

Chapter 4. The Practice of Dorothy Heathcote as a Pedagogy of Resistance

Amanda Kipling and Anna Hickey-Moody

This chapter explores the work of Dorothy Heathcote as an example of a material pedagogy of resistance. Taking the principles of Heathcote's (Bolton, 1998, Booth, 2012) work from the drama classroom into online teaching and learning practices, we demonstrate how contemporary pedagogies that are resistant to what might be considered neoliberal education (Giroux, 2012) can be facilitated through e-portfolios, developed with an ethos devised from the work of Heathcote (Heathcote and Bolton, 1996; Booth, 2012) and in order to scrutinise the specific nature of resistance and its impact on learners we draw on Deleuze's notions of affect (Hickey-Moody 2009).

Contextual Background

Dorothy Heathcote's practice was devised within the politically left wing British Drama Education movement of the late 1960's and 1970's (Heathcote and Bolton, 1996). This period in education is not seen as a time particularly resistant to innovation. The revolution of child-centred learning was established, however, this in itself was then embedded with certain fixed practices and Heathcote's work was positioned in a significantly different gear than was the norm. Her interpretation of child-centred dramatic exploration of learning was in contrast to the mainstream practice which still, in the main, lay in the teaching of speech and theatre skills. In the first section, *Dorothy Heathcote: a Pedagogue of Resistance*, Heathcote's work is considered in the more finely grained context. The varying ways in which she challenged the notion of the teacher being the 'one who knows' (Wagner, 1976, 38) and how she eroded this as her practice grew is examined.

In the second section, *Electronic Pedagogies of Resistance*, contemporary contexts are explored, using examples of Heathcote's philosophy of practice in the employment of electronic portfolios in initial teacher education at Goldsmiths, London. Heathcote challenged existing practices such as lesson plans based on the developmental work of practitioners like Piaget (Mussen, 1983) to break new ground in drama education that was more about uncovering what was already within the child. In this respect, Heathcote can be considered as part of what Hornbook (1998) describes as the 'revolution which profoundly altered ideas about teaching, learning and how education should be organised, and which had at its core the idea that the aim of education was to cultivate happy, balanced individuals.' (10) In similar ways, elements of the mainstream practice of initial teacher education is challenged by developmental models used by the Drama student-teachers at Goldsmiths.

In the third section, *The Pedagogue is Dead: Long live the Pedagogue of Resistance*, the two areas of drama education and technology for education are brought together, through Heathcote's last pedagogical model, the Rolling Role. Here, Rolling Role is examined in two contexts, both of which involve the use of ICT and, in their own ways, have created a pedagogy of resistance. This shatters the existing mainstream model of the teacher/pupil relationship, empowers pupils to be their own pedagogues, penetrates the superficial lesson plan, exposes and addresses the growing cracks which lie therein, and breaks through politically driven restrictions through developing post human practices.

DOROTHY HEATHCOTE: A PEDAGOGUE OF RESISTANCE

'Changing historical conditions posit new problems, define different projects and often demand new discourses' (Giroux, 2003, 5). This quote describes the context for the setting of Dorothy Heathcote's developmental work that followed the work of

both Peter Slade (1954) and his protégé Brian Way (Bolton, 1998) who had made major contributions to the field and whose work was pioneering in challenging what had been a well established practice of teaching ‘speech and drama’ and theatre skills on the curriculum. Working on plays, productions and exercises designed to refine presentation skills had, for some time, been the basic provision in schools. However, Slade (1954) introduced the idea of children’s fantasy play and ‘being’ something or someone else as a perfectly valid art form in its own right, stating that: ‘Child Drama is an Art in itself, and would stand by that alone as being of importance.’ (105).

Hickey-Moody (2009) explores Deleuze’ concept of ‘affectus’ as a form of material pedagogy through which we can track how matter changes places and people. She asserts,

‘The *affectio* refers to a state of the affected body and implies the presence of the affecting body, whereas the *affectus* refers to the passage or movement from one state to another, taking into account the correlative variation of the affecting bodies.’ (273)

In his book, *Acting in Classroom Drama* (1998), Bolton describes a class which Slade was teaching, where the very young children are completely absorbed in being dinosaurs, kangaroos and chasing hats that fly away in the wind. Compared to the forerunning rehearsals for school productions, this was a refreshing and energetic classroom with each child afforded creative agency and process foregrounded over product. There is no show, there is no audience, there is no finished product, simply the state of being and expressing this is the focus of his work (Bolton 1998). Bolton (1998) explains:

‘Slade ... too is disposed to perceive in children’s own drama the harmonious language of gesture’, the ‘law of rhythm’, and the contours of song’, but,

Slade would have us understand, their achievement of ‘higher realms of drama’ is to be largely unconscious. Indeed it is the very lack of contrived artistry that contributes to its beauty.’ (125)

In this new model, the affectio had been radically changed. However, the affecting body, the directing teacher, remained.

This somewhat formless version of drama required some kind of scaffold in order to progress into something which could grow from the roots established by Slade’s *Child Drama* (1954). Without this, this exciting and revolutionary thinking was at risk of reverting back to the study of play scripts or a simple narrative presentation. Having observed Slade (1954) as a critical agent and who had broken away from the existing views of what drama should look like in schools, Way (Bolton, 1998) had to produce a model of practice which was visibly robust enough to hold this freshly broken ground and communicate itself to teachers, in order to prevent this exciting and development in practice sliding back into previous practice for want of a more concrete material basis.

Accompanying this practice was another view – that this method could support and promote verbal communication. The pre-Slade model was about refining communications adhering to a notion of correctness. The Slade model had broken through the notion of correct response and this now allowed the emphasis to shift towards empowering the pupil voice. Developing articulate communicators is an essential strand of the fight against social and political oppression and this could now be taught through structured curriculum. While one could say the structure and guidance from Way was formalised and in some ways fixed, thus lacking the freedom which Slade’s (1954) model enjoyed, it did address the learning of specific skills to

increase pupil empowerment. This was the pupils' own text – not Shakespearean, nor the play written by an adult that the head of school had chosen for the end of term play, with all the hidden oppressions which lie therein; this pupil-generated content was lacking in Slade's (1954) model. Way's (Bolton, 1998) method enabled teachers to find and develop teaching styles that could progress in terms of skills, in line with political sympathies of the time. This model encouraged a sense that the work in the classroom could grow up with, and be informed by, the pupils.

It is the political conundrum Giroux (2003) points out when referring to the work of Freire (1970); pedagogy could be 'either reduced to a sterile set of techniques or dressed up within the discourse of humanistic methods that simply softened the attempts by the schools to produce an insidious form of oral and political regulation' (Giroux 2003, 6).

It is clear that Way (Bolton, 1998) faced the dilemma of how to move a progressive idea into progressive practice and he had to 'borrow' structures from the past in order to move forward. Teachers were still making the initial decisions, planning the lessons, planning the freedoms and defining the boundaries. In Freirian (1970) terms, even though the banking system of education is being challenged, and to some extent eroded, the teacher is still the 'narrator' ('dictator'?). While what is happening within these acts is challenging and increasing agency, stepping back and looking at the big picture teachers and learners are still trapped within a 'lesson and classroom' matrix. There was more to be done: the affecting body was still in its original position.

The work of Slade (1954) and Way (Bolton, 1998) turned fresh and exciting furrows in which Heathcote could plant seeds. If drama were to progress it needed to go beyond decision making, being and voice finding. It needed some kind of steering

and framing to ensure these freedoms were progressive and enriching; to enable learners of all ages ‘to think critically, take risks, and resist dominant forms of oppression...’ (Giroux 2003, 7). Heathcote took the work a step further in terms of reducing the presence of the teacher in the more traditional sense: instead of being the ‘one who knows’ (Wagner, 1976, 38) she sat on the floor with her class and joined in the work with them. Instead of a pre-planned session, she often worked spontaneously, negotiating the subject of the lesson, responding to the class and their direction, while ensuring challenge and depth. Echoing the physical positioning in language form, she used ‘we’ and fell into role as a fellow ‘worker’ in the classroom. The role and function of the teacher herself was now under scrutiny. The status of the teacher as the knowledgeable one in the classroom was being challenged and this left the issues regarding the role of the learners under the spotlight for interrogation and exploration (Booth, 2012).

Applying this notion to the work of Heathcote it is clear that she de-centered the concept of the teacher as an affecting body. Her model is one whose relationship with knowledge is that of co-discoverer; student teachers and teachers are part of material networks that intra-act upon each other. Instead of the positively charged active supplier of knowledge, she plays her role almost in reverse, encouraging pupils to fill themselves with learning. The affectus, the material trace of change, is this transformational vehicle; the classroom and what happens in it. Its impact on the affected bodies – the class – is quite different, as they have grown the knowledge themselves in a shared environment. Pupils have fed on its development while nourishing it and have owned the process. Heathcote, it could be argued, was original in working with affectus at this stage of practice.

A good example of this is seen in the BBC documentary *Three Looms Waiting* (Smedley, 1971). Heathcote was invited to Axwell Park Community Home to make a play with a group of boys. Within a few minutes of sitting on the floor with them and asking what they would like to make a play about, one of the boys had suggested a 'prisoner of war play' and Heathcote realized this was a metaphor for the children's own situation in school. Working spontaneously, she knew that being held captive is an experience to which young people in such a setting can relate. The drama unfolded with her in role as an officer going in and out of the drama to steer, or not, as required. However, more and more Heathcote left the group work in role on their own to find their own way through the dilemmas they faced. - This was *Teacher in Role*, but still as a teacher.

Later in the same documentary we see another project, this time set in a primary school in the Hartlepool area. The class had been told the bible story of Ahab and the relocation of citizens to make room for the new queen's palace. The play, which was presented on numerous occasions but with any child playing any role, involved socio-political issues, such as the injustice of class division, and the pupils wrestled with these in drama and arrived at this flexible presentation. With no script and no cast list, schools plays had never looked like this. Similarly unknown was the complete commitment to role and profound sense of being. Heathcote had no part in this play; she had facilitated its creation by selecting it and telling it, but the transformation into a 'play' had been wholly owned by the children.

The Freirian 'banking' concept of education (Freire 1970, 72) was finally being really challenged by Heathcote, as she framed the learning about what is unknown both to teacher and class. The pitch has to be the job of the teacher, as does the frame in which work gets started. However these concepts of letting the drama

carry the teaching and learning (rather than the teacher) was revolutionary: ‘Rather than being the subject of pedagogy, drama in education became a sophisticated form of pedagogy itself.’ (Hornbrook, 1998,13) As indicated before, the teacher as affecting body in this instance is quite different from the narrating or directing teacher of more traditional methods. The focus for the teacher is on the setting up of the affectus, which is operated by the affected bodies in the classroom. Here the pupils are both affected (by the Heathcote initiated framework for the lesson – the affectus) and become affecting themselves (the usual role of the teacher) as the drama unfolds and the learning is shared and processed collaboratively.

It is worth pausing here to consider the wider context of the times. In Sullivan’s *Art Practice as Research, Inquiry in Visual Arts*, having traced the growth of empirical research and its need to hypothesise, measure, test, and prove he goes on to describe the movement in the mid 20th century which is when Heathcote’s work was emerging.

‘Despite its impressive record of constructing knowledge, empiricism has its limits. Theorists who question the assumption that the observed experience is the only viable basis by which phenomena can be studied argue that other dialectical or dialogical approaches provide more scope in using reason and argument to come to understand things. The primary task is the need to amplify and contextualize phenomena found in the empirical world and this means being responsive to external, situated concerns and internal, felt cues.’ (Sullivan 2010, 38)

This challenge to the empirical practices of the time parallels the challenge Heathcote was making to Drama teaching classroom practice. Her awareness that the matter to be opened up for scrutiny was the ‘intra-action *between* bodies and matter’ (Hickey-Moody and Page, 13) provided part of the arts education backdrop for the

works of later scholars of arts practice as research, as examined in chapter one of this book (Hickey-Moody and Page, 2015).

The first of Heathcote's models which emerged from this way of working was called *Man in a Mess*. The class was confronted with some kind of dilemma, Heathcote would introduce them to the context, get them to invest in it, say, by spending a day creating an ancient manuscript which contained all the community records. Then she introduced the dilemma: they were under attack and the sacred place which housed the precious scrolls was occupied. When the class was ready, Heathcote would slide out of the drama and watch the class resolve the situation for themselves.

The affecting body was simply the designer of the frame. This was the extent of the impact of the affectio. After that, the pupils then made their own learning within this frame. It is worth pointing out at this stage that Dorothy Heathcote was not a mainstream teacher. She carried out all her work visiting schools that carved out some days for her in which to run such projects and was advantaged by the release of the timetable; times were such that this was possible.

The next development was *Teacher and Role*. This involved Heathcote as a classroom teacher and a second teacher in role as another. This is beautifully captured in '*Albert*' (Heathcote and Lawrence, 1973) – a drama session where a class of children with Special Educational Needs meet a tramp called Albert. Despite being branded as children with no social skills by the educational system, they demonstrated that they knew exactly what to do to improve his life situation as Heathcote steered herself away to the edges of the lesson, keeping it contained as a teacher, allowing the drama to exist between the class and Albert. Albert was thrown a party and taught how to dance because he did not know how to be happy – so the class showed him.

The oppression of labeling had been challenged and children could show the outside world what they really knew and what they could do. The teacher as narrator was disappearing.

In this extraordinary project, Heathcote's dismantling of the accepted structures in the education classroom became the careful designing of a resource – a teacher in role as a vagrant – to simply 'be' and generate, diffract and channel affectus. This teacher as an affecting, diffractive body made way for her subject, and dramatic energy itself, and the pupils took complete control. They were affecting bodies in a very positive sense, finding Albert some clothes and teaching him to dance. Albert was the affected; the usual roles have been reversed. Stepping outside the context of the lesson and considering the constructs of the time, pupils who had been considered incapable of relational social skills had proved the system wrong. The oppressive machine of labeling had been thwarted and both teacher and pupils had become 'oppositional intellectuals' (Giroux 2003, 7)

Mantle of the Expert is the next relative that grew from these two stages of Heathcote's work. Now plumbing new depths, she believed that pupils could become 'experts' if given the time and opportunity to do so. With books aplenty, carefully pre-selected and made available, in the *Mantle of the Expert* children remained in role as workers: looking up information, and empathizing with the situation until the language and notions they were expressing became identifiable as creative acts. Heathcote played the 'I have no idea register' (Wagner 1976, 38) and her ignorance was played to a high level so as to act as the perfect foil for pupils to become the 'knowledgeable' ones. Consequently the class has to be the affecting and affected bodies at once. They had become their own pedagogues. All the time they were

creating theatre/playmaking which is an organic affectus and developing transient art form. The 'lesson', as well as teacher as we knew them, had gone.

It appeared to some that the traditional concept of theatre was being lost in this improvisational educational practice, however, Heathcote pointed out that a play is 'an ordered sequence of events that brings one or more of the people in it to a desperate condition in which it must always explain and should, if possible, resolve.' (Bolton, 1998, 177). This matches Heathcote's practice very well in that the very fabric of all her lessons matched an ordered sequence of events that brings one or more of the people in it to a desperate condition. As David Davis (2010) observed:

'She (Heathcote) sees Drama as the means of rooting all the school curriculum back in a human context where it sprang from, so that knowledge is not an abstract, isolated subject-based discipline, but is based in human action, interaction, commitment and responsibility.' (177)

Heathcote's work was becoming very Freirian (1970) at this point. More than the drawing out and the empowering and the meaning making of the participants themselves, this was a curriculum that grew from the children. While much child-centred learning acknowledged the natural development of children and how to harness this to guide learning, Heathcote's was a model about finding a focus which would enable children to make their own foundations and grow the learning from within, rather than hijacking learning on top of a process already in progression. This was substantial empowerment made safe by the skilled use of an art form.

The *Commission Model* was a further development. A real commission – like the designing of a hospital garden - forms the focus of a project and very steadily, over considerable time the class would be in role as gardeners, botanists, horticulturalists and so on. Pupils would steadily, with this mission in mind, develop

the knowledge and expertise so as to present their design to the hospital governors – ‘Did they know this corner would only get 10 minutes of sunshine a day?’ ‘This means it might be best to put a decoration of some kind here – like a statue...’ At the National Drama Conference in York in 2000, Heathcote described this rationality between space, place and pupils that this method engendered.

It could be argued that this actually challenged the notion of drama as being about the make believe – not the real. However it functioned as a model because although the hospital garden quest was real, the children were not gardeners, horticulturalists and botanists – they had had to become versions of these, through role, in order to complete the task. This brought a hitherto unseen, unknown reality into drama and once again brought challenge and ownership and agency to pupils – the teacher was disappearing. Heathcote did not actively oppose existing models of practice but rather offered something else, something other, which would achieve the same ends and more. By so doing she was, in fact, creating learning circumstances which produced deeply developed dramatists in the fullest sense of the word. Ross (as cited by Bolton 1998) also remarked that the aesthetic in drama was being sidelined in Heathcote’s work when it was maybe truer to say that she was, while working in this vein, creating a different kind of theatre. Fleming (as cited by Bolton 1998), pointed out that this work pursued the idea of meaning making of an aesthetic nature. If children were increasing their understanding of meaning making and enriching the content of the work then this was a critical part of the aesthetic dimension. Form and content are inextricably entwined and enrich each other. The affecting body was no longer setting up an imagined frame, but rather selecting a real one. The affectus occurring within this frame was being generated by pupils. Moreover it was being generated by the ‘experts’ they were becoming, so now the identity of the pupils was

two fold. The affectus was, in the main part, being created between these two identities, the actual and the becoming, at individual and group level. This is where knowledge was being constructed.

Heathcote's developmental work in the classroom corresponded to the development of arts practice as research thinking during this late 20th century period. Heathcote was indeed ahead of her time.

ELECTRONIC PEDAGOGIES OF RESISTANCE.

Under the Thatcher government, 1979-1990, education saw a sea change in education, not only in the classrooms of the schools, but also in the lecture theatres in training providers. The Education Reform Act 1988 saw the introduction of the National Curriculum alongside other provisions which tied schools more directly to government influence and this, in turn, saw the arrival of a rigid system in schools. Similar changes came into universities. Peter Wilby describes the legacy in his article in the Guardian:

‘The government's grip over higher education was never to be relaxed: it became, over the following decades, ever tighter and more bureaucratic, as mechanisms were invented to measure teaching and research "quality".’

(Wilby, 2013)

In initial teacher education the dictats of Special Educational Needs, literacy and numeracy, behaviour management and so on replaced psychology, sociology, politics and philosophy. Student teachers in the English system now have to ‘gather evidence’ (for which one might read ‘gather qualitative and quantitative data’) against the Teaching Standards as set out by the government. There are eight basic standards. If you meet these standards, you can become a teacher. They are however lacking in

depth, sophistication, political awareness and the crucial child-centered learning features are hidden in a sub-clause referred to as:

‘Demonstrating an awareness of the physical, social, and intellectual development of children, and know how to adapt teaching to support pupils’ education at different stages of development.’ (DFE, 2013, 11)

Ironically, just as the development of arts practice as research was finding its way, the education system was catapulted in reverse to a system reliant on proving a teacher’s worth by the gathering of hard data of experiences had, books read and lectures attended. There has been a distinct return to the banking system which is easy to measure and monitor, and therefore to a certain extent research, but is hostile to innovation and creativity, and true learning.

Despite the laudable work being carried out under the Creativity agenda, (Craft and Jeffery, 2008) much of this involves work within the existing educational and curriculum structures rather than exploring could lie beyond them. According to Gibson, (Shaheen 2010) contemporary work within existing structures is accompanied by an awareness that creativity should be playing a key role in strengthening the economy. We propose that, while the economic commodification of creativity cannot be ignored, it should not overshadow its essential role in developing thinking and producing visionary practice within existing structures and most importantly, beyond. This point is was acknowledged and considered by Julian Sefton-Green in his lecture *The Creativity Agenda* where he highlights the need for ‘new forms of measurement for attainment beyond the performance agenda.’ (Sefton-Green 2011). Here the need for a serious reconsideration of the materialism we are discussing and ways of evaluating this in new non-empirical ways is echoed once more.

As mentioned earlier, Heathcote's pedagogy of resistance did not actually meet with much resistance. As the late 80's established themselves in statues written in stone the climate had changed. Resistance was considered foolhardy rather than fashionable. The education system began a process many might see as petrification. Drama is not a National Curriculum subject and therefore in a stronger position than others to follow its own lines of development. However there are restricting oppressive structures which impinge on this and it would be untrue to say that Drama has been completely unscathed by these. One critical area which has had an impact is that of initial teacher education.

Having worked in a number of teacher education establishments from 2001 to the present day we detected a pattern. The teaching practice file was virtually duplicated and covered in post-it notes indicating standards which were supposed to be 'evidenced' by this document. Consequently, teaching standards appeared to be about lessons plans, scheme of work and evaluations and observations. The files were massive – a lever arch file for each term for the tutor to go through at the end of the year, ticking off the standards as they searched. Most student teachers sectioned their files standards by standard, copying the scheme of work they made from scratch themselves maybe four times as 'evidence' against, what was initially, 33 different standards. Duplication was widespread, as was the amount of paper and time used. Student teachers groaned under the pressure of file production (duplication) and so did the tutors who had to go through them. According to these evidence files, initial teacher education was all about planning, lessons and how they went.

Student teachers were also not connecting the task of putting their evidence file together with what actually happened to them on teaching practice. The standards had been set as targets to improve the level of initial teacher training yet it was

possible for student teachers to present weak evidence and pass the standards. In fact the affecting body – the government – had set up a concrete directive as a vehicle for affectus. This was apparently done to raise standards and to make measurable what had hitherto had been difficult for the government to measure. (It bears resemblance to the traditional model which the movement in Heathcote’s time had progressed.) However, it had the reverse effect with student teachers providing superficial evidence which could be easily ‘ticked off’. It was failing to nurture the rich context for learning that was apparent in the earlier models as described during the developmental work of Heathcote. However it did succeed in wielding a great deal of power and control. Student teachers were busily collecting artifacts about minutiae and this did not encourage them to lift their heads up and look at the bigger picture. Student teachers would relate inspiring accounts of how they had achieved a breakthrough in their relationship with a pupil in their form, and then submit a register with the names erased as evidence of pastoral experience.

The affected body started to behave in a disempowered way and was reduced to a ‘deskilled corporate drone’ (Giroux 2003, 7) as they busily collated scrapbooks to satisfy the standards instead of satisfying themselves as student teachers on their quest for knowledge and by so doing, satisfying the standards. In addition, evidence had been misunderstood, universally it seems; what was in their files were artifacts. In order for an artifact to become evidence, some contextualisation, evaluation and or reflection is required. The example above would have been rich indeed, had student teachers included a copies of written accounts of pedagogical incidents; notes from meetings with the pastoral team; minutes from meetings with teams of specialists and lessons which had been designed to feature some of this advice/guidance. In fact such a presentation of evidence would have claimed a number of standards at once,

achieving depth, an understanding of how teaching elements relate to each other, a development of practice in the light of learning and the new relationships formed in terms of expertise and support. Something had to be done to

‘engage (authority) critically in order to develop pedagogical principles aimed at encouraging student teachers to learn how to govern rather than be governed, while assuming the role of active and critical citizens in shaping the most basic and fundamental institutional structures of a vibrant and inclusive democracy.’ (Giroux 2003, 7)

At Goldsmiths the process of building portfolios was redesigned to heighten the student teachers’ own personal learning, giving credence to the standards but using them as markers on their own journey rather than reaching them as end stops in themselves. After all, these are government stipulated standards which have seen several changes since they were first created and lack the consistency that true good teaching should enjoy (Alexander, 2011).

Student teachers should be enabled to take a Freirian perspective in this process and govern these standards, rather than be governed by them. This model focuses on student teachers’ autonomous personalised learning. It acknowledges the authority of the standards and indicates them, the quality of the evidence became much stronger than before and in as much heightened the profile of the standards on one hand but it heightens further the independent learning on the other. From that point student teachers were asked to collect ‘episodes or chapters’ about their own practice and then see what standards were covered, rather than the reverse. The files transformed. They became slimmer and were a truer, richer reflection of the student experience, rather than a scrapbook of disjointed paper artifacts which resembled their Teaching Practice file. This was akin to Heathcote’s practice in which all student

teachers were all aware of, and were developing, their own drama practice. Once the learner – centredness had been established, the quality of the evidence soared, with the files taking on individuality and engaging interesting content and reflection. In so doing the materiality of learning becomes a core part of what is perceived to be learnt and how the body becomes. The affected body, the student teacher, is manipulating its own affectus.

A couple of years passed and files were still large and still heavy to carry, so electronic versions were introduced. This opened up a few issues in Drama; the software was a rather clunky but those who used Facebook, which was quite widespread in 2009, could manage to make attractive pages evidencing both the standards and their own learning at the same time, held together largely by reflective personalised writing about processes, learning and creating, problem solving and engaging in challenging issues. The artifacts still included the usual lesson plans and evaluations and observation but there were also photos, emails, memos, journals, extracts from books and websites, links and records of pupils work, recordings and short pieces of video of their own work and their class. Files were attached –so a tutor could open and read if they wished and randomly one could do so to get a flavour of the artifacts – while the really engaging and educationally valuable part was the evaluative text itself. There is a space for ‘feedback’ at the bottom of each page.

Handy, user-friendly digital cameras - flip cams and then go-pros– had become trendy –and the next two years saw a refining in the software which added to the increased fluidity of page production. As online literacy increased the pages became more compact and pithier. In 2013-14 student teachers started to share their pages with one another and take each other’s schemes of work to use and report back to the original designer under the feedback section hitherto used by the tutor in college

and mentor in school. Student teachers enjoy sharing practice and have limited opportunity to do so in the university calendar. So they share extracts in the university studio and if the work is liked, others can go to their electronic portfolio to download the rest of the lesson or scheme. Hitherto this had been done by email. Now there was evidence that this portfolio was significantly more than a file of artifacts – this portfolio is an interactive record of evidence which is fuelling and supporting other student teachers: an online learning community (Wenger, 1998).

Reflecting on this, the online community is, in fact, initially framed by the tutor but is engaged with, grown and redefined by the student teachers themselves. Once the frame is set up, the tutor ‘lets go’ and student teachers use it as they please. Just as Heathcote spent time and consideration in setting up the learning frame for a drama class and ‘let go’ once they have grasped it, the work for the student teachers went into designing the skeleton of the portfolio. Once they had taken over ownership, the tutor had to ‘let go’ and learning became quite improvised in the online environment that the student teachers had developed.

Heathcote was accessing and uncovering the knowledge and the learning from within the pupil, as well as the intra-active learning happening between pupils, environments, and curriculum frameworks. In the same way the electronic portfolios were drawing out individualised learning and tracking and evidencing collaborative learning that was taking place between the student teachers, there was a material exchange of teaching and learning processes effected that placed the student at the centre of the learning process. In both cases what was being celebrated and nurtured was the child/student centred learning rather than their ability to recall information, or show how far they could conform to the status quo.

Affecting bodies are more than human. In this case, the generation of materials, experiences of teaching, lesson accounts and the sharing of these is an affecting body made manifest through technology: it is non-human. Thus the affectus exists in the interaction between the human student teacher as writer/sharer and a fellow student teacher receiving this through a non-human online channel, processing the material for themselves and projecting their imagined interpretation onto a class before preparing to go into the classroom. The affected human bodies are becoming released to be their own pedagogues. The student teachers are affecting the learning community (Wenger, 1998) and at the same time are being affected by it. They are playing both roles and by doing so are generating the affectus as an organic learning process. This is a direct parallel to the Heathcote drama lesson model where the pupils had become their own pedagogues. In this case the student teachers are becoming pedagogues *of resistance* as they enrich their own empowered learning and claim the standards as they pass them by. They collaborate and enrich each other so they enjoy more input from others and learning becomes about collaboration and material exchange.

Recent messages to a forum shared by the electronic portfolio system at Goldsmiths college, concerned designing lessons for interviews, sharing interview questions and experiences as well as tip-offs they had picked up regarding jobs coming up in schools they knew. In participating in this forum, the student teachers were helping each other find and gain employment. A structure originally designed to test, measure ('bank') and check their suitability for teaching, had been turned into a tool of empowerment by these student teachers. The affected body had overshoot the demands of the dictating powers and transformed the affectus into something of their own making. The government frame and the tutor frame had been eroded and

replaced by a new one forged by themselves. A complex process of affectus metamorphosis had taken place in the interface between the affecting and affected bodies (the student teachers) and the online communication structure they were building. A structure which could be described as rhizomatic (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) was beginning to emerge.

THE PEDAGOGUE IS DEAD: LONG LIVE THE PEDAGOGUE OF RESISTANCE

In the summer of 2013 the National Drama conference in Greenwich celebrated a project called *The Water Reckoning*. This was based on Heathcote's very last model – Rolling Role - which was still being developed when she died in 2011. Akin to the processes outlined above, Rolling Role initially involved a drama teacher running a lesson whereby the material left behind by one class became the stimulus for the next. This depended on a teacher being extremely skilled and quick in picking up the needs and interests of the group and shaping the learning – rather than teaching a lesson – around these factors, using not their 'own material', but working with whatever the last lesson left behind. The teacher again is squeezed out of the 'teaching' in the usual sense of the word and all the teaching and learning energies are within the class.

Heathcote continued to move the teacher away from their dominant knowledgeable role although the teacher, remaining responsible for the initial conception, hands over the stimulus making and designing; usually the key function of the 'teacher' in the classroom. This method encouraged interest in drama across year groups as classes wondered what the next class had done with their work and became increasingly aware of wanting to leave something 'good to work with' behind them for the incoming class. The focus was on the pedagogical link from class to class connecting through the learning process, rather than any teacher's lesson plan.

In 2011 Heathcote delivered a videoconference about Rolling Role for the Centre for Arts and Learning (CAL) at Goldsmiths. This was the last major event at a university before her death. By this time, the Rolling Role method of teaching had undergone some changes. In this she described a version of the model she ran on the famous Burke and Hare murders that took place in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1828. This involved a drama teacher – herself, a history teacher and a geography teacher. The system depends on a fused collaboration between teachers. The material produced by the children, all of it, is ‘published’ in some way so as to be built upon in the next lesson. There is no presenting of ‘the best work’ on the wall. All products of the lesson have value and may be picked up as stimuli by another in the following class. For example, in drama, student teachers would explore what might have happened, and how, in a historically significant event. This, in turn, would raise more questions to be followed up in the next history or geography class. The teachers were largely information facilitators, ensuring the pupils had internet and book resources in order to research the time and place as well as the apparent records of what took place. These lessons cannot be planned in the traditional way, as the direction of enquiry will spring from what the children are interested in pursuing questions arising from their previous lesson. The project culminated in a large sharing, where all the classes and areas were fused together making sense of one another in their context.

In this classroom pupils are using maps, consulting documents, using literacy and numeracy in complex ways, and discovering by investigation. The requirements of the National Curriculum are being surpassed: boxes are ticked as they are being passed by. The same can be said of the teachers who were engaging with the art form as it emerged and supported it to maintain the chain of development. In the National Drama conference of 2012 schools from around the world worked joined by internet

link to create a Rolling Role which celebrated a new twist. These were all drama teachers, just as in the early version of the model, but the classrooms were not in the same school: these were many miles apart. The theme selected was the *Water Reckoning* – every school was near the coast and so a geographical common theme could be enjoyed. Teachers ran lessons and classes produced sources which could then be shared electronically and have new life breathed into them on the other side of the world.

The link between the way these teachers were working and how the Goldsmiths student teachers' electronic portfolios had developed into an online learning community showed that the perfect vehicle was already in place and ripe for carrying this kind of project for student teachers. Drama teachers could now spread the impact of the work through their pupils using the internet. Schools have increasingly become separated by competition and the realm of teacher education has fallen more and more into the hands of schools who increasingly come under the pressures of a right wing government influence. The universities who are still straining under the pressure of the obligations set by government to cover certain aspects of the curriculum – for example the emphasis on phonics in the primary curriculum - fight valiantly to keep the sound well-researched principles of child-centred learning alive despite the system itself firmly rooted in a 'banking' model described by Freire (1970).

Through Heathcote, and through our appropriation of Heathcotes' work as a method for facilitating e-learning, teachers were finding a way of challenging isolation and working across cultures and countries, there was no restriction on this, and the internet freed enough communication to allow this work to happen across this medium. Once again in a system designed to keep heads down and focused within the

four walls of the classroom, teachers had found a way of breaking free and technology had been the vehicle by which this could happen. After Heathcote's death others were discovering anew the resistance in Heathcote's last model, though Heathcote did not use email herself and hand wrote all her documents throughout her life.

Up till this point, the pedagogy of resistance on the drama education course at Goldsmiths had been triggered or raised by the tutor. What happened next in this development lay more in the hands of the student teachers. Over the previous two years teaching had seen the widespread impact of the 5-minute lesson plan (@Teachertoolkit.me, 2014). Launched on twitter it went viral very quickly and OfSTED (Office for Standards in Education) endorsed this practice shortly afterwards. This is a plan which contains a simple outline of what is expected to be covered during the lesson and can be shown as a flowchart. A flowchart is a quick and deep way of recording a plan to oneself. It is excellent for a new spin on an old plan. It is ideal for when a new idea is being sketched out and the direction of the lesson could go in several ways, and the teacher needs to have considered a number of avenues to be prepared. The linear, fixed lesson plan does not help these common lesson circumstances. It can be represented using an electronic template of a flow chart but can easily be drawn freehand with a pen on paper.

Student teachers had met this idea in schools and wanted to try it out. This would make massive demands on their spontaneous teaching skills and yet the simplicity of the plan enabled them to prepare the kinds of activities they might do – but not be bound by them. It did of course leave the door open for the early Heathcote practice – ‘What shall we do today then? I have no plan. I can't plan till I've met a class...’ (Wagner, 1976, 16) and several were skilled enough to want to try this out without preconceptions and pre-designing the learning at all, leaving the work to the

class and the sources to carry the energy and direction, leaving them to chance their arms and do the shaping – a new direction for them as student drama teachers. They were willing to ‘let go’ and trust the dramatic content to assist the class in being both the affected and the affecting bodies. In varying degrees these student teachers wanted to see if they could take following the lead of their classes further and do so without the safety net of a lesson plan. They now had two technology-based vehicles with which to work and by putting the two together the project took off.

Looking at *The Water Reckoning* project website (www.water-reckoning.net/), the student teachers whose work I discuss above could not see how the project’s sessions went. There were the artifacts and a beautifully professionally made video sequence capturing the essence of the work with stunning underwater shots of sea statues. There was no process recorded– which seemed ironic to them. In their position as student teachers the actual process of managing the learning in the classroom swiftly using fresh stimulus material, with the pressure of the next class coming through the door was what they wanted to know about. In typical Heathcote style, the student teachers had been left to figure out how to do that out on their own.

As student teachers, they needed to share and know more for their own learning and so they set up a rota: each week two of them would run a session in their schools and contribute something to the ‘pot’ of resources grown from these sessions from which they/their pupils could feed. Everything would be recorded on a shared page in their portfolio, so they would be collectively gathering evidence of their venture into new pedagogy as they went. They would provide an outline of what happened in the session so there was a story behind the resources. A meeting was held with the online pedagogy specialist who discussed the design of the portfolio and set

it up for them. The original stimulus they chose was *Tower Block* and the stories varied enormously. The tutor was not present for this meeting.

Mentors in the placement schools shared some frustrations; despite the freedom of not being on the national curriculum, for years there had been pressure to have set schemes of work and to have assessment weeks with grades and comments and targets, some of which were incongruent with the drama form and its pedagogy. They had seen targets dwindle into a list pertaining to ‘facial expression’, ‘body language’ and ‘levels’, recalling the pre-Slade practice and increasingly the content and creative discovery learning was being sidelined in favour of the concrete markable features. Caught in the landslide caused in other subjects, there was pressure in some schools for drama to conform to this dominant banking trend. Evaluations felt obliged to use this mantra – the words were on the wall – and pupils were saying more or less the same thing in year 7 as they were in year 11 ‘because this is what gets them marks in GCSE examinations’. This not only thinned the quality of the work, while claiming to strengthen it but also provided a very flawed sense of what theatre is actually about to pupils. This superficial use of concrete indicators echoes the initial manner in which the teaching standards were being ‘evidenced’.

Some teachers resisted this, like Daniel Shindler. His workshop for the Centre for Arts and Learning, Goldsmiths College, University of London in 2009 utilised the archetypes as a vehicle for evaluating drama. Others demonstrated resistance and grew their own theatre criticism language in their classes. This resulted in rich interesting critique of theatre examining content and the challenge facing the audience rather than the checklist-for-comment approach which has become a failsafe way of gaining marks in the written component in the national public examinations. These were educationalists who ticked the boxes as they passed them by and their pupils’

grades did not suffer due to this. Some had been in a position to maintain this professional integrity with their school celebrating the unique position of drama, while others had struggled to do so within a school mentality which suggested that if one's head was kept down and looked like other subjects Drama would be smuggled through and kept safe.

The school-based drama mentors warmly responded to the idea of running with the Rolling Role project idea. However most said they could not let student teachers do this in a lesson – it had to be in a club. Initially disappointing, this in itself is an act of resistance. Mentors were not saying no – they needed to position it somewhere safe from criticism and scrutiny and thus ‘smuggle it through’. Mentors were happy to support the idea and student teachers busily took the wheel and set up the new portfolio which would serve as the vehicle by which they could pick up resources and read about how these were arrived at in these semi improvised sessions.

The student teachers found a picture of a *Tower Block* and this was the starting point. From this stage the work became a fiesta of differentiated learning. The interest in classrooms was huge in terms of where the work had come from and where it was going. Once again it is evident that there is a desire to reach out beyond the claustrophobic realms of the school classroom and connect with what is beyond. One girls' school was happy for their work to go anywhere but the boys' school next door. There was a range of ways in which both pupils and student teachers responded to the theme.

It is important to revisit the notion of the rhizome (Deleuze and Guattari 1987) again here. A rhizome is an organizational structure which resembles more the complex intertwining connections across various contexts than the more ordered striated organizations structures. It is of particular relevance in this context as a

"rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo*" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987 25) This model was arrived at incidentally by the student teachers and it gave them precisely the kind of flexibility which they needed. It was due to this kind of organic ownership amongst the students that the portfolios were turned into mechanisms whereby they could help each other find work. This rhizomatic fluid and organically adaptable vehicle was allowing freedom and choice to pursue their own ventures into the unknown, unfettered by the necessity for hypotheses and concerns about measuring. Not only was this in keeping with the practice of Heathcote, they were also free simply to pursue knowledge and this was entirely sympathetic to the notion of arts practice as research.

At this stage a further development took place in this malleable design. They were all engaged in *Tower Block* in order to find out what they did not know. Consequently their findings are all in very different directions and the results diverse yet rich and deep.

A few indicative examples have been selected.

One student working in a privileged boys' school decided to allow the club free-flow response to the photo of a Tower Block. What resulted was some slick physical theatre but the content showed prejudiced images of people unemployed and watching TV all day, with references to drink and drugs. At the end, the student reflected that despite what has been 'taught'; somewhere along the line this is what had been learnt. He said that we tend to start each lesson with a superficial picking up of what we had done the lesson before; rarely exploring what is being truly learnt. We often mistake what is learnt for what is recalled or understood for examinations. This caused him and others to consider the nature of true learning and how far the slick lesson plan that covers material and delivers a curriculum can be truly seen as

educational. The Heathcote practice student teachers had been following and gradually learning about during the year sunk in at yet another deeper level.

Another had his 'best lesson' with a very challenging group in a one hour and 40 minute lesson. He had prepared about five layers to help structure the lesson but had no idea if he would use any of them or how in the lesson. The class showed they could build a simple piece of theatre and show it making sense and having form without conflict within the working group, having not been able to do this at all in previous lessons. He felt he had truly focused on the learning of the class rather than trying to get them through his lesson plan. He and his mentor (who was fascinated by the previous lesson) decided to 'just see what happens if' their challenging Year 9 group played *The Great Game of Power*. This is a game invented by Boal, involving a set of chairs, a table and a bottle which are arranged and rearranged to try to make one chair carry the highest status in relation to the other items. Once this has been worked through and agreed, including people into the arrangement develops the game and the task continues. (Boal, 1992, 150) This resulted in pupils taking over the game and playing it solidly for half an hour. Mentor and student simply watched. Uncertain of what was happening it was clear that this was feeding some kind of learning need in the group, as they thirstily kept engaged with the game. Something about status was being worked out in safe and happy ways in that classroom and they both knew that the traditional lesson plan would never have allowed this to happen. It became part of the basis of an experimental scheme of work on Boal's Forum theatre (Boal, 1992). These were small starting points and yet large things grew quickly from them simply because the comfort blanket of the oppressive pedagogy was dropped. Feeling somewhat insecure about this, student teachers and mentors alike took a calculated

risk initially but rapidly saw the benefits of taking this practice into the classroom. They also saw how the curriculum was covering cracks – rather than addressing them.

Another had lines of text on paper on the floor. She asked which lines of text the pupils liked and to stand by them. After negotiating with the class it was decided that they would work in the groups into which they had fallen by text choice. She realised that one group had formed which she would never have allowed had she been in normal ‘lesson plan and delivery mode’ as they were likely to be poorly behaved if together. However, reminding herself that she was not in this mode, she carried on. The group worked beautifully. On reflection she asked when the classroom was ever going to be a place for really developing social skills if the groups are always pre-planned and realised how she had actually been instrumental in forcing a negative template onto these girls who were, in fact, ready and willing to move on. In addition she felt that the pupils had been invited to be the makers of artistic choice (offered the Mantle of the Expert) by selecting the piece of text which drew them in, and so shed the identity of pupils in a classroom ‘who were kept apart’. This notion of how she proffered alternative identity adoption as a learner, she felt, was worth exploring further in her practice.

It is possible to see clearly that the nature of the ground being broken here bears resemblance to the varying aspects of new materialism as explored by Bolt (2014) who acknowledges that this has ‘validated a rethinking of the relationship between humans and non-humans’ and that ‘the emergence of new human-technological relationships have decentred the subject.’ (Bolt, 2014 3). In this instance, the humans involved maintained their position as ‘sovereign human subject’ (Bolt, 2014 3) and so experienced increased agency in several directions. Bolt goes on to draw on the work of Haraway (1991) who sees the human subject in new

materialism as one who ‘encompasses the human and the non-human, the social and the physical, and the material and the immaterial.’ (Bolt 2014 3). This example would, it seems, place the human subjects in both positions at once.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the work of Dorothy Heathcote as a pedagogue of resistance albeit taking advantage of an era when the movement in education was to be so. She introduced some models and principles which can and have been developed from improvised learning and based on the intra-action between people and objects. Having marked several new ways ahead for people to consider and no doubt flattered by her following, she was aware of the issue Hornbrook had raised about her ‘devoted’ and ‘unshamefacedly messianic’ following (Hornbrook, 1998, 13). We recall her words in an informal discussion at a conference: ‘You don’t need me – you need to go to your classrooms and get on with your *own* lives.’ Above all, Heathcote was keen to free teachers to make educational drama their own. We would argue, therefore, that her pedagogy of resistance went further than her own pupils and herself as teacher in her classroom; this penetrated into the profession itself.

As an affecting body, Heathcote was removing herself from the situation and allowing the energies of the affectus to be affected and to affect the teachers themselves. This whole matter of the affected also being affecting is key to her practice of resistance. The more non-present the affecting body, the more reduced the potential for external oppression in the classroom. There will be internal oppressive moments within the drama but this will be grown by the affected body and becomes part of, and kept safe by, the art form itself. It will be resolved – it will be part of the essence of theatre. This does depend however, as the student teachers discovered, on highly skilled teachers designing the original frame.

In a very different climate today, drama educators are swimming against the tide so resistance is more challenging. Rather than breaking through barriers which are waiting to come down as in Heathcote's time, finding ways to access deep rooted learning happens starts within these boundaries and acknowledging the authority. Student teachers must show that they meet the standards or they fail. Progressing this requires placing the important above the requirements and resisting the pressure to reverse this. In addition, responsibility for initial teacher training is moving towards schools, reducing the role of universities and so making the influence of government control more direct.

However, when Heathcote's Rolling Role and the student-owned electronic portfolios fused together and the learning was allowed to happen, this time in a frame more owned by the learners rather than the tutor, a whole variety of resistance-featured teaching and learning discourses took place. This went beyond the usual restrictions of the lesson plan and the student teacher; it penetrated through to, and challenged mentors, curriculum design, the pupils themselves.

It would seem that Heathcote's focus on the learner rather than teacher is acutely pertinent in this current context as well as her classroom of last century. At present, immediate concern lies with the disempowerment of the teachers and the erosion of their role. However, by shifting focus towards empowering learners (in this case either student teachers or pupils) to be both affected and affecting bodies at once, giving them appropriate frames designed for gradual erosion so the possession is theirs, pedagogies of resistance emerge. Internet technology can play a releasing and critical role in this development bridging isolation in schools by forging communication links and developing materials of resistance for teachers and pupils as

affecting and affected bodies alike. At the same time it can map, monitor and evaluate it as an essential tool in the development of arts practice as research.

Sefton-Green, J. (2011) *The Creativity Agenda* available at <http://dusseldorp.org.au/resource/the-creativity-agenda-2/> accessed 27/02/2015

Sullivan, G. (2010). *Art Practice as Research – Inquiry in Visual Arts* London: Sage Publications

Wilby, P. (2013) *Margaret Thatcher's education legacy is still with us – driven on by Gove* available at <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/apr/15/margaret-thatcher-education-legacy-gove> accessed 27/02/2015