perspective of a visiting researcher, seems to strike a balance between openness and privacy. Faculty make themselves accessible at various times throughout the week for consultations with students.

The DRED&C studio classroom is right by the building entrance, tucked into a corner. This studio is small, but roomy enough for the 24-strong cohort to move around without difficulty. There is no fixed furniture, and the walls are soundproofed. These structural elements are important for allowing students to work in flexible groupings and for promoting a strong community of praxis (Parker et al., 2010).

Research Questions

This study set out to examine: (a) how drama praxis can be used to develop effective co-teaching skills among pre-service co-teachers; (b) how the structure of a given drama-based education program shapes collaborative philosophies; (c) how teacher educators can use drama to develop a community of practice in support of co-teaching. Additional inquiries included how the design of the program and the philosophies of the instructors shape the co-teaching aspects of the program.

Drama praxis and co-teaching skills. The collaborative processes of drama work involve, by their very nature, many of the same skills required for effective co-teaching. Students must employ communication and collaboration skills to navigate shared experiences and co-plan performances. Each participant is responsible for the success of the group. Participation requires that a community of trust and respect be established, and that ongoing tensions be resolved in an appropriate manner. Similarly, the reflective processes of drama praxis depend on the support of a community of praxis–students' peers, instructors, and even teaching assistants. Drama work seeks to examine social context and its influence on both

participants and society, as well as to act as a vehicle for personal and social change. Students are immersed in an atmosphere of reflective practice, developing their own philosophies and teaching identities in response to exposure to various texts and the theoretical work of drama practitioners.

As students choose to engage more fully in drama work, the quality of this type of introspection improves. Discussing shared experiences with peers engages students in co-generative dialogue, but embodying that discussion through performance adds social and physical aspects that stimulate additional discourse. Nokes et al. (2008) and Stairs et al. (2009) recommend that the co-teaching experience should be made public for other members of the community of praxis; Performed reflection takes this notion a step further by helping to make unconscious practices more explicit.

As facilitators of drama work, faculty can guide student co-teachers by acting as a character within the drama while also making connections to students' real-life work as educators. These connections serve to go beyond mere discussion by making students aware of hidden biases and influences, a necessary step in developing effective co-teaching skills (Anderson & Freebody, 2012; Scantlebury et al., 2008). Such connections also enable critical reflection about tension and power dynamics between co-teachers and within the environment of the field classroom, which allows students to perceive how their relationship and attitudes toward co-teaching are being influenced (Tobin 2006; Tobin & Roth 2005).

Drama work changes in response to the cultural context of its participants, while also acting as a vehicle for social change. As students become more aware of social and cultural influences, they become more aware of the implicit practices and ideas that shape their teaching

identities. This awareness makes co-teachers more effective (Dang 2013; McHatton & Daniel, 2008), but drama praxis also helps co-teachers to enact change within their environment.

Although some authors advise that co-teaching strategies should be explicitly modeled to avoid less-collaborative techniques (Parker et al., 2010), DRED&C does not address co-teaching strategies at all. Instead, such instruction is approached through the lens of drama practitioners like Augusto Boal. Boal's notion–that what can be rehearsed through drama work can be practiced in real life–suggests that by engaging in fully collaborative drama work in the university classroom, student co-teachers will naturally engage in more collaborative co-teaching strategies in the field classroom. Such an approach is supported by Goodnough et al. (2009) and Nokes et al. (2008), who suggest that co-teachers are more likely to use collaborative strategies like teaming when they have established trust and familiarity through shared training. This approach to learning, wherein necessary skills are embedded throughout the drama work rather than explicitly addressed, is commonplace within drama praxis.

How DRED&C shapes collaborative philosophies. Before students are admitted to the program, they must attend a collaborative workshop and intake interview. In this way, faculty can assess each potential student's openness to collaborative work and craft a cohort which is likely to develop collaborative philosophies.

Cooperative work is ubiquitous throughout the program, and collaboration is essential to basic participation in classes. Scaffolding of communication and collaboration skills begins in the first year with an introduction to group dynamics, social play and games, and collaborative theatre skills. This progression gives students myriad opportunities to practice and reflect about collaborative skills, which is essential for the development of an equitable power dynamic between co-teachers (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2010; Cramer et al., 2010;

Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Nokes et al., 2010; Pancsofar & Petroff, 2013).

The program's physical space and sense of place establishes a feeling of community, providing students with a safe space for collaborative work to happen. This space allows students to work collectively in a variety of dynamics ranging from partners and small groups to whole-class activities. Personal empowerment within this community is emphasized as a learning goal so that students can participate equitably in collective creation. Students also develop an awareness of social issues over time, using various means, with the aim of participating in communities outside the university classroom and acting as an agent of positive change.

The length of a four-year undergraduate program and the scheduling of DRED&C fieldwork, spread throughout the week and over several months, gives student co-teachers no shortage of formal and informal opportunities to develop their partnership and participate in the community of praxis. Such opportunities are essential to the development of co-respect and co-responsibility (Bacharach et al., 2010; Scantlebury et al., 2008), co-planning skills (Arndt & Liles 2010; Darragh et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2010), and effective communication (Scantlebury et al., 2008). This schedule also addresses a potential weakness of co-teaching. Throughout the field placement, DRED&C students continue to attend their core DRED&C classes. This schedule allows them time between teaching to reflect about methodologies, a critical process which is often ignored when co-teaching partnerships are undergoing substantial tension (Stairs et al., 2009).

Finally, the evaluation of fieldwork is structured to emphasize reflection about students' performance and experiences as co-teachers, rather than focusing on performance itself. This

approach reduces competition between co-teachers, a significant obstacle to effective co-teaching (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Goodnough et al., 2009; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; King 2006; Stairs et al., 2009).

How the design of DRED&C shapes its co-teaching aspects. The openness and flexibility of the studio space and the development of a trusting, respectful space for discussion aid in developing effective communication skills. The inclusion of at least one core DRED&C course each year helps to develop and strengthen bonds of trust between students and within the DRED&C community. As each student progresses through the program, they spend time reflecting about their educational philosophy and teaching identity. By understanding their own identity as teachers, students are expected to develop professional agency within their co-teaching partnership. As they develop alongside their teaching partner, they have opportunities to reflect about their emerging identities with a peer, which can strengthen the co-teaching team (Nokes et al., 2009).

The program strikes a balance between academic and practical work, with the aim of developing a strong appreciation for praxis–a necessary component of co-teaching. Reflective practice is a core aspect of each activity, leading to the development of co-responsibility among co-teachers (Nokes et al., 2008). A clear expectation for professionalism promotes co-respect among peers as valued contributors to praxis (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Bacharach et al., 2008; Darragh et al., 2011; Scantlebury et al., 2008).

Challenges related to time constraints were identified among half of the articles reviewed for this study. The schedule of DRED&C, compared to a two-year B.Ed. program, addresses many of these issues by giving students more opportunities over a longer period to practice various co-teaching skills, as well as to engage in reflection as part of a community of praxis

during the fieldwork portion of their training. Despite this advantage, DRED&C still faces time-related challenges. Student schedules can still create conflict, as faculty have no control over students' non-DRED&C courses or work schedules. Students also appear to be struggling to develop an understanding of theory as rapidly as previous cohorts, forcing instructors to spend more time covering critical topics in depth at the expense of other concepts.

How philosophies of DRED&C's faculty shape its co-teaching aspects. Central to every aspect of the program is the concept of rehearsal to practice. Drama games are used to develop personal and professional agency, reflect upon students' roles as teachers and co-teachers, and transform their practice as educators. Collaborative drama work is presented not as a special methodology, but as a core aspect of educational praxis. Critical pedagogy, questioning, and problem-posing are used to develop critical reflection skills and innovative thinking. Faculty work to foster an appreciation for drama praxis, and to help students develop a signature teaching style. Both interviewees made specific reference to avoiding creating clones of themselves. This emphasis on helping students to develop personalized teaching identities is important for assertiveness and self-advocacy, which lead to more equitable co-teaching partnerships (Brinkmann & Twiford, 2012; McHatton & Daniel, 2008).

Drama and the community of praxis. The drama work of the DRED&C program is rooted in the needs of the community, and changes in response to that community's needs–including the community shared by each new cohort of DRED&C students. There is a strong emphasis on praxis in co-teaching, but also in academic, health and community work which are all linked together through drama praxis. Performed reflection about practice gives faculty insight into student development that allows them to act as mentors and supports within the university community of praxis.

The limited scope of the DRED&C field work makes it a challenge for faculty to connect with principals. Even when faculty make efforts to reach out to mentor teachers, school principals and other professional educators, various circumstances have made merely establishing field placements challenging. Generating the kind of stakeholder support required to develop a community of praxis within each placement school is impractical, so faculty use drama praxis to create a kind of surrogate professional community within the university classroom. Drama work, which deepens introspective practices and stimulates co-generative dialogues, can be used to supplement the kinds of professional interaction that such a limited field placement may lack.

Conclusion

Co-teachers need sufficient time for critical reflection, co-planning, and talk about praxis. They need time to identify social structures and make unconscious practices explicit. DRED&C offers many opportunities during weekly classes and across all four years of the program to practice all of these skills. Some of the program's core emphases are on critical reflection, social justice, and developing an understanding of praxis. The use of drama to explore empathy, collaboration and community provides support for the development of trust, equality between partners, shared responsibility, conflict resolution skills and a sense of community.

The daily work in a DRED&C class requires reflection, collaboration, co-planning, awareness of social context, communication, trust, respect, shared responsibility and open dialogue for students to be successful. The program's space is designed purposefully for community development, collaborative work, and personal empowerment. Each of these critical co-teaching skills are carefully scaffolded across the four years of the program. Co-teaching skills are directly embedded into each activity, with little need for explicit instruction.

Chapter 6 - Conclusion

Co-teaching is an increasingly popular strategy in integrated classrooms, ESL classrooms, and other educational settings. American emphasis on high-stakes testing as a measure of teacher efficacy has made it more challenging to find individual placements for student teachers, forcing colleges of education to investigate alternative solutions like co-teaching. Budget cuts and access to online resources are driving school support staff like librarians and reading specialists to collaborate with classroom teachers. Effective collaboration among educators, however, is a learned skill which requires practice. Additional research into the development of effective co-teaching partnerships is needed to improve the success of co-teaching programs and to make more reliable determinations about their impact on elementary and secondary school students.

Outside of specialized programs, drama education is a relatively unknown tool for developing collaborative skills like communication and critical reflection. It is rarely included in Canadian B.Ed. programs despite its emphasis on creativity, collaboration and social justice. One of these specialized programs, the University of Windsor's Honours B.A. Drama in Education and Community, serves as a model for the integration of drama praxis and co-teaching.

DRED&C plays various roles within the educational community. It emphasizes not only drama education, but also community, health, applied theatre, and social action. It seeks to address the needs of multiple communities, and evolves over time in response to societal shifts. It is difficult to compare a four-year undergraduate program like DRED&C to Ontario's two-year post-graduate B.Ed. programs, which are focused primarily on preparing students for work within formal educational settings, with longer and more intensive field placements. However,

the findings of this study do provide answers to the important questions which led to the investigation of the DRED&C program.

The essential components of co-teaching – issues of praxis, relationship development, and supportive practice – are reinforced through drama praxis. The elements of successful co-teaching related to praxis and relationship development are strikingly similar to the set of skills required for educational drama work. Applying drama education methodology organically immerses students in a culture of reflective collaboration, with increased benefits for students who engage more deeply with drama work. The final category, supportive practice, is reinforced in the structure of the program.

The structure of DRED&C shapes collaborative philosophies and supports a community of practice in service of co-teaching. The scaffolding of collaborative philosophies begins as early as the initial intake process and continues to the final day of the program. Each cohort is given ample physical and social space to explore and develop drama and co-teaching skills with minimal risk. The program's emphasis on social justice empowers students as learners, teachers, performers and researchers through a balance of theoretical and practical work. The schedule of DRED&C provides students with plenty of thinking time between class and field work sessions so they can absorb, process and implement new strategies for co-teaching. Peers and faculty can support one another because class time and field work are scheduled concurrently throughout the second year. DRED&C's flexible programming adapts to the needs of both its students and the local community.

Summary of Findings

This study identified 21 elements which are essential to the development of successful pre-service co-teaching programs. The DRED&C program incorporates nearly all of these

elements to some degree using drama praxis philosophies. It heavily emphasizes the reciprocal relationship between theoretical drama education work and practical experiences through critical discussions and an overarching research strand. Each cohort is crafted to maximize openness to collaborative philosophies. Students are kept together as a community and exposed to the same theories and philosophical ideas about drama education as their peers. Each is encouraged to develop a personal teaching style, but these shared experiences help improve compatibility between partners.

The participatory nature of drama work leads students toward deep introspection about shared experiences while fostering elements of a strong community of praxis–a safe learning space, co-respect, trust, and co-responsibility. Core courses give students weekly opportunities each semester to develop their relationships with peers and co-teachers, including during field placements. Drama games and class discussions in each class provide students with opportunities to learn and practice co-teaching skills like critical reflection, communication, collaboration, co-planning, and tension resolution.

The design of the space and schedule, the scaffolding of reflective strategies, and the culture of respect and professionalism contribute to the program's strong sense of community. This community is directed toward critical reflection about teaching and learning through frequent research projects and guided discussions about educational and drama theory. Supervising teachers are included in this community of praxis by taking on roles as mentors rather than evaluators. Students' assessments mirror this emphasis on the process of reflection rather than mastery of technical teaching skill.

Drama praxis builds on the community of praxis to help students examine social contexts and act as a vehicle for social change. Drama work stimulates critical discourse through

embodiment. It gives students a new lens through which social norms–which can negatively influence critical elements of co-teaching–can be identified and examined. The collective experience of drama influences students to collaborate outside the classroom.

Each week, DRED&C students engage in cooperative work to learn and practice communication, collaboration, and tension resolution skills. They continue this work in parallel with their practice teaching placements. Students work in a flexible studio space with the same cohort, developing trust and growing familiar with their peers' philosophies and teaching identities.

The schedule of the program addresses some of the issues faced by typical B.Ed. field work schedules by maintaining regular classroom contact time between students and faculty. It also creates new issues, however, as faculty have no control over student schedules beyond the core DRED&C courses. The limited scope of the placements also makes it a challenge for faculty to work with principals and mentor teachers to develop communities of praxis within the placement schools.

Implications for DRED&C

The most significant challenge facing the DRED&C program is the perceived decline in students' appreciation for theoretical work. This decline is a serious concern because of the essential role praxis plays in the development of successful co-teaching. Critical reflection depends on students' ability to make connections between their experiences and established pedagogy. The community of praxis must necessarily include ideas and research from outside itself. The DRED&C program itself has undergone significant structural changes to try to overcome this challenge.

One strategy which may mitigate the impact of this decline is suggested in the literature on co-teaching: Anderson and Freebody (2012) found that supportive relationships with professional education communities can help teacher candidates better understand theory-practice relationships. If DRED&C students can be given more opportunities to participate in communities of praxis outside the university classroom, such as attending Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings, they may see the value that practicing teachers place on incorporating research and theory into their practice.

This approach would be challenging, as the other major issue facing DRED&C is the logistical puzzle of finding and scheduling placements. Finding PLC groups or meeting with principals and mentor teachers to discuss research would be an additional time commitment for both students and faculty, and it is not known how effective such an approach might be.

Implications for Pre-Service Co-Teaching

The integration of drama praxis with co-teaching offers solutions to various challenges faced by pre-service co-teaching programs. The structures and philosophies of the DRED&C program also address several challenges identified in the literature.

Integrating drama praxis and co-teaching. When the hidden curriculum of a school contradicts the goals of the co-teaching program, co-teachers may adopt a similarly hostile attitude toward co-teaching (Arndt & Liles, 2010). Further, conflicts between social norms and teachers' identities can cause additional tension between teaching partners (Dang, 2013). Students who engage in drama praxis methodologies learn to readily identify implicit social structures which could influence their perceptions of co-teaching or conflict with their teaching styles.

Competition, perceived favouritism, and an imbalance of authority between partners can cause serious problems with communication, collaboration and critical reflection (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013; King, 2006; Stairs et al., 2009). In addition to helping students identify and address social and cultural conflicts, drama praxis necessitates a balance of power among participants. Collective creation requires some amount of co-responsibility by each group member, reducing perceptions of favouritism and imbalances in authority.

Certain models of co-teaching, like one teach–one assist, can relegate one partner to a less-valued role, especially when special educators are paired with general educators. For this reason, more collaborative approaches like teaming should be encouraged (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013). Drama praxis philosophy requires a certain amount of collective responsibility for all work. DRED&C classes on group dynamics emphasize that effective leadership promotes equitable participation by all group members. These philosophies encourage students to engage in more collaborative co-teaching strategies when they enter the field classroom.

Structures and philosophies of DRED&C. Co-teachers with dysfunctional relationships are not challenged to reflect about their methodologies or teaching identities (Stairs et al., 2009). By scheduling the field work over a longer period and maintaining contact time in the university classroom, DRED&C students continue to be challenged in this way by peers and instructors regardless of any tensions within their partnership. When serious conflicts arise, weekly contact time with students gives faculty opportunities to address issues of tension between teaching partners. Such intervention is invaluable, as unresolved conflict between co-teachers can have a negative impact on their attitudes toward co-teaching (Hamilton-Jones & Vail, 2013).

Inadequate co-planning can lead to disastrous disagreements between co-teachers (Scantlebury et al., 2008). Students must have opportunities to communicate, set goals, develop their teaching identities, and establish roles within the partnership (Arndt & Liles, 2010; Parker et al., 2010). In addition to providing some class time for students to co-plan, the dilute schedule of DRED&C field work affords ample opportunities for co-teachers to meet and plan together.

General education co-teachers may be perceived as doing more work or having a more important role than special educators (Arndt & Liles, 2010; McHatton & Daniel, 2008). DRED&C includes courses on working with participants with disabilities. As a collective, community-driven process, drama praxis encourages inclusivity among all participants.

Inadequate classroom spaces make it challenging for instructors to use flexible groupings, which are important for learning and practicing collaboration (McHatton & Daniel, 2008; Parker et al., 2010). The studio space used for core DRED&C courses is open, with no fixed seating. It is soundproofed, with adequate temperature controls, and enough space for group work.

Finally, DRED&C faculty use a workshop and intake interview to ensure that each cohort is amenable to collaborative drama work. This process helps reduce conflict between co-teachers, and could be transferrable to other pre-service co-teaching programs.

Future Research

DRED&C is an undergraduate program, and students wishing to become qualified as teachers in Ontario must enroll in a consecutive B.Ed. program. As such, there is research potential for a B.Ed. or equivalent program which already uses co-teaching to adopt and integrate drama praxis methodologies.

Although the placement schedules of DRED&C and B.Ed. programs differ substantially, the weekly contact time embedded in the DRED&C placements addresses several challenges

related to co-teaching. Co-teaching programs with concentrated placement schedules, where students are in the field classroom daily for several weeks, could attempt to add additional contact time in the university classroom to reinforce praxis and address conflicts between co-teachers. For instance, instead of teaching five days a week for four weeks, students might teach four days a week for five weeks while meeting with their cohort on the fifth day. This would also afford students additional structured co-planning time with access to peers and faculty for consultation.

Further research could be conducted on the impact of the DRED&C placements on elementary students and mentor teachers. How are DRED&C co-teachers perceived by these groups? Does their relationship seem equitable? Research could also focus on which types of co-teaching strategies are employed by DRED&C students. Establishing trust and familiarity and exposing students to collaborative methodologies prior to fieldwork tends to bias co-teaching strategies toward the collaborative end of the spectrum (Goodnough et al., 2009; Nokes et al., 2008). If DRED&C students tend to use teaming more often than typical co-teaching pairs, it could further support the value of drama praxis as a tool for enhancing teacher collaboration.

Conclusion

Drama praxis uses many of the same skills as co-teaching. This overlap makes drama praxis a potentially valuable foundation for pre-service co-teaching programs. Drama offers many opportunities for enriching the kinds of introspective practices which are essential to co-teaching praxis. It is a flexible and socially-oriented medium which is adaptable to various contexts. Drama is about walking in the shoes of another, which aids in the development of reflection skills, equitable co-teaching partnerships, and other elements of praxis.

DRED&C embeds critical co-teaching skills within each course, allowing them to be scaffolded from year to year as students develop their unique teaching identities. It uses flexible space, both physical and social, to establish an open community of practitioners. The acceptance of and reflection about differing teaching philosophies helps develop effective relationships between co-teachers.

The program balances practice and theory through the philosophy of applying theory to immediate practice. Though such a balance is not always easy to maintain, this core focus of DRED&C aligns well with the skills required for pre-service co-teaching and ultimately offers program developers a model for incorporating co-teaching skills into teacher education programs.

References

Age, L. (2011). Grounded theory methodology: Positivism, hermeneutics, and pragmatism. *The Qualitative Report,* 16(6), 1599-1615.

Anderson, M. J. & Freebody, K. (2012). Developing communities of praxis: Bridging the theory practice divide in teacher education. *McGill Journal of Education*, 47(3), 359-377.

Arndt, K. & Liles, J. (2010). Preservice teachers' perceptions of co-teaching: A qualitative study. *Action in Teacher Education,* 32, 15-25.

Bacharach, N. L., Heck, T. W. & Dahlberg, K. R. (2008). What makes co-teaching work? Identifying the essential elements. *College Teaching Methods and Styles Journal*, 4(3) 43-48.

Bacharach, N. L., Heck, T. W. & Dahlberg, K. R. (2010). Changing the face of student teaching through co-teaching. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32, 3-14.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J. J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. RASE, 10(2), 17-22.

Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.

Belliveau, G. (2007). An alternative practicum model for teaching and learning. Canadian Journal of Education, 30, 47-67.

Boal, A. (1995). *The Rainbow of Desire: The Boal Method of Theatre and Therapy* (Jackson, A., trans.). New York, New York: Routledge.

Boal, A. (1992). *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (Jackson, A., trans.) New York, New York: Routledge.

Boal, A. (1985). *Theatre of the Oppressed* (A., C. & McBride, M-O. L., trans.). New York, New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Brinkmann, J. & Twiford, T. (2012). Voices from the field: Skill sets needed for effective collaboration and co-teaching. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(3), 1-13.

Cawthon, S. W. & Dawson, K. M. (2011). Drama-based instruction and educational research: Activating praxis in an interdisciplinary partnership. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(17), 1-22.

Carter, M. R. (2014). Drama and theatre education in Canada: A snapshot. *McGill Journal of Education*, 49, 237-245.

Cramer, E., Liston, A., Nevin, A., & Thousand, J. (2010). Co-teaching in urban secondary school districts to meet the needs of all teachers and learners: Implications for teacher education reform. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 6(2), 59-76.

Dang, T. K. A. (2013). Identity in activity: Examining teacher professional identity formation in the paired-placement of student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 47-59. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.006

Darragh, J. J., Picanco, K. E., Tully, D., & Henning, A. S. (2011). When teachers collaborate, good things happen: Teacher candidate perspectives of the co-teach model for the student teaching internship. *AILACTE Journal,* 8, 83-104.

Davis, S. (2013). Dramatic shape-shifter and innovative teacher: The creative life and legacy of Dorothy Heathcote. *NJ*, 37, 25-40.

Dillon, D. A. & Way, B. (1981). Perspectives: Drama as a sense of wonder–Brian Way. *Language Arts,* 58(3), 356-362.

Duke, T. S., (2004). Problematizing collaboration: A critical review of the empirical literature on teaching teams. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 27(3), 307-317. doi:10.1177/088840640402700309

Eick, C. & Dias, M. (2005). Building the authority of experience in communities of practice: The development of preservice teachers' practical knowledge through co-teaching in inquiry classrooms. *Science Teacher Education*, 89(3), 470-491. doi:10.1002/sce.20036

Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 (2015). Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1177/text

Flores, M. T. (2007). Navigating contradictory communities of practice in learning to teach for social justice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 380-402. doi:10.1525/aeq.2007.38.4.380

Flujit, D., Bakker, C., & Struyf, E. (2016). Team reflection: the missing link in co-teaching teams. *European Journal of Special Needs Education,* 32(1) 187-201

Freire, P. (2015). Pedagogy of the oppressed. NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Friend, M., Cook, L., Hurley-Chamberlain, D., & Shamberger, C. (2010). Co-teaching: An illustration of the complexity of collaboration in special education. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20, 9-27. doi:10.1080/10474410903535380

Gallagher, K. (2016). The social habitus of drama: the Ontario drama curriculum in theory and practice. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 21, 20-36. doi:10.1080/13569783.2015.1126172

Goodnough, K., Osmond, P., Dibbon, D., Glassman, M. & Stevens, K. (2009). Exploring a triad model of student teaching: Pre-service teacher and cooperating teacher perceptions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 285-296. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.10.003

Hamilton-Jones, B. & Vail, C. (2013). Preparing special educators for collaboration in the classroom: Pre-service teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *International Journal of Special Education*, 28, 1-13.

Harland, T. (2014). Learning about case study methodology to research higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development,* 33(6), 1113-1122.

Hurd, E. & Weilbacher, G. (2017). "You want me to do what?" The benefits of co-teaching in the middle level. *Middle Grades Review,* 3(1), 1-14

Iyer, R. & Reese, M. (2013). Ensuring student success: Establishing a community of practice for culturally and linguistically diverse preservice teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n3.4

Jackson, A. (2012). Points and practices: Mapping the archives 1. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance,* 17, 121-126.

Kana, P. & Aitken, V. (2007). "She didn't ask me about my grandma": Using process drama to explore issues of cultural exclusion and educational leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 46(6), 697.

Keefe, E. B., Moore, V., & Duff, F. (2004). The four "knows" of collaborative teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(5), 36-42.

King, S. (2006). Promoting paired placements in initial teacher education. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 15(4), 370-386. doi:10.2167/irg201.0

Langford, R., Di Santo, A., Valeo, A., Underwood, K., & Lenis, A. (2018). The innovation of Ontario full-day kindergarten educator teams: Have they reproduced the split systems of care and education? *Gender and Education*, 30(5), 569-586.

Leistyna, P. (2004). Presence of mind in the process of learning and knowing: A dialogue with Paolo Freire. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Winter, 17-29.

Loertscher, D. V., (2014). Collaboration and co-teaching: A new measure of impact. *Teacher Librarian*, 42(2), 8-19.

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & McDuffie, K. (2005). Case studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges. Intervention in School and Clinic, 40(5), 260-270.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Content Analysis*, 1(2).

McHatton, P. A. & Daniel, P. L. (2008). Co-teaching at the pre-service level: Special education majors collaborate with English education majors. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 31(2), 118-131. doi:10.1177/088840640803100205

Moreillon, J. (2016). Making the classroom–library connection. *Teacher Librarian*, 43(3), 8-18.

Morton, B. M., & Burky, G. D. (2015). Innovative university-school partnerships: Co-teaching in secondary settings. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 24(2), 119-132.

Murawski, W. W. (2006). Student outcomes in co-taught secondary English classes: How can we improve? *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 22, 227-247. doi:10.1080/10573560500455703

Murawski, W. W., Dieker, L. A. (2004). Tips and strategies for co-teaching at the secondary level. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 36(5), 52-58.

Murawski, W. W., Dieker, L. A. (2008). 50 ways to keep your co-teacher: Strategies for before, during, and after co-teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(4), 40-48.

Nokes, J. D., Bullough, R. V. J., Egan, W. M., Birrell, J. R. & Hansen, M. (2008). The paired-placement of student teachers: An alternative to traditional placements in secondary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 2168-2177. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.05.001

Ofstedal, K., & Dahlberg, K. (2009). Collaboration in student teaching: Introducing the collaboration self-assessment tool. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 30, 37-48. doi:10.1080/10901020802668043

Ontario. (2008). *Supporting English language learners: A practical guide for Ontario educators, grades 1 to 8.* ON: Queens Printer for Ontario.

Pancsofar, N. & Petroff, J. G. (2013). *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 36(2), 83-96. doi:10.1177/0888406412474996

Parker, A., Allen, D., McHatton, P. A., Rosa, L. (2010). Dance lessons: Preparing preservice teachers for co-teaching partnerships. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32, 26-38.

Parrott, D. J., & Keith, K. J. (2015). Three heads are better than one: Librarians, reading specialists, and classroom teachers in the learning commons. *Teacher Librarian*, 42(5), 12-18

Pearson, M. L., Albon, S. P., & Hubball, H. (2015). Case study methodology: Flexibility, rigour, and ethical considerations for the scholarship of teaching and learning. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 6(3), 12.

Postholm, M. B. (2013). Classroom management: what does research tell us? *European Educational Research Journal*, 12(3), 389-402.

Reich, J. Levinson, M. & Johnston, W. (2011). Using online social networks to foster preservice teachers' membership in a networked community of praxis. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 11(4), 382-397.

Roth, W-M. Tobin, K, Carambo, C & Dalland, C. (2004). Co-teaching: Creating resources for learning and learning to teach chemistry in urban high schools. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(9), 882-904. doi:10.1080/1354060042000188017

Rytivaara, A., & Kershner, R. (2012). Co-teaching as a context for teachers' professional learning and joint knowledge construction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28, 999-1008. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.006

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing and Health*, 23, 334-340.

Scantlebury, K., Gallo-Fox, J. & Wassell, B. (2008). Co-teaching as a model for preservice secondary science teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 967-981. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.008

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M., McDuffie, K. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.

Stairs, A. J., Corrieri, C., Fryer, L., Genovese, L, Panaro, R. & Sohn, C. (2009). Inquiry into student teaching in an urban school–university partnership. *School-University Partnerships*, 3, 75-89.

Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 7(17), 1-10.

Subraminam, K. (2013). Examining the content of preservice teachers' reflections of early field experiences. *Res Sci Educ*, 43, 1851-1872. doi:10.1007/s11165-012-9337-7

Sutherland, L., Howard, S., & Markauskaite, L. (2010). Professional identity creation: Examining the development of beginning preservice teachers' understanding of their work as teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 455-465. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.006

Taylor, P. (2000). The Drama Classroom: Action, reflection, transformation. New York, NY: RoutlegdeFalmer.

Taylor, P. & Warner, C. D. (2006) Structure and Spontaneity: The Process Drama of Cecily O'Neill. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited.

Tobin, K. (2006). Learning to teach through co-teaching and cogenerative dialogue. *Teaching Education*, 17(2), 133-142. doi:10.1080/10476210600680358

Tobin, K. & Roth, W-M. (2005). Implementing co-teaching and cogenerative dialoguing in urban science education. *School Science and Mathematics*, 105(6), 313-322.

Yamagata-Lynch, L. C. (2001). Community of practice: What is it, and how can we use this metaphor for teacher professional development? *Annual Proceedings of Selected Research and Development and Practice Papers Presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*, 1(2).

Yopp, R. H., Ellis, M. W., Bonsangue, M. V., Duarte, T., Meza, S. (2014). Piloting a co-teaching model for mathematics teacher preparation: Learning to teach together. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 23(1), 91-111.

Zaffini, E. J. (2018). Communities of practice and legitimate peripheral participation: A literature review. *National Association for Music Education,* 36(3), 38-43.

Vita Auctoris

Zach Dougall was born in London, Ontario in 1987. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Drama in Education and Community at the University of Windsor in 2010, a Bachelor of Education degree from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto in 2011, and a Master of Education degree from the University of Windsor in 2019.