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Abstract

Late adolescence is a critical time in the formation of a young person’s sense of self with studies pointing to the senior secondary drama classroom as a generative space for this to occur. What is not yet clear is the importance of context, and particularly the powerful forces of neoliberal times, in shaping and potentially delimiting young people’s explorations of gender and life trajectories. More specifically, through the texts students study and the characters they embody, personality and desires are moulded by capital in ways hidden from individual control.

Drawing on 15 drama teachers and 13 of their post compulsory students from government, Catholic and independent schools in Western Australia from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, this dissertation examines the formation of identity/ies in the context of students’ embodiment of characters from proscribed texts in the senior secondary drama classroom and asks: how does the embodiment of characters in texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? Year 12 is the final year of schooling for students in Australia. Framed through a critical, post-humanist ethnographic methodology, the theories of Butler, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari are utilised to examine how these forces and “becoming,” as a process of change and resistance, interact to create something new. Second, embodiment is considered through a neoliberal culture of competitive performativity, with gender considered third. Fourth, drama education and creativity are highlighted and linked in generative ways, with consideration then given to the ways that the contemporary zeitgeist impacts on drama education itself in uncertain times.

The study contributes to our understanding of neoliberal education systems, whilst focusing specifically on adolescent becomings in drama. The research revealed evidence of a culture of performativity in Western Australian drama education. This is manifest in fewer subject choices offered in schools that limit drama’s availability, “data-driven” curriculum implementation, mechanisms of surveillance of teachers, and deleterious effects on students and teachers in schools from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds. Nevertheless, despite a pervasive culture of performative neoliberalism, teachers and students find creative lines of flight from normative educational structures and gender binaries in the safe and open space of the drama classroom.
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1. Introduction

A moment in time

It’s January 27th, and I arrive back from the summer break and the beginning of a new school year to find flowers on my desk. My boss races into the office, coffee cup splashing precariously in her hand.

“Congratulations!” she says with a huge smile on her face. Has she got me mixed up with someone else? I’m not pregnant.

“Your results last year were outstanding! All of the year 12 drama and dance kids got As and Bs, and they were their top subjects for uni entry. I’m so proud of you. Well done!”

A feeling of joy mixed with relief floods my body as I hug my boss and stare at the purple flowers. Purple is my favourite colour. I love her so much right now for being so thoughtful.

“Jesus! What did you do? The stats are fantastic. Was it the tutoring?” she asks.

“I do that every year. The truth is they were just good kids. They studied hard and they wanted to do well. I was just lucky I guess. My previous group hardly ever came to tutoring and even though they could act they never handed any work in.”

I think back to the previous year when my results were abysmal. The year 12s underperformed across the board but they totally bombed in drama. Apparently the Principal had said to my boss, “Well … either change the marks or change the teacher!” I lived all year in fear. Maybe my luck will change from this point on.

“Well you’d better think of something, Kirsten, because I think the Principal might ask you to speak to the staff in the meeting at 9am, and they’ll want to know your secret!” she says as she whirls out the door spilling more coffee.

The General Staff meeting is in the library and when I enter, the Principal and staff greet me with a standing ovation. Oh god how embarrassing. I feel as if I’ve won some bizarre booby prize in a Kafka novel. Whilst it’s really rewarding being publicly acknowledged for a change, I can’t help feeling that the whole thing is ridiculous. I try my hardest every year as a teacher. I work my butt off. But with such small numbers in the Arts, it really is just the luck of the draw. So much depends on the kids themselves but it’s as if I’m the one being assessed. I’ve said so many times, “God if I could sit the damned exams myself I would!”

I hate the system for judging me on my students’ results. Statistics statistics statistics… statistics that bear little resemblance to the transformations that are happening in the classroom…nothing else matters. Not that the kids do amazing productions, or that they learn new skills, or find a close group of friends, or that they gain confidence in themselves and flourish as people. All that matters are the statistics that are published in the papers…the year 12 ATAR results.

I smile and accept their applause, but inside I know the truth, and so does every other teacher in the room. I just got lucky. I cross my fingers, look to the ceiling and sigh. Hopefully we’ll get a good group of kids and can keep our jobs for another year.
Background

For the past twenty-two years I have been intensively involved in arts education in the context of teaching drama, dance and performing arts in two secondary schools. In addition to teaching I am an external examiner and curriculum writer for the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA).

Over this time I have witnessed many changes in the content, delivery and status of the arts in secondary schools, particularly as the western world has adopted an increasingly neoliberal outlook in the face of global economic crises. As schools compete for limited resources by appearing "successful", they are far more accountable than they were when I first began teaching. For example, in the early nineties, the measure of my success as a drama teacher was my ability to put on big theatrical productions and keep the students working hard. Two decades on, a drama teacher’s success is judged entirely on her year 12 exam statistics that are published in the newspaper, and a production is only useful if it can improve the school’s brand and overall rankings.

Having also taught English and History in my early career, I have become aware of how very different the Arts are from other subjects in secondary schools because of the sheer nature of the theatre “space” — both physically and emotionally — because in drama there are no desks and rather than studying characters, students embody them. In my experience drama also attracts (or creates?) different types of students than do the “core” subjects (math, English, science, social sciences and history): students who generally do not fit the normative gender moulds. In my role as an examiner of drama for SCSA, I became aware that my experiences of the drama space and the drama students were not isolated as I discussed these issues with fellow teachers.

However, the main reason for beginning this research project arose from my frustration as an arts educator, where I could see the great potentiality for students’ emotional, physical and intellectual development through the arts — their “becoming other” at a critical time in their adolescence. However, this potentiality seemed to me to be delimited by a narrowing of the curriculum and an increasing focus on statistical data that can be extrapolated from exams. Moreover, in my role as an examiner, I noticed that even though there were many excellent texts on the drama curriculum, teachers across the state were studying the same few “classic” plays with their students, texts that had few female roles and even less gender diversity within those roles for the mostly female cohort taking senior secondary drama (years 11 and 12).

As I delved deeper into the issue, it came to my attention that much has been written about the potentiality of the arts for adolescent development and identity development. Even more has been written about neoliberalism and its affects on education: the narrowing of the curriculum, the commodification of education and the de-professionalisation of teachers. However, what is missing in the literature is an examination of how drama education in senior secondary years, because of its unique spatiality and physicality, can facilitate adolescent identity becomings, and how this is moderated by our increasingly neoliberal education climate. Based on my teaching experiences and a desire to make a contribution to arts education, six years ago, I decided to undertake my research
into the impact of changing contexts on senior secondary drama education. The overarching aim of this thesis is to contribute to contemporary debates on education by critiquing the current system through exploring who benefits (and who doesn’t) in drama classrooms when neoliberal discourses and practices dominate to identify alternatives for education policy, praxis and research.

2. Rationale for the study

This study sought to examine issues of gender, power and performativity in relation to teacher and student becomings in senior secondary drama classrooms. Originally this study intended to focus on adolescent girls because in many countries across the world girls outnumber boys in high school drama classrooms (Hatton, 2003), which was consistent with my experience of teaching drama for twenty-two years where the girls always outnumbered boys. In Australia, girls are twice as likely to participate in drama than boys (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). In Western Australia, traditionally, the ratio of girls to boys in senior secondary drama is approximately 70% to 30% (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013). However, when recruiting participants, I found a small number of boys who wished to be involved. I interviewed 13 students, three of whom were boys, which is more reminiscent of the ratio of girls to boys in the drama classroom. This also proved beneficial because of the rich data they provided with regard to gender and becoming.

There are currently two courses in upper school drama in Western Australia: ATAR and General. ATAR is the course that is taken in year 12 by students who aim to achieve an Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) for university entrance. In 2012, of the 939 year 12 students who completed ATAR drama, 72% of them were girls (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013). As part of drama, these young women are asked to study plays from a set text list. Teachers of year 12 drama usually study two texts in their entirety chosen from the set text list over the course of the year. In 2014 there were 37 plays on the set text list, made up of 18 Australian plays and 19 “world” drama (other than Australian) plays. These are the texts students write about in their final exams. In 2016 there are 24 plays on the set text list, comprising 12 Australian plays and 12 world texts.

However, unlike other subjects where students are merely reading and writing about a character in a text, students in drama are asked to embody the character. As Bresler (2004) notes, “The arts, unlike the traditional academic areas, are an arena in which the body is central to the process of inquiry and constitutes a mode of knowing” (p. 91). Role and character are key elements of drama. Taking on a role or a specific character involves the “identification of a person’s values and attitudes, intentions and actions as imagined relationships, situations and ideas in dramatic action” (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012, p.46). It involves developing internally consistent, motivated roles and characters and conveying a subtext of social and psychological situations, relationships and status. This identification and embodiment of roles and characters for senior secondary drama students occurs at a critical time in their physical, social and emotional development.
It is now quite widely accepted that adolescence is a time of transition involving multi-dimensional changes: biological, psychological (including cognitive) and social (World Health Organisation, 2015b). Biologically, adolescents are experiencing pubertal changes, altering brain structure and sexual interest. Psychologically, adolescents’ cognitive capacities are maturing. And lastly, adolescents are experiencing social changes through school and other transitions and roles they are required to play in family, community and school (World Health Organisation, 2015b). These changes occur simultaneously and at different paces for each adolescent within each gender, with structural and environmental factors often influencing adolescents’ development (Erulkar, 2003).

Adolescence can be separated into three stages: early (10-13 years of age), middle (14-16), and late (17-19) (United Nations Childrens’ Fund, 2011). This study focused on students in year 12, aged 17-18 years, who fall into the category of late adolescence. In this phase, adolescents experience physical changes including the completion of physical and sexual maturation. Cognitively, adolescents in the early stage develop concrete thinking abilities, while in middle and late adolescence, the young person moves to thinking abstractly and can develop reasoning skills. Socially, during the middle stage of adolescence, peers are very influential, and sexual interest develops further. Finally, in the late stage, transitions to work and further schooling take place. Behaviourally, middle adolescence is considered a time of risk-taking, ending in late stage adolescence, during which assessment of one’s own risk taking occurs (World Health Organisation, 2015a). Emotionally, adolescents in the middle stage begin to develop a sense of identity, established more fully in late adolescence. Late adolescence is often seen as a move towards independence, which involves the development of ideals and the selection of role models (United Nations Childrens’ Fund, 2006).

Many studies have explored the connection between drama praxis and adolescent development and have noted that drama can be a powerful tool to help students negotiate issues of identity or becoming (Armenta, 2005; Burton, 2002; Cahill, 2002; Gallagher, 2000; Hatton, 2003, 2013; Wright, 2011; Wright & Pascoe, 2014). This is particularly salient when one looks at the characters the students embody in the drama course. Are they empowering or limiting for adolescent girls or boys? Students embody a number of roles and characters in the drama classroom. Some roles they create themselves, and others they choose from the characters made available to them in the set texts. The study initially focused on the girls who embodied these characters and the teachers who assisted them. However, after interviewing the first few teachers and students it became apparent that the roles available for boys were equally problematic, but for different reasons, as will be discussed later. Firstly, I will consider the issues that were initially the focus of the study.

Studies have shown that within the drama class itself, power and status amongst students influence their selection of roles (Armenta, 2005; Gallagher, 1998). It has been argued that “adolescent girls are attracted to drama because it offers them the skills, aesthetic space and forums to play with notions and representations of self, gender and culture” (Hatton, 2003, p.139). However, as Armenta notes, “the influences of status and power hierarchies suggest that social dynamics in the drama classroom can limit the range of possible selves that girls’ explore in their dramas” (2005, p. 90). Likewise, gender stereotypes
and the “need to imitate” hegemonic images of femininity presented in the media also pushes girls to “relinquish power” in constructing their identities in relation to persuasive social ideals (Boal, 1985, cited in Armenta, 2005, p. 92).

Gender is a controversial concept that generally refers to social and cultural differences rather than biological ones. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines gender roles as “socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for men and women” (World Health Organisation, 2015b). Before Money (1955) introduced the terminological distinction between biological sex and gender as a role, the word gender predominantly referred to grammatical categories. Early feminist theorists embraced the conception of a distinction between biological sex and the social construct of gender, stressing that society and culture create binary gender roles through outlining proscribed and idealised masculinity and femininity (Cixous & Clement, 1986; De Beauvoir, 1949 [1998 trans]; Summers, 1975). Many theorists today think of gender as fluid, ambiguous and on a spectrum (Ainsworth, 2015; Bornstein, 2013). However, as Ainsworth notes, “Biologists may have been building a more nuanced view of sex, but society has yet to catch up … when it comes to sex, there is still intense social pressure to conform to the binary model” (2015, p. 291). This “intense social pressure to conform to the binary model” is often found in the drama classroom and schools in general.

Butler (1990) argues that gender is irreducibly linked to performativity in that gender is not something biologically determined, but rather is a social construct that is “performed,” (p. 45). Butler (1988) asserts that, “Gender is what is put on, invariably, under constraint, daily and incessantly, with anxiety and pleasure, but if the continuous act is mistaken for a natural or linguistic given, power is relinquished” (p. 531). This is particularly pertinent with regard to drama education because through embodying different characters, students are using performativity to “put on” various constructions of femininity and masculinity.

Feminist theorists have noted that most curricula offer limited options for girls (Bentley, 1999; Gallagher, 2000; Hatton, 2003). As Hatton notes, “Adolescent girls in secondary schools vote with their feet. The paradox is, however, that they are often a silent majority as the drama curriculum and its products are largely fashioned through the lens of masculinity and patriarchy unless the teacher is openly and ethically interventionary in their practice” (2003, p.140). As Davis (2014 [1995]) notes, “The current [Australian] curriculum is not serving the needs of females as much as males … In the manner in which knowledge is omitted, selected, valued and organised, reinforcing a view of the world where males and their activities are depicted as the norm and central, and where women are seen as different, or “the other”” (p. 7). One of the constant difficulties that we, as drama teachers, face is that most plays have more male parts than female and we have more girls in the class than boys. Moreover, the male roles are central, more complex and interesting to perform, whereas the female roles are small and two-dimensional, and frequently the majority of our talented actors are girls.

Currently in Western Australia, the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA) through the Drama Course Advisory Committee (CAC) is responsible for writing the senior secondary drama course. Each teacher decides which texts to study and how the course will be implemented. The CAC committee is made up of an Executive Officer from SCSA, the chief examiner, representatives from government, Catholic and independent education sectors,
and industry and university representatives. The CAC decides which plays make it onto the set text list with input from markers of the Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE) Examinations. Markers provide feedback to the Chief Examiner based on the answers provided in examinations. A number of factors influence the committee’s selection of texts including: suitability, availability, accessibility, under or over-use, a balance between “old” and “new”, a balance between “Australian” and “world” texts, the need to keep the number of texts low for markers, and the preferences of committee members (Pascoe, 2012).

Despite the fact that there are many outstanding “pro-feminist” texts on the list in Western Australia, from my experience of marking the ATAR exams I have observed that teachers often choose plays for their mostly female students that replicate a hegemonic construction of femininity (such as Cloudstreet by Monjo & Enright, Macbeth by Shakespeare and The Homecoming by Pinter). Moreover, from my involvement as a marker, most teachers teach the more well-known plays such as these, so that even though there were 37 plays on the set text list, of the around 400 papers I marked in 2011, over 50% of them wrote about Cloudstreet in the Australian drama section, and in 2012 over 50% of the papers I marked in the World Drama section were about Macbeth. It has been argued by many that dominant constructions of masculinity and femininity (such as those found in Cloudstreet and Macbeth) limit young people’s repertoires of behaviour (Butler, 2004; Coffey, 2013c; Keddie & Mills, 2009; McDonald, 2007). Moreover, given the general quality of the written answers in the ATAR exams, it could be argued that these texts are often examined uncritically.

A new Western Australian set text list was implemented in 2016, and the new Australia-wide National Curriculum is currently being developed. However, the issue of a national curriculum is still very contentious with debates “raging” over what to include in each subject, and whether or not to even have a national curriculum (Berg, 2011; Owens, 2012; Taylor, 2012; Topsfield, 2010). My research project examined the roles available to young drama students in the current Western Australian drama curriculum, with the impending introduction of a national curriculum in mind. I interviewed girls and boys who had recently completed year 12 ATAR drama to ascertain how they related to the characters in key texts. It was also important to interview the teachers of these students, as they are the ones who select and deconstruct the texts.

As the reader can see, initially, the study focused on the set text list and its opportunities and limitations for identity development, particularly for adolescent girls. What became apparent, even from the first half-dozen interviews, was that it was the drama space itself, when combined with the embodiment of characters from set texts and improvisation activities that held the most potential for identity development and the transgression of normative gender roles for both boys and girls. It was quite exciting for me to discover from the interviews with students, that even the most stereotypical of female characters, such as Lady Macbeth, could be generative and empowering for girls to embody, depending on how they performed them. In addition to this it became quickly apparent that my experience of drama as a safe place for boys to transgress narrow definitions of masculinity through dressing up “in drag” and “effeminate” displays of manhood, for dancing and for expressing one’s feelings, were not isolated to me as a drama teacher, but were common experiences of all the drama teachers and students I interviewed. This meant that the focus of my interviews and the research itself
shifted slightly to place more emphasis on interview question 7: “Someone once said that “drama is a safe place for boys to be less macho, and girls to be less girly”. What do you think?” because that was the most generative of questions for exploring the issue of adolescent becomings.

With regard to empowering and delimiting spaces, I also wanted to take into consideration the contemporary educational climate and the impact this had on the drama classroom. How are students and teachers’ becomings mediated by neoliberal education practices and discourses? Many have argued that teachers in Australia make text choices in a zeitgeist of capitalist neo-liberalism, which has had the effect of making education a commodity that can be bought and sold, competition being rife between schools for students based on published external test scores (Ball, 2010; Beder, Varney, & Gosden, 2009; Fitzgerald & Rainnie, 2011; Keddie, Mills, & Pendergast, 2011; Thompson & Cook, 2014). Corporate discourses of performance, competition and accountability have led to the surveillance and mistrust of teachers, their value being based on the narrow lens of their students’ success in standardised texts (Fitzgerald & Rainnie, 2011; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). This research led me to ask: Can the drama classroom remain a generative space for adolescent becomings when it is constrained by neoliberal performative pressure? How can drama teachers focus on issues of social justice (such as challenging binary hegemonic notions of gender) and personal development in the context of an arts subject, when we are judged solely on students’ exam scores? Was this why, as ATAR markers, we often see pre-prepared regurgitated answers on “classic” texts which fail to challenge the status quo? Furthermore, were teachers’ becomings being shaped by their embodiment of a “good” teacher in neoliberal environments as much as the students’ were being shaped by their embodiment of characters from set texts?

In my “moment in time” experience that I relay in the introduction, I recount an incident in my career that was pivotal to launching me on my research trajectory. One of the aims of this research was to find out if my experience of the pressures to perform as a drama teacher were “universal”, or at least common to drama teachers in Australian schools. Did drama teachers in Western Australia feel under pressure to perform and produce good grades and statistics, or was it just peculiar to my context? Was my experience limited to the lower-socio-economic government schools like mine — where teachers felt the most pressure to perform, and were we simultaneously under the most surveillance? Did Catholic and independent school teachers from lower socio-economic areas feel the burden to perform as much as government school teachers? Did our peers in the elite private school sector feel the same level of pressure, or was theirs even greater? Having talked to several other drama teachers at various professional events, it appeared that although my experiences were shared by many, not all teachers felt that this pressure was a negative and external force as I did and still do. Many teachers appeared to internalise the neoliberal performative ideology and had either resigned themselves to constant surveillance, or did not see it as originating externally. Rather they believed that the pressure to conform came from within them. Some even appeared to adopt market driven discourses and performative becomings as a part of their professional identities. Thus the research that initially sought to explore how text choices and neoliberal ideologies influenced teacher and student identities, evolved to focus on how the
drama space, embodied characters and neoliberal assemblages interwove to generate teacher and student becomings.

Six sensitising concepts arose as I began my research that enabled me to explore the research question: How does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? These concepts evolved from the iterative analysis of the data. The sensitising concepts are: senior secondary drama classrooms, space, text, performativity, gender and becoming. The six sensitising concepts were consistently highlighted by the respondents across the study as a whole. Becoming was an unexpected concept that arose from the data that eventually became an overarching motif. Figure 1. on the following page is borrowed from Ruitong (2015) and is her illustration of Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome: a non-hierarchical structure that can be used to elucidate these six concepts. I borrowed this image because I was profoundly influenced by Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the rhizome (which will be explained in more detail in the following section) in A Thousand Plateaus (1987 [2012], pp. 3-28) because it foregrounds complexity and the network between people, ideas and things, such as students, texts, discourses, bodies, spaces and becomings. In Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome everything is linked together in a non-hierarchical, non-linear, polycentric way. Rather than adolescent development (from one stage of development to another — a child to an adult), I could view the research through the lens of a rhizome, where all of the sensitising concepts are linked and influence each other, but are always in a process of change or flux, never “arriving” or stable. Following is an image of the rhizome with the six sensitising concepts superimposed on it. Senior secondary drama classrooms are the focus of the study, becoming is the process under exploration, and this is influenced by text, space, gender and performativity. Hence all sensitising concepts are “plugged in” to one another.
3. Significance of the Study

Much has been written within the broad areas of the six sensitising concepts of becoming, performativity, gender, text, space and even drama classrooms. However, an extensive literature review did not uncover any research studies examining drama teachers' choice of plays from set text lists for a majority of female students in senior secondary drama classrooms. Furthermore, there have been few studies that have examined the link between the embodiment of characters from plays and becomings in upper secondary (17-18 years) students.

The majority of the research exploring identity formation or becoming and adolescent girls occurs in the context of the single-sex drama classroom, focusing on adolescent girls in the middle (14-15 years) (Armenta, 2005; Gallagher, 1999, Hatton, 2013) or late (16-17 years) (Hatton, 2003, 2013, 2015) stages, and how drama activities assist girls negotiate issues of identity, gender and culture. Other research has examined identity formation, gender norms and boys in drama and dance classrooms (Holdsworth, 2013; McDonald, 2007; Sallis, 2011, 2014). Previous studies have not foregrounded the influence of neoliberalism on identity formation of both teachers and students in drama classrooms.

As yet, no study has been conducted which investigates the link between late adolescents in a variety of school contexts (both single sex and coeducational schools in the Catholic, independent and government sectors), their teachers, and how they utilise performativity to negotiate issues of power, gender and identity in the characters students embody from set texts. Whilst some studies have utilised the theoretical frameworks of Butler, Deleuze and Guattari to think about discursive subjectification to gender norms and for mapping affect (Coffey, 2013a; Hickey-Moody, 2010, 2013; McRobbie, 2009; Ringrose, 2011, 2013), these studies have not focused on drama education and gender in performance.

Following on from the aforementioned “moment in time,” background, rationale and significance of the study, the following research questions will be investigated.
4. Research Questions

The following research questions were those that I carried with me into the study and were also elaborated and refined through the process of inquiry itself. First, following on from the previous sections, is the one question that both drove the study and conveyed me through it.

**Overarching question:**

*How does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times?*

To answer this question I deconstructed it into four interrelated questions:

1. Is the drama classroom a safe space for heterogeneous adolescent becomings?
2. Which roles and characters are teachers choosing from the Western Australian ATAR set text list for adolescent girls and boys and what constructions of femininity and masculinity do these characters represent?
3. Why are teachers choosing these texts, and what powers are influencing their choices?
4. How did embodying these characters from the set text list in ATAR drama influence students’ becomings?

These four questions encapsulate the six sensitising concepts: senior secondary drama classrooms, space, text, performativity, gender and becoming. These ideas formed the core of my semi-structured interview questions for teachers and students:

1. **SPACE and SENIOR SECONDARY DRAMA CLASSROOMS** (teachers/students):
   - Is the drama classroom a safe space for boys and girls to transgress normative gender boundaries?
2. **TEXTS** (teachers/students):
   - Which roles and characters are currently available on the Western Australian ATAR set text list for adolescent girls and boys?
   - From a post-humanist feminist paradigm, what constructions of femininity and masculinity do these characters represent?
   - Which texts are drama teachers in Western Australia choosing for ATAR drama?
3. **PERFORMATIVITY and BECOMING** (teachers):
   - How, if at all, are teachers’ choices influenced by Ball’s notion of performativity?
   - What examples demonstrate the occurrence of teachers using Butler’s concept of gender performativity to:
     - Acquiesce to hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in the ATAR set texts in drama?
     - Disrupt hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in the ATAR set texts in drama?
4. **BECOMING and GENDER** (students):
   - What examples demonstrate the occurrence of students using Butler’s concept of gender performativity to:
i. Acquiesce to hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in the ATAR set texts in drama?

ii. Disrupt hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in the ATAR set texts in drama?

iii. How, if at all, did embodying the characters on the set text list in ATAR drama, help students negotiate issues of identity and gender, and how did it influence their becomings?
5. Review of the Literature

To examine the aforementioned questions an extensive literature review was conducted to survey existing research. The literature review presented here is comprised of and “structured” around the six sensitising concepts: senior secondary drama classrooms, space, text, gender, becoming, and performativity. However, these are intricately connected like a rhizome, thus each concept has its own life but overlaps and influences the others.

**Senior secondary drama classrooms**

Drama itself can provide a forum for re-discovering voice and arresting that crisis via the safety of “performance” and in the safety of the collaborative learning context. (Hatton, 2003, p. 139)

Research has shown that drama empowers girls to make connections between their drama experiences and their own lives (Hatton 2001, 2003, 2013). Hatton’s studies of adolescent girl’s experiences in drama classrooms in Sydney and London suggests that drama gives girls a “voice” and enables them to envisage new possibilities and social roles. She highlights the fact that girls dominate drama classrooms numerically, however, they are largely ignored by a masculine curricula. Many studies have shown that drama affords a generative nexus between students’ identities and their social and educational empowerment (Greene, 1980; Hatton, 2003; Hickey-Moody, 2010; Medina & Campano, 2006; Rousseau et al., 2014; Wright, 2011, 2015; Wright & Pascoe, 2014).

Even outside of the context of the senior secondary drama classroom, research shows that engaging young people through theatre can be a catalyst for both challenging and reifying gendered assumptions that drive societal mythologies and prejudices (Sutherland, 2013). Applied theatre approaches can create potentially transgressive open spaces where questions about entrenched plots and characters can be asked — particularly about what it might mean to be a man or a woman in the 21st century. Implicit in much drama education praxis is the hope that it can become a liberatory space for adolescents (Hatton, 2013). As Wright and Pascoe (2014) have shown, arts processes contribute to improved social and emotional wellbeing through creativity, connection, activity, taking notice, learning and giving (Wright & Pascoe, 2014).

Intensive theatre programs with youth can be an empowering experience. Rousseau et al.’s (2014) quantitative research into first generation immigrant youths with Emotional Behavioural Disorder found that a twelve-week theatre intervention program was associated with a small improvement in students’ symptoms. However, they note that educational institutions need to provide a “secure space” before drama and theatre can be an empowering transformative vehicle for students:

Overall, it is possible to envision that when institutional structures are not able to provide a secure enough space, alternative interventions may have a more limited impact because other structural changes are required before a modification of the curriculum could be effective. (Rousseau et al., 2014, p. 8)
**Space**

A safe social/emotional space is required if students are to take transformative risks in the drama classroom. Hunter’s (2008) research reveals that for drama classroom processes to facilitate performance making and empowering social change these outcomes are “predicated on the production of safe space” (Hunter, 2008, p. 5). She notes that a “safe space” includes the creative potential for tension and risk. Therefore, a safe space for applied theatre practitioners such as drama teachers is more than just a precursor for performance, but “a processual act of fever-becoming: a space of messy negotiations that allow individual and group actions of representation to occur” (Hunter, 2008, p. 5). Hunter’s research links the themes of risk taking and becoming and how these are enabled in the safe space of the theatre.

Gallagher’s (2000, 2007) research supports this understanding of safe space as a vehicle for personal and social change by suggesting that it is the “open space” of the drama classroom that enables relationships to flourish (Gallagher, 2000, 2007).

If the drama classroom is a safe space students are empowered to work collaboratively. Toivanen’s (2011) research into structural factors of group work in drama teaching concludes that space and collaboration are integral elements of the drama classroom and that in order to function effectively a number of factors must occur. Toivanen concludes that the “empty space” of the drama classroom “requires the physical and mental involvement of the pupils and the teacher, but at the same time, the pupils are also physically and mentally involved in the social group of the class” (p. 402). Becoming a teacher, therefore, requires skills and knowledge of drama and group dynamics: “the teacher using drama needs to be able to facilitate the working dynamics of both kinds of groups in empty space. There has to be simultaneous recognition and facilitation” (Toivanen, 2011, p. 402).

Previous studies have shown that the drama classroom can be a transformative space for the promotion of gender equality and sexual abuse prevention in schools (Kernsmith & Hernandez-Jozefowicz, 2011; Reed & Rae, 2007). However, not all drama classrooms’ open spaces are vehicles for positive social transformation to occur. Schick’s (2014) research into one middle school drama classroom shows that drama activities and performances can contribute to the “normalization of sexist, abusive and violent behaviour toward women” when drama teachers actively socialize female sexual objectification and male dominance during school-based activities (Schick, 2014, p. 39). This occurs when girls embody characters whose value comes only from their sexual appeal or behaviour, to the exclusion of other character traits. Sexualisation of girls in drama also occurs when female characters are sexually objectified by being made into a “thing” for other characters’ sexual use, rather than being a character with the capacity for independent action and decision making. Thus the generative possibilities for teachers and students in drama are delimited by sexist portrayals of women. Likewise, they may also be constrained by the texts that are proscribed for students in the Western Australian drama curriculum.
To investigate the characters teachers choose from the Western Australian ATAR set text list for adolescent girls and boys to perform it is important to examine what constructions of femininity and masculinity these characters represent. It is also necessary to understand why teachers are choosing certain texts over others in Western Australia and which texts are the most popular.

Although an extensive literature review was unsuccessful in uncovering any known research studies examining drama teachers’ selection of texts, there is a body of research on text selection and English teachers in the context of institutional constraints and censorship (Simmons, 1994; Greenbaum, 1997; Friese, Alvermann, Parkes & Rexak, 2008; Doecke & Hayes, 1999; Warner, 2003). There has also been a large phenomenological study on teachers and how they use choice in their classrooms (Flowerday & Schraw, 2000). This study showed that teachers gave choices to students in a number of ways, depending on age and ability. Choice was shown to increase motivation, however, contrary to popular belief choice does not necessarily improve learning (Flowerday & Schraw, 2000, p. 644). With regard to text selection and English teachers, Friese et al. (2008) argue that standardised curricula and a focus on high stakes assessment influences text selection. They argue that more attention needs to be paid to students’ interests and teacher agency if students are to be engaged and motivated learners. Likewise, Doecke & Hayes (1999) examine text selection and censorship in Australian secondary school education. They argue that the “back to basics” and standardised approach to literature “skills building” leaves students bored and disengaged. Warner (2003) emphasises that standardising the secondary school reading curriculum narrows the choice of texts and breadth of reading (p. 13). However, Doecke & Hayes (1999) also note that censorship involves more than simply excluding texts from the classroom, but “also operates through school literacy practices that deny students the opportunity to interrogate what they read or to use texts for their own purposes” (p. 36). They argue that comprehension activities, skills drills and even drama performances of texts which are merely rehashed versions of commercial productions aimed at enhancing a school’s prestige, close off opportunities for student engagement and the creative interpretation of texts (p. 37).

In Western Australia teachers are instructed to choose two texts from the set text list – one Australian and one World drama text (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2016, p. 9). Some texts are far more popular than others with drama teachers — meaning that their characters are performed and embodied by the vast majority of drama students. An exploration of the SCSA Drama Examination Reports 2012-2015 (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2016) was conducted to ascertain the most popular set texts in Year 12 ATAR Drama. Although information was limited, the investigation revealed that the most popular texts over this time frame were for world drama: Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*; and for Australian drama: *Cloudstreet* (Monjo & Enright, 1999) and *Ruby Moon* (Cameron, 2003). *Cloudstreet* the play is an adaptation of Tim Winton’s novel by the same name (Winton 1991), which has been described as being part of “the new canon” of Australian literature (Gioia, 2016, p. 1). Tim Winton is a Western Australian novelist and short story writer who has been named a Living Treasure by the National Trust and awarded the Centenary
Medal for service to literature (Griffiths, 2015, p. 1). *Cloudstreet* is arguably his best-known work, regularly appearing on lists of Australia’s best-loved novels.

The selection of these “canonical” texts by Shakespeare and Winton is consistent with what we know about the choices teachers make from the English Literature curriculum. Yiannakis’ (2014) research into English Literature curricula in Australia from 1945-2005 shows that year 12 set text lists signify more than just trends in literature, but rather, “literary legitimacy, cultural capital, notions of nationhood, canon fluidity and classroom practice are being affected” (2014, p. 100). He concludes that despite the shifts and state variations, “it is clear that notwithstanding changes in methodology and theory influencing selection processes … a core group of writers remain popular across the six decades since the end of World War Two,” and that “many by Shakespeare still the central and dominant texts throughout this period” (p. 110). While it is the case that there is a wide variety of texts available for teachers and students on the current 2016 list of set texts in Western Australia (24 in total), including texts from indigenous and feminist perspectives, teachers consistently choose the same few “literary canon” texts for their mostly female cohorts.

To examine the roles available to girls on the Western Australian drama curriculum’s set text list it is also interesting to review the wider context of the Australian national curriculum, how this has come into being, and its implications for drama pedagogy. Since the announcement of “Australia’s First National Curriculum” by the then Minister for Education, Julia Gillard (2008), researchers have been asking what drama knowledge will be represented, and whose knowledge will be given precedence in a national curriculum (Pascoe, 2009; O'Connor, 2009; Stinson, 2009). Any curriculum is a product of the knowledge, biases, and ideologies of the writers and the wider social, political, economic and cultural contexts in which they write. Drama is only one of many subjects, and in Western Australia, it is located in “The Arts” learning area — one of eight learning areas on the curriculum. The arts are not viewed as “core” subjects on the curriculum (as are math, English, science and HASS [humanities and social sciences]), but rather “options”. Moreover, as Hickey-Moody (2016) notes:

Youth arts practices and school arts curriculum are generally optional activities for young people, which are not likely to succeed without young people's choice to invest in them. Further, at more senior levels, school arts curriculum subjects are selective areas of study, the pursuit of which obviously reflects youth taste and agency. (p. 67)

Indeed, drama is “not at the top of the curriculum pile” (Neelands, 2009, p. 17), and is continually fighting for legitimation via space on the curriculum (Neelands, 2009; Pascoe, 2009; Stinson, 2009). In speaking about the drama curriculum Neelands (2009) argues that, “the first and most significant shaping of curriculum is in response to the ideological and political imperatives of the government in power” (p. 9). The drama curriculum is influenced by the current dominant values and desired outcomes of the governments in power at a state or national level. As Saxton (in O'Toole, Stinson & Moore, 2009) notes, “drama has flexed and shaped itself to fit the latest curriculum fashion… drama has found ways — honest, inventive, and appropriate — to demonstrate how that fashion can be served” (p. viii).

Haynes described the Western Australian Arts curriculum as “sublimely eclectic”, reflecting a “smorgasbord of ideologies” (2006, p. 769), which would
seem to be liberating for teachers. However, as Ball (2012) argues, curriculum, like any discourse, directs power. Whilst part of the justification for a national curriculum was to “ensure every child has access to the highest quality learning programs” (Gillard, 2008), there existed a strong push for a “back to basics” approach to education and a drive to make it more “accountable” (Pyne, cited in Bita, 2014). Many critics have asserted that the move towards measurable “outcomes” or “objectives” in drama education has lead to narrow technicist pedagogy (see Stinson, 2009; Apple, 2004; O’Connor, 2009; Eisner, 2005; Neelands, 2009; Beder et al. 2009) or what Neelands calls “death by a thousand outcomes” (cited in O’Connor, 2009, p.19).

Just as curriculum development does not exist in a vacuum, neither does its implementation by drama teachers into drama classrooms. As Haynes (2006) notes, in reality principals demand continuous assessment, high standards in ATAR results, and skilful dramatic performances for potential parents. As Ball (2012) stresses, teachers are inevitably enmeshed in a matrix of power relations and face continued pressure to submit to prevailing hegemonies. Even while curriculum writers construct diverse and well-informed curricula for the arts, which reflect a “sublime heterogeneity” (Haynes, 2006), the unifying metanarrative of economic rationalism driving educational “reform” in Australia works against this. Commentators insist that similar educational reforms in the United States serve the needs of big business (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Beder et al., 2009; Giroux, 2008; Henwood & Featherstone, 2013). In Australia, compulsory standardised testing in literacy and numeracy — NAPLAN², and the requirement to grade students against pre-specified levels of achievement in the arts to preserve accountability is often driven by an economic agenda (Haynes, 2006; Keddie, Mills & Pendergast, 2011). This continual press for teachers, schools and education sectors to be accountable, competitive and to perform, has led a number of researchers to link education with philosophical concepts of “performativity” (Keddie, Mills & Pendergast, 2011; Ball, 2003; Apple, 2005; Sloan, 2007; Giroux, 2004).

**Performativity**

To answer the question: how does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? I will now review the literature relating to the wider context of “contemporary times” in education. The performativity principle is believed by many to dominate education in the 21st century (Ball, 2003; Black, 2013; Marginson, 1997; McKenzie, 2001a). However, before this is discussed in relation to contemporary Australian education in more detail, it is important to define “performativity”.

The term performativity has been used in a number of contexts with a range of different meanings. There are three common articulations of performativity closely aligned with particular theorists that focus on specific manifestations of this moulding of subjectivity. Chronologically, the first of these is in the work of Jean-Francois Lyotard, although the term derives from the

---

² The National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) is an annual assessment for students in Years 3, 5, 7 and 9 in Australia in reading, writing, language conventions (spelling, grammar and punctuation) and numeracy.
founding work in speech act theory by ordinary language philosopher J. L. Austin (1962). Within the context of the philosophy of education the term is usually linked with the work of Lyotard. Lyotard (1984) used the term to describe the legitimation of knowledge in our postmodern society. The association of neoliberal schemas with pedagogy has the power to shape the subjectivities of teachers and students. Lyotard’s examination of the increasingly “performative” political and bureaucratic systems revealed that knowledge has become primarily a saleable commodity, and education is subsumed to the efficient functioning of the social system. The individual performs according to measure of outputs and becomes know as representations of those measures (Lyotard, 1984). He states:

The production of proof, which is in principle only part of an argumentation process designed to win agreement from the addressees of scientific messages, thus falls under the control of another language, in which the goal is no longer truth, but performativity — that is, the best possible input/output equation. The State and/or company must abandon the idealist and humanist narratives of legitimation in order to justify the new goal: in the discourse of today’s financial backers of research, the only credible goal is power. (Lyotard, 1984, p. 46)

Lyotard discusses how the “performativity principle” subsumes education to facilitate the efficient functioning of the social system (1984, pp. 47-53). Thus education is no longer to be concerned with the pursuit of ideals, such as that of personal autonomy or emancipation, but with the means, techniques or skills that contribute to the efficient operation of the state in the global market and contribute to maintaining the internal cohesion and legitimation of the state. This requires what Foucault (1975) would describe as normalized and governable individuals, or as Deleuze (1992) would name them — individuals — over against Kantian autonomous persons (Duncan, 2007). Foucault argued that performativity pays no heed to any kind of ethics, because the legitimating principle of society is to ignore the question of ethics in preference to a system of “might makes right”. This performativity ultimately leads to rule by terror, either via the great terror of a totalitarian state, or the smaller terrors of university research programs being discontinued because they are not sufficiently commercially competitive (Deleuze, 1992). These notions of performativity have influenced a number of education theorists (for example: Ball, 2003; Bell, 2012; Dey & Steyaert, 2007; Giroux, 2013; Stone, 1999; Vick & Martinez, 2011).

In a similar manner, Ball (2003) uses the term to describe the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. Thus performativity is:

...a technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and display as means of incentive, control, attention and change — based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). Performances (of individual subjects or organisations) are fabrications that serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of “quality”, or “moments” of promotion or inspection. (p. 216)

According to Ball, fabrications are versions of an organization (or person) which do not exist; they are not “outside the truth” but neither do they render
simply true or direct accounts; they are produced purposefully in order “to be accountable”. Truthfulness is not the point; the point is their effectiveness, both in the market or for inspection or appraisal, and in the “work” they do “on” and “in” the organization; their transformational and disciplinary impact (Ball, 2003, p. 224). As Duncan asserts, “the system cares only about the appearance of “quality”, and not about content” (2007). Many critics (see for example Apple, 2010; Beder et al., 2009; Davies & Bansel, 2007; Endacott et al., 2015; Giroux, 2013; James et al., 2010; Strain, 2009) have discussed the marketization or “commodification” of education where schools, universities and education itself become “products” on the global market. Dey & Steyaert (2007) have labelled what they see as the “McDonaldization” of education resulting in “fast-food knowledge” as the “spectre of the performativity principle” (p. 439). As McKenzie asserts:

Performance will be to the twentieth and 21st centuries what discipline was to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, namely, an onto-historical formation of power and knowledge…but let me just stress that performatve power/knowledge is really just coming over the horizon; discipline wasn’t built in a day, nor has the performance stratum fully installed itself. (McKenzie, 2001, pp. 5-6)

A number of researchers have applied this conception of performativity to education in an Australian context. The neoliberal ideologies of Thatcher and Reagan in the UK and US respectively, have had a significant impact on public policy and subsequent “education reform”, not only in their own countries, but also in many other nations, including Australia. Advocates of such reforms (such as Caldwell & Spinks, 1988, 1992; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Caldwell, 1998; Pyne 2014) suggest that public schooling is in “crisis” and the best solution is to adopt a market-driven approach to “selling” public schools to education “consumers”. Accordingly, “parent-consumers” are afforded more “choices” when market competition forces compel schools to continuously improve standards in order to attract parents to the educational product they are offering (Angus, 2015, p. 395). This impacts drama education because the drama “school production” becomes a vehicle for promoting schools (Ashton, 2016). As Angus (2015) notes, “At the local level, enterprising schools engage in impression management to signal their “distinctiveness” and worth in comparison with other schools … They are competing to be chosen” (p. 396). As one school marketing company highlights: Most of us all know the benefits a well-run event can provide your school – they can help build community, increase your school's profile and they can even increase enrolments. Events can contribute to your school’s marketing efforts, even if indirectly. Know your audience. Prospective parents want to be wowed by your school’s facilities. (Ashton, 2016, p. 1)

However, many authors argue that competitive neoliberal education policies have had a detrimental impact on public schooling (Apple, 2005; Ball, 2003; Beder et al., 2009; Connell, 1998, 2011, 2013a; Down, 2009; Marginson, 1997; Thompson & Cook, 2014; Whitty, Power, & Halpin, 1998). They argue that neoliberal market ideologies have strengthened the relationship between education, economic productivity and a view of students as human capital, which has narrowed the view of what constitutes “good” education as the measurement
and comparison of student performance on quantifiable academic measures. This “fetish” for standards and outcomes in schools, leads to a focus on management and basic literacy and numeracy skills over pedagogy and student learning (Pyne, 2014; Hayes et al., 2006; Keddie, Mills & Pendergast, 2011; Beder et al., 2009).

Keddie, Mills & Pendergast’s (2011) research examined the effects of one Australian school’s adoption of a status-oriented corporate discourse of “performance, competition and accountability” (p. 75). They drew upon Ball’s (2003) theorising of performativity and fabrication to bring to light the ways in which the managerial processes at the school, driven by the administration’s embracing of the aforementioned neo-liberal discourses, shape it into an auditable commodity and fabricate an identity around being “number one”. The study criticises the lack of authenticity of this deliberate fabrication of identity, and focuses on the surveillance and accountability measures used to discipline teachers into this performative phenomena. They assert that this socialisation process de-professionalises teachers, de-intellectualises teaching, and creates an atmosphere of fear and anxiety (p. 89). Other researchers support this view (Gerwitz, Mahoney, Hextall, & Cribb, 2009; Kumashiro, 2010; Loh & Hu, 2014; Thompson & Cook, 2012). Keddie et al. (2011) contend that issues of social justice and equity are marginalised at schools such as this (see also Ball, 1994; Singh & Taylor, 2007; Lingard, 2003). The school’s keenness to perform well on external performance measures “produced a narrow view of equity, as concerned with improving the academic performance of underachieving groups” (p. 85).

Such market driven corporate performative discourses intensify homogeneity and generate, as well as reinscribe, particular forms of exclusionary white and middle-class social capital or sociability (see also Apple, 2005; Sloan, 2007; Giroux, 2004). Angus’ (2015) research into the Australian My School website — which compares schools’ performance based on their NAPLAN results — and it’s impact on school choice reveals a significant intensification of homogeneity in Australian schools:

The neoliberal social imaginary may be future-oriented in terms of economic aspiration, but the standardized, backward-looking assessment, curriculum and pedagogy that it fosters in education are likely to make schools more boring places for all students — but particularly for less-advantaged and minority students whose cultural dissonance with traditional, mainstream, conservative schooling practices and high-stakes testing is most pronounced … These schooling practices explicitly reinforce the status quo (p. 409).

In Australia, performative, compulsory standardised testing in literacy and numeracy is often driven by an economic agenda (Connell, 2013b; Haynes, 2006; Keddie et al., 2011). Giroux notes that similar educational reforms in the United States serve the needs of big business, not only through the privatisation

---

3 According to the My School website ‘My School provides information about schools in Australia, letting you see how a school is performing, compared to schools with similar students’. My School provides assessment data about each of Australia’s just over 10,000 schools and campuses. The ‘publication of data on My School allows educators to share information about school achievements and characteristics with the aim of supporting and driving improvement across the nation’ which allows parents to attain ‘valuable information to help make informed decisions about their child’s education’ (https://www.myschool.edu.au/).
of schools but also through the writing, and administering of standardised tests and testing materials (2008). For example, according to Beder et al. (2009), it costs a state in the US around $10 million to have a school performance evaluated, mainly on the basis of standardised tests (Beder et al., 2009, p. 107). The market for school assessment, tutoring, test-preparation services and materials is worth US$25 billion. McGraw-Hill’s contract to supply tests to Kentucky alone in 2002 was worth US$30 million. According to Endacott et al., the adoption of Common Core State Standards in the US has created an estimated $500 billion market for educational products and services (Endacott et al., 2015, p. 417). In Australia, NAPLAN test booklets have filled supermarket shelves. In May 2013 Hinkler Books’ School Zone NAPLAN-Style Workbook: Year 3 Numeracy featured in the top ten bestseller list at book retailer Dymocks, alongside books by Jamie Oliver and Jodi Picoult (Morris, 2013). Whilst drama textbooks will never make the top ten bestseller lists, Impact Publishing’s popular Drama: A Resource for Year 12 ATAR by Stinson is a textbook used frequently by drama teachers and students in Western Australia that retails for AU$64 (Stinson, 2015).

Researchers cite many deleterious effects of the performative commodification of education on schools in Western Australia (Adoniou, 2012; Thompson, 2010b; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). They point to growing inequality, surveillance of teachers, loss of professionalism and increased stress for students and teachers with no statistical improvement in numeracy and literacy overall (Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). Moreover, NAPLAN has lead to a narrowing of the curriculum focus, a “teach to the test” mentality and a return to teacher-centered pedagogies that lower student engagement with learning (Polesel, Dulfer, & Turnbull, 2012). Teachers reported that test preparation and increased emphasis on competition meant that it was harder to cater for students with the greatest need. Reich stresses, “The danger with high-stakes testing, of course, is that schools become test-taking factories in which the only thing taught or learned is how to take high-stakes tests” (Reich, 2003, p. 1). For example, teachers in Australia reported spending less time teaching arts subjects because they did not feature in NAPLAN tests (Polesel et al., 2012, p. 11).

“Choice”, “accountability”, “standards”, “competition” and “reform” are the performative buzzwords of the neoliberal discourse in education. Neoliberal assemblages value narrow measurable outcomes as a means of control. As Deleuze states in his 1992 essay Postscript on the Societies of Control, “For the school system: continuous forms of control ... the introduction of the “corporation” at all levels of schooling” (1992, p. 7). Deleuze argues that in our contemporary neo-capitalist society of control the corporation has replaced the state disciplinary society through “continually analysing the ultrarapid forms of free-floating control that replaced the old disciplines operating in the time frame of a closed system” (p. 4). The normalisation of surveillance is a recurring theme in educational research with teachers being continually monitored and analysed by their data (Apple, 2010; Giroux, 2013; Thompson, 2010a; Thompson & Cook, 2014). Moreover, teachers are blamed for students’ poor results, rather than taking into account other factors such as decreased funding, socio-economic factors, and the students themselves (Giroux, 2013; Thompson & Price, 2012).

Neoliberalism’s focus on the individual means that increasingly social problems such as poverty, unemployment and inequality are blamed on individuals rather than on structural constraints (C. Smith, 2012). This neoliberal
view of education is evidenced in the current Australian Federal Education Minister, Christopher Pyne’s comments, insinuating that Australia does not have an equity problem but rather a problem with poor teaching:

We have an obsession with school funding in Australia when we should have an obsession with standards. The issue in education is not a lack of money, the issue in education is a lack of a fighting spirit about a rigorous curriculum, engaging parents in their children’s education. The argument around teaching shouldn’t be about industrial relations, it should be around, “Are our teachers as high a standard as they possibly could be, and if they aren’t, how do we get them to that point?” (Pyne, cited in Ferrari, 2013, p. 1)

However, Riddle claims that ideas like these oversimplify the problem. He notes the 2013 OECD global student rankings highlighted that a “slide in the performance of Australian students in reading, science and math, hides the real state of inequality in Australia’s education system” (Riddle, 2013). As Polesel et al. (2012) highlight in their report on the effectiveness of NAPLAN, since the introduction of high stakes testing “in the Australian context, the valuing of narrow assessment and reporting strategies, and limiting the subjects offered may contribute to inequitable outcomes for students” (p. 11). The Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS) 2015 report on equity in Australia highlights a, “growing problem of poverty and inequality in our country” (Australian Council of Social Services, 2015, p. 5). Moreover, the CEO of ACOSS, Dr. Goldie, concludes that,

We are as a nation today facing a worrisome wealth divide despite enjoying more than 20 years of unprecedented economic growth. The findings make it clear that the benefits of this growth have not been shared by all — wealth is now more concentrated in our country than ever before. (Australian Council of Social Services, 2015, p. 5)

According to Beder et al. (2009), there are currently three tiers of education in Australia. First, private schools that “cater to the elites who want to give their children social and educational advantages”; secondly, “other private and selective public schools that are adequately funded and able to control their enrolments”; and lastly, “inadequately funded public schools whose doors are open to any child, whatever their socio-economic background, religion, or ability” (2009, p. 187). They argue that these levels are a result of a neoliberal, market-driven, corporate approach to education.

The Australian Federal Government’s 2011 Review of School Funding (the “Gonski Report”) highlighted the disparity between the different education sectors. It noted that in 2010, 85% of all Indigenous students, 78% of students with disabilities, 83% of students in remote or very remote areas, 79% of students in the bottom SEA (Socio Economic Advantage) quartile, and 68% of students for whom English was their second language attended government schools (Gonski, 2008). This revealed that the schools with the least funding were responsible for educating the most disadvantaged students.

In contemporary times education reform occurs within an emerging audit culture in Australia that aims to improve schools and educational equity through collecting and providing data that are used to measure teaching quality. As
Thompson and Cook (2012) note, high stakes testing and other auditing measures have had significant impacts on teacher agency. They argue that our audit culture results in the “prioritization of sameness” (p. 11). This has implications when examining teachers’ selection of texts from set text lists. In Australia, performative compulsory standardised curricula and testing in literacy and numeracy is often driven by an economic agenda and has had a profound impact on both a macro and micro level on education (Connell, 2013b; Haynes, 2006; Keddie et al., 2011). The performative culture of late capitalism links educational achievement levels with economic development and international competitiveness. As Thompson notes:

The performative culture has become part of the fabric of mass, compulsory education, impacting on the ontological and epistemological foundations of the teacher and student in these late capitalist times. It has infiltrated education at all levels, from policy to homework, from teacher responsibilities to student expectations, such that it is now perceived as a key motivator for educational reform and the resetting of expectations of pedagogy and learning. (Thompson, 2010b, p. 414)

This definition of performativity is cogent to this research project because the performativity principle has been shown to impact the “ontological and epistemological foundations of the teacher and student” which in turn impacts their becomings in the drama classroom. The second articulation of performativity is aligned with the work of Judith Butler, and it is to this that we now turn because it falls within the scope of this research.

Gender

Much has been written on gender and the performance of gender. The research explores the roles the characters teachers choose from the Western Australian ATAR set text list for adolescent girls and boys to perform and what constructions of femininity and masculinity these characters represent. Butler’s notion of gender performativity provides a rich theoretical resource for analysing the complex ways in which young adolescents create their femininity and masculinity through stylised acts/performances.

Judith Butler is a well-known feminist philosopher who uses the term performativity to discuss the “performance” of gender. As with Lyotard, Foucault’s treatment of the performative is significant to Butler’s project. I hope to show that introducing Butler’s approach to Lyotard’s version of performativity can lead to a fruitful analysis of educational performativity and raise important questions pertaining to the ethics of education. Furthermore, the relationship between these thinkers and the conceptual apparatuses that they employ will be mediated in what follows by Deleuze and Guattari’s (1972 [2009]) schizoanalysis, especially concepts such as “lines of flight”, “territorialising”, “deterritorialising” and “reterritorialising” in the specific context of hegemonic constructions of femininity.

Butler (1990) argues that gender is culturally constructed through the performative repetition of stylized acts. She notes that, “Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory
frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a
natural sort of being… within the compulsory frames set by the various forces
that police the social appearance of gender” (1990, p. 45). These stylized bodily
acts, in their repetition, establish the appearance of an essential, ontological
“core” gender (pp. 33, 185). Butler also challenges biological constructions of
binary sex, asserting that the sexed body is itself culturally constructed by
regulative discourses (p. 44). She argues that the performance of gender, sex,
and sexuality, however, is not a voluntary choice, but rather it derives from what
Foucault (1975) would call “regulative discourses”. Butler asserts that on the
basis of this construction of natural binary sex that binary gender and
“compulsory heterosexuality” (a term she borrows from Adrienne Rich, 1983) are
likewise constructed as natural (pp. 44, 184). Butler aims to subvert and displace
“the naturalized and reified notions of gender that support masculine hegemony
and heterosexist power” (p. 46).

In Undoing Gender (2004), Butler refines her notion of performativity and
focuses on the question of undoing “restrictively normative conceptions of sexual
and gendered life” (p.1). She continues to use theatrical terms to describe the
performative nature of gender:

If gender is a kind of doing, an incessant activity performed, in part without
one’s knowing and without one’s willing, it is not for that reason automatic
or mechanical. On the contrary, it is a practice of improvisation within a
scene of constraint. Moreover, one does not “do” one’s gender alone. One
is always “doing” with or for another, even if the other is only imaginary

Butler also builds upon Joan Riviere’s (1929) concept of femininity as a
“masquerade”. Butler states that there is no distinction between genuine
womanliness and the masquerade, because, “they are the same thing” (p. 72).
Many feminist writers in the field of education have utilised Butler’s concept of
performativity with regard to gender (Arnot, 2002; Bell, 2006; Braidotti, 2013;
Chikkatur, 2012; Coffey, 2013b; David, Coffey, Connolly, Nayak, & Reay, 2006;

Butler’s notion of performativity provides a rich theoretical resource for
analysing the complex ways in which young adolescents create their femininity
and masculinity through stylised acts — a becoming. She writes:

*Woman* itself is a term in process, a *becoming*, a constructing that cannot
rightfully be said to originate or to end. As an ongoing discursive practice, it is
open to intervention and resignification. Even when gender seems to congeal into
the most reified forms, the “congealing” itself an insistent and insidious practice,
sustained and regulated by various social means. (Butler, 1990, p. 45)

It is important to note that Butler sees gender as a becoming; not a fixed
point of subjectivity, that is an effect of a number of different desires and forces.
This is similar to Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of *becoming woman*, which will
be discussed later in more detail. Adolescents in the drama classroom engage in
an ongoing discursive practice of constructing becomings as they embody a
range of gendered characters from drama texts, in an increasingly performative
milieu.

More recent feminist theorising has re-read Butler’s concepts of gender
and performativity in the context of our current neoliberal and allegedly depoliticised “postfeminist” times (McRobbie, 2009). This theorising has pointed to a “resurgent patriarchy within neo-liberal postfeminist times”, which re-orders and restabilises what Butler (1990) describes as the “heterosexual matrix” (Renold & Ringrose, 2008). This is achieved through a politics of “postfeminist masquerade” demanded of girls (McRobbie, 2009). In western culture girls and young women are represented as success stories of late capitalism, where discourses of choice, freedom and autonomy exist alongside discourses of hypersexualised femininity (Renold & Ringrose, 2008; McRobbie, 2009). Postcolonial capitalism, gender and hegemony are intertwined, each embedded and co-constructing one another. As Connell (2015) notes:

In the contemporary world, direct imperial rule has been replaced by financial power, corporate investment, differential trade relations, frequent but dispersed military interventions, development aid programmes and the multilateral state structure of the United Nations. Gender relations are embedded in, and constituted by, all of these structures. (p. 55)

Feminist theorists assert that postcolonial neoliberal heteronormativity perpetuates and reifies hegemonic binary gender constructions and have written about the ways in which boys’ and girls’ normative gender identities are inextricably embedded and produced within hegemonic representations of heterosexuality (see Blaise, 2005; Renold, 2005, 2007; Robinson & Davies, 2007; DePalma and Atkinson, 2007). These theories highlight the profound influence hegemonic representations of gender can have on adolescent students in the drama classroom.

Many feminist educational theorists have brought together the work of Butler (1990, 2004) with the philosophers Deleuze and Guattari (1972, 1987) to resist hegemonic constructions of gender binaries (for example: Coffey 2013; Reynold & Ringrose, 2008; Hickey-Moody, 2013; Braidotti, 2003; Markula, 2006; Linstead & Pullen, 2006; Bell, 1999, 2006, 2012). It has been noted that Deleuze scholars make up an elite intellectual community largely invested in being distinguished from scholars working with the writings of Butler, emphasising the fact that Butler is not a philosopher (Hickey-Moody, 2016). This results in the legitimization of only particular (masculinist) hegemonic interpretations of Deleuze, or Deleuze and Guattari. However, as Hickey-Moody (2016) insists:

Butler and Deleuze/Guattari can be part of a shared intellectual public. Reading Butler and Deleuze together can teach us to appreciate lack as a mode of aesthetic refusal, as a way of being obviously different, or “positively negative” (Hickey-Moody and Rasmussen, 2009) in public culture. I take Deleuze and Guattari and Butler as part of the same intellectual public, a community concerned with creative cultural interventions into normative identity politics. (p. 532)

Deleuze and Guattari offer a theoretical “tool-kit” for mapping subversive action within rigid hierarchical, normative and dominant “phallogocentric” discourse in the drama classroom. Phallogocentrism is a term coined by Derrida to refer to the patriarchal privileging of the masculine (phallus) in the construction of meaning (Reynolds & Roffe, 2004). Clément and Cixous (1975) assert that women have been “colonized” by phallogocentric thinking (p. 65). Deleuze and
Guattari's radical critique of capitalism and Oedipal structures offers an important lens for building upon Butler's notion of mapping disruptions and instabilities in the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990; Deleuze & Guattari, 1972). In *Anti-Oedipus* Deleuze and Guattari challenge the Oedipal framing of the feminine as being signified by lack (of the phallus) (p. 61). This anti-phallogocentrism has resonated with many feminists and has been taken up, used and critiqued by feminist writers (such as Irigaray, 1985; Grosz, 1994; Braidotti, 2003; McRobbie, 2006; Hickey-Moody and Rasmussen, 2008). Deleuze and Guattari's (1972 [2009]) concepts of territorialisation, deterritorialisation, reterritorialisation and lines of flight have been utilised by these researchers to map how participants engage with hegemonic gender binaries, such as those found in dramatic texts. Characters such as Rose and Dolly Pickles from *Cloudstreet* and Macbeth and Duncan from *Macbeth* (which will be explored in more detail in the “becoming” section following) reify heteronormative phallogocentric femininity and masculinity. These hegemonic binary notions of femininity and masculinity are arguably limiting for both girls and boys (Antinora, 2013; Hatton, 2015; van Wyk, 2014).

The issue of boys and masculinity is explored in the literature, especially in light of the fact that girls seem to be outperforming the boys in school (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2012), leading many to assume that schools have become feminised spaces that need to be “reclaimed” for the boys (see for example, Bleach, 1998; Gurian, 1999; Hoff Sommers, 2000; Noble & Bradford, 2000). In 2002 the Australian Federal Parliament under the Howard government set up a national inquiry to develop an understanding of the reasons for boys’ poor performance at school (House of Representatives, 2002). In 2003, in the foreword of the *Meeting the challenge report: guiding principles for success from the Boys' Education Lighthouse Schools Programme stage one*, Dr Brendan Nelson, the then Federal Minister for Education, stated that “Where masculinity was once seen as a virtue, it is now seen as an obstacle to be overcome” (p. iii). Boys were seen as the new (homogenised) disadvantaged group, and classrooms were to be made more “boy friendly” through such things as male mentors and a more masculinised curricula (Mills & Keddie, 2010). Masculinity was seen as under threat in “overly” feminised spaces. The “poor boys” discourse has been challenged by many theorists (see for example: Mills, 2000; Lingard, 2003; Mills & Keddie, 2010; Summers, 2003; Epstein, 1998; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012). Mills and Keddie (2010) argue that this construction of boys as oppressed amounts to “anti-feminist resentment” which fails to acknowledge the extent to which girls and women experience oppression, and also fails to acknowledge that “schools are highly masculinised institutions that are hierarchical in their organisation, with disproportionate numbers of men in leadership positions, that are dominated by masculine curricula content” (p. 411). Furthermore, highly essentialist binary notions of masculinity and femininity are arguably harmful to both boys and girls (Mills & Keddie, 2009, 2010; McDonald, 2007; Balfour, 2010; Garcia-Gomez, 2011).

Research shows that some teachers appear to possess significantly binary and essentialist notions of gender (Chikkatur, 2012). Chikkatur's study is interesting in this regard in that it exposes the difficulties that young people face in negotiating notions of gender (and race), which are often hindered by teachers' beliefs about the binary nature of both. Chikkatur also analysed how different
adolescents negotiated gender performativity. Chikkatur’s research shows that homophobia and misogyny go hand in hand. She concludes:

Masculinity was not a homogenous category that any boy possesses by virtue of being male. Rather, masculinity … is a configuration of practices and discourses that different youths … may embody in different ways and to different degrees. Behavioural norms, including being unequivocally heterosexual, influenced ascriptions of masculinity … feminine behaviour is “almost universally demeaned” whether it is displayed by men, women, or transgendered people. (Chikkatur, 2012, p. 87)

An understanding of masculinity (and femininity) as heterogeneous and embodied underpins my research. Adolescent conceptions of masculinity are also influenced by neoliberal discourses. Connell’s (2016) exploration of global masculinities emphasises that masculinity in neoliberal times has multiple tiers and manifestations. Regarding the relationship between masculinity and hegemony Connell proposes that neoliberal globalisation has resulted in “hegemony under construction” rather than achieved hegemony” (p.1). This global corporate economy produces a “transnational corporate masculinity” that is constantly shifting. However, she also indicates that this lack of consolidation “is not producing a kinder, more inclusive or more feminized capitalism” (Connell, 2016, p. 315). Connell views gender as a multidimensional, embodied structure operating in a complex assemblage of bodies, discourse and institutions. Moreover, gender operates in an environment of globalised structural violence (Connell, 2012, 2016). Masculinity and femininity is embodied performed in the drama classroom set against a backdrop of deeply entrenched hegemony.

The influence of neoliberal globalisation on masculinity and femininity cannot be understated. Hickey-Moody’s (Hickey-Moody, 2010, 2013; Hickey-Moody & Laurie, 2015; Hickey-Moody & Rasmussen, 2006) research into youth, disability and gender highlights how masculinity and femininity are embodied performances of institutionalised patterns of hegemony. Hickey-Moody and Savage (2010) note that global media texts operate transnationally such as the global flows of “gangsta culture” that construct hegemonic masculinity: “global flows of gangsta culture are gendered and carry with them specific kinds of idealized masculinities in relation to which young people produce themselves … gangsta masculinities are ubiquitous and constitute sites of constant contest and reconstruction” (Hickey-Moody & Savage, 2010, p. 277). Her research into Australian youth shows that young men construct their masculinities dialogically, in relation to the perception of peers, family, teachers, media pedagogies and the local space producing both problematic and productive performances of gendered identities (Hickey-Moody & Savage, 2010). Often media constructed masculinities venerate aggressive behaviour in boys as a way to achieve dominance over both girls and one another.

In the drama classroom, boys and girls interpret texts and embody characters in a world surrounded by normative media constructions of masculinity and femininity. As Hickey-Moody (2016) notes: “The communities that young people create (and to which they belong) through practicing in and out of school youth art/s are obviously influenced by the pedagogical effects of popular media” (p. 64). However, the texts and the characters themselves have their own original context and construction of masculinity and femininity. Teachers when teaching a text then interpret this, and because students are
assessed on their embodiments of characters from these classic texts, a
teacher’s interpretation is often seen as authoritative. As Hickey-Moody (2016)
stresses, when exploring youth arts productions it is important to remember:

Teachers ultimately have a final say in the work that makes it to the stage
and as such, the youth voices created in school performance pieces are
partly performances of adult ideas about youth because the teachers are
shaping, monitoring, and censoring their student’s work. (p. 67)

**Becoming**

The final aspect of the research question asks how embodying characters
from the set text list in ATAR drama influenced students’ becomings. This aspect
of the research focuses on the students themselves. Adolescence is a formative
time for being, belonging and becoming. Becoming is a theoretical concept that
originated in ancient Greek philosophy and is attributed to Heraclitus of Ephesus
(535-475BCE). Heraclitus is said to have claimed that becoming is the process or
state of change and coming about in time and space. He linked the idea with
movement and change, as becoming is here associated with movement or
growth as it assumes a “changing to” and a “moving toward” something.
Nietzsche extended this idea in his vision of a chaotic world in perpetual change
and becoming. For Nietzsche the state of becoming does not produce fixed
entities, such as being, subject, object, substance, thing. Deleuze was influenced
by Nietzsche’s concept of becoming. In Hardt’s foreword to Deleuze’s *Nietzsche &
Philosophy* (2006, p. xi) he states that Deleuze’s “linked sequence of concepts —
multiplicity, becoming, affirmation, joy — not only characterizes his reading of
Nietzsche but also runs throughout the various turns of Deleuze’s work as a
guiding thread.” For Deleuze becoming is a process of change, flight, or
movement within an assemblage (an assemblage is any number of things
gathered into a single context — such as a student, a book, or a classroom).
Rather than regard the pieces of an assemblage as an organic whole, within
which the specific pieces are kept in place by organisational unity, the *process* of
becoming accounts for the relationship between the distinct elements of the
assemblage. In becoming one property of the assemblage is drawn into the
territory of another property, changing its affect and bringing forth a new
becoming. As Deleuze and Guattari explain,

> We encounter becomings-woman, becomings-child ... This is not
> surprising, since becoming and multiplicity are the same thing. A
> multiplicity is defined not by its elements, nor by a centre of unification or
> comprehension. It is defined by the number of dimensions it has... A
> multiplicity is continually transforming itself into a string of other
> multiplicities.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 272)

When exploring adolescent becomings in the drama classroom students
embody characters from texts in ways that both challenge and acquiesce to
cultural norms. Previous research into youth and becoming has utilised Deleuze
and Guattari’s schizoaalysis because it accounts for multiplicity and embodied
affect (Hickey-Moody, 2016; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose, 2011;
Tamboukou, 2008; Vick & Martinez, 2011). In *Anti-Oedipus Capitalism and
Schizophrenia* ([1972] 2009) Deleuze and Guattari develop a concept they call
“schizoanalysis” which they contrast to Freudian psychoanalysis. Schizoanalysis examines contradiction and multiplicity that breaks free from Freud’s Oedipal interpretive framework (“daddy-mommy-me” [p. 24]) — to discover “desiring machines” that are blocked by Oedipal forces. Against the Oedipalized territorialities (family, church, school, nation, party) Anti-Oedipus seeks to discover the “deteritorIALIZED” flows of desire, the “lines of flight” that escape Oedipal codes (pp. 338-339). A “line of flight” is a Deleuzian term representing a complete break from an accepted cultural norm. In the drama classroom lines of flight from hegemonic gender norms could be manifested in a boy “coming out” or wearing a wig, dress and heels, or a girl playing King Duncan or taking on a leadership role such as the director of a school play.

Becomings are transformations. Becoming will be discussed in more detail in the “theoretical considerations” section of the thesis following. However, suffice to say, the basis of my empirical research into adolescent becomings was to explore the ways in which students were transformed by the embodiment of characters from texts in senior secondary drama classrooms. In a similar manner to Coleman (2008), in her examination of how the relationship between girl’s bodies, their own photographic images and “media images” limit and extend the possibilities of becomings, I sought to explore how texts, space, gender and performativity limit and extend adolescent becomings in the drama classroom.

Recent studies into drama and adolescent girls have suggested that drama can assist girls with issues of becoming, such as self-esteem, identity, culture and gender (Armenta, 2005; Gallagher, 2000; Hatton, 2013). Hatton (2003) argues that girls outnumber boys in drama in the western world because drama gives them a voice. Carol Gilligan’s research in to girls' developmental psychology highlighted that in adolescence girls face a crisis of identity (1995, p. 201). The crisis involves a process of silencing, where a girl must either lose her own voice or “find herself in frank contradiction with people who have greater power than herself” (1995, p. 201). Hatton (2003) argues that “drama itself can also provide a forum for re-discovering voice and arresting that crisis via the safety of “performance” and in the safety of the collaborative learning context (safety in numbers)” (p. 144). Gilligan’s (1995) research also showed that girls possess sophisticated relational knowledge in pre-adolescence. In Hatton’s view, “drama enables girls to exercise their relational knowledge when manipulating roles and contexts, when understanding subtext and layers of meaning in action. In drama, this type of knowledge is suddenly seen as valuable” (2003, p. 144).

However, the drama curriculum often reinforces hegemonic constructions of femininity seen through the male gaze and silences female voices.

Student becomings in the drama classroom are empowered and restrained by characters they embody from plays on the set text lists. Historically, women have been denied access to the stage and male playwrights wrote mostly about men, or women as viewed through male eyes. Although female actors (and to a lesser extent, playwrights) are widely accepted today, plays on the set text list in Western Australia that represent female voices and experiences are few. In discussing the NSW drama curricula, Hatton describes it as a “girl-less desert” (2003, p. 141).

An extensive search of existing literature did not reveal any research into how embodying characters from drama set text lists influenced student becomings. As mentioned previously, what we do know from the Western Australian drama examination reports from the School Curriculum and Standards
Authority (SCSA) is which plays are the most popular with teachers because these are the texts most often written about in ATAR exams (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013). This in turn will influence student becomings by either constraining or limiting choices for girls and boys in the drama classroom. There is no statistical data giving precise percentages of students writing on particular texts, however, the drama examination report reveals that when plays which give voice to women’s lives are placed on the set text list in Western Australia (such as Black Sequin Dress by Jenny Kemp), they are largely ignored by teachers, in favour of the “classics”, such as Macbeth by Shakespeare, Waiting for Godot by Beckett, or The Homecoming by Pinter, or “popular” texts such as Cloudstreet, by Enright & Monjo (based on the aforementioned novel by Tim Winton). This is problematic when one considers that girls represented 71% of the population of ATAR drama students in Western Australia in 2014 (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2015).

Student becomings may be constrained by embodying narrow constructions of femininity in popular texts. In “classic” plays from the literary cannon, female voices are often rendered silent, and female characters are positioned as “maids in service” to the dramatic action (Hatton, 2003). For example, in “classic” popular texts on the ATAR drama set text list such as Waiting for Godot there are no female characters at all. In Macbeth, five of the 19 characters are female: the three witches, Lady Macbeth (a powerful and ambitious temptress who later becomes deranged and commits suicide) and Lady Macduff (a minor character who is murdered). In The Homecoming, there is one female character, Ruth, who by the end of the play becomes both a mother and a prostitute to the entire (male) family. Contemporary plays are often no better. In the popular play Cloudstreet the main female characters could easily fit into one of Irigaray’s (1985) three categories of commodified women: “the mother” (Oriel), “the virgin” (Rose) or “the prostitute” (Dolly). While Lady Macbeth is arguably one of the most powerful female characters in Shakespeare’s corpus, she represents hegemonic femininity constructed during the complex struggle for religious and political authority at the outset of King James’s English reign. As Levin notes, Lady Macbeth and the witches represent “demonic femininity; positioned as antithetical and analogous constructs, the demonic woman and the hysteric each sought to explain ‘disorderly’ womanhood, and to enforce (if also to differentiate between) nodes of masculinist control” (Levin, 2002, p. 22). These patriarchal categories conceptualise and manage female power and agency: “Represented as antimothers, both the witch and the hysteric negatively sanctioned patriarchal control over female generativity and nurture” (p. 37). Freud himself diagnosed Shakespeare’s tragic villainess, declaring: “Lady Macbeth’s illness … could be explained directly as a reaction to her childlessness” (Coriat, 1914 [1955], p. 22). Lady Macbeth and Lady Macduff are often contrasted in literary criticism (see Levin 2002; Callaghan, 2016). This dualism reifies a binary representation of women as madonnas/whores or in the case of Lady Macbeth, villainous heroine/nurturing mother:

While the play resists a complete identification of Lady Macbeth and the witches, the narrative also contrasts its villainous heroine to the nurturing mother, Lady Macduff. Lady Macduff provides a “new representation of maternity in patriarchal ideology. … for most of the play, Lady Macbeth acts as the antithesis to this ineffectual domesticity. (Levin, 2002, p. 42)
As yet no study has revealed how embodying characters such as Lady Macbeth and the witches in senior secondary drama classrooms shapes adolescent becomings.

**Summary**

The embodiment of characters from set texts in year 12 drama classrooms can empower or constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times. To ascertain how students are impacted by embodying texts in the drama classroom I examined the existing empirical research, or literature, on senior secondary drama classrooms, space, text, performativity, gender, and becoming.

This literature review reveals that drama and theatre education can be a potent site for developing self-esteem and identity formation for adolescents, particularly adolescent girls, who make up two-thirds of drama classes in Australian schools. However, the theatre space itself needs to be a safe environment if students are to take risks in their characterisations. Drama classrooms that reify normative gender roles by replicating popular performances of heteronormative femininity and masculinity may constrain transformative adolescent becomings.

Observations were also made concerning the narrow range of texts selected by senior secondary drama teachers in Western Australia, and that these choices reflect a preference for texts from a literary canon. The SCSA Drama Examination Reports show drama teachers in Western Australia choose texts such as *Macbeth* and *Cloudstreet* more frequently than other texts that offer a wider variety of female roles for their year 12 drama students.

I also examined the effects of the performative commodification of education on schools in Western Australia. Ball's (2003) notion of neoliberal competitive performativity was explored to shed light on the Australian educational milieu. Research points to growing educational inequality, surveillance of teachers, loss of professionalism, increased stress for students and teachers, and a narrowing of the curriculum, and a "teach to the test" mentality. As yet no study has examined the effect of this performativity on drama classrooms and teacher and student becomings.

This was followed by an exploration of gender performance. Adolescence is a formative time for being, belonging and becoming. In a world surrounded by normative media constructions of masculinity and femininity, boys and girls interpret texts and embody characters in the drama classroom. To understand how gender is constructed, I examined Butler's (1990, 2004) concept of gender performativity, which sees gender as being assembled through repetitive performance. Performativity of gender is a stylized repetition of acts, an imitation or miming of the dominant conventions of gender. In an effort to resist hegemonic constructions of gender binaries, many feminist educational theorists have brought together the work of Butler (1990, 2004) with the philosophers Deleuze and Guattari (1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]). As yet no study has examined how embodying texts in the drama classroom mediates gendered becomings.

Lastly, I examined the literature on the concept of *becoming*, in preference to "identity formation" in relation to adolescent girls and boys in senior secondary drama classrooms. Becoming has been associated with movement and assumes a "changing to" and a "moving toward" something, rather than producing a fixed
entity, such as being, subject, object, substance or thing. Deleuze’s conceptualisation of becoming was relevant to becoming in the drama classroom because it takes into account embodiment and multiplicity. For Deleuze becoming is a process of change, flight, or movement within an assemblage and the process of becoming accounts for the relationship between the distinct elements of the assemblage. In becoming, one property of the assemblage is drawn into the territory of another property, changing its affect and bringing forth a new becoming. Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of the rhizome, becoming, territorialising, deterritorialising, and reterritorialising are also useful in relation to hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in drama texts.

No research has yet been conducted that explores how the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empowers or constrains adolescent becomings in contemporary times. This dissertation seeks to address this gap by examining issues of space, text, performativity, gender, and becoming. The following section details the theoretical frameworks, the methodology and the methods utilised in the research.
6. Theoretical Frameworks

Philosophers of science have repeatedly demonstrated that more than one theoretical construction can always be placed upon a given collection of data. (Kuhn, 1970, cited in Anfara & Mertz, 2006b, p.190)

A researcher’s interpretive and theoretical framework is both foundational and central to a qualitative research project, framing and shaping the research questions and providing a lens through which to view and interpret the data. Metaphorically, theoretical frameworks have been described as a “roadmap” (Kearney & Hyle, 2006) a “sieve” (Fowler, 2006), and the “reconstruction of a broken mirror” (Lugg, 2006).

This chapter outlines the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the research. To answer the question “how does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times”, I utilised the post-humanist and critical philosophical theories and concepts of Deleuze (1983; 1992, 1994 [2012]) and Deleuze and Guattari (1977; 1987 [2012]), Butler (1990, 2004) and Foucault (1977). Deleuze and Guattari’s “post-humanist” theories of embodiment, materiality and affect foreground the non-human and often non-intentional nature of power relations between bodies and things.

As mentioned previously, these theorists can be illuminative when exploring gender, text and performativity in senior secondary drama classrooms because they conceptualise gender as an embodied process of becoming; not a fixed point of subjectivity, that is an effect of a number of different desires and forces that interact in a society of control. Adolescent students are at an age where they are typically negotiating issues of identity and becoming and the embodiment of roles and characters in the drama classroom at this time has the power to transform them. The physicalisation of “the other” on the body can be a liberating experience for young actors (Boal, 1995). My aim was to map this process of becoming in a way that was sensitive to multiplicity. It is my experience that drama can attract and encourage heterogeneous manifestations of gendered subjectivity; therefore, I sought a theoretical foundation for an exploration of identity that conceived it as both complex and multiple. Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the rhizome provided that philosophical capstone.
Deleuze and Guattari

In the introduction to *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari outline one of the pivotal concepts of their philosophy — the *rhizome* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012]). A rhizome (a continuously growing underground plant stem that puts out lateral shoots and adventitious roots at intervals) according to Deleuze and Guattari, is an “acentered, non-hierarchical, non-signifying system”, a multiplicity (p. 23). Multiplicities can be understood as neither subject nor object, only magnitudes and dimensions that cannot increase in number without changing in nature. For example, temperature is a multiplicity because any change in number produces different effects, or qualitative differences. Likewise gender can be seen as a multiplicity because any change in the many domains defining gender such as biology, expression, and preferences produces different *affects*, or qualitative differences. Rhizomes are *multiple* multiplicities with no structure.

The concept of the rhizome is useful when exploring becoming in drama classrooms because it allows the researcher to approach the data in ways that account for heterogeneity and interconnectedness in a manner that does not privilege one sensitising concept over another. It helps me to question
hierarchies and binaries and provides me with a way to see how becomings can be multiple and interrelated. Deleuze and Guattari contrast an arborescent system of thought (based on the tree structure) with rhizomatic thought (rhizomes — bulbs and tubers). A tree has a trunk and branches reaching into the sky. Arborescent systems are “hierarchical systems with centres of significance and subjectification, central automata-like organised memories” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 18). Thinking, they argue, has historically been imagined arborescently — based on hierarchies and categorisations. Much of western philosophy has stemmed from this model, including our theories of child development, which present a beginning or trunk (the child) and a desired end (the adult) at the top of the “tree”. They argue that a tree is rooted and logical whereas bulbs and tubers appear to have no logic at all because they have no top or bottom, no beginning or end. Deleuze and Guattari explain that the rhizome has the following principles: connection, heterogeneity, multiplicity, asignifying rupture, cartography and decalcomania (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], pp. 6-16). Thus any section can be connected to any other; it can be broken off at any point but it will always start up again; and it is an open system that one can enter or exit at any point in the system.

What these six characteristics allowed me to see is that the rhizome is not merely an object but an immanent process that allows us to question hierarchical organisation. In the same way a student’s identity is not an object but an immanent process of becoming. The rhizome’s emphasis is not on what is or what was, but what is becoming. For Deleuze and Guattari, becoming is a state of transition or movement between one state and another. Becoming is like a rhizome in that it has no beginning or end, it is always in the middle.

Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of the rhizome also allows researchers to move beyond a “rational” approach to knowledge. To think rhizomatically is to abandon beginnings and endings, tops and bottoms because rhizomes are “always in the middle, between things, interbeing, intermezzo” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987 [2012], p. 27). Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts provide a path for me to think creatively and dynamically where things are not either “this” or “that” but always “and and and …”. In the context of drama education thinking rhizomatically allows the researcher to see how the embodiment of certain characters can be liberating and limiting and life-changing and terrifying and …

Interpreting texts and characters physically can be both an empowering (potentia) and constraining (potestas) force for adolescent drama students. Deleuze discusses power using two French terms: puissance and pouvoir. Puissance is immanent power, potentia — the power to act rather than the power to dominate another. Pouvoir is a transcendent power of a superior over an inferior — potestas, implying dominion, control and mastery. Likewise, embodying characters from texts can be a constraining force for students through imposing hegemonic gender norms on young people’s bodies, and it can also create lines of flight from those same norms. Deleuze and Guattari write:

The question is fundamentally that of the body — the body they steal from us in order to fabricate opposable organisms. This body is first stolen from the girl: Stop behaving like that, you’re not a little girl anymore, you’re not a tomboy, etc. the girl’s becoming is stolen first, in order to impose a history, or prehistory upon her. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], pp. 304-305)
Deleuze and Guattari note that becoming is a process, not a point of subjectivity that is divorced from the temporality of the body. They also highlight that a girl’s body is stolen from her by hegemonic conceptions of masculinity and femininity. By embodying powerful characters in the drama classroom girls (and boys) have the opportunity to try on heterogeneous conceptions of masculinity and femininity, thus drama provides a line of flight from the normative gender territoires (normative strata). For Deleuze and Guattari, lines of flight are deterritorialisations that do not stop but branch out and produce rhizomatic connections (multiplicities). Deterritorialisation describes a process whereby the flow of energy escapes or momentarily moves outside the normative strata, and reterritorialisation describes the process of recuperation from those ruptures (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360). They write: “Deterritorialization must be thought of as a perfectly positive power that has degrees and thresholds (epistrata), is always relative, and has reterritorialisation as its flipside or complement” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 60).

Building upon Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptual foundations, I sought to examine how both the students and the teachers construct, re-construct or resist heteronormative, hypersexualised femininity (McRobbie’s post feminist masquerade) and hypermasculinised masculinity in the drama classroom (McRobbie, 2009; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose, 2013) — or as one teacher named them, the “grrr heterosexual dudes” and the “princess girls” (Claire, Clemency Catholic College). The research combined Deleuze & Guattari’s (1972 [2009]) concepts of “territorialisation” (acquiescence), “deterritorialisation” (resistance) and “reterritorialisation” (capitulation) in the context of “societies of control” (contemporary capitalism), and Butler’s (2004) concept of gender performativity (the unconscious “performance” of hegemonic gender binaries). The drama space, if it is a free or smooth space that allows heterogeneity, is the ideal space for adolescents to perform multiple gendered identities.

Deleuze and Guattari distinguish between two kinds of spaces: smooth space and striated space. This distinction coincides with the distinctions they draw between the nomadic and the sedentary, between the space of the war machine and the space of the state apparatus. Smooth space (or nomad space) is essentially heterogeneous, associated with free action and “always possesses a greater power of deterritorialisation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 530). Striated space is homogenous and is associated with work and capitalism (1987 [2012], pp. 523-551). A nomad is the “deterritorialized par excellence” (p. 421). Nomad thought rejects the “universal thinking subject” and does not ground itself in an all-encompassing totality” (p. 420). Even from the very first interviews, participants frequently spoke of the drama space as a “safe space” for students to try on various forms of gendered identities. Boys felt free to wear high-heels, wigs and dresses and girls felt free to be more “masculine” or “powerful”. Combined with Butler’s understanding of gender as a performance, Deleuze and Guattari’s vivid conceptual ideas about space, rhizomes, becoming, assemblages and the disruption of hegemonic social relations provided a powerful theoretical framework for this research.

Deleuze and Guattari are seen as offering significant theoretical resources for thinking that is “post-signification”, in that their work takes goes beyond analysing discourse and takes into consideration materiality, embodiment and affect (Ringrose, 2013). Their “post-human” theories foreground the non-human,
machinic and often unintentional nature of forces between bodies and things — labelled the “affective turn” in the social sciences where the new “configuration of bodies, technology and matter” requires new modes of thinking. Post-humanist theories displace the traditional humanistic unity of the subject (Ringrose, 2013). Rather than perceiving this situation as a loss of cognitive and moral self-mastery, Braidotti argues that the post-human helps us make sense of our flexible and multiple identities (Braidotti, 2013). This is important when exploring student and teacher becomings in the drama classroom because it takes into consideration the configuration of bodies, texts, and neoliberal educational assemblages. According to Haraway, whose “cyborg politics” contrasts identity with “otherness, difference, and specificity”, “there is nothing about being female that naturally binds women together into a unified category. There is not even such a state as “being” female, itself a highly complex category constructed in contested sexual scientific discourses and other social practices” (Haraway, 1991, p. 155). Thus, a post-humanist conceptualisation of subjectivity allows us to map flexible and multiple identities when exploring becomings in the drama classroom.

As mentioned in the Literature Review, Deleuze and Guattari call their anti-psychiatry model schizoanalysis. This can be represented by four circular components that bud and form rhizomes (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 162). Deleuze and Guattari’s revolutionary schizoanalysis or “materialist psychiatry” is contrasted to psychoanalysis, particularly Freud’s theory of the Oedipus complex. Schizoanalysis, on the other hand, “treats the unconscious as an acentered system, a rhizome, and thus arrives at an entirely different state of the unconscious” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 19). This is useful when exploring adolescent becomings because it focuses on desire and affect rather than on lack. Rather than seeing social oppression as a product of the nuclear family; schizoanalysis reverses the direction of causality making psychic repression depend on social oppression:

The task of schizoanalysis is that of tirelessly taking apart egos and their presuppositions: liberating the prepersonal singularities they enclose and repress; mobilizing the flows … Schizoanalysis is so named because throughout its entire process of treatment it schizophrenizes, instead of neuroticizing like psychoanalysis. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972 [2009], p. 362)

Desire for Deleuze and Guattari is not an imaginary force based on lack as in the Oedipus complex. It is a productive force that is mechanic in nature – a kind of desiring machine that produces a flow of desire from itself. For Deleuze and Guattari desire is not a “lack in a Lacanian sense”, but “is generative and seeking, resulting in the production of privilege, power, and voice” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 91). Desiring machines are connected to the social machines. Affect describes the forces behind all forms of social production in the contemporary world. It is an ability to affect and be affected, a pre-personal intensity corresponding to an encounter between one affected body and another (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. xvii). Massumi (2005) suggests that an imagined threat in the future causes embodied fear in the present (from the virtual to the actual). Therefore, when analysing affect (such as fear), one’s methodology must take into account affect and its immanent dynamism. He states that there is, “a kind of simultaneity between the quasi-cause and its effect, even though they belong to different times” (2005, p. 36).
Adolescent becomings are produced through the flow of desire and affect between assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972 [2009], p. 2). The charge then becomes not to define desire, but to understand the interests that produce desire, and the interests that desire seeks to produce and/or protect — in short to ask “how does it work?” How does desire function to create/maintain/produce gendered becomings and neoliberal assemblages? Assemblages, as conceived of by Deleuze and Guattari, are complex constellations of objects, bodies, expressions, qualities, and territories that come together for varying periods of time to ideally create new ways of functioning. Assemblages operate through desire as abstract machines” (Parr, 2010, p. 18).

According to Deleuze and Guattari desire is assembled and moulded over time through our experiences and interactions: “Desire has nothing to do with a natural or spontaneous determination; there is no desire but assembling, assembled, desire” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 440). We discover what we want, how to get it, how to maintain it, and what it means through the act of connection. Teachers and students learn to survive and/or thrive in neoliberal educational assemblages because they have connected their desires with those of others in the production of new becomings. As Colebrook notes:

Desire begins from connection: life strives to preserve and enhance itself and does so by connecting with other desires. These connections and productions eventually form social wholes; when bodies connect with other bodies to enhance their power they eventually form communities or societies. (p. 91)

I utilised the post-humanist theoretical frameworks of Deleuze & Guattari to map how teachers and students responded to hegemonic constructions of masculinity and femininity. Similarly, Jessica Ringrose (2011) explored young women’s engagements with social networking sites using Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical concepts. She suggests that, “a Deleuzoguattarian analysis offers new theoretical tools for thinking about discursive subjectification but also for mapping complex desire-flows and micro movements through and against discursive/symbolic norms” (2011, p. 598). Utilising Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts can be useful when challenging essentialist discourses on children’s self-identities. As Ohrlander argues, “within dominant discourses, the possibilities of creating something new are there, possibilities which have to do with constructions of subjectivities of agency and creativity, and thus with possibilities of both grasping new and transforming old discourses” (Ohrlander, 2005, p. 270).

Combining Deleuzian concepts with Butler’s poststructural feminism to follow the arborescent and rhizomatic becomings of teachers and students in drama classrooms enabled me to think about how affect flows in the current neoliberal education climate in a way that moves outside analysis of discourse. Kofoed and Ringrose (2012) state that a “Butlerian-Deleuzian-Guattarian” framework “helps us to understand affect as bound in, but not limited to, discursive signification” that helps us to, “understand both fixity and becoming” in young people’s confrontations with power (p. 5). In this research I focused on how teachers and students negotiated traditional heterosexist gender roles found in drama texts in the senior secondary drama curriculum. I mapped how these texts are sometimes transgressed and potentially disrupted by teachers and students, how they embody the roles and how they manoeuvre in the neoliberal assemblage of the secondary school.
Ringrose and Ohrlander join a number of other researchers utilising Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts in the field of education across the globe (Coffey, 2013; Hickey-Moody & Laurie, 2015; Semetsky & Masny, 2013; Thompson & Cook, 2014). Rather than approaching adolescent identity construction as a linear “cause and effect” storyline, Deleuze and Guattari offered me ways of mapping social life and the micropolitics within it which pays careful attention to “affect, desire, and temporality, with an eye toward dynamic flows, multiplicities and moments of becoming” (Henriksen, 2012, p. 437).

**Poststructuralism and Post-humanism**

When researching space, text, performativity, gender and becoming in drama classrooms in our current neoconservative age, it is helpful to utilise methodologies that take into consideration the theories of the “posties” (for example, poststructuralism and post-humanism). This research utilised a poststructural and post-humanist conception of identity derived from Deleuze and Guattari because, “theories influenced by the posties are key in moving us from the unified, conscious, rational subject of humanism (think Paulo Freire) to the post-humanist, split, desiring subject (think Jacques Lacan)” (Lather, 2012b, p. 1024). This “post” move entails a shift from positive epistemology to a focus on the limits of our knowing, with an emphasis on the affective turn. Furthermore, Lather states that: “Under conditions of conservative neo-liberalism, the fluid, post-subject is necessary in moving toward something in excess of meaning, signification, representation, narration, something not containable. Something that attends to how affective capacities are modulated, manipulated as quasi-causality” (2012, p. 1024). This research specifically utilised the post-humanist philosophical theories of Butler (Butler, 1990, 2004) and Deleuze and Guatttari (1972 [2009], 1983 [2006], 1987, 1992, 1994 [2012]).

Poststructuralism and post-humanism destabilise and redefine the humanist concept of “self”, “identity” and “development”, which is why it is cogent for my exploration of adolescent becomings in the drama classroom. Sampson (1989, pp. 15-16) outlines the difference between the humanist and poststructuralist/post-humanist concept of self:

The concept of the self as integrated, and the valuing of that concept, flow from and participate in the Western world view. The ego as master in its own household, seeking to integrate the competing demands it faces and being successful to the extent that it achieves unified wholeness, has its parallels in theories of governance and of authority within the Western world.

He then goes on to point to a post-humanist, post-structuralist alternative view of self:

The alternative, more Derridian, view would give us a subject who is multi-dimensional and without centre or hierarchical integration. It would give us a process and a paradox, but never a beginning or an end.

When researching gender, text and performativity in drama classrooms it is helpful to utilise the concept of the post-human subject who is “multidimensional and without centre or hierarchical integration”. Thus a
The post-human concept of the decentred self is contrasted to the Cartesian ideal of the autonomous ego, which is “master in its own household”. Wolfe (2010) further elucidates the post-human as a linking of the human with its nonhuman others including animals, machines, objects, systems and settings — an idea she calls “postanthropocentrism”.

Twenty First Century post-humanism has evolved from its anti-humanism forbearers. Twentieth Century poststructuralist thinkers such as Lacan, Barthes, Lyotard, Derrida and Foucault have been labelled anti-humanist (Braidotti 2013; Willmott 2010) as a result of their rejection of the significance of the subject and universalist ideas such as “human reason,” “human nature,” “man,” or “humanity”. As Willmott (1989) notes:

Anti-humanism effectively denies the presence and significance of the subject in the reproduction of social structures. Post-humanism, in contrast, decentres the subject without erasing its key importance and capacity to transform these structures, but not as a unified subject. Post-humanism allows that subjects are positioned and constituted within diverse discourses (p. 100).

The post-human subject is an interaction of bodies, machines, discourses and effects in the social field of advanced global capitalism.

Drama teachers and students embody a multitude of identities in a culture of performative neoliberalism where education, the environment and human beings are commodities. If research is to question the common sense notions of neoliberalism and the taken-for-grantedness of global capitalism, then it must take into account this neoliberal subject/consumer. This post-subject drama teacher or student is one who conforms to the shifting requirements of capitalism and blames herself for not matching up to its standards. As Lather states, “we are the fish who live in this water” (Lather, 2012, p. 1022).

Advanced global capitalism links humans with technology and biotechnology in an ever changing yet homologised system of commodification. Braidotti (2013) asserts that advanced capitalism appears to be faster in grasping the potential of the post-human. She asserts that capitalism excels at embracing both the “cognitive” aspects of new media technology as well as the biological extension provided by biotechnology, the life sciences and bioinformatics, which means that “contemporary bio-genetic capitalism generates a global form of reactive mutual inter-dependence of all living organisms, including non-humans” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 49). The “post-human predicament” for Braidotti, requires that humans embrace the risk of living beyond the traditional humanist limitations and becoming-other-than-human. Braidotti’s theory has been labelled “critical post-humanism” alongside other theorists such as Wolfe (2010), and a “feminist posthumanist” (Herbrechter, 2013) because their writings are political projects. Their writings are grounded in lived experience of difference, with a focus on embodiment and materiality. As Braidotti states: “The post-human condition urges us to think critically and creatively about who and what we are actually in the process of becoming” (Braidotti 2013, p. 12). It is to this charge that this research project seeks to respond by examining the becomings of teachers and students in the both creative and performative neoliberal space of the drama classroom.

Because power is explicitly addressed in critical, post-humanist research, it examines power on the micro and macro level in education. Much has been
written about how neoliberal discourses have become “common sense” in Western education assemblages (Apple, 2005; Giroux, 2008; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013), and this research serves to illuminate how these common sense policies and practices play out when they manifest in everyday educational contexts — how they “hit the ground” at the local level. Moreover, this research sheds light into how the effects of neoliberalism and heterosexual male hegemony are embodied in the teachers’ and students’ experiences of disempowerment and marginalisation.

Postmodern approaches have brought into question the certainty of epistemological realism, i.e. that a “truth” out there can be known. Philosophers who have been labelled poststructuralists (such as Derrida, Foucault, Butler and Lacan) reject structural universalisms and simple binary oppositions (such as male/female, signifier/signified). Instead they emphasise how discourse constructs complex power relations. However, postmodern approaches such as poststructuralism have been criticised for eliminating the potential for agency and social change because they reject modernist interpretations of a stable subjectivity. Nevertheless, the main objective of this chapter is to show that critical, post-humanist and Deleuzian schizoanalysis can open up new ways of conceiving of identity that leads to new approaches to resisting hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity in the current neo-liberal educational assemblage. Rather than presenting a coherent theoretical framework, I draw on different theoretical concepts as if from a “tool box”. As Deleuze suggests when using their work, “the only question is, ‘Does it work and how does it work? How does it work for you’” (in Poxon & Stivale, 2005, p.73).
**Critical theory**

Critical theory has long been regarded as an effective paradigm or lens through which to conduct qualitative educational research because it aims to disrupt and challenge the status quo (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1998) and emancipate “individuals and groups by disrupting dominant discourses and understanding the field of social power [in] which they operate” (Apple, 2004, p. 14). Critical theory analyses power by questioning who benefits and who loses in any society. In a similar manner, postcritical researchers “study issues of power and systemic inequities, practice recursive reflexivity in their work, represent their research in layered ways, and trouble static representations of culture, and claims of objectivity” (Anders, 2012, p. 100; Noblit, 2004). This is relevant when researching teachers and drama students and how they operate in our current neoliberal climate. My research maps how the so-called “opportunities” of neoliberalism have “trickled down” into the daily lives of teachers and students in schools in the 21st century. As Nef and Robles (2000) note, according to its proponents neoliberal unregulated markets are “the best way to increase economic growth, which will benefit everyone: “supply side” economics would produce “trickle down,” however, as they later warn: “In the last analysis, the only possible outcome is the maintenance of an inequitable socioeconomic order” (pp. 38-39). Accordingly, this research sought to bear witness to the effects of neoliberal education reforms on the individual lives of teachers and students in Western Australian drama classrooms.

Researchers who adopt a critical paradigm approach knowledge from a transactional or subjectivist position, meaning that knowledge is created by inquiry through a dynamic interaction between the investigator and the investigated (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Importantly, findings are value mediated. Critical theory asserts that knowledge is socially constructed, is produced by power and consequently what appears to be “common sense” is merely an expression of power rather than truth. Critical theory and research aims to emancipate individuals and groups (such as teachers and drama students) by disrupting dominant discourses and “understanding the field of social power [in] which they operate” (Apple, 2004, p.14).

Critical theory has traditionally been associated with modernist social justice movements such as feminism and Marxism, which are premised on the notion of unified subjects (such as women and the proletariat) who engage in struggles against their oppressors (men and the bourgeoisie) (see for example: Greer, 1970; Marx & Engels, 1848/2011). For Deleuze and Guattari a “desiring subject” is not a “rational humanist subject” but rather a “subject group” — thus subjectivity is not “located solely within the individual, but rather is assembled, performed and constructed” with “each experience, each telling, each desiring” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 93). In 21st century capitalism, the “oppressor” is not merely an outside power or force, but a desire that comes from within, as our values and desires are shaped by neoliberal market-driven discourses and

---

4 'Trickle-down economics’ is a populist political term used to characterize economic policies that favour the wealthy. Political satirist Will Rogers famously joked that in the Great Depression “The money was all appropriated for the top in the hopes that it would trickle down to the needy…Give it to the people at the bottom and the people at the top will have it before night anyhow” (Rogers, 1932, p. 184).
competitive ideologies. Managerial discourses have saturated educational assemblages and even drama classrooms and curricula.

Researchers who adopt a critical paradigm approach knowledge from a transactional or subjectivist position, meaning that knowledge is created by inquiry through a dynamic interaction between the investigator and the investigated (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Importantly, findings are value mediated. Epistemologically, critical researchers assume that knowledge is socially constructed through the media, institutions and society, and therefore “what counts as worthwhile knowledge is determined by the social and positional power of the advocates of that knowledge” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 27).

Unlike the positivist researcher, who believes that truth can be obtained because knowledge rests on indisputable truths, the critical researcher believes that knowledge is produced by power and is an expression of power rather than truth (Mack, 2010).

For example, in the UK in 2012, we saw the narrow focus on core English Baccalaureate subjects putting the arts at risk because of the withdrawal of subjects that did not fit into, “a core of academic subjects: English, maths, history or geography, the sciences and a language” (Greevy, Knox, Nunney, & Pye, 2012, p. 10). The situation is similarly dire in Australia with the new conservative government cutting $110 million from Arts funding in its first year in office (Westwood, 2014). Likewise, in this study many participants reported that their schools did not place much importance on the arts.

Critical theory is useful for understanding the multiple and contradictory discourses which shape teachers, students and the social world they inhabit. This was germane to my research into gender, text and performativity in drama classrooms where the body is central to the process of inquiry and constitutes a mode of knowing (Bresler, 2004). This meant that I had to take into account the effects that physicalizing dramatic characters had on participants.

The theoretical frameworks, outlined previously, represent the epistemological foundations that underpin my understanding of how teachers and students engage with drama texts in neoconservative, neoliberal educational assemblages. As Madison (2005) notes, philosophical concepts enable researchers to make sense of the data, particularly when participants seem to be acting against their own best interests. For example, when looking at the data, I ask, “What is happening? How are these teachers and students becoming? What are the motivations that stem from intersecting desires/forces/drives/intensities that produce this action?”

**Post-humanist Feminism**

This research is also underscored by a (post-humanist) feminist positionality. The feminist project is as heterogeneous as its proponents. The feminist perspective utilized in this study to examine how gendered identity is constructed in the drama classroom is framed by a broad definition of feminism that aims to identify, resist and challenge restrictive patriarchal power relationships. Feminism aims to give voice to women’s experiences and to problematize the social roles girls and women are expected to take. Feminist methodology takes the lives of women as central and addresses the ways in
which women have been excluded, either intentionally or unintentionally from public life. Feminism is thus a critical project in that it critiques the status quo or the canon of literature. Poststructuralism has had a profound impact on feminism as it challenges the “identity politics” and cohesion of groups such as “women” (Skelton & Francis, 2005, p. 5). Post-humanist feminism utilizes insights from poststructuralist thought and emphasizes “the contingent and discursive nature of all identities” (Randall, 2010, p. 114) and the social construction of gendered subjectivities.

As Simone de Beauvoir famously said, “One is not born, but rather becomes, woman” (1949 [1998 trans], p. 293). Poststructuralist theory asserts that there is no absolute truth and that all identities are transient and relative (Gavey, 1989). Hence, the self is understood and performed differently depending upon the discursive environment (Butler, 2004; Francis, 2002). Poststructuralism theorises that “the subject” is constructed through discourse and is essentially non-unitary, embodied, and is both more and less than “essentially rational” (Davies, 2006, 2012; Hey, 2006; Vick & Martinez, 2011). Thus, my approach to gender is that it is a social construct and not an essentialist one (such as: women are essentially emotional, and men are essentially rational).

My feminist perspective is framed by a broad definition of feminism that aims to identify, resist and challenge restrictive patriarchal power relationships. Feminism aims to give voice to women’s experiences and to problematize the social roles girls and women are expected to take. Feminist methodology takes the lives of women as central and addresses the ways in which women have been excluded, either intentionally or unintentionally from public life. Feminism is thus a critical project in that it critiques the status quo or the canon of literature. Poststructuralism has had a profound impact on feminism as it challenges the “identity politics” and cohesion of groups such as “women” (Skelton & Francis, 2005, p. 5). Poststructuralist feminism utilizes insights from poststructuralist thought and emphasizes “the contingent and discursive nature of all identities” (Randall, 2010), and the social construction of gendered subjectivities.

Feminist post-humanism provides an invigorating interpretive framework from which to conduct inquiries. From this perspective, the identities of individuals, such as teachers and students, are not fixed entities, but rather “an unfinished project, swarmed upon by a variety of competing discourses” (Sowell, 2004, p. viii). From a post-structuralist perspective, teachers and students’ individual identities are not constituted through their own agency but through discourse located in particular historical and cultural contexts. As Davies (2012) notes, “We are often unaware of the way discourse works through us to create us in predictable, historically specific ways” (p. ii).

The post-humanist feminist position adopted for this research assumes a non-unitary, post-human subject that is multiple, embodied and becoming. It is a liberatory feminism that is based on the notion of the enfleshed desiring subject. Because it adopts Deleuze’s notion of multiplicity and the dispersion of sexed identities, this approach differs from Irigaray’s notion of sexual difference — her “virtual feminine” that affirms a new female subjectivity. Like Wittig’s materialist feminism that welcomes Deleuze’s notion of multiplicity the project’s theoretical lens rejects binary and heteronormative systems of thought. Despite their differences, Irigaray, Deleuze, Guattari and Wittig all place emphasis on the embedded and embodied nature of the subject through the notion of radical
immanence, and it is this aspect of their work borrowed for this project. However, this research aligns most closely to the post-humanist feminism of Rosi Braidoti, who in turn engages with the work of Deleuze and Irigaray. Braidoti describes her own feminism as: a “feminism as a political and ethical feminism” where “the feminist subject-position is not a given, but a project” (Braidotti, 2002, p. 61).

Braidotti’s feminist post-humanism is useful for mapping becomings in the drama classroom because it allows the research to make sense of students and teachers’ flexible and multiple identities. I have borrowed from Braidoti’s theoretical approach because it unites critical theory, post-humanism and imagination, calling for conceptual creativity and risk-taking as a way of thought. Her concept of the non-unitary, nomadic subject is the prerequisite for my understanding of teachers and students’ becomings. Sexual difference as affirming the principle of “not-one” at the core of subjectivity remains for Braidoti a relevant starting-point in the process of nomadic becomings. As Braidotti states:

My political passion lies with positive metamorphoses the kinds that destabilize dominant power-relations, deterritorialised Majority-based identities and values and infuse a joyful sense of empowerment into subjects bent on becoming … I have argued that philosophical nomadism is not a heterogeneous brand of monism but the actualisation of multiple differences… Rhizomatic or nomadic philosophy constitutes an anti-essentialist brand of nomadism that stresses radical immanence, or the bodily roots of subjectivity. (2002, p. 265)

Philosophical frameworks and theories enable researchers to interpret what they discover in the field: “to discover and describe the way things are in the world” (Connell, 2011, p. 5). Moreover, utilising different interpretive frameworks, such as post-humanism and critical theory, allowed the research to have greater breadth of analysis of the situation studied (Mills & Bettis, 2006). I found that in this research utilising a pluralistic methodology allowed me to examine issues of power as well as becoming in senior secondary drama classrooms.

**Mixing Different Interpretive and Theoretical Frameworks**

To borrow from critical theory and yet remain within a post-humanist/poststructuralist, feminist paradigm can be both problematic and illuminating. Critical pedagogy continues earlier traditions of progressive, radical, liberation and emancipatory pedagogies, whose roots lie in modernist thinking (Bowers, 1993). Poststructuralism, however, challenges modernist notions of freedom, history and progress, rationality and subjectivity. Yet poststructuralism has made an important contribution to critical theories of education over the last two decades particularly with regard to the analysis of oppression, privilege and power in education (Bell & Russell, 2000). According to Bell & Russell, poststructuralism and critical theory are both movements against oppression that “need to be aware of and support each other”, and that both are useful “in our efforts to come to terms with dominant assumptions about education” (2000, pp. 188-189). Both critical theorists and poststructuralists alike have challenged the societal discourses of domination that underlie racism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism. Thompson & Harbaugh (2012) use the term “bricolage,” and argue
that there is a need to mix and use the paradigms because they each offer something different. Given their different foci, both critical theory and poststructuralism stand to enrich this research project by offering different insights into the central phenomenon. As Anfara & Mertz note, “qualitative forms of inquiry demand that theory (i.e., theoretical frameworks) be used with imagination and flexibility” (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. 195).

In conclusion, in order to answer the research question, how does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? I used the philosophical theories and concepts of Butler (1990, 2004), Deleuze & Guattari (1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]), Foucault (1977) and Ball (2003). These authors’ powerful conceptual ideas about gender, becoming, performativity and the acquiescence to or disruption of hegemonic social relations helped me to develop a theoretical framework for my research. Thus, building upon these authors’ work, I decided to examine how both the students and teachers construct, re-construct or resist heteronormative hypersexualised femininity and masculinity in the drama classroom. This study primarily utilised Deleuze & Guattari’s (1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]) concepts of becoming, rhizomes, “deteriorialisation” (resistance) and “reterritorialisation” (capitulation) in the context of “societies of control” (contemporary capitalism), and Butler’s (2004) concept of gender performativity (the unconscious “performance” of hegemonic gender binaries). In order to shed light on the current neoliberal education milieu I borrowed from Foucault’s (1977) concept of governmentality and Ball’s (2003) understanding of competitive performativity. This theoretical framework provided both the foundation to the building of the research and the lens through which to interpret the results.
7. Methodology

The method of inquiry and rationale

To answer the research question: how does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? The research methodology that best served my purposes was a qualitative, critical ethnographic case study approach. As Connell (2011) notes, in our neoliberal age of austerity, shifting discourses and continuing gender inequality qualitative research “has to be empirical; it tries to discover and describe the way things are in the world” (p. 5). She also highlights the fact that although quantitative research has “distributive insight” it does not clarify what lies behind the statistical distributions. To answer the research question, a qualitative research method was most appropriate because I was exploring an issue and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon. The data consisted of participants’ views and experiences generated as text data that will require thematic data analysis, and the approach to inquiries was subjective (Creswell, 2012, p. 26). Given the critical and transformative nature of my inquiry (which emanated from my transformative, critical post-humanist feminist paradigm [see Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006, p. 196]), a qualitative methodology was the best approach for “discovering and describing the way things are in the world” (Connell, 2011, p. 5).

I decided against using a quantitative methodology because quantitative research methods are useful when seeking to collect “specific, narrow, measurable and observable” data to answer narrow research questions, and “taking an objective, unbiased approach” (Creswell, 2012, p. 26), whereas my research was more of a subjective exploration of a phenomenon. The quantitative researcher “collects numeric (numbered) data from participants, analyses these numbers using statistics” (Creswell, 2012, p. 39). Quantitative research was appropriate for “describing trends and explaining the relationship among variables found in the literature” (Creswell, 2012, p. 626). Quantitative research designs would not fulfil my research aims.

Because I was analysing becomings and examples of students and teachers using performativity to territorialise, deterritorialise and reterritorialise hegemonic constructions of femininity, the methodological approaches I chose to utilize elements of for my thesis were collective case studies and the critical ethnography. Broadly speaking, ethnography “is that form of inquiry and writing that produces descriptions and accounts about the ways of life of the writer and those written about” (Denzin, 1997, p xi). A critical ethnography is an “ethnographic project read through the lens of and informed by critical theory” (Giardina & Newman, 2011, p. 531). Autoethnography is a “turning of the ethnographic gaze inwards on the self (auto), while maintaining the outward gaze of ethnography, looking at the larger context wherein self experiences occur” (Denzin, 1997, p. 228). When combined this is sometimes called an ethnographic case study approach (Gallant, 2008).
Critical Ethnography and Autoethnography

This research contains *elements* of ethnographic and autoethnographic methodologies because, although I am not elaborating elements of our present culture (for example, I was not doing a study of how the media constructs femininity), I explored how students who have recently completed their year 12 drama course interact with the current hegemonic culture. I also examined how the teachers’ beliefs, behaviours and language interacted with that culture. However, the research is not ethnographic in the traditional sense in that I am not “describing, analysing and interpreting a cultural group’s shared patterns of behaviour, beliefs, and language that develop over time” (Creswell, 2012, p. 620).

Because this research study is framed by a critical, post-humanist lens which focuses on identifying, resisting and challenging restrictive patriarchal power relations, one of the aims of the research is to explore the discourses and processes that restrict the freedom of choice of the students and teachers in the study, and the ways that students and teachers take up, reject, resist and challenge them. Power is developed through dominant discourses and performative processes and therefore can be challenged through identifying, analysing and disrupting power relations that are often seen as inevitable and natural (Adams St Pierre, 2000). As Creswell (2012) notes:

> Critical ethnographies are a type of ethnographic research in which the author is interested in advocating for the emancipation of groups marginalised in our society. Critical researchers are typically politically minded individuals who seek, through their research, to advocate against inequality and domination. (p. 467)

My rationale for choosing to utilise aspects of this methodological approach is because the research has a “value-laden orientation”, it is concerned with “empowering young people”, “challenging the status quo”, and disrupting “power and control” (Creswell, 2012, p. 467). As researchers, using elements of an ethnographic approach and a postcritical, feminist paradigm has allowed us to examine societal issues of power, hegemony, dominance, and inequality from an openly subjective perspective. Although this means that this research was not “value free”, as Walter (2010) notes,

> Social scientists are embedded members of society too, and the non-acknowledgement of personal and/or social and institutional values in the research does not equate to value-free or objective research. Rather, social research is about the real world in which moral, political and cultural values are central to the things we examine. Therefore being value free is impossible, and those who say this are kidding themselves or disingenuous. (p. 16)

Critical researchers are reflexive and acknowledge their biases (Creswell, 2012, p. 467). My critical post-humanist feminist paradigm, or axiological standpoint, explores the relationship between knowledge and power from the perspective of a socially constituted knowing self, as opposed to an individualised stable, Cartesian, knowing self (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). Thus my knowledge is partial, situated and embodied. This feminist epistemology stands
in direct opposition to the modern, foundationalist project or scientific method that seeks direct connections between knowledge and reality. As Foley (2002) notes:

> Whatever their differences, most autoethnographers are openly subjective. They seek to undermine the grandiose authorial claims of speaking in a rational, value-free, objective, universalizing voice. From this perspective, the author is a living contradictory, vulnerable, evolving multiple self, who speaks in a partial, subjective, culture-bound voice. (p. 474)

This critique allowed me to trouble the claim to authority that can implicitly be made through the process of research. It also reminded me to continually ask the question, “How might the data be interpreted differently?” Recursive reflexivity serves as a reminder that this research was merely a representation of my situated ethnographic experiences and positionality as both a researcher and an arts teacher. It is not, therefore, an “objective” account of drama education in Western Australia; however, it does shed light on the structures that reinforce and reify systemic inequalities and hegemonic gender constructions. Next, I will discuss case study design.

**Case Study Design**

According to Creswell (2012), the case study is a form of ethnographic research. In Creswell’s glossary of terms, he defines a case study as: “a variation of an ethnography in that the researcher provides an in-depth exploration of a bounded system (e.g., an activity, an event, a process, or an individual) based on extensive data collection” (2012, p. 617). An ethnographic case study is, “a case analysis of a person, event, activity, or process set within a cultural perspective” (Creswell, 2012, p. 464). The cases I examined were the teachers and students, the processes were the use of performativity to deterritorialise and reterritorialise hegemonic gender constructions, and the cultural perspective was the 21st century year-12 drama class in Western Australia (which incorporated contextual issues such as neo-liberalism and cultural capitalism: Deleuze’s “society of control”).

Case study research allows for a contemporary examination of a phenomenon within real-life contexts (Creswell, 2012). Through varied data collection procedures, case study researchers emphasise the importance of individuals’ (such as the teachers’) lived experiences, perspectives and relationships (Creswell, 2012; Tripp, 1994). I examined the roles in the plays available on the ATAR text list, which texts teachers were using and why. I found examples of the occurrence of students and teachers using performativity to disrupt or acquiesce to hegemonic gender constructions through an analysis of field observations, interviews, and document analysis. The case study approach that I utilised was consistent with Stake’s (2000) definition of a collective case study where the researcher studies several cases in order to investigate a phenomenon. I then presented the interview data in the form of quotes from the teachers and students (which represented cases of becoming and disrupting or acquiescing to hegemonic constructions of gender). According to Stake, the purpose of narrative case studies is to “describe the cases in sufficient descriptive narrative detail so that readers can vicariously experience these happenings and draw conclusions (which may differ from those of the
researchers)” (Stake, 2000, p. 439). This approach was the most appropriate for this study whose aim was to explore the students’ negotiation of gender performativity and also to provide some insight into how teachers disrupted or acquiesced to hegemonic constructions of gender in the plays found in the set text list in the ATAR course. The expectation was that the study of these cases might lead to a better understanding of a larger collection of cases (Creswell, 2012, Stake, 2000).

Case study research is a value-laden, subjective exercise, particularly as this was a project developed and conducted by a feminist drama teacher. The effect of my personal opinions and positionality as well as the effect of the interplay between the interviewer and the participants on the data collection and analysis was explored. As Tripp (1994) notes:

The one fundamental fact of case study research is that, contrary to some exhortations in the literature, it is simply not possible to tell it as it is; it is only possible to tell it as we see it. (p. 99)

One of the limitations (and strengths) of the research was that because I was a drama teacher interviewing drama teachers, this had an impact on both the teachers’ answers and my perceptions of the phenomenon. All of the participants who were teachers knew that I was also a drama teacher. I did not work at the same schools as they did and I did not have any position of power over them. I worked with most of them as an examiner of the state ATAR exams where I worked alongside them in the same role.
8. Methods

Qualitative research methods were the most suitable for my research because my inquiry was an exploration of people’s lives, experiences and behaviours, and the stories and meanings individuals ascribe to them. As Walter (2010) notes, “qualitative or quantitative methods are not the same as qualitative or quantitative methodologies” (p. 45), although qualitative methods are used within a qualitative methodology. As Denzin & Lincoln (2005) note:

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self… This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3, italics added)

As Mackenzie & Knipe (2006) suggest, “It is the paradigm and research question, which should determine which research data collection methods and analysis methods will be most appropriate” (p.198). The research methods, or tools, required to answer my research questions from a critical post-humanist feminist paradigm, in the context of critical ethnographic case study research, were mostly fieldwork. This consisted of a combination of semi-structured interviews — individual and group (with teachers and students), observations (of schools and classrooms in order to describe a teacher’s context), informal conversations, and documentary materials (diaries, school promotional materials, and curriculum documents such as the ATAR course outline and the set text list). By far the primary method I used to answer my research question was the ethnographic interview, because I was interested in exploring meanings; for example, how teachers and students used performativity to create meaning from characters in a text. As Soyini (2004) asserts, “The ethnographic interview opens realms of meaning that permeate beyond rote information or finding the “truth of the matter”” (p. 25).

The research site/s

Upon the completion of the research project, I had interviewed 15 drama teachers and 13 students. Most of the interviews were conducted at the schools where the teachers or students worked, however, some interviews occurred at cafes or the homes of two teachers. Moreover, I visited all of the schools that the students or teachers attended. The interviews were conducted at a site convenient to the participants, for example: a quiet room at the school of a teacher, a quiet café for one drama student, at Murdoch University, or the house of an post-compulsory drama student when I interviewed a small group of students. My interviews involved talking to one or more participants, where the categories of response were focused but not necessarily pre-determined. The interviews were conducted in locations mutually acceptable to participants and me (The National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, 2007, p. 25). I did not need to enlist a “key informant” for the teachers as I had enough
contacts in the industry to locate 15 drama teachers. However, I did enlist two key informants for students, who invited their friends to participate so that I had students from Catholic, independent and government school systems. The interviews took place over one year and were approximately an hour in length.

Procedure

Data Collection

Specifically, the types of data that I collected to address my research questions were: observations, interviews, and documents. My observations included field notes in a journal collected from my observations of the schools where the teachers worked. The observational field notes included “thick descriptions” of the buildings, activities and people, and reflective field notes, which that included personal thoughts that related to my insights, or broad ideas and themes that emerged during the observations (Creswell, 2012, p. 217).

According to Tracy (2010) thick description is one of the most important means for achieving credibility in qualitative research. She defines “thick description” as: “in-depth illustration that explicates culturally situated meanings and abundant concrete detail” (p. 843; see also Geertz, 1973, and Bochner, 2000).

I conducted unstructured and semi-structured interviews with teachers, audiotaped the interviews and then transcribed them. Likewise, I conducted individual and focus group interviews (where the students were friends) with the young people who had recently completed the ATAR course, audiotaped the interviews and then transcribed them. The documents I collected included a personal journal that I kept during the research study, curriculum materials, and examples of school promotional materials.

Creswell (2012) and Gay, Mills and Airasian (2006) recommend using “clarifying” and “elaborating” probes in qualitative interviewing. For example, if my initial question to one of the students was, “Tell me about the character you played in Cloudstreet, Dolly”, then an elaborating probe would be, “What did you mean when you said ‘Dolly’s a slut’?” A clarifying probe might be, “Did you have to change the way you walked when you played Dolly?”

In addition to audiotaping the interviews I utilized research protocols to record information during the interviews. These data recording protocols are forms used by qualitative researchers to record information in a structured manner (Creswell, 2012, pp. 225-6). The forms contain general information (such as the interviewee’s name, position, date, time, and location), and had nine (for teachers) and 11 (for students) open-ended questions beginning with an icebreaker, or “grand tour” question: “How would you describe your school?” At the end of the form was a reminder to thank the interviewee for their cooperation, and an assurance that their responses would remain confidential. By far the most generative and evocative of the questions was, “Someone once said, “Drama is a safe space for girls to be less girly and boys to be less macho.” What do you think?” This generated the most illuminating discussion among the young people in particular.

The use of a number of methods (including observations, interviewing ex-students and teachers, and document analysis) allows for strong triangulation (Creswell, 2012; Atkinson, Coffey & Delamont, 2003; Hesse-Biber, 2007; Yin,
Triangulation also provided a “rationale for using multiple sources of evidence” (Yin, 1994, p. 91, cited in Hatchell, 2003, p. 118).

**Selection of participants/sampling**

The rigor of a qualitative study should not be judged on sample size. When sampling is appropriate, the objectives and theoretical basis of the research should determine the size of the sample and the sampling strategy. (The National Statement, 2007, p. 27)

Quantitative or statistical research typically seeks to find a statistically representative sample of the population from which it is drawn (Ezzy, 2010, p. 72), whereas qualitative research emphasises the significance of particular contexts and settings and it is not necessary to generalise its results (the National Statement, 2007, p. 27). The sampling strategy I adopted both before and during data collection was purposeful sampling, which aimed at the selection of information-rich cases relevant to my research question (Creswell, 2012, p. 206). I used snowball sampling (where participants identify other participants) as a means of locating young people to interview, who had recently graduated from year 12 and who studied ATAR drama. For example, after interviewing Miranda individually, she invited three of her friends over for a further interview. As mentioned previously, I also interviewed 15 drama teachers, and in the interests of gathering a diverse range of perspectives as with maximal variation sampling (not in the interests of obtaining a representative sample), I interviewed male and female teachers from the independent, Catholic and public school systems, all of whom had marked ATAR exams for SCSA (School Curriculum and Standards Authority). Thus I could guarantee that the teachers I interviewed were experienced drama teachers who had already been recognised as being the best in their field by SCSA, because SCSA employs a rigorous selection process for employing teachers to mark the ATAR exams.

Once the data collection had started I engaged in further “opportunistic sampling” to take advantage of whatever case unfolds (Creswell, 2012, p. 209). For example, when I found the young female participant, Cassie, whose deterritorialisation of hegemonic gender binaries represented a “line of flight” (a Deleuzian term representing a complete break from an accepted cultural norm) or a “performative surprise” (Butler, 2004) and thus would be an interesting critical case, she then introduced me to her friend, Miranda, who subsequently invited her friend, Zac to participate. Critical cases such as Zac (or critical incidents) featured as transcripts under thematic chapter headings, such as “Lines of flight from normative masculinity: deterritorialising hegemonic gender binaries”. In critical sampling some individuals such as Zac represent the central phenomenon (in my case territorialising, deterritorialising or reterritorialising hegemonic gender constructions) in dramatic terms. In studying a critical sample as an exceptional case such as Zac, I learned much about the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2012, p. 208).

**Data analysis**
Analysing qualitative data requires understanding how to make sense of text and images in order to form answers to my research question. In a Deleuzian fashion I was not aiming to seek a “true interpretation” of the data but rather I sought “to make sense, to give a direction” to it (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012, p. 91). According to Creswell (2012, p. 236), analysing and interpreting qualitative data involves: “preparing and organising the data, exploring and coding the database, describing findings and forming themes, representing and reporting findings, interpreting the meaning of the findings, and validating the accuracy of the findings”. Firstly, I organised the transcripts of the interviews into file folders (such as “teacher interviews” and “student interviews”); then utilising NVivo, I stored, classified, sorted and arranged the information, assigning codes in order to search the data. Coding the documents involved identifying text segments, bracketing them, and assigning a code word or phrases that described the meaning of the text segment — such as “power,” “surveillance” and “gender” (Creswell, 2012, p. 244). Once this was done NVivo assisted me to collapse these code labels into a few broad categories, and include evidence for each category. This allowed me to identify major and minor themes, glean insights and develop meaningful conclusions that answered my research questions. The major themes were: drama space, gender performativity, neoliberal performativity, text and becoming.

Once the data had been coded and analysed, I displayed these themes visually, by colour coding them and by using layering, which organised the themes from basic to more sophisticated (Creswell, 2012, p. 252). I was then able to map the interconnect themes and displaying these visually, as shown on the following page:
More than princess girls and “grrr” heterosexual dudes: an exploration of becoming, performativity, gender, text and space in senior secondary drama classrooms.

I also kept a journal when I visited schools, where I wrote a series of narrative descriptions of each school and my initial impressions. The narrative form of data representation was useful for my research because it is able to shape events and observations into a unified story (Tedlock, 2000). The examination and analysis of underlying hegemonic discourses shed light on issues of gender, power relationships and freedom of choice (Francis, 2002).

**Ethical Considerations:**

*How validity and reliability (or trustworthiness and authenticity) was addressed.*

The integrity of any research depends not on its scientific rigour, but also on its ethical adequacy. (Walliman, 2005, p. 355)

Murdoch University’s Responsible Conduct of Research Policy (2012) is compliant with the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* and the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (the National Statement). According to the National Statement ethical adequacy stands upon the principles of merit and integrity:

Unless proposed research has merit, and the researchers who are to carry out the research have integrity, the involvement of human participants in the research cannot be ethically justifiable. (2007, p. 11)

The two aspects of integrity that I had to consider in my thesis were personal integrity and my ethical responsibilities to the participants in my research. Personal integrity includes issues such as intellectual ownership and plagiarism. Citation and acknowledgement must be given to the ideas and work of others (Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2007, 4.6, p. 18). Honesty is essential in the writing, for example, giving accurate descriptions, and not being *too* selective in the choice of data used so that one ignores evidence that is contrary to one’s beliefs. For example, before the study began I viewed the character Lady Macbeth from Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* from my feminist paradigm, in a negative light, and did not see her empowering potentiality for students who embodied her. After interviewing other teachers and the students who took on the role of Lady Macbeth, I was surprised to find that teachers and students found her to be an empowering female role model. I had to ask myself, “How else can I view the data?” Regarding beliefs, Mauthner and Doucet (2008) stress the need in qualitative research to remain reflexive with regard to one’s intertwined ethical, methodological and epistemological processes in order to attain a high degree of “epistemological accountability” (p. 424).

With regard to merit, ethics and the participants in the study, according to the National Statement, the overarching principle is that my research should not cause harm, and preferably it should benefit participants (2007, p. 15). The National Statement states that any potential participants have the right to receive
clearly communicated information from the researcher in advance (p. 16). I received conditional approval (no. 2013/006) from the Murdoch University Research Ethics office on the condition that I sought approval from the Department of Education and the Catholic Education Office and sent my list of indicative questions to the participants. I also had to acquire a Working With Children card; however, I already possessed this being a teacher. I received permission from the Department of Education and the Catholic Education Office to commence data collection and then wrote to all of the Principals of schools I intended to visit. Once this approval was given I contacted potential participants. Participants in this study were given plenty of time to study the information sheet and consult relevant parties because I emailed the information sheets to them weeks before their interview, and they were not pressured to participate in a study. Participants, and third parties (such as the teachers and the principals at their schools) who may have bee affected by the research, gave their informed consent before participating in my research. Other ethical issues such as confidentiality and anonymity, and the collection and storage of research data complied with Murdoch University’s Human Research Ethics Policy (2012).
9. Glossary of Terms

In this thesis I frequently use a number of educational acronyms and theoretical terms. These are outlined below to assist the reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Australian Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACARA</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAR</td>
<td>Australian Tertiary Admission Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Course Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Department of Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSEA</td>
<td>Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN</td>
<td>National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLB</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind act (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PISA</td>
<td>Programme for International Student Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSA</td>
<td>School Curriculum and Standards Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACE</td>
<td>Western Australian Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary of Theoretical Terms: A. Deleuze and Guattari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Affect describes the forces behind all forms of social production in the contemporary world. It is an ability to affect and be affected, a pre-personal intensity corresponding to an encounter between one affected body and another (Deleuze &amp; Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. xvii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arborescence</td>
<td>Arborescent schema: concept from tree-like structures, arborescent systems are hierarchical systems with centres of significance and subjectification, central automata like organised memories. (Deleuze &amp; Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblages</td>
<td>“Assemblages, as conceived of by Deleuze and Guattari, are complex constellations of objects, bodies, expressions, qualities, and territories that come together for varying periods of time to ideally create new ways of functioning. Assemblages operate through desire as abstract machines” (Parr, 2010, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming</td>
<td>Becoming is a state of transition or movement <em>between</em> one state and another. Becoming is like a rhizome in that it has no beginning or end, it is always in the middle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiring Machines</td>
<td>Desire is not an imaginary force based on lack as in the Oedipus complex. It is a productive force that is mechanistic in nature — a kind of desiring machine that produces a flow of desire from itself. Desiring machines are connected to the social machines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of flight</td>
<td>Lines of flight are deterritorialisations that do not stop but branch out and produce rhizomatic connections (multiplicities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad</td>
<td>A nomad is the “detrriorialized par excellence” (Deleuze &amp; Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 421). Nomad thought rejects the “universal thinking subject” and does not ground itself in an all-encompassing totality” (Deleuze &amp; Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 420).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Deleuze discusses power using two French terms: puissance and pouvoir. Puissance is immanent power, potencia – the power to act rather than the power to dominate another. Pouvoir is a transcendent power of a superior over another – potestas, implying dominion, control and mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhizomes</td>
<td>Rhizome &amp; rhizomatics – a concept (from plant root) used to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
describe a more multiple system, heterogeneous, a map, a multiplicity that is not hierarchical or overcoded. Contrasts with arborescent tree-like organised and hierarchical structures (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], pp. 3-9). “The principal characteristics of a rhizome: unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other, and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature … it has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle (milieu) from which it grows and which it overspills”. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 22)

Schizoanalysis
Deleuze and Guattari’s revolutionary schizoanalysis or “materialist psychiatry” is contrasted to psychoanalysis, particularly Freud’s theory of the Oedipus complex. Rather than seeing social oppression as a product of the nuclear family; schizoanalysis reverses the direction of causality making psychic repression depend on social oppression. “The task of schizoanalysis is that of tirelessly taking apart egos and their presuppositions; liberating the prepersonal singularities they enclose and repress; mobilizing the flows … Schizoanalysis is so named because throughout its entire process of treatment it schizophrenizes, instead of neuroticizing like psychoanalysis.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972 [2009], p. 362)

Smooth space and striated space
Smooth space is essentially heterogeneous, associated with free action and “always possesses a greater power of deterritorialisation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 530). Striated space is homogenous and is associated with work and capitalism (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], pp. 523-551).

Territorialise, deterritorialise, reterritorialise
Territory – normative strata. Deterritorialisation describes a process whereby the flow of energy escapes or momentarily moves outside the normative strata, and reterritorialisation describes the process of recuperation from those ruptures (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360). “Deterritorialization must be thought of as a perfectly positive power that has degrees and thresholds (epistrata), is always relative, and has reterritorialisation as its flipside or complement” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 60)
**Performativity**

The term “performativity” is used in a number of different contexts with many meanings (Austin, 2004 [1962]; S. Ball, 2003; Butler, 1990; Derrida, 1971 [1988]). This research utilises Steven J. Ball’s (2003) concept of performativity in the context of neoliberalism, and Judith Butler’s concept of performativity in the context of gender.

**A. Neoliberal performativity: Steven J. Ball**

Ball (2003), uses the term to describe the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement, and in this interpretation performativity is:

> A technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change — based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of “quality”, or “moments” of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgment. The issue of who controls the field of judgment is crucial (Ball, 2003, p. 216)

Likewise, McKenzie utilises the term to describe a dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity:

> Performance will be to the twentieth and 21st centuries what discipline was to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, namely, an onto-historical formation of power and knowledge…but let me just stress that performative power/knowledge is really just coming over the horizon; discipline wasn't built in a day, nor has the performance stratum fully installed itself. (McKenzie, 2001b, pp. 5-6)

Locke (2015) explains: “Through conditions of “performance” capitalism, education is to conform to a logic of performativity that ensures not only the efficient operation of the state in the world market, but also the continuation of a global culture of performance (p. 247).

**B. Gender performativity: Judith Butler**

Butler (1990) argues that gender is irreducibly linked to performativity in that gender is not something biologically determined, but rather is a social construct that is “performed,” (p. 45). Butler (1988) asserts that, “Gender is what is put on, invariably, under constraint, daily and incessantly, with anxiety and pleasure, but if the continuous
act is mistaken for a natural or linguistic given, power is relinquished” (p. 531).

If gender is performative, then it follows that the reality of gender is itself produced as an effect of the performance. Although there are norms that govern what will and will not be real, and what will and will not be intelligible, they are called into question and reiterated at the moment in which performativity begins its citational practice. One surely cites norms that already exist, but these norms can be significantly deterritorialised through the citation. (Butler, 2004, p. 218 emphasis added)
Section II Published Articles

Article One: Embodiment and becoming in secondary drama classrooms: The effects of neoliberal education cultures on performances of self and of drama texts

Around results time there’s a lot of arse covering. I am definitely one of those people. I make sure I cover all aspects of the priorities of the college. Every lesson I cover my instructional intelligence, my cooperative learning, the content, exam preparation … and even though I’m a part time teacher and only work three days a week I still run tutorials every week, on a Friday afternoon, outside working hours. So I am seen to do everything I can do to further the students’ learning. Everything you do is visible … It’s a very results driven college. (Denise, government school teacher)

In order to make sense of raw data, such as the quote from Denise above, I had to find theoretical paradigms that took into account power, control and desire. This paper outlines the theoretical and methodological groundings of the research project whilst giving an overview of some of the major findings. To answer the research question: How does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? This paper explored different paradigms and displays how critical and post-humanist analyses are useful methodological tools for mapping the complexities of student becomings in the neoliberal and heterosexually striated space of the secondary school. These paradigms and concepts take into consideration the wide variety of becomings and ways of being in the world that are a reflection of the drama classroom. Rather than thinking in binaries: male/female, virgin/whore, girl/boy, good/bad, hero/villain, gay/straight, I needed to find paradigms that would foreground complexity and difference but that would also pay attention to power. As Rexhepi and Torres (2011) state: “A political intellectual pays as much attention to the process as she does to the product of intellectual work” (Rexhepi and Torres 2011, p. 691).

Because of the emancipatory nature of my research question I first explored neo-Marxism as a suitable paradigm to view the research because Marxism calls for empowerment and liberation from oppression. However, Marxism was epistemologically too binary in its understanding of the oppressed and the oppressor (capital/labour, bourgeois/working class) for my purposes. I needed a paradigm that was subtle to multiplicity and nuances in the data but still took into consideration power and its construction. In order to deconstruct these binaries I needed to analyse and critique their manifestations in order to mark their differences and interplay. Therefore I considered the ways critical and post-humanist analysis has enriched qualitative research.

In this article I specifically employ Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis as an example of this analysis and how these theories enable us to chart the embodied, relational, spatial and affective energies that inhabit the drama classroom. I needed a political paradigm that would critique power structures. In this paper I show how Butler’s concept of gender performance, Foucault’s governmentality and Ball’s theory of competitive performativity are particularly salient in the context of ingrained late-capitalism that shapes the desires of its subjects. These frameworks, when combined, can be advantageous in critiquing neoliberal educational assemblages and in signifying emerging de-territorialisations and lines of flight in teachers and students.

Given that the research project was qualitative in nature, I required a paradigm that was expansive enough to explore a central phenomenon without subjectifying participants’ experiences into neat categories. Drama education is inherently embodied, relational and spacial and Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts
account for this phenomenon because they take into consideration the interconnectedness of assemblages, energies and powers. Previous studies have foregrounded the individual and how drama education can assist their social, emotional and intellectual development, and political forces have remained in the background. Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis, because of its focus on the rhizome and its interconnectedness, place equal weighting on political forces, desire, interconnection and affect. I felt that this was an appropriate lens through which to map what occurs in the drama classroom because it gives equal weight to all forces that influence becomings.

I also explored Foucault’s powerful conceptual apparatus to understand the central phenomenon. Foucault’s understanding of disciplinary powers and the panopticon were pivotal for my understanding of how schools worked in practice. Foucault, Deleuze’s long time friend and mentor, had a profound influence on Deleuze and Guattari’s work and all three writers show a high regard for each other. Deleuze and Guattari’s writing echoes Foucault’s focus on multiplicities and they follow the overall tenor of Foucault's critique of contemporary society. Like Foucault, they view late-capitalist ‘societies of control’ as an unparalleled historical era of domination based on the proliferation of normalizing discourses and assemblages that permeate all aspects of society (Deleuze, 1992). This critique was useful when mapping how teachers and students were constrained by normalising discourses and educational assemblages and their power of enculturation.

However, while Foucault inclined toward a totalizing critique of culture and society, Deleuze and Guattari seek to conceptualise and appropriate its generative and liberating elements — the decoding of libidinal flows initiated by the dynamics of the capitalist economy. This focus on the generative aspects of forces and flows allowed me to examine the data with an open mind, attune to any positive affect of capitalist desire. Also, while all three theorists highlight the importance of theorizing microstructures of domination, Deleuze and Guattari highlight the importance of macrostructures in their detailed critique of the state.

Importantly for this research, where Foucault's emphasis is on the disciplinary technologies and the body within regimes of power/knowledge, Deleuze and Guattari focus on the colonization of desire by various discourses, powers and assemblages. Desire is of primary importance for Deleuze and Guattari. Their critique of psychoanalysis builds on Foucault's critique of Freud, psychiatry, and the Oedipal family. Fundamental to this study was the notion of desire as a constraining and liberating force, and how capitalism moulds desire in ways that remain hidden from sight. As Foucault maintains:

For a long time one has known that the role of philosophy is not to discover what is hidden, but to make visible precisely what is visible, that is to say, to make evident what is so close, so immediate, so intimately linked to us, that because of that we do not perceive it. Whereas the role of science is to reveal what we do not see, the role of philosophy is to let us see what we see (Foucault, 1978, pp. 540–1, cited in Marshall, 1999).

Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari all decentre the unified rational humanist subject. Human beings operate not as rational beings but as desiring beings, dependent upon discourses that frame the thinking process and determine the limits of what can be thought. One group of discourses is elevated by society to a hegemonic status, while others are exiled. As Best and Kellner (1991) note:
‘Foucault pursues this through a critical archaeology and genealogy that reduces the subject to an effect of discourse and disciplinary practices, while Deleuze and Guattari pursue a schizophrenic destruction of the ego and superego in favour of a dynamic unconscious’ (p. 88). All three theorists attempt to make possible the emergence of new types of decentred subjects, liberated from fixed and unified identities, and free to become dispersed and multiple. These decentred subjects are reconstituted as new types of rhizomatic subjectivities and bodies without organs: “Body without Organs, in other words, the unformed, unorganized, nonstratified, or destatified body and all its flows: subatomic and submolecular particles, pure intensities, prevital and prephysical free singularities” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 49).

Although the boundaries of the journal’s word limit restricted the amount of information I could include on theory in the Embodiment and Becoming article following, the paper articulates my poststructural and post-humanist methodology. It examines how the concepts and theories of Foucault (1977), Butler (1988, 1990, 2004) and Deleuze and Guattari (1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]) are useful for mapping the complexities of student and teacher becomings in neoliberal educational institutions. Their powerful conceptual apparatus allowed me to view the data in a manner that accounted for intricacy and multiplicity in decentred subjects who were continually in the process of becoming. It also allowed me to critique the generative and constraining powers of desire that flow through late-capitalist assemblages and bodies in a dominant culture of competitive performativity.

The article begins with an argument for the use of pluralistic approaches to educational research, in particular critical and post-humanist methodologies. I assert that when analysing drama education it is necessary to use a paradigm that takes into account the embodied nature of the subject. I discuss how students physicalize characters and emotion in drama and how this process can be a transformative becoming experience. I then explore Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of becoming and how they conceive teachers and students as multiplicities continually in the process of becoming, and not as unified subjects. The data presented in the article forms part of a large corpus of data that shows how the embodiment of characters in drama can have a transformative effect on students.

I then discuss how data conversely revealed that students (and teachers) are constrained in these generative possibilities of becoming by a neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. I provide citations from teachers who reported being under an enormous pressure to get good grades for students in published exams. This influenced their choices around text selection and pedagogy. I show how the neoliberal commodification of education and the subsequent focus on data production and analysis has had a profound effect on education. Linking my research with other contemporary research into the nexus between neoliberalism and education, I show how this impacts drama education at the local level in Western Australia. Using data from the study I highlight how the focus on results and school rankings leads to the surveillance and mistrust of teachers, as well as a narrowing of the curriculum to focus on “core” or “academic” subjects over the arts.

In addition to critiquing the current system I show how post-humanist theory can open up a multitude of possibilities to perceive how teachers and students are creating lines of flight from cultural norms and systems. I give
examples from the data of where students and teachers have deterritorialised from the neoconservative educational assemblage. I explore how the drama classroom can be a safe space for students to explore minoritarian expressions of sexuality and identity, giving examples from the interviews with teachers and students.

As an example of deterritorialising from hetero-normative expressions of gender I show how the embodiment of the character Lady Macbeth and the witches was a liberating and empowering experience for three young students, and how they transformed the text to free it from its original oppressive context. However, I also show how these deterritorialisations were “reterritorialised” by normative educational structures and beliefs.

The article outlines how every element of the research process is affected by the theoretical framework — from the framing of the research questions to the interpretation of the raw data and the writing up of the results. I argue that qualitative research has been enriched by the theories of Deleuze, Butler and Ball and how my research extends work by others who have utilised their conceptual apparatuses for analysing gender and education (Coffey, 2012; Hickey-Moody, 2013; Ringrose, 2013). I display how insights gleaned from poststructuralist critical theories can be useful when mapping the embodied spatial and affective energies in the drama classroom. The drama classroom is shown to be a smooth space for facilitating multiple becomings of students in their final year of high school. The embodiment of a variety of characters and roles in drama is a powerfully transformative experience. However, the smooth transformative space is regulated by the burden on both teachers and students to produce good grades in external exams.

I conclude by highlighting how insights gleaned from Deleuze, Guattari, Foucault, Butler and Ball can be useful to trace the culture of competitive neoliberalism that manipulates the desires of the tenants of Western Australian educational institutions. Combining these theories can also expose teachers and students occasional flight from the normative strata in the drama classroom.
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Abstract
This article explores the effects of neoliberalism and performative educational cultures on secondary school drama classrooms. We consider the ways Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis and Butler’s concept of gender performance enable us to chart the embodied, relational, spatial and affective energies that inhabit the often neoliberal and heterosexually striated space of the drama classroom. These post-humanist analyses are useful methodological tools for mapping the complexities of student becomings in the space context of the secondary school. We also show how Foucault’s governmentality and Ball’s theory of competitive performativity are particularly salient in the context of immanent capitalism that shapes the desires of its subjects. These frameworks, when combined, can be useful in critiquing neoliberal educational assemblages and in indicating emerging de-territorialisations and lines of flight in teachers and students.
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A. Introduction
Studies exploring the connection between drama praxis and adolescent development have noted that the drama classroom can be a potent space for students to negotiate issues of identity (Armenta, 2005; Burton, 2002; Cahill, 2002; Gallagher, 1998, 2000; Hatton, 2003). Previous studies, however, have not foregrounded the influence of neoliberalism on identity formation, where desires can be moulded by capital in ways beyond awareness (Roberts, 2012). This research examines issues of identity and becoming in this context, taking as its focus students’ embodiment of characters from proscribed texts in the drama classroom.

Neoliberal times are characterised by a master narrative of economic rationalism. For example, the Australian Federal Education Minister states that “economic reform” will benefit students through “spreading opportunity and staying competitive” (Pyne, 2014). This study reveals how the so-called “opportunities” of neoliberalism impact the daily lives of teachers and students in schools in the 21st century. This article is one account of the ways in which the theories of Deleuze and Guattari (1994 [2012]; 1977, 1987), Butler (1990, 2004), Foucault (1977) and Ball (2003) are useful for researching becoming and performativity in contemporary times in senior secondary drama classrooms.

More specifically, informed by these contemporary theorists and employing a critical paradigm, we foreground the impact our “neoliberal culture of competitive performativity” (Ball, 2003, p. 219) has on moulding student becomings in the drama classroom. We explore student “becomings” rather than “identity” because “becoming” in a Deleuzoguattarian sense (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], pp. 264-278) accounts for multiplicity and is a process, whereas “identity” can be seen as a fixed point.

To borrow from critical theory and yet remain within a post-humanist paradigm can be both problematic and illuminating. Specifically, we map how teachers and students responded to hegemonic constructions of masculinity and femininity in drama texts and the influences on them. In a similar way, Jessica Ringrose (2011) in exploring young women’s engagements with social networking sites uses Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical concepts to “offer new theoretical tools for thinking about discursive subjectification but also for mapping complex desire-flows and micro movements through and against discursive/symbolic norms” (2011, p. 598).

The research is thus enriched through the utilisation of a critical, post-humanist methodology that examines wider issues of power in neoliberal times as well as notions of becoming. To do this, we interviewed 15 drama teachers and 13 of their 18 year-old-drama students in Western Australian government, independent/private and Catholic secondary schools (post high school graduation) about how teaching or participating in senior secondary drama embedded in our current neoliberal educational milieu shapes their becomings.

The first section of the article, by going beyond analysing discourse, explores how the concepts of Deleuze and Guattari can contribute to previous studies of embodiment and student becomings in the drama classroom. Second, we use the work of Foucault and Ball to shed light on neoliberal culture and how it influences student and teacher becomings. The third section utilises Butler’s concept of gender to examine how a culture of performative neoliberalism impacts students’ gendered subjectivities. The final section provides examples where these theories are used to map student becomings through their
embodiment of characters from Shakespeare's *Macbeth* as one illustration of praxis.

**B. Embodiment and identity in drama education**

Linking drama with identity work is not new. For example, van Wyk's (2014) study into grade 10 life skills shows that drama-in-education (DIE) activities can be a powerful tool to understand the ways in which gender and identity is constructed. Using theories from Friere, Foucault and Butler in the context of a Life Orientation curriculum, van Wyk sought to stimulate critical modes of thought; however, her research was not set in a drama class with a “theatre-based” curriculum. Other studies focusing on adolescent girls, in the context of the single-sex drama classroom, noted that drama activities help girls negotiate issues of identity, gender and culture (Armenta, 2005; Gallagher, 1998, 2000; Hatton, 2003, 2013, 2015). Research has also examined identity formation, gender norms and boys in drama and dance classrooms (Holdsworth, 2013; McDonald, 2007; Sallis, 2011, 2014).

Studies focusing on the drama classroom, in particular, have foregrounded the phenomenological subject and how drama education can assist social, emotional and intellectual development, yet political forces key to understanding context have remained in the background (Armenta, 2005; Hatton, 2003, 2013; McDonald, 2007). Understanding this context is important because of the potential influence of neoliberalism on identity formation of both teachers and students in drama classrooms. Consistent with the research, this study also highlighted that the drama classroom can have a potent impact on student becomings; however, this impact is moderated by neoliberal culture. For example, Elizabeth, an independent school student, noted that “Drama gave me the confidence to say, I’m going to change all my life plans.” However, as a teacher at a Catholic school highlighted, that “impact” was also mediated by, “the pressure that I have to produce stuff. I have to be seen to be showing the school off” (Bianca, Catholic school teacher).

What Bianca’s remarks highlight is that in 21st century capitalism, the “pressure” to “produce stuff” is not an outside power or force, but a desire that comes from within, where values and desires are shaped by neoliberal market-driven discourses and competitive ideologies.

This means that when analysing drama education, it is imperative that paradigms and methodologies are used that take into account the embodied nature of drama as a subject as it functions in schools today recognising how the body is used in sense-making.

Deleuze and Guattari (1987 [2012]) offer one set of helpful conceptual tools in this process of sense-making where they highlight the way that becoming, as a richer way of understanding identity work, is a process whereby bodies affect other bodies and are transformed within assemblages. Bresler (2004) also highlights the way that the body is central to the process of inquiry and constitutes a mode of knowing. For example, in drama education particularly, students do not merely study texts and characters; they embody or physicalize them in the space of the drama classroom when they take on roles to enact
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5 Pseudonyms are used throughout for names of participants and schools.
scenes. This meant that the effects of physicalizing dramatic characters can be significant to participants, with Marie noting the way that this can make “you feel more powerful” [independent school student]. In a similar way Cassie elaborated how this embodiment enables students to explore their own identity and possible becomings:

I guess in theatre you can be whomever you want. It’s the same with identity, I can be the most opposite of me that I can to explore and see where it goes. And you use yourself as a basis to build characters upon and that helps you explore your own identity (Independent school student).

Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis is also relevant to this research because it places emphasis on bodily experience, taking into account the embodied interrelationship and energies within and without assemblages (such as students, teachers and educational systems), rather than studying discourse as an end in itself. Considering this concept within the research also helps reveal that students and teachers are situated within systems, and these systems are both reflective of and embedded in a culture of competitive performativity and each of these are embodied experiences.

Theories influenced by the “posties” (Lather, 2012, p. 1021), such as schizoanalysis, are vital in moving us from the unified, conscious, rational subject of humanism to the post-humanist, split, desiring subject. This “post” move entails a shift from positivist epistemology to a focus on the limits of our knowing, with an emphasis on the “affective turn” (Clough & Halley, 2007). This affective turn is important when exploring student becomings in the secondary drama classroom because it takes into account the transcorporeal agency of (student and teacher) bodies understood not as “human”, but as “non-human” or “more-than-human” — where discourse and matter are co-constitutive (Alaimo, 2010; Asberg, Koobak, & Johnson, 2011; Hird & Roberts, 2011; Lenz Taguchi, 2013). Educational research based on post-human materialist frameworks such as Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis is growing rapidly (Hickey-Moody, 2013; Lenz Taguchi, 2013; Renold & Ringrose, 2016; Ringrose, 2015) because they provide tools for mapping heterogeneity.

This research found that the transcorporeal embodiment of characters in drama has a profound impact on student becomings. Miranda, an independent school student, described her experience in this way:

Embodying characters in drama forces you to become them. There’s a lot more understanding about how emotions work, how people work, their strengths and weaknesses and you kind of learn about yourself, like what makes you upset or angry and how you deal with that.

This intense study and physical embodiment of characters in drama can be a transformative becoming experience for students, an issue considered later through characters from Macbeth. On becoming Deleuze and Guattari state that “Becoming and multiplicity are the same thing” (1978 [2012], p. 275). In the context of drama linking these two developmental forces highlights the way that drama offers students this multiplicity of dimensions. For example, Deleuze and
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6 Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987 [2012]) rhizomatic “schizoanalysis” is a concept created as an alternative to reductionist psychoanalysis, particularly Freud’s theory of the Oedipus complex.
Guattari’s concept of becoming, allows us to view teachers and students as multiplicities continually in the process of becoming — not as unified subjects. Thus we were able to see the intersection of the students, the embodied characters from plays, and the space of the drama classroom itself, as energies and affects that transform one another. As Cassie notes: “In drama you get very good at connecting to people. Being an actor you have to be able to know the layers” (independent school student).

It is also important to understand that this multiplicity occurs in particular spaces. Deleuze and Guattari distinguish between two kinds of spaces: smooth space and striated space. Smooth space is essentially heterogeneous, associated with free action (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012]), whereas striated space is homogenous and is associated with work and capitalism (1987 [2012], pp. 523-551). Linking space and embodiment is important and this research highlights that the intersection between smooth space and embodied characters can be life changing for some students, moulding their personalities and desires. For example, Cassie, a government school student notes: “I used to be the quiet kid in the corner but since doing drama I have become more confident. I don’t care as much what everybody thinks”.

Identity, however, is also influenced by choices students and teachers make about the roles and characters they embody in a dominant neoliberal educational climate of competitive performativity where exam marks and school rankings dominate (Ball, 2003, 2012; Thompson & Cook, 2014; Webb, 2014b). Performativity, for Ball (2003), relates to performance of “success” for the purposes of accountability. This is to be distinguished from Butler (1990, 2004) who uses the term to refer to the performance of one’s gender to adhere to societal expectations of masculine/feminine. In the drama classroom, teachers reported the pressure they felt to produce good [exam] data in order to perform the role of “successful teacher” (Thompson and Cook 2014). As one government school teacher noted:

> The year 12 exams are always my priority so the other aspects of drama might fall off a bit. That’s my biggest pressure. I mean last year our results weren’t good and I think it definitely changed the way I taught this year. (Ariel)

This pressure can be further understood through a consideration of neoliberal subjectivity.

C. Neoliberal subjectivities

Neoliberalism reconfigures “constituent subjectivities and their relationships” (Doherty 2015, p. 395) in the drama classroom by way of accountability practices, such as the publication of exam results. Defined as “an ideology and policy model that emphasizes the value of free market competition” (N. Smith, 2016, p. 1) neoliberalism is often used in academia as a “catch-all explanation for anything negative” (Rowlands & Rawolle, 2013, p. 261). Nonetheless, this “metapolicy” (Doherty, 2015) of individualism and personal responsibility is criticised for its transformation of citizens to “homo economicus” and the “domination of politics by capital” (Stern, 2012, p. 387). This lies in
contrast to the humanist ideals drama teachers describe (Lambert, Wright, Currie, & Pascoe, 2015a).

Deleuze and Guattari also offer methodological tools for mapping “tactics of domination” because the post-human subject is beyond the human via assemblages and relational networks. As they elaborate:

Capitalism arises as a worldwide enterprise of subjectification by constituting an axiomatic of decoded flows. Social subjection, as the correlate of subjectification … an entire system of machinic enslavement [where] human beings are constituent parts. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 505)

Under the metapolicy of neoliberalism, the fluid, post-subject is key to understanding how affective capacities and desires are modulated and manipulated. If research is to question the common sense notions of neoliberalism and the taken-for-grantedness of global capitalism, then we must take into account the neoliberal post-human subject/consumer. In critical theory the post-human subject re-conceives the universal, autonomous, rational thinking human being. The post-human, for critical theorists, is not a singular, defined individual, but rather one who can “become” or embody different contradictory identities and understand the world from multiple, heterogeneous perspectives (Haraway, 1991). What drama offers in this regard is both a process for both exploration and expression (Lambert, Wright, Currie, & Pascoe, 2016). Moreover, in considering the pressures teachers feel, this post-subject is one who conforms to the shifting requirements of capitalism and blames herself for not matching up to its standards. As one teacher shared:

I feel the pressure that I have to produce stuff. I have to be seen to be showing the school off, but there’s nothing in my contract that says, ‘you have to do a musical, you have to do a play’. So they never say that to you but I think as you go on you get into this mindset that you kind of have to. That’s part of your job whether it’s written or not but it turns into pressure that’s not so much put on by them but pressure that you put onto yourself to do that. (Bianca, Catholic school teacher)

The data further revealed the ways in which teachers and students’ becomings are affected by dominant neoliberal performative ideologies where energies and attention is “directed”. Neoliberalism, for example, has been characterised as a form of “governmentality”, that is, the art of government and “the way in which the conduct of individuals or groups might be directed” (Foucault, 1977, p. 341).

The emergence of neoliberal states has been characterized by the transformation of the administrative state, one previously responsible for human well-being as well as for the economy, into state that now gives power to global corporations and installs apparatuses and knowledges through which people are reconfigured as productive economic entrepreneurs of their own lives’ (Davies & Bansel, 2007, pp. 248-249, emphasis added)

To govern, in this sense, “is to structure the possible field of action of others” (Foucault, 1977, p. 341). In terms of education, Ball (2003), drawing upon
Foucault, has argued that our current education system operates on the “performativity” principle where the corporatisation and marketization of schools has changed the very nature of education itself. Thus schools, students and teachers embody and perform certain identities such as the “good school,” the “successful/good student” and the “hard working” teacher (Thompson, 2010a). As Tannock (2009) notes, the neoliberal rise of “meritocracy … substitutes concern for full equality of social and economic outcomes” (p. 210). This performative culture was echoed in our research findings. Gemma, an independent school teacher, describes it this way:

And I must admit that I do get disheartened when I hear of other schools that drill towards the test. I think legislation is putting more and more pressure on the schools, like our school, to actually perform well. And I think in actual fact we could lose the essence and the joy of what we do.

Theorists who apply Foucault’s theory of governance to education stress that teachers are inevitably enmeshed in a matrix of power relations and face continued pressure to submit to prevailing hegemonies (Ball, 1994, 2012; Besley & Peters, 2008; Peters, 2015). This requires what Foucault (1977) would describe as docile and governable, normalised individuals (or bodies) who are controlled by constant surveillance (panopticism), testing and ranking in schools:

The power relations, not above but inside the very texture of the multiplicity, as discreetly as possible, as well articulated on the other functions of these multiplicities and also in the least expensive way possible: to this correspond anonymous instruments of power, coextensive with the multiplicity that they regiment, such as hierarchical surveillance, continuous registration, perpetual assessment and classification. (1977, p. 220)

This constant surveillance even extends to the architecture of school buildings. As Denise, a government school teacher noted: “Our school has glass walls. You can see into every classroom. The college is quite open. There are no little dark dingy spots. The kids can’t hide … no one can hide at Northside College”. This is one manifestation of hypersurveillance.

Corporate discourses of performance, competition and accountability contribute to the hyper-surveillance of teachers. Teachers are sensitive to this, as Liz, a drama teacher in one interview cautioned herself: “I’ve got to be careful what I say here.” This surveillance focuses on quantifiable outcomes: “Our school has even employed people to analyse our [exam] results for us and tell us how we can make them better” (Tom, government school teacher). Moreover, a teacher’s value is reduced to the narrow lens of their students’ success in standardised tests (Fitzgerald & Rainnie, 2011). As one teacher in the study stated, “I essentially teach to the exams… my course is judged entirely on exam scores” (Tom). Capitalism’s power lies in its capacity to break each workplace down into quantifiable measurable assets such as exam data.

Lather notes, “Neoliberalism LOVES quantitative reductionism” (2012, p. 1023). From a critical paradigm, the majority of schools in this research displayed what appears to be an obsession with data, or what Paulos (2010) labels “metric mania” (p. 3). Thus the only reliable “measure of quality” is statistical data such as test results. For example, one principal (Mick, government school principal)
rejected any data that was not easily quantifiable as “fluffy stuff”. He then went on to say, “Don’t give me the fluffy stuff about what’s happening in the classroom. The only thing that counts is data, numbers. I want the facts”. In this regard, “evidence” of good teaching is narrowly defined.

According to Lawn (2011), over the last decade new powerful data-gathering technologies have “enabled a new way of governing education through performance data” (p. 277). He notes data are central to modern governance because: “Without data there can be no comparisons of performance or close management of production … Data are a way of categorising and governing groups and individuals to make them known and governable” (Lawn 2011, p. 278). It is this performative pressure these teachers respond to.

The focus on data analysis as a way of measuring teacher “success” was also experienced in the “faith based” Catholic sector, even though they purport to approach education “with a focus on the development of the whole person” (Catholic Education Western Australia, 2015, p. 1):

We do get hauled over the coals if our stats don’t … I mean I spent a lot of time at the start of this year really pulling apart those stats. I would like to teach the kids how to act but we don’t have time. It’s so assessment and exam-centred. (Claire, Catholic school teacher)

The pressures of performance and surveillance means that many Australian teachers make choices about pedagogy and praxis in a zeitgeist of capitalist neoliberalism making education a commodity where data reigns supreme (Ball, 2012; Beder et al., 2009; Fitzgerald & Rainnie, 2011; Keddie et al., 2011; Webb, 2011). In this this research more particularly, teachers report enormous pressure to perform and therefore choices about pedagogy, such as which plays to study, are made on the basis of getting better marks in exams (Bacon, 2015; Connell, 2013a; Thompson & Cook, 2014). For example, Ariel felt that her students did poorly in exams when they studied and performed a contemporary pro-feminist text. Her solution to the problem was to revert to “the classics”: “So I think we will change the play next year to Macbeth. I know that the classics don’t have very many female roles but I want to just get them all on stage”.

However, it is worth noting that this “choice” is made in a context where 60% of Ariel’s class is female and most characters in Macbeth are male. Considering context, and pressures to perform, how do these choices affect students’ gendered performances?

D. Gendered subjectivities

Butler’s theory of discursive re-signification emphasizes “the contingent and discursive nature of all identities” (Randall, 2010, p. 7) and the social construction of gendered subjectivities. This is important because her concept of gender performance is useful for understanding the multiple and contradictory discourses that shape teachers and students in contemporary times, challenging the pre-existing and seemingly “common sense” order of things and opening up a multitude of possibilities. Building on Foucault’s post-structural discourse analysis, Butler argues that subjectivity is discursively constituted though a
“heterosexual matrix” of norms that constrains “what we can be” (2004, p. 57). The psychosocial dimensions of Butler’s theories have been usefully elaborated by educationalists such as Davies (2006), Renold (2013), Youdell (2010) and Ringrose (2013). They utilize Butler’s concepts in their exploration of the discursive organization of gendered identity and power relations in ambiguous and contradictory discourses of girlhood. Butler’s theories offer possibilities of identity transformation through discursive agency and performative acts:

If gender is a kind of doing, an incessant activity performed, in part, without one’s knowing and without one’s willing, it is not for that reason automatic or mechanical. On the contrary, it is a practice of improvisation within a scene of constraint. (Butler, 2004, p. 4)

In this research, participants embodied a number of gendered identities. For example, Zac (independent school student) identified himself as openly “gay” in the drama classroom; however, “the moment drama finished I had to quickly switch on my masculinity again. Not that apparently I was very good at it. But I felt like I could be myself and not be judged for it”. Cassie (independent school student) identified herself as:

the black sheep in my household. I identified with Rose [a character from Cloudstreet, (Monjo & Enright, 1999) quite a bit as the strong girl who was being resilient and was trying to break out of where she was. I do performing and everyone else does engineering or chemistry.

Each of these identities was performed successfully, or unsuccessfully in relation to other identities and forces. For example, Zac felt he was unsuccessful in performing in his words “masculinity”, and Cassie defined herself as a “strong girl” — in relation to others.

The self is understood and performed differently depending upon the discursive environment (Butler, 2004; Francis, 2002) as we can see with Zac performing masculinity in the playground, but his gay identity in the drama classroom. In this research we worked with theorisations that “the subject” is constructed through discourse and is essentially non-unitary, embodied, and is both more and less than “essentially rational” (Davies, 2006, 2012; Hey, 2006; Vick & Martinez, 2011). Thus, in this research gender is viewed as a social construct and not an essentialist one such as: women are essentially emotional and men are essentially rational.

Combining Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts with Butler’s analysis opens up new ways of conceiving subjectivity (Bacon, 2015). This composite, for example, leads to new approaches to resisting hegemonic constructions of identity in the current neoliberal educational assemblage. In relation to this research, using Butler’s discursive and performative understanding of gender with Deleuze and Guattari’s post-humanist theories of embodiment, materiality and affect foregrounds the non-human and often non-intentional nature of power relations between bodies and objects or texts in the drama classroom.

Utilising pluralistic approaches to theory gives rise to inevitable tensions. Critical pedagogy continues earlier traditions emancipatory pedagogies, whose roots lie in modernist thinking (Bowers, 1993). Post-humanism challenges modernist notions of progress, rationality and subjectivity (Braidotti, 2013). Yet post-humanism and critical theory are both movements that are useful “in our
efforts to come to terms with dominant assumptions about education” (Bell & Russell, 2000a, pp. 188-189). Thompson and Harbaugh (2012) argue that there is a need to mix paradigms because this creates a “bricolage”. Given their different foci, both critical theory and post-humanism stand to enrich research projects by offering different insights into the central phenomenon. When mapping student and teacher becomings in the drama classroom in contemporary times, it is critical that “Qualitative forms of inquiry demand that theory (i.e., theoretical frameworks) be used with imagination and flexibility” (Anfara & Mertz, 2006a, p. 195).

Schizoanalysis, when combined with critical theory, offers significant resources for thinking that is “post-signification” and that is useful for mapping tactics of neoliberal performative domination and for understanding how energetic forces affect break off from normative regimes in the drama classroom. Rather than being locked in a “paranoid” reading of the negative affects of neoliberalism (Sedgwick, 2003), the positive task of schizoanalysis consists of discovering in a subject the nature, the formation, or the functioning of [their] desiring-machines, that is, the unconscious and the partial objects that constitute it (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983, p. 322). As Savat and Thompson (2015) note, “Schizoanalysis, both as a method and process, is about the ongoing and continual process of questioning and destroying beliefs and values, that is reterritorialisations, as well as about the ongoing and continual process of understanding how we produced those particular beliefs and values in the first place” (p. 283).

The theories of Butler, Deleuze and Guattari offer alternative but reconcilable frameworks and vocabularies for understanding subjectivity, power and the possibility to disrupt norms in the drama classroom. Three students, Grace, Marie and Elizabeth, converse about how embodying characters in drama enabled them to deterritorialise from gender norms:

Grace: Drama gives you that sense of you can get away with a little bit more than what you usually can.
Marie: My monologue — I was like Portia from Julius Caesar. You feel powerful because you’re like, “I’m not like this, but I can be like this.”
Grace: That was the same with my monologue. I played Roxy from Chicago and I am definitely not the type of promiscuous girl and I got to play around with that.
Elizabeth: I was Tamora from Titus Andronicus and performing that and having someone go, “Oh my God you are scary.” I was never told that before.

The embodiment of characters in drama enabled these students to explore multiple possible selves. Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts of deterritorialisation and lines of flight were helpful tools to illuminate the data. “Deterritorialisation” refers to the process of breaking free momentarily from the normative strata and a “line of flight” refers to a more “absolute” break (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 559) What these concepts allowed us to do is view drama as a class where students felt safe to deterritorialise from cultural norms and perform multiple and often dangerous identities. Safe space is critical if drama is to provide multiple possibilities.
I think the drama space is a lot safer. I think it’s safer in terms of students expressing themselves; it’s much freer. I often have kids coming in and saying… [whispers] I’ve got to be careful what I say, but … “Oh, I just had maths [sigh]. At least I can think in this class… there’s room to be creative, there’s room to breathe; there’s room to work in a different way.” (Liz, Christian school teacher)

Similarly, Zac, discussed earlier, added his perspective.

I’m gay so obviously having to act I always acted differently in drama because I felt like out in the schoolyard I’d get bashed. And it was an actual genuine fear. When I stepped into the theatre, like I could finally be who I truly was. (Zac, independent school student)

All of the drama teachers interviewed agreed that drama was a safe place for deterritorialisation of gender norms, particularly for boys to be less macho and girls to be less girly. Claire and Kate, two Catholic school drama teachers, add:

It does. A lot of the girly stuff is habit, and social survival, you know when they fiddle with their hair or roll up their skirt … that’s a social conditioning thing. [In drama] they can break down that wall and stop worrying about what people think about them, start to play characters and find a truer version of themselves. (Claire)

Kate amplifies this theme.

Drama attracts the kids who may be questioning their sexuality or are more in touch with their emotions, which as a boy, is not so acceptable in our society. They get an opportunity to step into those roles. ‘Oh I’m role-playing, I’m playing somebody else’ so it’s safe to try being the person that they feel like they have inside. They get to express themselves in a way that they’re not comfortable doing in the playground. (Kate)

Unfortunately, in the neoconservative environment of the independent Christian school, this freedom appeared to be limited to the drama space: “That’s what I didn’t like about St Albans because the moment drama finished, I had to quickly switch on my masculinity again” (Zac). Massumi (2005) suggests that an imagined threat in the future causes embodied fear in the present (from the virtual to the actual). Therefore, when analysing affect (such as Zac’s fear), one’s methodology must take into account affect and its immanent dynamism. Massumi states there is, “a kind of simultaneity between the quasi-cause and its effect, even though they belong to different times” (2005, p. 36). Affects are embodied intensities resulting from encounters between bodies in various cultural contexts or material conditions/assemblages. For example, Zac’s fear of being bashed affected the performance of his gender in the schoolyard of the Christian school, whereas the smooth space of the drama classroom enabled him to embody his “true” self.

E. Performativity in context
To better understand the role that text, character and space can play on young people’s becomings it is important to examine the cultural contexts or material assemblages. The teachers and students interviewed came from government, independent and Catholic education systems from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds in the metropolitan area of Perth, Western Australia. The performative pressures of neoliberalism are visible in different ways depending on context. For example, Alecia’s government school is one of the poorest in Perth’s outer suburbs with 73% of her school’s students coming from the bottom 50% of the state’s Index for Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA\textsuperscript{7}). As a drama teacher, Alecia says that one of the biggest struggles she faces is a student’s home life: “Because of the demographic of the school my kids are coming from a place where even the best of our kids is struggling. The parents value education in one breath but their home lives are far more important.”

Roberts (2012) notes that capitalist processes of “increased work intensification” are associated with neoliberal ideology and practices (p. 42). Alecia adjusts her pedagogy and offers full tutoring four days a week in her own time to attempt to make up for students’ underprivileged backgrounds and compete in the externally published exams:

> Because a lot of kids flopped badly last year … quite frankly I’m looking at the exams, what do they have to do to be able to do them? Never mind what other useful things are good for drama. So unfortunately, I am ditching parts of the course that are good. (Alecia, government school drama teacher)

Conversely, Gemma’s wealthy independent school on the riverfront has only 1% from the bottom ICSEA quartile, and 84% of students from the top quartile. Her students easily soar above state averages in published exams; however, the performative pressure on teachers in elite schools is just as strong as in struggling schools, as Gemma notes:

> There’s quite a focus on exam results. Yeah, there’s a lot of pressure because they are published in such an open way, particularly in the high profile independent sector. You know, parents will pick their school based on results.

Somewhere in the middle, Bianca’s Catholic school — where she felt compelled to “produce stuff” and “show off the school” — in an ocean side suburb has 8% of students from the lowest ICSEA quartile and 30% from the highest, with the majority of students residing in the centre. Bianca reported that the pressure to perform via externally assessed exams and impressive school

\textsuperscript{7}The Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) is a scale of socio-educational advantage for each Australian school. Each school’s ICSEA value appears on the School profile page on the My School website. A table presents the distribution of students across four socio-educational advantage quarters representing a scale of relative disadvantage (“bottom quarter”) through to relative advantage (“top quarter”) (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2014, pp. 1-2)
productions was felt across sectors and socio-economic divides. Teachers reported that this manifested in various ways such as: “looking at the data analysis at the beginning of every year, how we went, where we fall” (Helen, independent school teacher); “working really hard” (Alecia, government school teacher); getting the “right marks” (Andre, government school teacher); and to generally “be successful” (Tom, government school teacher).

The private sector influence (private companies and consultants with data–based and improvement contracts) on the public sector has enabled the growth of an “audit society” with an emphasis on formal measurable standards and the measurement of performance (Lapsley, 2009). Governing has become a process of data production and analysis and “the greater the accumulation of numerical data, the more powerful the process of governing” (Lawn, 2011, p. 279). In this study teachers in the poorer schools, in particular, felt under the surveillance of line managers and the Department of Education (DET) who would go over their statistics with “a fine tooth comb” (Andre, government school teacher). For example, Denise a government school drama teacher from a lower-middle ICSEA government school stated:

There’s a lot of competition. My school is based on a business model rather than a traditional school in almost every way. So we have a lot of reliance on results and we have a huge reliance on teacher responsibility for those results. We are asked to explain poor exam results as a part of our grades analysis at the beginning of the year. All teachers go into the auditorium and all the results for all subjects are flashed up on the screen and they are ranked. (Denise, government school teacher)

These descriptors Denise uses: “competition”, “business model”, “results”, “success” and “ranking” are all terms one would expect to find in the corporate sector; however, their use sheds light on the pervasive influence of immanent capitalism on educational assemblages. Managerial discourses have saturated educational assemblages from all socio-economic strata. For example, Gemma, the elite private school teacher noted:

Look, they’re [parents] paying $20,000 plus here and some of them want to get their money’s worth. So yeah, we are VERY accountable to the parents… they’ve paid their money and they want you to sort of parent them as well.

The competitive culture of neoliberal performativity forces schools to compete for students — “homo economicus” — by marketising their product (Stern, 2012). Wealthy schools, such as Gemma’s, built state of the art theatres, hired professional actors, directors and technical crews to put on impressive performances as a “great selling tool for the school” (Jo, independent school teacher). Jo’s music department spent “over $20,000 on musicians” for their school musical but would not let the students play because, “that would sound terrible” (Jo, independent school teacher). Deleuze and Guattari highlight that under the schizoid logics of capitalism the branding of a product (such as a school) is more important that the product itself.

Capitalism institutes or restores all sorts of residual and artificial, imaginary, or symbolic territorialities, thereby attempting, as best it can,
to recode, to rechannel persons who have been defined in terms of abstract quantities … That is what makes the ideology of capitalism ‘a motley paining of everything that has ever been believed’. The real is not impossible; it is simply more and more artificial. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972, p. 34)

Elite schools appear to be “producing” students who are capable of performing in professional productions, while in actuality they have contracted industry professionals. Teachers in poorer government or Catholic schools talked about working hard to improve the “school image” (Kate, government school teacher), the importance of having a “good reputation” (Helen, government school teacher), and being a “good school” (Claire, Catholic school teacher). Students likewise talked about the pressure to “work hard” (Elizabeth, independent school student), equating hard “work” with lengthy assignments: “People don’t understand how much work… my assignments ended up being 20 pages” (Grace, independent school student). What each of these key ideas does is raise the spectre of a culture of performativity.

F. Macbeth, embodiment and becoming

The assemblage of bodies, schools and immanent capitalism are enabling and constraining forces on student becomings in the drama classroom, and these will be made explicit through Macbeth as an example. The students and teachers in this study embodied the “successful student”; the “hard working teacher” and the “good school” as well as they embodied the characters proscribed for them in set texts such as Macbeth. In this sense, students and teachers each performed a multitude of characters that were shaped consciously and unconsciously by the desire to conform to (and occasionally rebel against) neoliberal ideologies and systems.

Even though many drama teachers in Western Australia stick to the “classics”, they still find creative ways to produce difference rather than sameness. Both teachers and students pushed the boundaries in schools. Kofoed and Ringrose (2012) state that a “Butlerian-Deleuzian-Guattarian” framework “helps us to understand affect as bound in, but not limited to, discursive signification” that enables researchers to, “understand both fixity and becoming” in young people’s confrontations with power (p. 5). Combining Foucault with Butler, Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts allowed us to follow the arborescent and rhizomatic (multitudinous and interconnecting) becomings of students when interpreting texts and performing characters in drama classrooms. These concepts combined enable us to think about how affect flows in the current neoliberal education climate in a way that moves us beyond analysis of discourse (Lambert, Wright, Pascoe, & Currie, 2015). Canonical texts such as Macbeth are sometimes transgressed and potentially disrupted by teachers and students, how they embody the roles and how they manoeuvre in the neoliberal assemblage of the secondary school. As one student described her awareness that came through an exploration of the character of Lady Macbeth:

I was Lady Macbeth … playing such a strong character was much more fun. That’s why I was always drawn to her. How could someone have that much power in an age when like women had nothing? That annoys me,
when they make the men so much more powerful and the women seem so pathetic. But that's what it's like in real life. (Elizabeth, independent school student)

It is easy to presume from a critical positionality that the characters the research participants embodied such as Lady Macbeth (one of the characters most frequently written on in the year 12 drama exams in Western Australia) would be disempowering for young female students because they reify hierarchical and heteronormative power relations. However, female participants who studied and embodied the character of Lady Macbeth felt empowered. These students drew strength from such characters in a way that could be mapped as affective flows that mediated lines of flight — breaks from homogeneity — in their becoming women. Some students reflected on their own experiences in these ways:

I was drawn to Lady Macbeth and the witches… Yeah, I think it was the power. It was a different character to what we usually get to play. (Grace, independent school student)

Marie compared the experience of working with a more contemporary Australian play (that was as heteronormative):

I did Away (Gow, 1986) in year 11 and it was like, ‘I love you. I love you too.’ And when we were like the witches [from Macbeth] it was like, ‘You’re going to be king.’ You feel powerful because you’re like, ‘I’m not like this but I can be like this.’ (Marie, independent school student)

Utilising Deleuze and Guattari’s understanding of difference as a positive force of transformation to follow the rhizomatic becomings of young women’s affective relationships with their texts/characters enabled us to map how affects were manoeuvred and possibly disrupted by young people in their interpretations of the plays they were required to study in drama: “We made the witches the more powerful ones over the men. It was interesting making women more powerful in a Shakespearean play” (Elizabeth, independent school student). In a similar vein Marie noted, “It was the witches who had control over the Shakespearean world” (independent school student).

Yet one cannot forget that these young women are surrounded by the same hegemonic normative constructions of identity in both dramatic texts and in school assemblages as the following conversation between two students shows:

Marie: I found that in most plays … the women can be powerful but like in Macbeth, Lady Macbeth dies. You’re like, ‘Okay.’ It’s always the men in the end who are the most powerful.
Elizabeth: Yeah, I’m not a huge feminist. I’ve come to accept the fact that most of these plays are male dominated and I just love them the way they are.

Marie and Elizabeth’s deterritorialisations, “We made the witches more powerful over the men”/“witches had control” were accompanied by reterritorialisations — “men in the end who are the most powerful”/“I’ve come to accept … male dominated”. As Deleuze and Guattari note, “We can see clearly here how smooth space subsists, but only to give rise to the striated”
Drama is simultaneously an enabling and constraining space for adolescent becomings where lines of flight/deterritorialisations are quickly recaptured/reterritorialised by wider heteronormative powers: “Never believe that a smooth space will suffice to save us” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 500).

G. Conclusion

The drama classroom can be a smooth space for facilitating multiple becomings, including becomings that deterritorialise from heteronormative culture. Students in their final year of high school find the embodiment of a variety of characters and roles a powerfully transformative experience at a critical time in their adolescence. However, this space can be striated and reterritorialised through the pervasive influence of performative neoliberalism that requires assemblages to perform “good school” in order to remain competitive in the education “market”. Finding themselves under constant surveillance, drama teachers often revert to teaching “the classics” in the hope that this will improve students’ grades. This safe path is a limiting force on both pedagogy and praxis. Yet, as the interview data shows, teachers and students find lines of flight from capitalist governmentality.

Insights gleaned from post-humanist and critical theorists such as Butler, Deleuze, Guattari, Foucault and Ball can be useful to map the complex terrain teachers and students find themselves traversing in the 21st century drama classroom. It is these frameworks, for example, that help us to think through the classroom dynamics and practices to see how neoliberalism impacts schooling practices and, in particular, the becomings of students and teachers in these settings. We considered how research can be enriched by critical analysis and Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis because these theories are able to chart the embodied, relational, spatial and affective energies that inhabit the drama classroom in the context of immanent capitalism. Combing these theories and frameworks in a pluralistic way allows a critique of neoliberal educational assemblages to emerge as well as revealing the emerging de-territorialisations and lines of flight in teachers and students. As one student, sharing her experiences, insightfully sums up:

High school just teaches you how to do tests. Drama teaches you life.
(Marie, independent school student)
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Claire: So I think drama is a fantastic way for kids to find themselves and to play characters that are completely different from them or to play characters that are you know bigger versions of themselves as well. … I mean I’ve had a mix over time. I’ve had incredibly macho you know heterosexual “grrr” boys. But I’ve got a few completely asexual, and then I’ve got very effeminate boys.

Kirsten: And is it a safe place for those kinds of guys?

Claire: Yes, depending on who else is in the class. So when you’ve got the effeminate ones and the aggressive you know, heterosexual dudes, that’s often quite challenging, but I think they feel safe enough in the class… I mean that’s always my number one goal first off, to create a safe classroom, because I mean, if you don’t have that then they’re not going to take risks and step out of their comfort zone.

Kirsten: Do you have girls who really break the mould?

Claire: Oh, I do, but I’ve also got the real princesses as well.

Kirsten: So tell me about the ones who do break the mould?

Claire: Well see, I probably wouldn’t look at it as boys or girls I would say that… I mean with Drama Club for example I’ve got 80 kids in it….

Kirsten: 80? Wow.

Claire: Yeah, and I think that is a magnet for the socially inept. I look around and I think oh my God we’ve got probably 90% of the social outcasts are in this room.

In the previous paper I explored how post-humanist and post critical paradigms are illuminative for analysing how the embodiment of characters from set texts in year 12 drama can empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary neoliberal times. This article extends this idea by focusing on the specific space of the typical drama classroom, such as Claire’s drama classroom above. My research revealed that because the drama classroom is an open and dynamic space, typically free of desks it holds a certain potentiality for adolescent becomings. For example, Claire’s drama classroom was a safe space for the “social outcasts” in her school.

In the article I begin with an extract from my research journal that describes my visit to a high-ranking middle class government school in the leafy green western suburbs of Perth. I visited “Oceanside College” (not its real name) in 2014 in the middle of my interview process. Oceanside College is a “successful” government school that boasts continually good results. They boast of a “culture of excellence,” “successful students,” “academically gifted,” and “outstanding success” in a wide array of events “at state, national and international levels” in their promotional materials. I use this school as an example of the embodiment of neoliberal performativity in educational assemblages.

A major conclusion of the study is that neoliberalism has had a profoundly detrimental impact on arts education. In this paper I build on existing studies that show how neoliberalism has influenced education in the western world generally,
by narrowing the focus on to drama education in schools in Western Australia. I show how schools such as Oceanside College conform to the performativity principle with their “displays of quality” in their promotional materials. I discuss how previous research has shown that standardised testing serves an economic agenda with no statistical improvement in numeracy and literacy overall (Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). My research builds on this by exposing the impact of performative standardised on drama education. The deleterious effects include a shifting of resources away from the arts and towards “academic” subjects that are ranked in standardised tests such as NAPLAN and OLNA. The study also supports previous research that shows that the commodification of education leads to growing inequality, the surveillance of teachers and increased stress.

I introduce Deleuze’s “society of control” as an illustrative conceptual portrait for understanding the neoliberal education system. I examine how a control society impacts adolescent becomings in contemporary times. A major finding of the research was the real inequality in Australia’s education system. Elite schools have state of the art theatres that rival the State Theatre Centre. They hire professional actors, directors, managers and crew to put on spectacular productions with budgets around $40000, which improves the school brand. Inadequately funded government schools, on the other hand, have dilapidated converted classrooms painted black with budgets of $0-$2000 to put on productions that they too attempt to use to promote the school. Drama teachers in these schools reported using their own time and money to facilitate a school production.

The previous article theorises as to how Deleuze and Guattari’s schizonalaysis can be used to map teacher and student becomings in contemporary times. In this paper I draw on a series of key Deleuzian concepts including becoming, territorialisation and lines of flight, which allowed me to delve deeper into the data. I explore how these potent conceptual tools can be used deconstruct how becomings are actualised in the neoliberal assemblage of the secondary school. Students both resisted and acquiesced to hegemonic constructions of masculinity and femininity. One student, Zac, found drama to be a safe space to express his homosexuality in an otherwise conservative Christian school where students told him he would “burn in hell”. Other female students found embodying powerful characters like the witches from Macbeth or Portia from The Merchant of Venice gave them a strength they had not previously experienced.

Central findings of the study show that drama is a subject rich with potentiality for students to strengthen their creativity and “speak back” against the neoliberal project. The research revealed how the drama classroom is an open, dynamic space where students can embody nomadic identities at a critical time in their adolescent development. I introduce Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of smooth and striated space to describe how space is composed of the constrictions and flows of energy. Smooth spaces are characterised by free-flowing energy and heterogeneity whereas striated spaces are strictly bounded and rule intensive. I discuss how the research revealed that the drama classroom can be a smooth space in Deleuzian terms because of its propensity to allow creative inquiry and expression, and the embodiment of a multitude of identities. The participants described the drama classroom as a safe, free, collaborative and creative space. Normative gender binaries were frequently transgressed in
the drama classroom, particularly for boys, where it is socially acceptable (and indeed desirable!) to wear wigs, dresses and heels. Participants also frequently compared the drama classroom to a math or English classroom with desks and a focus on individual achievement. In Deleuzian terms, the drama space can be a smooth space for adolescent desire to momentarily move out of the heteronormative strata.

What is delimiting about the drama classroom’s potentiality is the tendency of teachers and students, as desiring machines, to conform to the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. I explore how neoliberal market ideologies strate the space. Teachers were profoundly influenced by neoliberal discourses of “professionalism” and “excellence”. Schools’ adoption of the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity can be seen in their striving for an “achievement culture” and a desire to create a “culture of excellence”. Through culture, knowledge and power educational institutions contribute to the shaping of experience and identity. Some teachers performed “professionalism” through adopting corporate dress and placing more emphasis on theory than practical work. As Deleuze states, “the corporation constantly presents the brashest rivalry as a healthy form of emulation, an excellent motivational force that opposes individuals against one another and runs through each, dividing each within” (1992, p. 5).

In the complex interplay of power relations within different social assemblages I felt it was important to explore how issues of power were being played out in the schools as a whole. The data revealed that schools place a low status and little priority on the arts. The arts (particularly drama and dance) were marginalised on the timetable and their physical spaces were often overtaken by administration for a number of activities deemed more “important” than teaching. Some schools even reported theatres and dance studios being converted into lecture theatres. The general consensus was that drama was not perceived as being an “academic” subject but rather one where students “ran around pretending to be trees”.

However, the data also revealed ruptures to the normative strata through teachers adopting creative forms of resistance such as doing practical and collaborative work outside of class time or the traditional theatre space, or refusing to hire professional actors in school productions simply to promote the school brand. Other teachers refused to dress in a corporate manner: “I’ll dress like a lawyer when you pay me like one” (Ella, government school teacher).

In this article I demonstrate how Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis can be utilised to map student and teacher becomings and the way these are actualised within the neoliberal and often heterosexually-striated spaces of the secondary school assemblage. I propose that schizoanalysis offers new insights for mapping complex desire-flows and embodied identities through and against the dominant performative and heterosexist culture. In the concluding sections I introduce the notion of creativity as one of the ways drama teachers can protest against neoliberal hegemony.
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Prelude

Green grass (real grass), limestone blocks and busy students neatly dressed in navy blazers, white shirts and navy skirts or trousers. An artistic bronze sign announcing “Oceanside College” rose up out of the manicured garden, and a welcoming arrow guided me to the Administration block.

“The principal will be with you in a minute, ma’am. He’s just on his mobile phone. Would you like a tea or coffee?”
I sit and wait in the reception. High ceilings, tall glass windows, comfortable chairs. I’m surrounded by trophies and photographs of students: in brass bands, winning awards, shaking hands with people in suits. The principal talks on his mobile for another 20 minutes so I read the glossy folder on the table. A newspaper cutting of the school’s impressive NAPLAN results – first place; then their ranking as one of the top schools in Western Australia’s year 12 results. Students’ names are highlighted in the subject awards. Page after page follows with exhibitions, successful competition entries and beautiful people smiling receiving plaques from politicians, university deans and the principal. Impressive. Finally, I get to an article from a local newspaper relating to drama: the school production of a Shakespearean classic. Students dressed in Elizabethan garb smile standing in stylised poses in an outdoor amphitheatre. Given that this play has only one female character, I wonder what all of the girls in hooped velvet dresses actually did? The article states that the production was a great success. I look up from my reverie. A man in a suit is smiling at me. The Principal.

Introduction

Our qualitative ethnographic research project mapping the effects of neoliberalism on drama education is based on semi-structured interviews with 15 drama teachers and 13 of their ex-students in Western Australia across government, Catholic and independent school systems. Utilising a post-humanist paradigm, we drew upon Deleuze and Guattari’s “schizoanalysis” as a lens to interpret the data, because it foregrounds complexity. As Guattari explains, “rather than moving in the direction of reductionist modifications which simplify the complex,” schizoanalysis “will work towards its complexification … in short towards its ontological heterogeneity” (Guattari, 1995 [2006], p. 61). For Deleuze and Guattari “everything is a machine” (1972, p. 2): both the great capitalist machine and the teachers and students who are plugged into it — all are, and are made up of “producing-machines, desiring-machines” (p. 2). They note:

There are no desiring-machines that exist outside the social machines that they form on a large scale; and no social machines without the desiring machines that inhabit them on a small scale. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1972 [2009], p. 2)

Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis can be helpful when examining the intersection between capitalist neoliberalism and drama teachers and students — the vast social machine and the desiring machines. Schizoanalysis offers conceptual tools to explore embodied student-becomings and teacher-becomings in the drama classroom, and the way these are actualised or not within the neoliberal and heterosexually striated spaces of the secondary school assemblage. It is particularly useful for examining the embodied, relational, spatial and affective energies that inhabit the drama classroom because it moves beyond analysing discourse. Rather than viewing teachers and students as Kantian unified individualised “subjects” (Kant, 1998, p. 142)— Deleuze and Guattari (1972) speak of “desiring machines” that do not “exist outside the social machines they form on a large scale” (p. 2), indicating a symbiotic relationship.
between the desiring machines inhabiting teachers, students and neoliberal assemblages.

We also draw on a series of other key Deleuzian concepts including notions of **becoming**, **territorialisation** and **lines of flight**. Each of these further allows us to look in richer ways at the data. Other contemporary researchers have also found these concepts useful. For example, Recent studies including those by Renold and Ringrose (2008) and Ringrose (2011) have also used Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts such as “becoming”, “territorialisation” and “lines of flight” to analyse qualitative research because they offer strategies for mapping resistance and acquiescence to hegemonic constructions of femininity and masculinity; questions that are key to this paper.

The first section of this paper focuses on neoliberalism, education and its intersection with Deleuze and Guattari’s thought. Specifically, we examine the effect neoliberalism is having on drama education in Western Australia. The second section considers space and becoming in the context of the drama classroom itself, and how these are moderated through the dominant neoliberal performative culture.

### Neoliberalism, performativity, education and Deleuze and Guattari

According to Down (2009), “Neoliberalism is committed to the idea that the market should be the central organising principle for all political, social and economic decisions” (p. 51). Moreover, “like the rest of the Western world, Australian schools are being restructured and re-cultured around the values of neo-liberalism” (p. 51). Many critics have discussed the marketization or “commodification” of education where schools, universities and education itself become “products” on the global market (Apple, 1989; Beder et al., 2009; Boxley, 2003; Connell, 2013b; Giroux, 2003; James et al., 2010; McLaren, 1989).

Schools like Oceanside College⁸ compete for students in a market where they are judged by published external test scores (Ball, 2003, 2012; Beder et al., 2009; Connell, 2013b; Fitzgerald & Rainnie, 2011; Keddie et al., 2011; Thompson & Cook, 2012a, 2012b, 2014; Webb, 2011, 2014). Dey and Steyaert (2007, p. 439) have labelled this the “McDonaldization” of education which results in “fast-food knowledge” and reflects that “spectre of the performativity principle.” As McKenzie (2001) asserts:

> Performance will be to the twentieth and 21st centuries what discipline was to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, namely, an ontological formation of power and knowledge...but let me just stress that performative power/knowledge is really just coming over the horizon; discipline wasn’t built in a day, nor has the performance stratum fully installed itself. (pp. 5-6)

The term “performativity” is used in a number of different contexts with many meanings (Austin, 2004 [1962]; Ball, 2003; Butler, 1990; Derrida, 1971 [1988]). Ball (2003), for example, uses the term to describe the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement, and in this interpretation performativity is:

---

⁸ All of the names of schools, teachers and students in this paper are pseudonyms.
A technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgments, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change — based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic). The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of “quality”, or “moments” of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgment. The issue of who controls the field of judgment is crucial (p. 216)

This performative “display of quality” can be seen in Oceanside College’s positioning of their NAPLAN results and other statistics on the first pages of their glossy promotional folder. All of the schools in this study, government, Catholic and independent, had their NAPLAN or test results displayed on their web-pages, promotional materials or newsletters. In our research the Western Australian schools’ adoption of corporate performative discourses featured prominently, even in the most unlikely contexts. For example, in Catholic schools, whose promotional materials focus on “collaboration, love and service,” teachers reported being “hauled over the coals” if their statistics didn’t match up to expectations (Claireii). Another teacher from an elite private school received a text message when he was on holiday saying that he had 62 hours to explain why his test results weren’t as good as last year (Jason, independent school teacher).

In Australia, performative compulsory standardised testing in literacy and numeracy is often driven by an economic agenda (Connell, 2013b; Haynes, 2006; Keddie et al., 2011). Giroux (2008) notes that similar educational reforms in the United States serve the needs of big business, not only through the privatisation of schools but also through the writing, and administering of standardised tests and testing materials. For example, according to Beder et al. (2009), it costs a state in the US around $10 million to have a school performance evaluated, mainly on the basis of standardised tests (p. 107). The market for school assessment, tutoring, test-preparation services and materials is worth US$25 billion. McGraw-Hill’s contract to supply tests to Kentucky alone in 2002 was worth US$30 million. In Australia, NAPLAN test booklets have filled supermarket shelves. In May 2013 Hinkler Books’ School Zone NAPLAN-Style Workbook: Year 3 Numeracy featured in the top ten bestseller list at book retailer Dymocks, alongside books by Jamie Oliver and Jodi Picoult (Morris, 2013).

Researchers cite many deleterious effects of the performative commodification of education on schools in Western Australia (Adoniou, 2012; Thompson, 2010b; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). They point to growing inequality, surveillance of teachers, loss of professionalism and increased stress for students and teachers with no statistical improvement in numeracy and literacy overall (Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). Moreover, NAPLAN has lead to a narrowing of the curriculum focus, a “teach to the test mentality” and a return to teacher-centered pedagogies that lower student engagement with learning. Teachers reported that test preparation and increased emphasis on competition meant that it was harder to cater for students with the greatest need. Reich stresses, “The danger with high-stakes testing, of course, is that schools become test-taking factories in which the only thing taught or learned is how to take high-stakes tests” (Reich, 2003, p. 1; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013)
“Choice”, “accountability”, “standards”, “competition” and “reform” are the performative buzzwords of the neoliberal discourse in education. Neoliberal assemblages value narrow measurable outcomes as a means of control. As Deleuze (1992) states, “For the school system: continuous forms of control … the introduction of the "corporation" at all levels of schooling” (Deleuze, p. 7). This neoliberal view of education is evidenced in the current Australian Federal Education Minister, Christopher Pyne’s comments, insinuating that Australia does not have an equity problem but rather a problem with poor teaching:

We have an obsession with school funding in Australia when we should have an obsession with standards. The issue in education is not a lack of money, the issue in education is a lack of a fighting spirit about a rigorous curriculum, engaging parents in their children’s education. The argument around teaching shouldn’t be about industrial relations, it should be around, ‘Are our teachers as high a standard as they possibly could be, and if they aren’t, how do we get them to that point?’ (Pyne, cited in Grattan, 2013, p. 7)

However, Riddle (2013) claims that ideas like these oversimplify the problem. He notes the 2013 OECD global student rankings highlighted that a “slide in the performance of Australian students in reading, science and math, hides the real state of inequality in Australia’s education system” (Riddle, 2013).

An unequal playing field: Drama education in Western Australian secondary schools

Oceanside College is a government school in the leafy green “western suburbs” of Perth, Western Australia. According to Beder et al. (2009), there are currently three tiers of education in Australia. First, private schools that “cater to the elites who want to give their children social and educational advantages”; secondly, “other private and selective public schools that are adequately funded and able to control their enrolments”, such as Oceanside College; and lastly, “inadequately funded public schools whose doors are open to any child, whatever their socio-economic background, religion, or ability” (p.187). They argue that these levels are a result of a neoliberal, market-driven, corporate approach to education.

With regard to drama, elite schools often have state of the art theatres that are “better than the WA State Theatre Centre” (Ella, independent school teacher). They hire professional actors/directors/lighting and set designers to work alongside students to do massive productions that advertise the school. Kate, a teacher at an elite school noted:

They had paid actors in leading roles, paid lighting and sound. They were just using the school’s money and stage, and it involved a couple of students but the community saw them as a St Albert’s Catholic School production.

In the second tier, selective private and government schools cater for the middle class, are well funded and have the ability to pick and choose students. As one teacher from a selective government school said:
It’s a very, very good school … a lot of people move into the Green View area to go to Green View. A lot of people come from overseas. It’s a sought after government school, an independent government school. We’re always in the top 20 schools. (Andre)

Whilst Green View may not have a theatre that rivals the State Theatre Centre, Andre’s well-funded school has the financial ability to hire industry professionals to tutor his students. Compared with well-funded schools which had school production budgets in excess of $40 000; in the third tier inadequately funded government schools had budgets from $0-$2000 for school productions and teachers often used their own money to buy costumes, props and sets. However, these productions were still a source of advertising for schools. Every school in this study utilized images of their drama productions in promotional pamphlets and websites — as we saw in Oceanside College’s glossy folder. Teachers often spent their own money as a commitment to the powerful developmental possibilities of drama that go beyond massaging public perception.

The Australian Federal Government’s 2011 Review of School Funding (the “Gonski Report”) highlighted the disparity between the different education sectors. It noted that in 2010, 85% of all Indigenous students, 78% of students with disabilities, 83% of students in remote or very remote areas, 79% of students in the bottom SEA (Socio Economic Advantage) quartile, and 68% of students for whom English was their second language attended government schools (Gonski, 2008). This revealed that the schools with the least funding were responsible for educating the most disadvantaged students.

Space and becoming in senior secondary drama classrooms

Smooth space and striated space — nomad space and sedentary space — the space in which the war machine develops and the space instituted by the State apparatus — are not of the same nature. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 524)

Drama classrooms are usually large spaces that exist within the larger space of the school. More than their physical dimensions, Deleuze and Guattari develop the concepts of striated and smooth spaces to describe how “space” more broadly is composed of the constrictions and flows of energy in the socio-cultural sphere. Striated spaces conflate with homogeneity and conversely, “the smooth [space] actually seemed to pertain to a fundamental heterogeneity” (p. 536). Thus “striated spaces are hierarchical, rule intensive, strictly bounded and confining, whereas smooth spaces are open, dynamic and allow for transformation to occur” (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360).

In drama, smooth spaces are those that are “safe” spaces for students to be and become minoritarian. In drama, students engage in becoming through the trying on of a multitude of different identities. When taught well, drama involves a process of creative inquiry and expression (Greene, 1995). According to May (2003), the concept of “becoming” is central to Deleuze’s work (May, 2003, p. 139). Becoming is a process not a goal, and has an affinity with multiplicity and difference. The concept of “becoming” is a useful tool to explore mid to late
adolescents’ developing sense of self. The word “identity” has implications of a fixed point or a defined subjectivity (Guattari, 1995 [2006], p. 3). To use the phrase “becoming woman” or “adolescent becomings” incorporates multiplicity and describes a process that young people are undertaking, rather than a point of arrival. In Nietzsche and Philosophy Deleuze states, “There is no being beyond becoming, nothing beyond multiplicity … multiplicity is the affirmation of unity; becoming is the affirmation of being” (Deleuze, 1983 [2006], p. 23). This commitment to multiplicity was evidenced in the pedagogy of drama teachers in this research, reflecting a different set of values than those in the neoliberal project.

In our interviews with Western Australian drama teachers and students, every participant agreed that drama was a “safe space” for student becomings. For example, drama teacher Liz described how her drama classroom differed from a math classroom:

It’s actually is a lot safer [than a math classroom]. I think it’s safer in terms of students expressing themselves; it’s much freer. I often have kids coming in and saying…[whispers] I’ve got to be careful what I say, but…”Oh, I just had maths [sigh]. At least I can think in this class”. Or you know, I feel like there’s room to be creative, there’s room to breathe; there’s room to work in a different way. It’s much more open, it’s freer, it’s collaborative, it’s creative. (Liz, drama teacher, independent school)

Similarly, Yana and Di, two drama students from government schools, described how the space in a drama classroom differed from other classrooms:

Yana: Well the obvious thing is the complete difference between walking into a drama classroom and walking into an English room. In a normal classroom you’ve got the chairs set up, there’s that authority already stamped in because everyone’s sitting, it’s formatted, its structured. Whereas you get into a drama classroom [laughs] and it’s, “Space!” You know? It’s like pure chaos. There’s not the formality in a drama classroom. Generally the students who do drama together have a bond that you don’t see in a lot of other subjects…. I think that’s what it really is in a drama class: a community. You’ve got your misfits and your attention seekers and it’s great because you’ve got all of these people who wouldn’t normally fit together are put into an environment and yeah, it’s really special.

Yana: But drama is a safe space… Well it’s fascinating. I mean guys always want to dress up in drag. Put a wig and a skirt in front of them and they’re like [clicks fingers], “I’m there.” Bit of lipstick, heels.

In these extracts Liz (the teacher) and Yana compared the striated and smooth/nomad spaces of the English/math and drama classrooms. They described how “space” was composed of the constrictions (such as desks and normative gender boundaries) and flows of energy in the socio-cultural sphere of the school. The striated spaces of the math and English classrooms could be seen to conflate with homogeneity; whereas the smooth space of the drama classroom appeared to elicit heterogeneity. Moreover, the striated spaces of the English and math classrooms were hierarchical (“authority stamped on it”), rule
intensive, and strictly bounded and confining. Conversely, the smooth space of the drama classroom was open, dynamic and allowed for transformation to occur.

Normative gender binaries of femininity and masculinity have been described as: “The dominant culture of femininity (for females) has constituted nurturance, dependence, cooperation, intuition and passivity, while for males, masculinity has embodied aggression, independence, rationality, activity, and competition” (Chepyator-Thomson & Ennis, 1997, p. 90). In addition to being a free, creative space, the idea that the drama classroom is a safe space for heterogeneity (“misfits”) and moments of deterritorialisation from normative gender boundaries was echoed by a number of teachers and students:

I look around drama club and I think oh my God we’ve got probably 90% of the social outcasts in this group. (Claire, drama teacher, Catholic school)

The gender roles are diminished a lot more in the theatre space. I think a lot of the guys who do drama are still seen as being effeminate and some of them really are, and that’s cool. That’s fine in the drama class. That’s expected and it’s acceptable and a guy that dances is an awesome thing in drama but in some of the classes it’s not. (Tom, drama teacher, government school)

The first thing I get asked for with the junior boys is, “Miss, do you have a wig?” And they love wearing dresses and wigs… Maybe it’s a way for them to explore, you know, being in the shoes of the other, the opposite sex in a safe environment…The drama space is a safe place for them to explore issues that they might not otherwise talk about. Drama attracts the kids who may be questioning their sexuality or are more in touch with their emotions, which as a boy, is not so acceptable in our society unfortunately. But they get an opportunity to play with that here and step into those roles. “Oh I’m role-playing, I’m playing somebody else” so it’s safe to try being the person that they feel like they have inside of them. They get to express themselves in a way that they’re not comfortable doing out in the playground. (Kate, drama teacher, Catholic boys school)

The interview data shows that the drama classroom can be a smooth space for students who do not fit over-coded, heterosexist gender binaries to take up lines of flight and perform or embody heterogeneity and multiplicity. This was reflected in two of the gay students who were interviewed for the research stating that they felt comfortable to “come out” in drama. As Zac illustrates, the drama space — a smooth/nomad space — allowed him to express his minoritarian subjectivity:

I’m gay so obviously having to act I always acted differently in drama because I felt like out in the school-yard, I’d get bashed. And it was an actual genuine fear… When I stepped into the theatre, I could finally be who I truly was. That’s what I didn’t like about St Albans because the moment drama finished, I had to quickly switch on my masculinity again. But in drama I felt like I could be myself and not be judged for it. (Zac, independent school student)

In summary, our research showed that the drama classroom could be a space where difference and multiplicity is accepted. In Deleuzian terms, it could
be a smooth space for adolescent desire to momentarily move out of the normative strata. Students demonstrated their deterritorialising from normative heterosexist gender binaries. Boys felt free to put on dresses, wigs, or “the lycra suit” (Ariel, government school teacher), and girls felt free to “be ugly” (Gemma, independent school teacher). Drama was a safe place for “the socially inept”, “social outcasts” and the generally “weird” students, who don’t fit the “grrr heterosexual guys”, “princess girls,” or the “academic good student” mould (Claire, Catholic school teacher). As one student explained:

You can get it all wrong in drama and try it all again … there’s this protection, the fact that you’re not being yourself. You can let down the barriers. (Miranda)

Nomadic spaces and neoliberal assemblages

While the drama classroom can be an ideal, smooth space for students to explore heterogeneity at a critical time in their adolescent development, Ringrose (2013) argues that school space is also shaped by neoliberal and market ideologies which “striate” it. Tension exists between these two spaces: smooth (heterogeneous/free flowing) and striated (homogenous/rigid). For example, our research revealed low perceptions of the status of drama. As one Catholic school drama teacher noted, according to popular opinion, drama students “just run around and pretend to be trees” (Claire). Likewise, students complained that drama was perceived to be: “a throw away subject” (Cassie, Catholic school student); “the [subject] you do because it’s easy, which it’s not, it’s as hard as history” (Miranda, independent school student); “the fun subject” (Di, government school student); and “the subject you do because you’re not smart enough to do physics” (Lorenzo, independent school student).

Drama was generally viewed as “not academic” (Claire). This view reflected the status afforded to those subjects that cannot be quantitatively measured. At one school, for example, the Principal regularly told staff, “Good teachers get good results: measurable data. I’m not interested in fluffy feel-good stuff." As Deleuze (1992) states, “...the different control mechanisms are inseparable variations, forming a system of variable geometry, the language of which is numerical” (p. 4). Of key importance to the neoliberal assemblage is “the development of techniques of auditing, accounting and management that enable a ‘market’ for public services to be established autonomous from central control” (Barry, Osborne, and Rose 1996, p. 14, cited in Webb, 2011, p. 736).

Measurable data becomes the sole means of judging teacher success, rather than the “fluffy stuff” such as: creativity, working collaboratively, and kinaesthetic learning. Deleuze states that in control societies, “We no longer find ourselves dealing with the mass/individual pair. Individuals have become “individuals” and masses, samples, data, markets, or “bands” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 5).

This development has had a marked effect on drama teaching. For example, the youngest teacher interviewed stated that she didn’t want her drama classes to be thought of as “fun”. She wanted them to be taken seriously, so she did a lot more “written work” and dressed “really professionally” (Liz). When interviewed at school, Liz wore stilettos, skirt and suit jacket. This stands in marked contrast to the other 14 drama teachers who wore “comfortable shoes” and “smart-casual” clothing. It is not unusual for drama teachers to sit on the floor
or participate in movement activities that require loose-fitting clothing. Liz’s independent Christian school is a conservative lower-middle socio-economic suburban school that appears to have adopted the dominant culture of competitive performativity and the accompanying surveillance of teachers, as is evidenced in her description of her school and curricula:

Liz: This school is definitely a Christian school so all of their policies and everything they do, their value system is all based on Biblical principles first of all. They want to have an achievement culture — specifically academic. They want to create a culture of excelling and excellence. So with our programming it’s very specific and they check all of our programs.

Kirsten: Who’s they?

Liz: Curriculum [whispers] officers…so basically we have two people who look after curriculum.

Kirsten: Right, so that culture is that because it’s a competitive area around here with all of the different schools?

Liz: Definitely. At the end of each year the curriculum manager will go through and show us how each school performed, where we ranked. Last year we ranked 19th in the state. Then they show us on a scale how all of the different subjects did, in front of everyone. So I guess there is that accountability.

The school’s “achievement culture” and its desire to “create a culture of excellence,” coupled with the control of teachers’ programs and Liz’s whispering when talking about the “managers” is illustrative of the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. It appears Liz has adopted and embodied the school’s performative “academic” culture, as can be seen in her comments on the following page:

Kirsten: How would you describe your teaching style?

Liz: I’m much more serious…academic. I try to always break the stereotype of ‘drama is fun’. It’s been an ongoing thing at our school, like, ‘Drama’s fun. It’s the subject where you don’t have to write’. And we’re actually changing that culture so we’re doing a lot of counselling, where if they’re not doing well in English they can’t do it. So I’ve bought in a lot of theory in year nine and ten. There’s this push to be professional. I’ve really tried to change the culture. I would rather fewer students and have the serious tone of “If you want to do this, you’ve got to be focused and you’ve got to be good at it.”

However, not all teachers in this study adopted the dominant culture of neoliberal performativity.

**Becoming minoritarian**

Our research revealed that teachers and students moved between deterritorialisation, “freeing ourselves from the restrictions and boundaries of
controlled, striated spaces — and reterritorialisation — repositioning ourselves within new regimes of striated spaces”. For Deleuze and Guattari, deterritorialisation describes a process whereby the flow of energy escapes or momentarily moves outside the normative strata, and reterritorialisation describes the process of recuperation from those ruptures (Tamboukou, 2008, p. 360). Lines of flight are deterritorialisations that do not stop but branch out and produce rhizomatic connections (multiplicities).

These ruptures can be seen in drama teachers’ actions in this study. One teacher, Kate, refused to hire professional actors for the school production because she argued that the event was supposed to be a “school production”. Another teacher, Ella, when told to “dress like a lawyer” retorted that she would dress like a lawyer when they paid her like one. Most drama teachers held their more creative productions and arts clubs outside of school hours. Even Liz, the young drama teacher who dressed like a lawyer and adopted a neoliberal approach to teaching in order to be taken seriously, stated that if she could change anything about teaching drama she wished that other teachers (“like maths teachers”) “could understand that creativity takes time and that you just can’t teach a concept in half an hour”.

Teachers also adopt creative forms of resistance through developing safe spaces that encourage becoming minoritarian in their classes. Drama in this way enables students to move “beyond oppressive self—other relations towards a form of subjectivity that can welcome differences as well as the differentiating force of life itself” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 560). In this way teachers created “new weapons” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 4) to speak back to the neoliberal project.

Paradoxically in the contemporary drive for measurement, it is in the arborescent, hierarchical, Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002) we find “creating” at the pinnacle of the cognitive pyramid representing the highest form of cognitive thinking. “Creating” includes generating new ideas, designing, constructing, planning, producing, or viewing things in innovative ways. Creating is the bedrock of drama. For Deleuze and Guattari, “to create is to resist: pure becomings” (1991 [1994], p. 110).

Conclusion

Australian teachers operate in a zeitgeist of capitalist neoliberalism, which has had the effect of making education a commodity that can be bought and sold. Our research shows that drama is a subject that celebrates creativity and heterogeneity. Yet it is often reterritorialised by the neoliberal assemblages of the school hierarchy and the need to be taken “seriously” and be identified as a “professional” and not just be a “fun” place where students can be creative. Creative lines of flight are also recaptured by the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. Nevertheless many teachers persist in rerouting the flow of power toward new and creative constructions.

In A Thousand Plateaus, Deleuze and Guattari (1987 [2012]) state, “We can be thrown into a becoming by anything at all, by the most unexpected, most insignificant of things. You don’t deviate from the majority unless there is a little detail that starts to swell and carries you off” (p. 541). Perhaps drama classrooms can still provide that “little detail” that propels teachers and students into that line of flight which sees them becoming minoritarian.


Beder, S., et al. (2009). This little kiddy went to market: The corporate capture of childhood. NSW, University of NSW Press.


Article Three: More than sluts or prissy girls

Figure 1. Multiplicite Rhizomatique. Adapted from Mille Plateaux (p.1), by Y. Ruitong 2015, France: WordPress. Copyright 2015 by WordPress. Reprinted with permission.
The representation of women in *Cloudstreet* is cringe-worthy! The kids’ responses are very two-dimensional. They describe Dolly as a slut and they always dress her in red. They never see the nuances of her character. And they are always horrified when she has that physical connection with Lester. I’m like, “Yes. They have sex. It’s not as if Lester is as pure as the driven snow.” … They have such a fairy-tale view of literature. (Denise, government school teacher)

Trevor [the Vice Principal] used to say, “We need to start teaching the bible more in your class.”… But you know the number of boys we had in drama who were gay and couldn’t say they were gay and you know they just couldn’t come out. (Jo, independent school teacher)

This article illuminates the intersection between text, gender and becoming. In the previous journal article I revealed how the drama classroom generated smooth space that applauds creativity and heterogeneity. Conversely this empowering space is striated by the school administration’s marginalisation of drama on the timetable and the physical space of the school. Furthermore, the space is further constrained by teachers’ desire to conform to normative neoliberal performative identity of a “professional” and not wanting their subject to be seen as just a “fun” place where students can be creative. Nevertheless drama teachers and students found lines of flight from restrictive forces through outright non-cooperation and also indirect creative resistance.

This article foregrounds the gendered elements of becoming in order to answer the research question: How does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings in contemporary times? I pose the following questions: What constructions of femininity and masculinity are students embodying from popular dramatic texts in the drama classroom at a critical time in their social and emotional development? Are these constructions empowering? What powers are influencing teachers’ choices of texts for their predominantly female students? The relationship between the embodiment of dramatic characters, gender, and identity is explored using Butler’s concept of gender performance and Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome. Drawing on ethnographic data based on observations and interviews with drama teachers and senior secondary drama students in schools in Western Australia I focus on student’s experiences of embodying various characters from the most popular texts in the Western Australian Curriculum. The research revealed that whilst approximately 70% of drama students in any given year in Western Australia are female, the texts most frequently chosen by teachers offer little in the way of female characters or positive role models for girls.

I explore how student becomings are mediated and constituted through socially overcoded gender binaries. The teachers and students in this study held binary views of the female characters in the plays they studied labelling them using signifiers such as “slut”, “prissy” and “bitch”. I examine how discourses surrounding characters in texts construct subjectivities and how the embodiment of these characters can reify or challenge norms such as hegemonic masculinity. When students see characters such as Dolly as being a “slut” their personification of that character with “red” costume and “sassy” gait further reinforces dominant discourses. However, when teachers and students reinterpret traditional characters such as the witches from *Macbeth*, as powerful business-women, injurious signifiers such as “witch” can be deconstructed and
reconstructed as powerful. The subversive redeployment of values such as power and control that originally belong to the masculine domain to the witches can be a potestas for adolescent girls. Moreover through creative reinterpretations of texts teachers and students in this study were able to see how gender is constructed socially. A hegemonic discursive/epistemic model of gender intelligibility that assumes that for bodies to make sense there must be a stable gender where masculine expresses male and feminine expresses female can be challenged in the drama classroom when girls take on male roles and vice versa.

I examine the performance of characters from texts set for students to study in their final year of high school, and the potentiality this holds for developing empathy and an understanding of the “other”. For example, one student described how in the theatre she could be whoever she wanted to be, she could “be the most opposite of me that I can to explore and see where it goes.” The research showed that identity exploration that occurs at a critical time in adolescent development could be a life-changing experience for students. However, what hampers this potentiality are the roles available to young women in particular so that these generative possibilities are constrained by restrictions of gender binaries such as the virgin/prissy girl and the prostitute/slut. This monolithic conceptualisation of femininity is enduring, despite decades of feminist action. For example, last century Irigaray (1985) argued that our entire society is predicated on the exchange of women. This system creates three types of women: the mother, who is entirely use value; the virgin, who is completely exchange value; and the prostitute, who embodies both use and exchange value. It is interesting to note that the majority of characters in the set texts fit these powerful normative constructions of femininity.

In this article I utilize Braidotti’s (2011) critical post-humanism to define a post-anthropocentric understanding of subjectivity and sexual difference as a way of rejecting essentialist monolithic conceptualisations of masculinity and femininity. This understanding of subjectivity emphasizes the embodied and sexually differentiated non-unitary subject. The drama classroom holds the potentiality for creative transformations away from heterosexist subject positions, as is evidenced by participants such as Zac, who reported that he felt safe to be openly gay: “when I stepped into the theatre I could finally be who I truly was.”

In this paper I elaborate on the students’ deterritorialisation from gender norms from the data and I then explore the reterritorialisation or recoiling through the recapturing powers of normalization. The investments of desire limiting adolescent becomings include imitating wealthy, white, thin, consumerist characters from the media. However the most significant potestas for adolescent minoritarian becomings was the lack of good female characters on the set text list. This coupled with the culture of competitive performativity led teachers to “play it safe” and choose well-known classic texts over indigenous or feminist works to limit minoritarian becomings. I discuss the global culture of performance as one of the conditions of capitalism where education conforms to the logic of the corporate model. The deterritorialisation of students and teachers making characters such as the witches and Lady Macbeth a source of power is recaptured or reterritorialised by the powerful capitalist construction of heteronormative neoliberal femininity seen in the characters from The Devil Wears Prada. Capitalism shapes the desires of its subjects. As Deleuze notes:
Many young people strangely boast of being “motivated”; they re-request apprenticeships and permanent training. It's up to them to discover that they're being made to serve, just as their elders discovered, not without difficulty, the telos of the disciplines. The coils of a serpent are even more complex than the burrows of a molehill. (1992, p. 7)
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Abstract:
This article examines the relationships between the embodiment of dramatic characters, gender, and identity. It draws on ethnographic data based on observations and interviews with 28 drama teachers and senior secondary drama students in Western Australia. We explore how student becomings in year 12 drama classrooms are mediated and constituted through socially overcoded gender binaries in a dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. We ask the questions: What constructions of femininity and masculinity are students embodying from popular dramatic texts in the drama classroom at a critical time in their social and emotional development? Are these constructions empowering? Or disempowering? What factors are influencing teachers’ choices of texts for their predominantly female students? Our research shows that what is delimiting about this potentiality in a time of identity exploration and formation are the constraining gender-binary roles available to young women particularly, and the performative pressures teachers are experiencing.
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INTRODUCTION

As a dynamic and fluid space the drama classroom provides a place where identity can be considered and critiqued in embodied ways through processes that reflect the fluidity of contemporary times. Drawing on scholars whose research utilizes critical and poststructuralist paradigms including Butler (1990, 2004), Braidotti (2010, 2013) and Deleuze and Guattari (1968; 1992, 1994 [2012]; 1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]), this article first maps how drama teachers and students negotiate issues of masculinity, femininity and becoming in the drama classroom; and secondly, considers how identity is mediated within the neoliberal performative culture of the secondary school. We focus on the notion of becoming as it is a useful tool to explore adolescents’ developing sense of self at a time of significant change, and particular to drama where students engage in becoming through trying on a range of different identities. Key to this process is
that is a course of action, not a goal, and animates multiplicity and difference (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012]).

The study draws on 28 qualitative, in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted with drama teachers and students from four school contexts (single sex and coeducational schools in the Catholic, independent and government sectors) in Perth, Western Australia. It explores the intersection between gender, text and becoming in the drama classroom in order to consider what constructions of femininity and masculinity students embody as they are drawn from commonly used set (i.e. syllabus required) dramatic texts at a critical time in their social/cognitive and emotional development. More specifically, we consider the ways in which these constructions affirm or restrict students’ becomings and why these drama teachers choose some texts over others. Furthermore, to consider how drama and the curriculum enables or constrains these explorations and choices, we turn our attention to the broader context in which these explorations occur, critiquing for example, the influence of neoliberalism on education in Australia. It is within this context that critique is important as Locke (2015) explains: “Through conditions of “performance” capitalism, education is to conform to a logic of performativity that ensures not only the efficient operation of the state in the world market, but also the continuation of a global culture of performance” (p. 247).

Gender, Embodiment and Text in the Drama Classroom

In many countries across the world girls outnumber boys in high school drama classrooms (Hatton, 2003), and in Australia, girls are twice as likely as boys to participate in drama (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). In Western Australia—the site for this research—the ratio of girls to boys in senior secondary drama is approximately 70% to 30% (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013). Consistently across each of these school systems students as part of their final year of high school are asked to study plays from a set text list determined by a curriculum authority10 (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2016).

Unlike other Humanities subjects where students are asked to read and write about characters in a text, students in drama are asked to embody characters. This process of embodiment broadens the way that young people can engage with ideas and others, and is key to the different ways of knowing that are part of drama and arts education (Barbour, 2011; Wright, 2011). As Bresler (2004) notes, “The arts, unlike the traditional academic areas, are an arena in which the body is central to the process of inquiry and constitutes a mode of knowing” (p. 911). More specifically, role and character are key elements of drama. Taking on a role or a specific character, for example, involves

---

10 The set texts are decided by the Drama Course Advisory Committee, which is made up of drama teachers from Government, Independent and Catholic schools systems and representatives from universities and the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA). It is SCSA policy that a new set text list is chosen every five years. The current set text list 2016-2020 for the ATAR (tertiary ranking) year 12 course consists of twelve Australian and twelve World drama texts (See Appendix for current list). The other senior secondary (Year 11 and 12) drama courses have recommended texts only and allow for school-based decisions on texts.
the “identification of a person’s values and attitudes, intentions and actions as imagined relationships, situations and ideas in dramatic action” (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2014, p. 46); it engages students with developing internally consistent, motivated roles and characters and conveying the subtext of social and psychological situations, relationships and status through action and re-action. As one student from our study explained, this process can be empowering:

Drama definitely helped with the ability to empathise with other people. Cos like it forces you to become them. There’s a lot more understanding about how emotions work, like you do exercises that really tap into emotions so you can bring them up again in plays and that … but you get a bit more of how people work, their strengths and weaknesses and you kind of learn about yourself… like what makes you upset, what makes you angry, like how you deal with that. (Miranda, independent school student)

This identification and embodiment of roles and characters for senior secondary drama students occurs at a critical time in their physical, social and emotional development where adolescence is a key time of transition (United Nations Childrens’ Fund, 2011). Biologically, for example, adolescents are experiencing pubertal changes, changes in brain structure and sexual interest. Psychologically, adolescents move to more complex abstract thinking and develop autonomy and independent identity (Headspace, 2014). Mucchielli’s (1986) definition of identity is instructive here where he describes identity in terms of an internal awareness of one’s material being, unity and coherence; a sense of temporal continuity, relatedness, difference; a sense of worth, autonomy, confidence; and a sense of existence.

Late adolescence is often seen as a move towards independence where ideals are developed and thus role models become important (United Nations Childrens’ Fund, 2011). Consequently, the embodiment of roles and characters in the drama classroom where other roles and characters become available at this critical time in adolescent development can be potentially empowering, and conversely delimiting when these opportunities are constraining. What this means is the link between identity and drama is compelling and of interest to drama educators and students alike.

**Potentia and Potestas: affirmative & restrictive power in the drama classroom**

Studies have explored the connection between drama praxis and adolescent development and noted that drama can be a powerful tool to help students negotiate issues of identity (Armenta, 2005; Burton, 2002; Cahill, 2002; Gallagher, 1998, 2000; Hatton, 2003; Lambert, Wright, et al., 2015a; Lambert, Wright, Currie, & Pascoe, 2015b; Wright & Pascoe, 2014). Students both embody roles and characters they create themselves in improvised and devised drama, and others they choose from the characters made available to them in the set texts. These roles and characters can be affirmative (potentia) or restrictive (potestas) for adolescent girls (and boys) (Braidotti, 2002). Braidotti (2002) describes this potentiality in terms of the process of becoming and the social
imaginary where embodied subjects both affect and are affected by social norms, power and desire:

The embodied subject is thus a process of intersecting forces (affects) and spatio-temporal variables (connections). This in turn affects the notion of the social imaginary. The process of becoming subject requires sets of cultural mediation; the subject has to deal with institutional sets of rules and regulations as well as the forms of cultural representation that sustains them. Power is negative (potestas) in that it prohibits and constrains. It is also positive (potentia) in that it empowers and enables. The constant negotiation between the two poles of power can also be formulated in political terms in the notion of subjectivity as power and desire. (2002, p. 21)

What these concepts reveal is that in terms of young people’s development, it is the way that the aesthetic is experienced—both social and affective—that is key. Also consistent across each of the four research sites participants highlighted that the embodiment of roles and characters in drama is potentia that is affirming and sometimes life-changing for them. As these two students revealed:

I’m naturally shy, whereas drama has really helped me with that. I think drama helps you develop as a person. To work on a character you have to look internally on yourself you know, social skills and confidence … all of those skills that you need to be successful in the world are developed in a drama classroom. (Yana, government school student)

I guess in theatre you can be whomever you want. Our teacher said guys don’t play girls and girls don’t play guys purely because it’s very hard. I had to be a guy in a surreal piece and it was very hard. But you can just explore it and get some clothes and a wig. It’s the same with identity; I can be the most opposite of me that I can be to explore and see where it goes. And you use yourself as a basis to build characters upon and that helps you explore your own identity. You can do anything you like in drama: there are no limitations. It’s as much as you can imagine as much as you can envision…there’s no restrictions. (Cassie, independent school student)

As Yana and Cassie note, the processes of drama can help students negotiate the complex terrain of becoming other in late adolescence, and this is consistent with the literature. As Coffey (2012) explains, “To study becoming is to study the micro-processes of change that occur through affect and relations. Bodies are thus understood in the context of the connections and relations that are formed and their potential for becoming” (p. 7). The explanatory power of these concepts also lies in the way that Potentia in drama is key to understanding how “becoming other” is more than the linear development from childhood to adulthood of a Kantian unitary subject (a rational, centred, internally consistent self that is not socially constructed).

For the decentred subject composed of diverse, socially constructed and context-dependent identities, becoming is a generative and embodied experience. In relation to drama, the notion of becoming is also active in nature.
Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s understanding of becoming (1972 [2009], 1987 [2012]), Hickey-Moody views the child as “a generative force through figuring the child as a vector of affect: an activator of change” (Hickey-Moody, 2013, p. 273). In this sense affect incorporates change: “the passage from one state to another” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 49), and its potentiality lies in what is not only embodied, but also embedded in both teachers and students as socially positioned, multilayered subjects. Deleuze and Guattari describe this process in terms of deterritorialisation where:

Nomadic waves or flows of deterritorialisation go from the central layer to the periphery, then from the new centre to the new periphery, falling back to the old centre and launching forth to the new … Deterritorialisation must be thought of as a perfectly positive power. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 60)

To map students’ deterritorialisations in the drama classroom, we first sketch an understanding of subjectivity.

**Subjectivity and becoming in the drama classroom**

A number of poststructuralist feminist scholars provide a starting point for redefinitions of subjectivity. Braidotta (2011), for example, provides a definition where subjectivity is a “new form of materialism that develops the notion of the corporeal by emphasizing the embodied” and sexually differentiated subject (2011, p. 24). The embodied non-unitary subject in this sense comprises the symbolic, the physical and the sociological body as a collection of “flows and energies, affects, desires and imaginings” (Braidotti, 2011, p. 25). And it is in the drama classroom where these “flows and energies” are animated as one drama teacher describes:

Emma: I’ve got a boy in drama and whenever he gets into my classroom he starts um…this funny walk that…he sort of does this prancing and this ballerina move…and he just does it for a laugh….the kids laugh. But it’s not because he’s wanting to be a ballerina… he’s just exploring his body and exploring what he can do with his body and having that safe environment to do that and not to be told…or labelled. You know to be given a stereotype …

Likewise, female students reported that drama gave them a safe space to move beyond molar (binary, socially-overcoded) gender norms:

Well, like you can kind of get it all wrong in drama and try it all again, because you’re not … there’s this protection, the fact that you’re not being yourself. You can let down the barriers that you have. You can be yourself in that process. It’s sounds a bit weird, that in not being yourself you can be yourself. You can let more of yourself through. (Miranda, independent school student).

Key to understanding this process and what then restricts it as a developmental force is the questions of power and control. The research revealed a number of recapturing powers that were both disciplinary and
immanent: such as the disciplinary power of the texts on the curriculum and the control of programming by administration, to more subtle immanent powers of “enculturation,” such as a culture of surveillance, competition and performance. And in terms of education and against the aspirations of critically engaged drama teachers, potestas or restrictive power is both complex and “dangerous” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 97).

Set texts and cultural learning

The “fine segmentations” of individual text choices made by drama teachers to the “rigid segments with their overcoding” of the conservative neoliberal zeitgeist in which teachers and students reside underpin a number of normalising factors that are restrictive or limiting for adolescent becomings in the drama classroom. To better understand what limits and territorialise adolescent becomings in the drama classroom, we first examined the characters from the most “desirable” (frequently chosen) plays from the drama curriculum in Western Australia, and asked teachers why they have invested in these choices. Second, we examined how the current culture of performative neoliberalism acts as a restraining power on teachers’ and students’ becomings.

Yiannakis’ (2014) research into English Literature curricula in Australia from 1945-2005 shows that year 12 set text lists signify more than just trends in literature, but rather, “literary legitimacy, cultural capital, notions of nationhood, canon fluidity and classroom practice are being affected” (2014, p. 100). He concludes that despite the shifts and state variations, “it is clear that notwithstanding changes in methodology and theory influencing selection processes … a core groups of writers remain popular across the six decades since the end of World War Two” and that “many by Shakespeare still the central and dominant texts throughout this period” (p. 110). While it is the case that there is a wide variety of texts available for teachers and students on the current list of set texts in Western Australia (24 in total), including texts from indigenous and feminist perspectives, teachers consistently choose the same few “literary canon” texts for their mostly female cohorts.

This choice also represents a form of cultural capital and sits, for example, in the context of girls comprising 70% of the drama students in Western Australia. This means that in terms of using drama’s affective power for all student’s growth and development, it is perplexing that the most popular texts chosen are Macbeth (Shakespeare, 2004), The Homecoming (Pinter, 1991) and Waiting for Godot (Beckett, 2006) which have few or no female characters (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013). Not only do these classic drama texts lack women’s roles, the ones available such as Lady Macbeth and Ruth, were seen by teachers and students alike to represent normative feminine gender stereotypes. It is also the case that even the most popular contemporary Australian play chosen by drama teachers (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2013), Ruby Moon (Cameron, 2003), replicates negative and narrow interpretations of femininity. We now consider some of the implications of this lack of representation and diversity.

Prissy girls and sluts: the Madonna and the whore dichotomy
Youdell (2010) asserts that normative hetero-feminine subjects are constituted and regulated in the school context through gender binaries like the whore/virgin binary where some girls are constituted as sluts/whores. Based on Freud’s “Madonna-whore complex” (Freud, 1957), this literary trope divides women into two mutually exclusive binary categories: Madonnas and whores (Wolf, 1997). According to the trope, the virginal Madonna figure is everything that women should aspire to be. Conversely, women who fail to live up to the Madonna standard are whores driven exclusively by sexual desire and are thus lacking in morality (Welldon, 1988). These distinctions are also clearly evident in the constraining number and range of female roles available to these drama students.

More specifically, in considering the female characters in the most popular plays in the Western Australian drama set text list, the teachers and students interviewed easily made distinctions between “pathetic”/“prissy girls” (Madonnas) such as Rose, Oriel in Cloudstreet (Monjo & Enright, 1999), Ruby, Dulcie and Dawn in Ruby Moon (Cameron, 2003); and “sluts”/“prostitutes” (whores) in Lady Macbeth (Macbeth (Shakespeare), Dolly (Cloudstreet), Ruth (The Homecoming (Pinter, 1991) and Veronica (Ruby Moon). By way of example, while Lady Macbeth is arguably one of the most powerful female characters in Shakespeare’s corpus, and the most popular text amongst the teachers and students in this study, she represents to them hegemonic femininity constructed during the complex struggle for religious and political authority at the outset of King James’s English reign. As Hatton (2003) argues, in “classic” plays, female voices are often rendered silent, and female characters are positioned as “maids in service” to the dramatic action.

In more contemporary times, as Ringrose (2013) highlights, “the long-standing signifier of sexual regulation used to discipline girls’ reputations at school is ‘slut’” (p. 93), and it is this potestas (restrictive power) that limits girls’ options to two binary constructions of femininity. The paradox is, as Hatton goes on to note, that [girls] are often a silent majority as the drama curriculum and its products are largely fashioned through the lens of masculinity and patriarchy unless the teacher is openly and ethically interventionary in their practice” (2003, p. 140).

**Female roles in the drama set text list**

Currently in Western Australia, the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA) through the Drama Course Advisory Committee (CAC) is responsible for writing the senior secondary drama course. How this course is implemented in classrooms (and the texts chosen to study) is dependent on individual teachers, their choices, and proclivities. This means that cultural understandings and mores can often unwittingly be enacted in choices teachers make. However, it has been argued by many that hegemonic constructions of masculinity and femininity restrict young people’s repertoires of behaviour (Butler, 2004; Keddie & Mills, 2009; Martino & Rezai-Rashti, 2012; McDonald, 2007). This is particularly pertinent in the drama classroom where different constructions of gender are embodied through taking on roles and characters from dramatic texts. Coffey (2013) notes, for example, “Through body work practices, gender is continually reasserted and reconstituted” (p. 39).
All of the female students interviewed complained about the lack of acting roles for girls in the set texts, as Elizabeth and Marie, two 18 year-old students from an independent Christian school, illustrate:

Marie: In our class there were eight girls and four guys. The main characters were given to boys and the side characters were given to girls. I want a play with more girls, more women roles or more unisex roles. Every play we’ve done, there are more male roles; and there are more girls than guys in our classes.

Elizabeth: I’d love a play with more girls. But when they do a play with more women, it becomes very stereotypical.

Marie: That’s the way… like the four boys in our class had all the characters they wanted. Ours were like “mother”, “strong woman” or like “in love”. That’s what it was like; there was so little choice.

While girls’ main criticism of the drama course was that there were not enough “women roles” available for their mostly female class, there was also recognition that the female characters were “very stereotypical” representations of femininity, such as “mother” and “in love”. Many drama teachers agreed about the lack of female characters; however, their criticisms focused on the restrictive quality (rather than the quantity) of those roles. For example, Ella, an experienced drama teacher from a government school discussed the Western Australian drama curriculum set text list and the female characters in them:

Ella: Um, so Australian texts first. Cloudstreet? Dolly is a fantastic part but she’s a horrible person. Um, Man from Mukiupin, well kill me now, really. What, you play the prissy girl or the sister who’s a slut. Ruby Moon? They’re just so … oh God.

Kirsten: Well let’s look at the world texts before we go on to the male parts…

Ella: Oh my God I was looking at that in my head! Like Ruth from The Homecoming! Lady Macbeth is the most amazing part but she doesn’t have much of a journey. She’s really powerful and then she crumbles, because I’m sure we’ve missed out a scene, we’ve missed something. Like really? Amazing…but crumbles. I mean where was the journey? She’s amazing to play though. I mean she’s like the epitome of female roles. And she’s the only real female role in that play. Now the dominance is definitely to males. The Homecoming: there’s one female and all the rest are males but the male parts in that play are incredible to play; they’re so juicy.

Ella’s comments highlight the fact that the “juicy” roles in the set texts are predominantly male, whereas the female roles lack a character “journey” or conform to the normative “prissy” vs. “slut” binary. Claire, a drama teacher in a Catholic school, emphasised the restrictive options for girls in the texts she chose for her students from the set-text list in terms of both quantity and quality:

Claire: We are currently studying Life of Galileo by Bertolt Brecht, and semester two will be Ruby Moon by Matt Cameron…Well, there’s very limited choice, keeping in mind we’re a Catholic school and have an ethos that we have to protect. Some of the themes aren’t entirely appropriate in other texts. Last Cab to Darwin – euthanasia. Summer of the Aliens – losing your virginity. Cloudstreet? On page three, “Dolly sits on him, fucking him well” or something. Page three! I actually started that one a few years ago but I had a complaint …To be entirely honest I was a bit hesitant about Galileo being that it talks about the fight with the
Catholic church (laughs), however, looking at it, that’s actually a piece of history and that happened so it’s not a playwright’s opinion.

And in response to a question about role availability

Claire: Well Ruby Moon’s good, obviously that’s one male one female. Life of Galileo: two females; both subordinate (laughs). So yeah, but that is the nature of the text though… and the playwright (laughs).

But even like Ruby Moon…[female roles are] all loopy. I mean you’ve got Veronica Vale, not only the seductress; but the husband stealer. Dulcie — the church loving spinster with the parrot. Sylvie who’s so dependent and drug induced and neurotic… Yeah. Your female roles in those two texts aren’t something that you would hope that your female students could identify with.

Claire’s remarks illustrate the “very limited choice” available for a Catholic school drama teacher because of the potestas (restrictive power) of the Catholic education system. Moreover, of the texts she chose, the female roles are limiting. She notes that there are only two female roles in Life of Galileo, and they are both “subordinate”. Claire described Ruby Moon as “good” because of the even number of male and female roles; however, the characters themselves are not “something that you would hope that your female students could identify with”.

At a time in adolescent development when young women are navigating complex issues of identity and role formation, are these female characters potestas or potestas for students? Di and Yana, 18 year old students from two different government schools, discuss why having to play male roles was a potestas for them:

Yana: What I get annoyed about the set text list is generally in a drama classroom it’s usually heavily… girls. Yeah, and so a lot of the plays on the set text…
Di: Are male weighted.
Yana: You know like it’s so difficult to find things that you can actually… yeah we’re actors but we’re not men. And I’m a woman so you know I have boobs and it’s just not going to happen as much as you try and you know be masculine. I think that’s a shame. So that’s my key issue really with the set text list. You do the scene over and over and over again — the one scene where you actually do have girls in it. I guess you’ve got Twelve Angry Men [on the set text list]. I think there’s plenty of just guys plays.
Di: I think there’s lots of plays with just men whereas female it’s a bit harder. I think The Homecoming was year 11 actually cos we did Waiting for Godot in year 12. Yeah, all men. Whereas Waiting for Godot that was hard. That was really hard.

Popular contemporary plays offer students more female characters. However, in the most popular plays, such as Cloudstreet, as with Macbeth, the female characters are often described by students using restrictive hegemonic signifiers such as: “slut” (Dolly), “bitch” (Oriel), “pathetic” (Rose), and “wife” (Lady Macbeth — above).

The female characters in Cloudstreet are pretty pathetic (laughs). Dolly was a slut … obviously. She would have problems and then just drink and then try and
pretend that they're not there. And Oriel ... she is the family matriarch who controls everything and everyone blindly obeys her even though she makes some quite stupid decisions and she's a bit of a bitch. I don't think any of the characters are particularly powerful to be honest. Which kind of makes it quite a frustrating play because they're all weak. And...Rose, [Dolly's anorexic daughter], in my opinion the way she was acted was pathetic but that's because she was a pathetic character. (Miranda, independent school student)

Miranda, from a Christian independent school, described Dolly as a “slut” and Oriel as a “bitch”. As Ringrose (2013) argues, “Certain injurious terms like ‘bully’, ‘fat’; ‘slut’, ‘whore’ and ‘slag’ subjectivate teen girls” (p. 72) and in this way are culturally learnt and perpetuated. Moreover, “Slut constitutes a discursive nodal point of fixation in the discourses of adolescent girlhood or what I have termed a sticky signifier that glues bad affects onto girls bodies” (Ringrose 2013, p. 93). As Fjaer (2015) notes, even in liberal countries such as Norway, the “slut” signifier is still a powerful boundary marker against “other” women which contributes “to the persistence of a sexual double standard among young people” (p. 960).

The challenge with these constructions and in constructing young people’s identities, gender stereotypes in texts and the “need to imitate” hegemonic images of femininity in the media push girls to “relinquish power” to persuasive social ideals (Boal, 1985, cited in Armenta, 2005, p. 92). It has also been argued that “adolescent girls are attracted to drama because it offers them the skills, aesthetic space and forums to play with notions and representations of self, gender and culture” (Hatton, 2003, p. 139). Through performing different characters, for example, girls “put on” various constructions of femininity, however the adjectives teachers and students used to describe the female characters in the plays studied include restrictive feminine signifiers such as: “slut”, “bitch”, “crazy”, “pathetic”, “weak”, “anorexic”, “manipulative”, “controlling”, “drunk”, “seductress”, “husband-stealer”, “spinster” and “neurotic”. Even when characters such as Ruth from The Homecoming make “liberating” sexual choices, teachers recapture these deterritorialisations from normative gender boundaries by labelling the characters using restrictive feminine signifiers such as “prostitute”. As one teacher observed

It was really interesting in the discussion in the class because the students looked into Pinter’s reasons for his choices in The Homecoming and they could understand that in the context he was trying to liberate Ruth in making those choices. And that created a lot of discussion on how today that’s not really... you shouldn’t feel liberated by becoming a prostitute really [laughs]. (Emma, government school teacher)

Text selection and performative pressure

As yet, there are no known studies that show why teachers choose certain texts over others for their predominantly female drama classes and how embodying characters, such as Lady Macbeth and the witches, shape adolescent becomings. Teachers in this context are important as they are both conveyors of culture and providers of links to it. What teachers in our study revealed is that
they chose particular texts over others for many reasons, including the availability of resources, a teacher’s familiarity with certain texts, and students’ cultural and social contexts. As one government teacher recounted:

We did Cloudstreet and we also did Caucasian Chalk Circle. I’ve been doing them for a long time and let’s be honest, it takes a long time for me to get to know them, to get to know the characters, how to teach it, how to explain it, how to collect all those materials. I am changing our world text this year for Macbeth just because I really love doing Shakespearean plays. (Ariel)

However, the overriding reason teachers chose “classic” and popular texts such as those by Shakespeare, Beckett and Pinter, was because of the perceived performative pressure they felt under to get the best marks for their students. Even though this choice impacted on students’ choices of roles and other wider cultural considerations such as indigenous issues and the feminist project, these teachers’ primary concern was the pressure on them to “perform”— perform in this context meant to meet expectations placed on them by administration and neoliberal education discourses — what Ball (2003) refers to as the “performative worker”. For example, one teacher participant illustrated how she was publicly shamed at the staff meeting when her students “underperformed” in the ATAR12 exams:

The history teacher and I were just sitting there. All that happens is that people don’t meet your gaze. We got spoken to about those anomalies. We get asked to attend a meeting with the Department of Education people. They go over all of our results, our students’ results. (Denise, teacher, government school)

The zeitgeist: neoliberalism

Many argue that Australian teachers make choices about pedagogy in a zeitgeist of capitalist neoliberalism, which has had the effect of making education a commodity that can be bought and sold. Schools compete for students in a market where they are judged by published external exam scores (Ball, 2010; Beder et al., 2009; Keddie et al., 2011). And it is also the case that some teachers lean towards popular texts that fail to challenge the status quo simply in order to survive in a competitive culture of neoliberal performativity. Tom, a government school teacher, shed light on teachers’ motivations in relation to the “massive” pressure to get “good marks”.

Tom: Our school has even employed people to come out from the Department of Education to analyse our results for us and tell us how we can make them better… So the pressure was on big time … and I guess that’s motivated me to choose the texts that I have because I want the kids to stand out in the marking process.
Kirsten: Right. So you are entirely judged on those exam scores…
Tom: Entirely.

12 The ATAR (Australian Tertiary Admission Rank) is a number that students achieve between 0.00 and 99.95. It is a numerical measure of a student’s overall academic achievement in relation to other students.
Tom’s experiences were not unique. Most of the teachers we interviewed felt under enormous pressure to get good grades (for their students), and to remain above published benchmarks.

A number of researchers have applied the concept of performativity to education in an Australian context, and this helps better understand choices made by Tom and others. Advocates of “education reform” (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992, 1998; Chubb & Moe, 1990), for example, suggest that public schooling is in “crisis” and the best solution is to adopt a market-driven approach to “selling” public schools to education “consumers”. However, many authors argue that this has had a detrimental impact on public schooling itself (Apple, 2005; Ball, 2003; Beder et al., 2009; Boxley, 2003; R. Connell, 2013b; Giroux, 2008; Marginson, 1997; Thompson, 2010b; Thompson & Cook, 2012b, 2014; Whitty et al., 1998). They argue that neo-liberal market ideologies have strengthened the relationship between education, economic productivity and a view of students as human capital, which has narrowed the view of what constitutes “good” education as the measurement and comparison of student performance on quantifiable academic measures. This “fetish” for standards and outcomes in schools leads to a focus on micro-management and a focus on basic literacy and numeracy skills over pedagogy and student learning (Beder et al., 2009; Hayes, Mills, Christie, & Lingard, 2006; Keddie et al., 2011) and our concern here with cultural learning.

It is also the case that such market driven corporate performative discourses intensify homogeneity and generate, as well as reinscribe, particular forms of exclusionary phallogocentric, white and middle-class social capital or sociability (Apple, 2005; Giroux, 2004, 2008, 2013; Sloan, 2007). Teachers, such as Tom, whose pedagogy and selection of texts is heavily influenced by the exams, are restricted in how much they can assist students in their becomings by the disciplinary power of the neoliberal education assemblage. Deconstructing these power relations and showing how important the embodiment of powerful role models can be for adolescents is a crucial step in creating a world where young people are empowered to “find themselves”. Drama teacher Claire described it this way:

Kirsten: In an ideal world what would you like to change about teaching drama?
Claire: I would like to teach the kids how to act but we don’t have time. It’s just so rushed, it’s so rushed…and we do everything for the assessments and the exam. You know, it’s ridiculous.
Kirsten: And what’s the best thing about teaching drama?
Claire: Well I think part of it is what I was saying about drama earlier …some kids they find themselves. They find themselves. (Claire, Catholic school teacher)

Potentia and creative reinterpretations of texts

Regardless of the narrow and limiting choices drama teachers appear to be making with regard to text selection, the research revealed that what some drama teachers do with those texts in the classroom tells a different and more hopeful story. The first unit in year 12 ATAR Drama course is *Reinterpretation of Drama for Contemporary Audiences* (School Curriculum and Standards
Authority, 2016). At its best, the relative freedom of the drama space and the creative reinterpretations of traditional texts and characters, such as Lady Macbeth, can both be a generative and empowering force for students such as Elizabeth and Marie to collaborate and gain confidence in themselves and their sexuality.

Elizabeth: You become really close in the arts.
Marie: Yeah five people have come out to me and said they’re gay.
Kirsten: So why would they come out in drama?
Grace: Because when you’re working on a production you’re working with the same group of people for a long time and…
Marie: I find it helpful when people tell me I’m like, straight face, “Oh really.” Even if I’m like shocked. My face didn’t show it.
Elizabeth: You can become more people focused. People think you’re more open and they can talk to you. People who focus too much on numbers people aren’t going to come out and tell them something personal whereas arts students…
Marie: Everyone works as a team.
Grace: Everyone’s in the same place as you, everyone has to go through the same stuff.
Marie: I think it’s just because the people who do drama are hard-working and trustworthy and know what it’s like to work in a team and be freaking out backstage. So working on a production you bond and that brings out your trust and your caring and then they see you laughing and dancing around like a bunch of idiots at school and they think that person isn’t going to judge me.
Elizabeth: When you do drama, you stop judging.

There was interpretive experimentation that empowered female students.

Kirsten: How did you interpret the witches in Macbeth, did you play them the traditional way?
Grace: Oh it definitely wasn’t very traditional.
Marie: We did it…the people who weren’t the witches spoke Shakespearean and the witches spoke contemporary English.
Grace: Changed a lot of the lines.
Marie: So it was the witches who had control over the Shakespearean world.
Grace: I was drawn to Lady Macbeth and the witches.

In their own scripted monologue performance work, as Elizabeth showed, in drama students found capacity to make choices.

Elizabeth: Yeah… Just having someone say, “You were like actually scary and powerful.” I don’t think I actually like shouted during the entire monologue. Just your presence there and playing a character who is like so different from myself is amazing.

Similarly, drama students were able to challenge conventions.

Kirsten: And do you think that playing those like dominant female characters when you’re not normally a dominant person, does that help you be more confident or stretch yourself?
Grace: Yeah, it does because you can turn it on. Like even it you’re not like that, you can put it on and pretend to be that person.
In this way through providing opportunities to reinterpret classic texts teachers spoke back to the neoliberal assemblages by providing lines of flight (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012]) for students from normative gender binaries providing both opportunity, support, and safe. Although teachers are restricted by curriculum text lists, Tom describes how the plays and the characters are interpreted and performed is up to them:

No I don’t think there are strong female characters. You take a text like Macbeth, which if you are to perform it traditionally, is performed by men. And if you are to reimagine it and make it something new and different. I mean lots of schools do it…set it in nightclubs and all over the shop…but there’s still only one female character who is the manipulator. And then you’ve got your witches. So from that female point of view it doesn’t really offer a huge scope for actresses. (Tom, government school teacher)

Even though Tom notes that there are no strong female characters in the popular plays, his comments about reimagining Macbeth raises an important point about the potentia teachers and students hold to re-signify injurious social norms.

It is also important to note that our research also acknowledges that it is not enough to examine the constructions of femininity in the characters in the most popular texts on the current Western Australian (or any other) drama curriculum. A play, after all, is only a blueprint, a plan for building a performance. The final product is completely up to the director and the actors. Therefore, to ascertain the affects and flows of power at the intersection between the characters on the page and their embodiment, we examine how teachers interpreted texts in the classroom.

Embodiment, gender and neoliberalism

If gender is performative, then it follows that the reality of gender is itself produced as an effect of the performance. Although there are norms that govern what will and will not be real, and what will and will not be intelligible, they are called into question and reiterated at the moment in which performativity begins its citational practice. One surely cites norms that already exist, but these norms can be significantly deterritorialised through the citation. (Butler, 2004, p. 218 emphasis added)

What the research reveals is the disruptive potential and empowering or affirmative potentia of embodying characters such as Lady Macbeth and the witches for late adolescent girls does provide space for engagement, explanation, and illumination. Liz, an independent school teacher described it this way.

I guess the witches [in Macbeth]; they enjoyed playing them because we made them corporate women who were organising an event. So they were orchestrating the whole thing. So they were the only ones who … so they came across as the, you know, career driven women. They were very direct. They knew what they wanted … strong. Sort of like a … the idea I gave them … what’s that movie, the one with Meryl Streep in it?
**Devil Wears Prada.** That character, I wouldn’t say she’s evil but she’s very cold. So they sort of based their characters on her.

Even though characters such as Lady Macbeth and Ruth are often seen by teachers and students to conform to the slut/prostitute stereotype, as Liz notes, they can still be significantly deterritorialised when embodied as powerful characters. A poststructural, cartographic approach that maps this multilayered data provides the theoretical tools to see the representation of women in *Macbeth* as both restrictive in terms of hegemonic gender binaries, and transformative in terms of embodied affect. Braidotti (2002) talks about the need in the new millennium to provide new “figurations” – alternative representations or a “living map” of transformative accounts of the decentred self:

Figurations are not figurative ways of thinking, but rather more materialistic mappings of situated, or embedded and embodied, positions. A cartography is a theoretically-based and politically-informed reading of the present. A cartographic approach fulfils the function of providing both exegetical tools and creative theoretical alternatives… A figuration is a living map, a transformative account of the self – it is no metaphor. (Braidotti, 2002, p. 2)

The cartographic approach requires that we think of power relations simultaneously as intimate or “personal” desires and as “external” collective social phenomena. As Braidotti notes: “power is the process that flows incessantly in between the inner and the outer” (2011, p. 17). Even though teachers and students deterritorialise molar gender norms through reimagining texts, the flow of desire in capitalist regimes of production is often reterritorialised by being channelled into commodified versions of gendered subjectivity. It is the scale and implications of representation that accompanies the structural transformations of subjectivity in the social, cultural and political spheres of late-capitalist neoliberal culture, that this paper seeks to address.

In western culture, girls and young women are represented as success stories of late capitalism, where discourses of choice, freedom and autonomy exist alongside discourses of hypersexualised femininity (McRobbie, 2009; Renold & Ringrose, 2008; Ringrose, 2013). Feminist theorists assert that in our Western industrialised consumerist culture idealised feminine beauty, heteronormativity and societal pressure to attain and maintain the “perfect body” perpetuate and reify hegemonic binary gender constructions (Coffey, 2013a, 2013c; David et al., 2006; Hickey-Moody & Rasmussen, 2006). Boys’ and girls’ normative gender identities are inextricably embedded and produced within hegemonic representations of heterosexuality (Blaise, 2005; DePalma & Atkinson, 2007; Renold, 2005, 2007; Robinson & Davies, 2007).

Whilst the set drama texts themselves may be seen as reflecting traditional hegemonic representations of gender binaries, teachers such as Liz post-modernise them according to post-feminist neoliberal norms. As Braidotti notes, “Post-feminist neoliberalism is pro-capitalist and hence it considers financial success in the world as the sole indicator of status of women” (Braidotti, 2006, p. 45). In Deleuzian terms, the deterritorialisation of students and teachers making the witches and Lady Macbeth a source of power and independence for young women to embody, is recaptured or “reterritorialised” by the powerful capitalist construction of heteronormative, neoliberal femininity. It is this rich
potentiality that lies within the hands of interventionist and critically-aware teachers to speak back to these forces that is key.

CONCLUSION

In this paper we examined student becomings in drama classrooms in Western Australia and the potentialia the embodiment of a variety of characters and roles holds for identity exploration at a critical time in adolescent development for both boys and girls. We drew on ethnographic data based on interviews with drama teachers and senior secondary drama students in schools in Western Australia to examine the dramatic embodiment of characters from popular set texts and how these are mediated and constituted through hegemonic gender binaries and a dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. What the research revealed was the how delimiting the choice of roles available to young women was, and in particular, that generative possibilities were constrained by stereotypes, and the broader context in which they sit.

However, despite restrictive gender norms, under the direction of a critically-conscious teacher, students found characters such as Lady Macbeth and the witches to be empowering deterritorialising assemblages when embodied in the safety of the drama classroom, even if they are potentially reterritorialised by neoliberal constructions of femininity and the neoliberal agenda. Informed by this hopeful note with the possibility of change, these challenging drama teachers contribute in significant ways to young people’s lives. And being mindful of diverse students, a critical consciousness means that the benefits of creative practices unconstrained by system pressures means that benefits do not simply accrue to the students themselves, but more broadly to the society in which they live.
Appendix:

Drama ATAR Year 12 Syllabus Set Text List from January 1, 2016. (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian texts for Unit 3</th>
<th>World texts for Unit 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Enoch: <em>The Story of Miracles at Cookie’s Table</em></td>
<td>Bertold Brecht: <em>The Resistible Rise of Arturo Ui</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Nowra: <em>Radiance</em></td>
<td>Caryl Churchill: <em>Mad Forest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannie Rayson: <em>Two Brothers</em></td>
<td>Eugene Ionesco: <em>Rhinoceros</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Sewell: <em>Myth, Propaganda and Disaster in Nazi German and Contemporary America</em></td>
<td>William Shakespeare: <em>As You Like It</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana Valentine: <em>Parramatta Girls</em></td>
<td>Sophocles: <em>Antigone</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian texts for Unit 4</th>
<th>World texts for Unit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Bovell: <em>When the Rain Stops Falling</em></td>
<td>Samuel Beckett: <em>Endgame</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Cameron and Tim Finn: <em>Poor Boy</em></td>
<td>Friedrich Durrenmatt: <em>The Visit: A tragic comedy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Futcher and Helen Howard: <em>A Beautiful Life</em></td>
<td>Bryony Lavery: <em>Beautiful Burnout</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lally Katz: <em>Return to Earth</em></td>
<td>Tracy Letts: <em>August: Osage County</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Kemp: <em>Kitten</em></td>
<td>Yasmina Reza: <em>God of Carnage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Lazaroo: <em>Asylum</em></td>
<td>Brian Yorkey (writer) and Tom Kitt (composer): <em>Next to Normal</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There’s a complete difference between walking into a drama classroom and walking into an English classroom — in a normal classroom you’ve got the chairs set up, there’s that authority already stamped in because everyone’s sitting, it’s formatted, its structured. Whereas you get into a drama classroom [laughs] and it’s…particularly with sevens and eights…and they’re just like, “Space!” You know? It’s like pure chaos. So there’s definitely that. There’s not the formality in a drama classroom. And that’s just what I’ve experienced myself, and what I’ve noticed in schools. Generally the students who do drama together have a bond that you don’t see in a lot of other subjects…maybe later on in a lot of year 11 and 12 subjects where you generally get a bit closer. But from day dot as you were saying, Di, you know, getting involved in productions… you know — the community. I think that’s what it really is in a drama class: a community. You’ve got your misfits and your attention seekers and it’s great because you’ve got all of these people who wouldn’t normally fit together are put into an environment and yeah, it’s really special. (Yana, government school student)

As Yana notes above, the space of the drama classroom is unique: “pure chaos,” “a community,” “special”. The previous article illustrated how the drama classroom can be a safe space for minoritarian expressions of gender. However, these deterritorialisations are recaptured by hegemonic constructions of femininity in texts, and teachers and students own desires to conform to capitalist norms. As Stiegler notes, “The concept of desire is the key to understanding the relation between economics and psychoanalysis, that is, between the social and psychic investment, or between productive and libidinal economies” (Stiegler, 2011, p. 150). I showed that the generative possibilities for nomadic subjectivity that the drama classroom offers through the embodiment of characters at a critical time in adolescent development are restricted by the desires of teachers and schools to “succeed” in our neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. Stiegler (2011) labels capitalist desire the “pharmacology of desire” referring to the Greek, Platonic, and Derridean understanding of the pharmakon as both poison and cure. Thus in the neoliberal education system teachers and students desires can be both their poison and cure.

Performativity and Creativity in Senior Secondary Drama Classrooms draws our gaze us toward the drama classroom — by specifically focusing on it as a powerful transformative vehicle for creativity. Following on from the previous article I examine the intersection between the senior secondary drama classroom, creativity and neoliberalism. I draw attention to corporate rhetoric regarding a need for creative solutions to global crises. In our contemporary “milieu of scarcity” (Sartre cited in Douglas, 2011), governments, scientists, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank call for “creative, innovative and collaborative solutions” to global financial and environmental crises where what is “performed” is key. Whilst the arts have long been associated with creativity and innovation, creativity can be understood differently depending on agendas and audience. Moreover, capitalism has a way of appropriating innovation for profit. As Deleuze states, “even art has left the spaces of enclosure in order to enter into the open circuits of the bank” (1992, p. 6).

Creativity itself is explored in this section. Research shows that all students can develop divergent innovative thinking for problem solving but it requires and educational climate where students are able to use the senses,
imagine, think and reason without having the “answers” already proscribed (Atchley, Keeney, & Burgess, 1999; Dawson, Tan, & McWilliam, 2011; McCrae & Costa, 1987; Sternberg & Kaufman, 2010). This requires that teachers adopt a pedagogy that encourages: openness to new experiences, curiosity, questioning and reflecting critically on ideas from diverse sources, a willingness to take intellectual risks and collaborative learning. All of these are attributes of learning through drama and sits in contrast to what is measured through high stakes testing (Wright, 2011, 2015). Furthermore, creative classrooms are enhanced through the use of physical activity including the use of the embodied learning and the senses. This means that the drama classroom is ideally placed to provide students with opportunities for creative learning.

Research shows that teachers play a significant role in fostering creative thinking if the school culture and curriculum allows it by demonstrating creativity and providing same and congenial environments for creative learning. As mentioned in previous articles, my research revealed that teachers and students believed that drama was a safe environment that assisted them with creative thinking that they then utilised in other subjects and with everyday life. They reported that the physicalisation of the “other” leads to deeper personal understanding of difference and political issues. Although limited in scope, my study suggests that drama classrooms provide safe spaces and congenial environments for fostering creativity and heterogeneous becomings.

The main threat to the congenial environment of the drama classroom was a narrowing of the curriculum and a “teach-to-the-test” mentality where teachers were so concerned with getting students “over the line” that they abandoned creative pursuits in order to focus on exams. They reported not having any time to teach creativity or to teach creatively. Moreover, creativity was not valued because it was not tested. Judging teachers by students’ results in high stakes tests resulted in teachers adjusting their pedagogy to “teach to the exams”. Neoliberal reforms and the slashing of school budgets results in schools directing funds to areas that produce the most gain in high stakes tests – the core subjects of math, science and English. This is supported by recent research that shows creativity is on the decline among American children since the introduction of the neoliberal No Child Left Behind education reforms (Kim, 2010). Moreover, as schools place greater emphasis on learning content and taking texts there are fewer opportunities for creative thought amongst students than in the past (Jung, 2015).

The key findings that emerged from this study are that the drama classroom is ideally place to be a congenial environment for creativity because of its embodied practice and collaborative culture. Second, given the demands of the new millennium for creative solutions to environmental, social and economic crises the drama classroom can provide a safe and supportive educational environment to engender creativity, lateral thinking and collaboration. Third, drama teachers frequently acquiesce to the culture of performativity and are both constrained by curricula and pressures to perform. However they also work in the drama space to speak back to these powerful discourses.

I consider the drama classroom as one site where tensions between the performative desires of neoliberal education assemblages in a culture of high-stakes testing and the more liberatory desires that drama teachers exemplify are enacted. This paper suggests that drama education can elicit creative and innovative thinking because of its spatially unique classroom environment and
embodied nature. However, although creativity is winning the battle of hearts and minds with students and teachers in the drama classroom; it is losing the war with performativity in the current neoliberal zeitgeist. Ironically, although drama can equip students to meet the challenges of the 21st century, neoliberal education reforms and the need for corporations to make ever-increasing profits from education have lead to creativity being afforded a low status that will have a direct negative effect on students. In this article I suggest that what is needed is a complete reorganising of the curriculum so that it places greater value on creativity and collaboration.
Abstract:
This article examines the intersection between the senior secondary drama classroom, creativity and neoliberalism. Informed by a research project involving fifteen Western Australian drama teachers and thirteen students, it considers the drama classroom as one site where tensions between the performative needs of neoliberal education assemblages and the more humanistic desires that drama teachers embody are enacted. This paper suggests that drama education can be a powerfully transformative vehicle for creative and innovative thinking because of its spatially unique classroom environment and embodied nature. However, collisions between rhetoric and reality, social good and economic return, what is performed, and what is enabled or constrained can mean that young people are denied opportunities for choice and the capability development that drama education brings.
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Introduction

We are on the brink of an era where unbalance would be the rule and as such human beings need to be more creative than ever before to survive. Have the arts a role in all this? Have artists a responsibility in this context? (Dal Farra, 2013, p. 1)

At a recent Creative Innovation 2015 corporate conference in Melbourne, Australia, Dal Farra's, central message to today's business leaders as the keynote speaker was “innovate or die” (Baldwin, 2015). We can understand this
rhetoric in terms of more than a decade of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, where we are experiencing change at a rate possibly never before seen in human history. Puccio, Murdock and Mance (2011), for example, argue that our increasingly complex epoch requires new and more creative mindsets to tackle 21\textsuperscript{st} century social, economic and environmental problems. These creative mindsets are those central to arts education generally, and drama education particularly. However, the agendas that drive the corporate world and increasing measures to privatise public education can mean that this “public good” remains backstage to economic values rather than those reflective of a broader creative and humanistic mission (Conrad, 2015).

As arts educators, drama teachers have a well-established role to play in nurturing creativity in students where public good is realised through the development of young people’s capabilities. Numerous studies have revealed that drama has a positive impact on the development of students’ communication skills, socialization levels, emotional intelligence, social skills, empathic skills and empathic tendencies through aesthetic engagement in the art form regardless of their grade levels (Cahill, 2002; Collard & Looney, 2014; Ewing, Hristofski, Gibson, Campbell, & Robertson, 2011; Ozbek, 2014; Russomanno, 2014). In our view and taken more broadly, we believe we are beyond the point of providing “proof” on the impact of drama on students’ cognitive and affective capabilities, the richer and more productive foci being on interrogating how drama can improve student’s capabilities, and the enablers and constraints to it. The focus of this research then became the drama classroom, in its different forms, as a site both shaped by differing often competing agendas, and a place where tensions can be productively engaged. In order to do this we considered young people, drama teachers, the curriculum, and the impact of the neo-liberal project on them.

A qualitative, ethnographic research project based on interviews with 15 drama teachers and 13 of their students examined how the drama classroom environment and curriculum influenced adolescent identity development, or “becomings”. It is this later notion that is important in the way that it allows us to distinguish between simply being and becomings where there are “trajectories of movement and growth” (Ingold, 2013, p. 8) and so an “unfolding of the-world-as-it-might-be” (Mangiameli, 2013, p. 150). This article explores how the open classroom spaces and improvised characterisation activities integral to drama influenced young people in places of “transition” and hence, adolescent becomings.

Our research raises the following questions: “Is capitalism’s desire for performativity greater than its need for creativity?” and more particularly, “how might this mitigate drama’s innate potential for generative possibilities?” We engage with these related questions through five sections where we consider the call for “greater creativity”, a brief consideration of creativity itself, the drama classroom as a creative safe space, then an elaboration from the student’s perspective on some important dimensions of this space that engenders creativity and human flourishing. Finally, we address some of the tensions – including the press of performativity (Garoian, 1999) – and how different agendas shape and frame what is enacted in this enabling and constraining site rich with generative possibilities.
The link between drama and creativity

Creativity is widely accepted as being essential for innovation, social and economic development and human dignity (Collard & Looney, 2014; Michalski, 2011; Nussbaum, 2011). At the recent 2015 Spring Meeting of the World Bank Group and the IMF in Washington, D.C., the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund spoke about the need for “innovation” and “collaboration” to revitalise the global economy (Lagarde, 2015). Vis-à-vis business, an IBM poll of 1,500 CEOs identified creativity as the no. 1 “leadership competency” of the future (International Business Machines, 2012). As Collard and Looney note, “Creativity is core to progress in knowledge societies” (2014, p. 348).

However, in a zeitgeist of “reform” and “austerity measures”, whether or not business, governments, the IMF and the World Bank actually invest in creativity and innovation, and for what purpose/s is another matter addressed in the final section of this paper. What is clear given the status of these comments is that the consensus of these world influencers is that global prosperity — and indeed survival — requires creativity and collaboration “measured” through performance; for example, performance in this context is that which is reducible to highstakes testing.

What progress means in this context represents only one viewpoint driven by the idea that prosperity can only be understood in economic terms. Drama teachers, however, often respond to other imperatives where flourishing is key (Lambert, Wright, Pascoe, et al., 2015).

Given the attention to creativity and going from the global to local, what unique role does the drama classroom play in fostering creativity in the next generation of Western Australian youth? Given the sometimes competing agendas of neoliberalism and creativity, what might this mean? Each of these questions are now considered in turn.

Creativity considered

Whilst there are many definitions of creativity, neuroscientist Jung defines creativity as “the ability of the brain to use abductive reasoning, to solve adaptive problems in the environment, in novel and useful ways” (2015, p. 1). In the literature on creativity in education early research assumed that creativity was a fixed “gifted” trait and focused on “divergent thinking” and “ideational fluency” (Cattell & Butcher, 1968). However, contemporary research focuses not so much on how many innovative solutions students can discover to address a problem, but how useful and simple those solutions are (Runco & Albert, 1986). This means that all students can develop divergent innovative thinking for problem solving.

Creative or “open learning” – where the outcome is unknown — requires an educational climate where students are able to use the senses, imagine, think and reason without having the “answers” already proscribed (Miller, Looney, & Siemens, 2011). This requires teachers to adopt pedagogy that encourages: “openness to new experiences” (Amabile, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1987); curiosity (Edwards, 2001); questioning and reflecting critically on ideas from diverse sources (Atchley, Keeney, & Burgess, 1999; Sternberg & Kaufman, 2010;
Torrance, 1972); a willingness to take intellectual risks (Bandura, 1997); and collaborative learning (Dawson, Tan, & McWilliam, 2011b). What is important to note is that these are all attributes of learning through drama (Wright, 2011) and sits in contrast to what is measured through high stakes testing (Wright, 2015).

Research also tells us that responsiveness to change, flexibility and fluidity are dispositions strengthened through arts practice (Wright & Pascoe, 2014). Not only does drama have these attributes, but also they are developed through effective drama education. Collard & Looney also highlight the link between creativity and drama noting that, creative classrooms are student-centred and that the combination of physical activity including “the use of the body and all the senses”, performing, collaborative learning and imaginative storytelling was an ideal environment for optimal creative learning (2014, p. 353). As such, the drama classroom is ideally placed to provide students with opportunities for creative learning where students utilise their senses through embodied practice (Davis, 2010). Drama, when taught well, asks students to be imaginative, to think and to reason through improvisation and playbuilding. It also requires of students that they adopt an openness to new experiences through performing and reflecting on drama from other cultures. Drama can develop curiosity, questioning and reflecting on divergent political ideas. Moreover, the drama classroom can be a collaborative learning environment as most tasks are done in groups. It is also important to understand that opportunities for openness and creativity can also be constrained various factors including the curriculum and the teacher (Lambert et al. 2015). Consistent across the literature (Nicholson, 2011) and highlighted by our respondents in order for creativity to be promoted in the drama classroom, and for risks towards growth to occur, the site or place of inquiry and transformation must be “safe”. It is to this characteristic that we now turn our attention.

**Drama classrooms as safe spaces**

As Wright and Pascoe note, “The Arts are now well understood as “sites” where human dispositions of creativity, imagination and innovation are developed, and where personal, social and cultural capital is developed as outcomes” (2014, p. 3). The teachers in our research project echoed this in their comments. Andre, a government school teacher observed:

> It comes down to the teacher. If they’re going in there with this real grrr type of approach into the classroom, then you’re not going to get that kind of expression and creativity in the kids, which I think is really important.

This point of view was amplified by Liz:

> The drama classroom is safer in terms of students expressing themselves; it’s much freer. I often have kids coming in and saying, “I feel like there’s room to be creative; there’s room to breathe; there’s room to work in a different way. It’s much more open, it’s freer, it’s collaborative, it’s creative. (Independent school teacher)

According to the Australian Curriculum, collaboration, imagination and creativity are central to drama (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2015), and this was reflected in teachers’ comments on their
You can’t teach a concept in 30 minutes without actually playing around with it, without doing it, and some kids just don’t get it straight away. And you can’t squish being creative into 30 minutes or an hour so you can’t actually put a time limit on it. So it’s not a, “Okay you get to be creative five times a week” you know. So I think having time is something that you need and that’s why I do after school rehearsals for two hours because that’s where the magic happens. (Liz, independent school teacher)

It is interesting to note that this observation was consistently expressed across government, independent, and Catholic school sectors.

As Liz points out, creativity doesn’t just happen instantaneously, it needs time and it needs a suitable environment. The responses of teachers also highlight the tension between a commodified view of creativity and innovation and what happens in their classrooms where a safe environment of collaboration and trust is required before the “magic” of creativity can happen. It is this link between sites where relationships of trust can be developed and what might flow as a consequence that it missing from the rhetoric of creativity of “innovate or die”. What this means is that teachers can play a significant role in fostering creative thinking – if the school culture and curriculum allows it – by demonstrating creativity and providing safe and “congenial environments” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996).

In our research, drama teachers described drama classrooms that were congenial environments for fostering creativity and this reveals that it is the teachers themselves who are critical in building relationships of trust. However, whilst the drama teachers interviewed believed that their classrooms were safe spaces, the potential for harm to occur in an environment where students are encouraged to articulate their thoughts, feelings and attitudes, is tremendous. Were the teachers’ beliefs about their safe spaces reflected in student’s responses?

The “different” space: student’s perspectives

Drama students in our study noted that drama was a creative subject that assisted them with everyday life, and fostered heterogeneous becomings that enabled them to move beyond restrictive social and cultural norms. What this references is the developmental power of drama learning where role and identity formation are key. From our interviews for example, it was evident that girls could embody powerful “masculine” characters and boys were able to feel free to dress in drag. More specifically, these examples reflect how acceptance of difference, openness, tolerance for change and ambiguity, challenging tasks and goals, risk taking, and absence of rigid sanctions for minor and harmless mistakes characterise congenial environments for fostering creativity (Amabile, 1990; Olivant, 2015).

The students interviewed also remarked that drama operated differently from other subjects because of the unique spatial environment, the open-
endedness of the tasks, and its requirement to embody various characters. Elizabeth, for example, linked role, embodiment and identity development.

Drama helps with everyday life. You can’t just say, “Oh I know this” and spit it back out. It doesn’t work that way. In drama you get the opportunity to be put into a new situation and you have to work out how to respond to that. (Independent school student)

Di, a government school student, also linked drama, creativity and identity development.

There’s a dynamic there that sometimes people who haven’t experienced drama and the creativity and the improvisation, don’t have. Yeah definitely it’s shaped me as a person.

What is important about these safe spaces was also the support for difference that links the classroom with relationships of trust. Zac, an independent school student described this in an evocative way.

I’m gay, so obviously having to act, I always acted differently in drama because I felt like out in the school yard I’d get bashed. And it was an actual genuine fear. But when I stepped into the theatre like, I could finally be who I truly was.

The data from the student interviews supported the drama teachers’ claims that the classroom space was a congenial environment that fostered creativity. Student data showed that drama is an affective form of creativity because it is embodied and relational. Embodied learning is a very powerful tool for fostering creativity because not only does it involve physical activity (Collard & Looney, 2014, p. 353); but the physicalisation of the “other” leads to a deeper personal understanding of difference and the issues associated with it than does rote learning (Bresler, 2004). It is the case, for example, that students literally put themselves in another’s shoes. As one student shared:

With my original solo performance\textsuperscript{13}, I was a terrorist and so I did a huge amount of research on the emotional side of terrorism and why people become them and at the same time in politics I was doing a parallel assignment on human rights issues. I was looking at terrorism in Australia and like legally what it means and whether it exists or not. Embodying the character sort of gives you a rounder understanding…you have a closer relationship with it. You feel more emotionally attached to it. You get to understand it a lot more because when you’re just learning about it like text-book or reading it off the internet, you can learn to recite facts but you don’t what you’re missing. Whereas when you go to perform you…you’re forced to become the person so you have to understand them. Cos you can’t not love part of your character, or you can’t do them justice. (Miranda, independent school student)

\textsuperscript{13} The Original Solo Performance is one of the pieces students must perform for their final year 12 exams. This five to seven minute self-devised solo production can be about any topic or theme but must show evidence of a character journey and a chosen dramatic form and style.
Consistent across the student respondents were reports that kinaesthetic or "embodied" learning gave them a deeper and more complex learning and understanding of the other. And it is this kind of creativity where sociality and the social imagination are key that requires the right "congenial environment" that fosters risk-taking and collaboration (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). Miranda, for example, highlighted the safety afforded by role.

Well, like you can kind of get it all wrong in drama and try it all again, cos you're not … there's this protection, the fact that you're not being yourself. You can let down the barriers that you have there. (Independent school student)

And it is these elements of safety that have benefits that go beyond the classroom itself where the inner and outer world are linked.

I think drama helps you develop as a person. To work on a character you have to look internally on yourself you know. As I said before, social skills and confidence…all of those skills that you need to be successful in the world are developed in a drama classroom. (Yana, government school student)

What these two sets of data revealed is that both students and teachers believed the drama classroom provided a safe space, a congenial environment, to foster creativity and becoming. However, this environment is threatened in an educational climate that places little actual value on creativity as a public good and affords status to performativity via high-stakes testing in "academic subjects". It is to this difference that we turn to now.

Creativity and performativity: what is felt and what is seen

In factory-like schools, you will often hear words like "performance" and "achievement," but rarely words like "discovery" or "exploration" or "curiosity." (Kohn, 1997)

The deleterious effects of neoliberalism and the subsequent commodification of education such as the narrowing of curriculum, de-professionalisation of teachers and a teach-to-the-test pedagogy have often been cited (Apple, 2004, 2005; Appleton, 2014; Ball, 2003, 2012; Beder et al., 2009; Black, 2013; Boxley, 2003; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Down, 2009; Giroux, 2004; Hursch, 2007; Jensen, 2013; Kenway & Bullen, 2005; Locke, 2015; Thompson & Harbaugh, 2012; Tienken, 2013). As Beder, Varney and Gosden (2009) note, this push to commodify education and performativity serves the needs of the market, rather than those of students and teachers:

The push for high-stakes standardised testing has created many business opportunities, as government funding is channelled into tests and texts rather than teacher training and reducing class sizes. This had fed a massive industry in test-related materials … The market for school assessment, tutoring, test-preparation and services and supplemental content supplies is worth $25 billion in the US alone. (Beder et al., 2009)
Drama teachers in this study highlight that despite their concerns with developing the creative capabilities of their students, they are not immune to the neoliberal competitive culture of performativity, and while “performativity” has meanings ranging from “performative utterances” (Austin, 2004 [1962]), to the ways gender is performed (Butler, 1990) and the performative worker mentioned previously (Ball 2003), the pressures teachers feel reflect the latter, that is where “a work climate [where] failure to perform successfully (perceived or otherwise) can have profoundly negative consequences”. It is these pressures influenced by an "attitude of valuing the ‘effective’ and the ‘efficient’ in systems where the least ‘input’ produces the greatest ‘output’” (Burnard & White, 2008, p. 674) that teachers report as tensions in their otherwise humanistic work. As one drama teacher Claire observed:

Claire: The league tables are given quite a lot of credit ... if we get in there then a big deal is made about it ... For us, it's just getting the year 12s over the line, getting them the best marks we possibly can. We look at which kids got their first preference at university, which kids used which subjects as their top four in their ATAR — so we look at all the stats ... We get hauled over the coals if our stats don’t... (nervous laugh).

And later in the interview she added:

Claire: I'm a drama teacher, but that doesn't mean I don't have my own opinions and interpretation of things, and I’m having to shove that down a kid’s throat as fact, and it might not be, and it might not be what they want out of it. [Just]...let me teach them. I'm not saying I think I need to be Strasberg Studio, but let me just teach them how to act.

Our research further found that teachers face a variety of barriers to integrating creative pedagogy in the classroom, such as time limitations and lack of funding. However, the greatest barrier is cultural. For example, teachers reported first that creativity as a form of expression and bridge building between individuals and communities is not valued in the school environment for what it can do, and secondly it is not “taught” as it is not tested. The teachers in our study noted that drama has a low status in schools across all sectors (Government, Independent and Catholic), because it is perceived by administration as not being academic. Subjects such as math, science and English held the highest status because secondary schools are judged on their results— or what is performed—in high stakes testing regimes such as NAPLAN14. Therefore, "academic" results from high stakes tests become a quantifiable commodity that can be utilised as a performative source of branding for the school. What this reveals is the mismatch between rhetoric and reality, and how “creativity” has been appropriated in order to serve the neoliberal project.

In addition, our research further supports Berland’s findings, who surveying teachers in Australia, Germany, the US and the UK, identified the low status placed on creativity in educational settings, a narrow curricula, and high-stakes testing as the main barriers to creativity in education (Berland, 2013). As many researchers have pointed out, assessment – particularly high-stakes

---

14 The National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) is an annual assessment for students in years 3, 5, 7 and 9.
assessment – is the greatest obstacle to nurturing creativity (Cachia, Ferrari, Ala-Mutka, & Punie, 2010; Cizek, 2001; Collard & Looney, 2014; Hamilton et al., 2007; Olivant, 2015). High-stakes tests for example, typically demand reproduction of a set of facts where creativity and ambiguity are excluded, in settings where failure is not acceptable (Cizek, 2001; Thompson & Cook, 2012b, 2014; Valli & Buese, 2007).

The press of performativity

Increasingly, western education assemblages adopt neoliberal performativity practices that also measure teacher quality through student performance on published test scores (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2005, 2009). Teachers in our study felt an enormous amount of pressure to “teach to the test” as Tom and Denise, both drama teacher from low socio-economic schools highlight:

Kirsten: How much pressure is there on you as a drama teacher to get good marks and statistics?
Kirsten: So it influences the way you teach?
Tom: Yeah, I essentially teach to the exams.

This point is reinforced by Denise’s observation from the point of view of a teacher in an Independent Public School.

My school is an Independent Public School. So we have an interesting structure that sort of models a business structure rather than a school in almost every way. So we have a lot of reliance on results. We have a huge huge reliance on teacher responsibility for those results and we are encouraged every semester to reflect on our performance as a teacher. We have to ensure our students’ success and we are asked to account for anything that has not assured their success. It’s a very results-driven college. Which is quite strange because our kids are exactly the opposite. The kids don’t care, [they] have got so many other things that they’re caring about that they just can’t add anymore.

Given this context, and unsurprisingly, Jung (2015) reports that creativity is on the decline among students. Furthermore, in a 2010 study of about 300,000 creativity tests going back to the 1970s, Kyung Hee Kim found creativity had decreased among American children since the introduction of the No Child Left Behind education reforms (Kim, 2010). Since 1990, for example, children have become less able to produce unique and unusual ideas. They are also less humorous, less imaginative and less able to elaborate on ideas (Kim, 2010). Even though research shows that creativity is innate, it needs to be cultivated (Berland, 2013). And as schools place greater emphasis on learning material and taking tests, Jung (2015) notes that there are fewer opportunities for creative thought amongst students than in the past.

It is this observation that sits in stark contrast to western world leaders describing creativity, innovation and collaboration for ensuring future global prosperity, when simultaneously slashing education and arts budgets (Beder et al., 2009).
Burnard and White (2008) framed the problem as a “complex interplay between performativity and creativity agendas” (p. 667). They note that creativity is “eminently suited to the multiple needs of life in the 21st century, which calls for enhanced skills of adaptation, flexibility, initiative, and the ability to use knowledge in different ways than has been hitherto realized” (p. 668). As Collard and Looney (2014) highlight the only way to challenge these obstacles is by rethinking curricula: “Ultimately, integrating creativity in teaching and learning will require profound changes in policy and practice. Policies will need to place a higher value on creativity, supporting both open and closed learning” (p. 359).

Conclusion

A number of key findings that emerged from the study. First, and consistent with the literature, there is a link between drama and creativity. More specifically, the drama space, the embodied practice of the form, and the collaborative culture of its practice stimulated creativity.

Second, the results of our study show that drama classrooms can provide a supportive educational environment for students to meet the demands of the new millennium, namely safe spaces that engender creativity, lateral thinking and collaboration. This result was consistent across drama teachers and students, and across all systems considered — government, independent and Catholic education sectors. Third, drama teachers are not immune to the culture of performativity and are both constrained by curricula and pressures to perform, but also work in the drama space to speak back to these. This is reflected in both the teachers and students’ experiences. Although limited in scope, our study suggests that students and teachers believe the drama classroom provides a safe space and a congenial environment to foster creativity and heterogeneous becomings. The irony in this finding is that although drama can equip students to meet the challenges of the 21st century, neoliberal education reforms and the need for corporations to make ever-increasing profits from education have lead to creativity being afforded a low status that will have a direct negative effect on students, limiting experiences, diversity, choice and differentiation.

We suggest what is required is that drama teachers have a greater understanding of how their subject can foster creativity and therefore contribute to our “knowledge economy”, add balance through their work to competing agendas, and advocate for the promotion of “difference”.

In lieu of a complete reorganising of the curriculum so that it places greater value on creativity and collaboration, what drama teachers can hold fast to is the certainty that congenial environments, collaboration and risk taking, do promote creative innovation, social cohesion, tolerance and diversity, and an “unfolding of the-world-as-it-might-be” (Mangiameli, 2013, p. 150).
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My school is an Independent Public School. So we have an interesting structure that sort of models a business structure rather than a school in almost every way. So we have a lot of reliance on results. We have a huge reliance on teacher responsibility for those results and we are encouraged every semester to reflect on our performance as a teacher. We have to ensure our students’ success and we are asked to account for anything that has not assured their success. (Denise, government school teacher)

The previous article highlighted the unique potential the drama classroom holds to be a congenial environment for creative thinking. I also explored how this potential is constrained by the performativity principle and by neoliberal education reforms that have led to a restructuring of education budgets away from the arts. This final section focuses clearly on the contextual aspect of the question – the contemporary times. Thus I examine in detail the forces that impact on drama education in Western Australia. As Denise states above, her school, “models a business structure rather than a school in almost every way”. This article underscores the effects of economic neoliberalism on schools and the marketization of education, in combination with our “age of austerity”. When these forces drive education “reform”, profound effects are visible at both the macro and micro levels in the lives of individual teachers and students.

I trace the effect that decades of neoliberal education reform policies have had on schools and place Australia in its international context. In this article I focus on the results of the research that reveals that subjects such as art, dance, drama and music are among the first to be cut from the curriculum resulting in fewer options for students. My research supports international studies that schools are directing resources and students towards “academic subjects” (Hursch 2007; Loh and Hu 2014). In this final article I further elaborate on space, but this time focusing on space as a form of capital. I deconstruct how neoliberalism and free market reforms impact arts spaces. Neoliberalism transforms relations between government, industry and society so that the economic desires of the private sector are positioned as central to government economic and social agenda. Thus public institutions such as schools are viewed as spaces that are part of the market.

I focus on the Australian context and show privatisation impacts schools, for example the Independent Public Schools model. Using qualitative data from my research with drama teachers and their students across a variety of school contexts, including IPS schools such as Denise’s, I explore how funding cuts and market-oriented ideologies impact on teachers and students. The results are a dominant culture of performativity, fewer subject choices, a “data-driven” curriculum, and the constant surveillance of teachers.

Once again, the theories of Ball (2003), Foucault (1991) Deleuze and Guattari (1972 [2009]), provide lenses to examine how these neoliberal discourses intersect with school assemblages and impact on drama education. I focus on the dominant culture of competitive performativity in schools means that drama teachers are conscripted into increasing the school brand through whole-school drama productions. Teachers also reported that they felt responsible for “improving the school image” and they achieved this by working longer hours and changing their pedagogy to focus more on exams.

I explore how one of the discourses of neoliberalism is that education is said to be in crisis. This results in “dataphilia” or a “data fetish” that originates
from private enterprise. Data-driven weapons are seen as essential for companies to control their businesses via “watching everything” in real time. The supposed education crisis focuses on teachers “failing” to meet set standards in a belief that quality teaching equates to a teacher’s individual ability to improve students’ test scores. My research supports other research that shows that this discourse leads to the de-professionalism and increased surveillance of teachers. Interestingly my analysis reveals that the most noticeably deleterious effects are on students and teachers in schools from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds.

Foucault’s concept of the panopticon is explored because it a useful lens through which to view the issue of the surveillance of teachers that has arisen in contemporary schools. Foucault describes the panopticon as a laboratory of power through visual means (Foucault, 1977). Many of the teachers we spoke to were resigned to continual surveillance and being judged by data produced by students’ results on high stakes tests. One of the government schools I visited had glass walls in every classroom so that students and teachers were constantly visible to all. According to the drama teacher staff in this school were under an “extraordinary amount of pressure to perform” (Denise). The concepts of the panopticon and dataphilia correspond with the teachers’ experiences of continually being watched and judged by their data.

Denise: Everything you do is visible.

Kirsten: Are they data driven?

Denise Yes! It’s a very results driven college. Which is quite strange because our kids are exactly the opposite. The kids don’t care. The percentage of kids who care would be under 10%. The kids have got so many other things that they’re caring about that they just can’t add anymore.

It’s not overt. All that stuff is behind closed doors. All that stuff is in discussions with your manager. All that stuff is held at arms length from the kids. The kids have no idea. There’s a phenomenon that we found with our entrance video. We have a promotional video for prospective students… and when they showed it to the staff everyone looked at each other said, “I want to go here.” It was so different. The kids’ view of North Side is – amazing; the staff view is – tough place to work. None of that angst, anger, dissent and annoyance is passed on to the kids at all. We’re really good at acting. We’re really good at performing. It’s scary for new people. We once had a staff member who came in and only lasted two days of PD [professional development] and then he demanded an exit interview. And he said, “If you think normal teachers are going to go through this amount of work you’re crazy.” He lasted two days of PD at the beginning of the year. And the new teacher who took over from him has won awards. He’s in the “purple circle” of leadership now. There’s favourites. I was one a couple of years ago. I’m not now I’ve had a baby. I’m on the shelf.

Kirsten: Is that dangerous being on the shelf?

Denise: As long as my results are good, as long as I keep doing tutorials, and as long as I don’t rock the boat. As long as I cover my arse then I’m okay.
It has been noted by many that one of the tenants of neoliberalism is competition (Giroux, 2008; Spies-Butcher, 2014; Thompson & Cook, 2012a; Tienken, 2013). One of the alarming results of my research was the detrimental affect of this competition on teachers. The public shaming of supposedly underperforming teachers was also a common phenomenon I encountered in the interviews. All teachers talked about having the results from the previous years’ ATAR exams projected up onto a screen in front of the whole staff at the beginning of the year. Some schools ranked their subjects; most ranked their schools in comparison with other schools; and others made comparisons between year groups’ results. The similarity in the teachers’ comments were that teachers were made to feel responsible for their students’ results; an atmosphere of competition was encouraged; and teachers felt embarrassment or shame if students’ results did not meet up to perceived expectations. As Denise stated above, as long as her “results are good” and she is perceived to be doing the right thing in a performative sense, the she is “okay”.

One of the detrimental effects of neoliberalism on a national scale is that greater competition has led to greater inequality in education (Spies-Butcher, 2014). This was evident in my study where lower socio-economic schools were losing students, particularly middle-class students. The flow on effect of fewer students in the high school context, is fewer subject choices, which once again leads to fewer students, as students move to other schools with greater options. This has a deleterious effect on the arts in the schools I visited, particularly on dance and drama, which were cut from the curriculum in three of the 15 schools I visited.

One of the interesting flow on effects of neoliberalism and a culture of competition is that drama is perceived as having a low status in schools. This was reported in 100% of the interviews I conducted. Drama was not perceived as being an “academic” subject by other staff, even some drama teachers. Drama was not valued on the curriculum with the placement of subjects on school grids for students to select. Several teachers and students spoke of the low status of drama amongst staff and other students in terms such as: “a throw away subject”, “pretend to be trees,” “fun subject where you don’t do any work,” and an “easy subject”. Teachers spoke of not being taken seriously, not being given resources and not being allocated space on the timetable because of the lack of status of arts subjects.

According to neoliberal discourses competition in education leads to more choice for educations consumers. However, previous research has found the opposite to be the case. Competitive performativity results in a pedagogy of memorization, teaching to the test and classroom practices that applaud repetition and conformity (Loh & Hu, 2014; Robinson, 2012; Tienken, 2013). This phenomenon was echoed in my research where participants reported adopting exam centred pedagogies, or “teaching to the exams”. Many of the teachers who participated in this study also marked the state drama exams, and it was noted that in recent years fewer texts had been chosen from the set text lists on the year 12 curriculum. Even though there were many texts on the set text list, most teachers “played it safe” and chose the same “classic texts”. Rather than producing greater choice, increased competition between and within schools actually produced more similarity and repetition.

In this article I discuss Deleuze’s seminal work Difference and Repetition (1994 [2012]) in relation to this proclivity for teachers to “play it safe” in a
dominant culture of competitive performativity. For Deleuze creative thinking is difficult because it involves challenging commonly held perceptions or “truths.” For Deleuze learning is not the memorisation of facts but the challenging of commonly held “everybody knows” assumptions. For Deleuze difference underlies thought because ideas are multiplicities. Common sense treats the universe statistically and economically and attempts to control it to produce the best outcome. Common sense is rationalist and doesn’t affirm difference. It has an interest in reducing rather than amplifying the power of difference. To combat “common sense” thinking Deleuze proposes paradox. Paradox serves as the stimulus to real thought because it forces thought to confront its limits. In relation to drama teaching this article maps instances where teachers both acquiesce to the common sense doctrine of neoliberal performativity and stick to the well-known texts and the safe path to good “results”, and reject commonly held educational “truths” by adopting creative lines of flight through difference. Jo represents an example of a teacher adopting a creative line of flight in her rejection of the “standard musical” performance.

Jo: Well the school wanted me to do the stock standard musicals that they’d always done. And every year their musicals have the same songs that they’ve always done. And their justification for it is they want their past students to come back and sit in the audience and sing along.

Jo: But I chose The Little Book of Everything and it’s a great text, and great for the school to explore, and the students were starting to question this whole Uniting Church thing because it was starting to become incredibly fundamentalist. They were starting to get pressured to believe and things were being hidden from them. And I said, “Well this play’s right because it deals with all that and it can be kind of turned around by simple faith.” I thought the school may want to do a lead-up to it and discuss it. So I handed it to my Head of Department and she said, “Yeah no worries.” And I gave her the script and said, “If you want to make it available to anyone else.” And she didn’t; and she didn’t read it. So anyway we did Cabaret that year and one of the boys had this fantastic monologue where he was God. I think he played God and it was beautiful. It was a Rowan Atkinson one. It just made God out to be this really funky dude.

Kirsten: Yeah, right. Nice.

Jo: And it was really funny and everyone really loved it. Here’s this little guy with no real confidence and he was very socially awkward and physically awkward and he just got up and did this monologue. He was awesome and everyone was like, “Wow” and shaking his hand and they just loved it.

Kirsten: Oh fabulous.

Jo: And I got called into the Dean’s office and he said, “That’s inappropriate.” I said, “I don’t know how you can take offence at that because my view of God is a totally funky kind of guy. He is forgiving.” So I said, “Well if you’re offended by that I think you need to read the school production.”

Kirsten: Oh boy.
Jo: I was like, “I think we’re on the wrong page”.
Data-driven performativity: Neoliberalism’s impact on drama education in Western Australian secondary schools.


Abstract

When economic neoliberalism combines with our “age of austerity” and drives education “reform”, profound effects are visible at the macro level. Troublingly, these effects play out at the micro level in the lives of individual teachers and students. Using qualitative data from our research with drama teachers and their students across a variety of school contexts, we explore how funding cuts and market-oriented ideologies embedded in these reforms “trickle down” educational pathways to become classroom realities. The results are a dominant culture of performativity, fewer subject choices, a “data-driven” curriculum, and the constant surveillance of teachers. The theories of Ball (2003), Foucault (1991) Deleuze and Guattari (1972 [2009]), provide lenses to examine how these neoliberal discourses intersect with school assemblages and impact on drama education. This analysis reveals that the most noticeably deleterious effects are on students and teachers in schools from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds.
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Introduction

The much touted “difficult economic times” we live in have in recent years resulted in a drastic reduction in arts and education funding in western capitalist nations (Fowles, 2014; Henwood & Featherstone, 2013; Murray & Erridge, 2012; A. Smith, 2013). For example, in Australia, the 2013 landslide victory of the conservative Abbott government resulted in an almost immediate slashing of funding for education (A$1.1b) and the arts (A$87.1m) (Riddle et al., 2014; Tregear, Potts, Mem-delsohn, & Caust, 2014). Simultaneously, the new Federal government decided to spend A$12 billion on fifty-eight F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft (Tregear, 2014). This prioritising of government spending accords with what Giroux would call the twin ideologies of neoliberalism and violence, or “today’s culture of consumerism and violence” (Giroux, 2013, p. 458).

Combined with this “age of austerity”, schools have been subjected to decades of neoliberal education reform policies and programs such as the No Child Left Behind Act, and the Race-to-the-Top funding in the United States, and The Academies Act in the United Kingdom. These and other education “reforms” promote high-stakes testing, accountability, and competitive markets (Hursch, 2007; Loh & Hu, 2014). How does this zeitgeist of austerity and reform affect arts education at the local level where practice is enacted? Many curriculum changes have been made as a result of these reforms. Consequently schools are primarily judged on the grades students achieve for English, mathematics, science and sometimes languages. This often means that subjects such as art, dance, drama and music are among the first to be cut from the curriculum resulting in fewer options for students, as schools direct students to focus on so-called “academic” courses in order to attain the requisite data to be ranked as a “good” school. By way of example, Appleton (2014) reports that in the UK, 23% of schools have dropped drama in favour of “academic subjects.”

Our ethnographic research project based on semi-structured interviews with fifteen drama teachers and thirteen of their ex-students in Western Australia across government, Catholic and independent school systems shows that these responses are not isolated to one or two countries. For example, in two of the fifteen schools represented in our study, dance as a subject had been dropped despite a strong desire for it by students: “We had a lot of dancers in our year” (Grace, student, independent school); “there were so many girls saying they wanted to do dance” (Elizabeth, student, independent school). Speculating on a reason for this change, one student noted, “I think with subjects like dance they look at other countries like Asia and say, ‘They do all science and all maths and they don’t focus on the arts. They’re smarter so we need to compete with that’” (Elizabeth, student, independent school). Interestingly, this desire by students themselves to do more in the arts is consistent internationally (Palmer Wolf, 2014). Students also report that effects of the “reforms” go beyond curriculum choice to include the use of space.

Space is a form of capital. Whether it is a physical space such as a theatre, a space on the timetable/curriculum, or an emotionally safe space for teachers and students to express themselves freely, space is impacted by the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. For example, Zac, a gay student from an independent school who “loved drama” because it gave him a safe space to “finally be who I truly was” highlighted that as arts subjects were
removed from the space of the school curriculum, physical arts spaces were also being remoulded to suit more “academic” subjects:

Our school was based around academics and sport. The arts…we cut our dance program about a decade ago. We were one of the hubs for the northern suburbs for dance and we cut that. Our theatre is being [re-] built as a lecture theatre rather than a theatre. Drama was one of the hardest hit. (Zac, student, independent school).

To better understand these neoliberal changes to education, where schools seek to be more “competitive” in the global education market by privileging more so-called “academic” subjects such as math, science and English in lieu of the arts, we turn our attention to “neoliberalism” and to the neoliberal reforms themselves.

Neoliberalism

The discourses of neoliberalism have been “reforming” education in capitalist countries since the 1980s. Giroux (2013) defines these policies as:

Neoliberalism or unbridled free-market fundamentalism employs modes of governance, discipline, and regulation that are totalizing in their insistence that all aspects of social life be determined, shaped and weighted through market-driven measures… it is also a mode of pedagogy and set of social arrangements that uses education to win consent, [and] produce consumer-based notions of agency. (2013, p. 459)

As Giroux notes, neoliberalism fundamentally transforms relations between government, private enterprise and society so that the economic desires of the private sector are positioned as central to government economic and social agenda. Thus public institutions such as schools, which were previously viewed as central to the collective good, are re-framed under neoliberalism to be part of the market. For example, as Australian Federal Education Minister, Christopher Pyne recently announced, “Our Students First policy will encourage students to develop practical, targeted skills that will help them compete in the global jobs economy” (2014).

The creation of “free schools” in the UK has opened the doors to private enterprise. Wilby (2010) highlights this transformation in this way,

Once a profit-making school was unthinkable, and one that received state funds even more so. But for private capital, it is a win-win situation: a guaranteed income stream from the government and the likelihood of state rescue if everything goes wrong. And the last 30 years suggest that what private capital wants, it usually gets in the end. (cited in Gillard, 2011, p. 7)

Consistent with this agenda, Western Australian Education Minister, Peter Collier, recently announced plans to build and run eight public schools in partnership with private companies (Collier, 2014). This “Public Private Partnership” (Barnett, 2015) model has been utilised in other states and is part of
the gradual move towards privatisation of schools occurring both state and federally in Australian education. As Davies and Bansel note, “economic productivity is seen to come not from government investment in education, but from transforming education into a product that can be bought and sold like anything else” (2007, p. 254). The “Public Private Partnership” model has been contentious for the Western Australian Government with private company Serco (who manage hospitals, prisons and detention centres) appearing regularly in deleterious newspaper articles (Daizell, 2015; Millimaci, 2014; O’Connor, 2015; Vickery, 2014).

In addition to privatising schools, neoliberal governments are also making government schools more private, that is, based on the corporate model. For example, in Western Australia in 2009, the state government announced the introduction of Independent Public Schools (IPS). However, a 2013 evaluation of the initiative concluded that, “There was no hard evidence of any change to attendance, suspensions, or academic achievement” (Clinton, 2013).

Despite the lack of evidence of any success of the IPS model, in 2014 the Federal Education Minister Christopher Pyne announced a $70 million Independent Public Schools Initiative, which aims to make around 1,500 more public schools across Australia autonomous within the next three years. Pyne cited the education model used in Western Australia as “very autonomous”, where schools are run by principals, their senior staff and a board “with some knowledge about how to make a school hum” (Griffiths, 2014). However, according to our research, drama teachers at IPS schools stated that rather than being “harmonious,” working conditions were “terrible” (Leah), or “incredibly stressful” (Matt). Moreover, they felt “micromanaged” (Mandy), and were under “a massive amount of pressure” (Tom) to perform and compete with one another and between schools for students. As Bianca stated: “I feel the pressure to produce stuff. I have to be seen to be showing the school off” (Bianca). Denise sums up the difference between her IPS school and a “traditional school”:

> My school is an IPS. So we have an interesting structure that sort of models a business structure rather than a traditional school in almost every way. So we have a lot of reliance on results. We have a huge reliance on teacher responsibility for those results and we are encouraged every semester to reflect on our performance as a teacher. We have to ensure our students’ success and we are asked to account for anything that has not assured their success. (Denise, government school teacher).

What these teachers report, and consistent with Ball’s (2003) notion of a dominant “culture of competitive performativity”, is pressure to “perform,” be seen to “work hard”, and be a “good school” or a “good student/teacher” (2003).
The Dominant Culture of Competitive Performativity

Performance will be to the twentieth and 21st centuries what discipline was to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, namely, an ontological-historical formation of power and knowledge. (McKenzie, 2001, p. 176)

The term “performativity” has been used in a number of contexts with different meanings. Although the term derives from Austin (2004 [1962]), within the context of education philosophy the term is usually linked with the work of Jean-Francois Lyotard. Lyotard (1984) used the term to describe the legitimisation of knowledge in postmodern society. Lyotard discusses how the performativity principle in capitalism (maximising output and minimising input) subsumes education to facilitate the efficient functioning of the state. Building on this, Ball (2003) uses the term to describe the worth, quality or value of an individual or organisation within a field of judgement. Furthermore, Ball notes that educational neoliberalism often utilises managerial control systems such as benchmarking of academic standards and assessment and fostering competition by ranking schools publicly and giving parents more “choice” (Ball, 2012; Schiller, 2011). This dominant “culture of competitive performativity” (Ball 2003) imposes compliance through various accountability measures (Valli & Buese, 2007; Valli & Croninger, 2012). As one of the teachers we interviewed at a low-socioeconomic IPS school well known for being a “dodgy school, a difficult school”, stated:

We’ve got a new principal in the last couple of years and he’s really strong and focused on building our school image up and so we’ve all been working our guts out to do that. We’re one of those schools where people say, “Where do you work?”

“Hill View”

“Ooohhh”.

Or we had one comment recently, “Oh so you wear a vest to work every day do you?”

…So one of the measures we’ve implemented is that they get full tutoring, four days a week. Four days a week, after school. (Alecia, government school teacher)

As we can see from Alecia’s comments, in the dominant educational culture of competitive performativity, the solution to “improving the school image” is for staff to work harder (“we’ve all been working our guts out”) by doing unpaid tutoring after school four days a week. In the global education market to be seen as successful in competitions, high-stakes tests and other published data amounts to a “branding” strategy for a school to “project a highly positive image of itself to the general public” (Loh and Hu 2014, p. 14). As one teacher, Tom, at an IPS school noted, the pressure to perform radically changed the way he taught drama:

The results are analysed with a fine tooth comb…Basically in the last two years I’ve entirely changed the way I teach the course aimed purely at getting the best results that I can…Yeah, there’s a lot of
pressure…I essentially teach to the exams. (Tom, government school teacher).

Tom, along with many of the teachers interviewed, believed that his teaching was judged solely on his students’ results:

Tom: I start day one talking about exams — what you need to write, how you need to perform, the etiquette and all that sort of stuff…straight away because 50% of their mark is that and my course is judged entirely on that. If my kids do an awesome performance to their mums and their grandmas, it actually doesn’t make the school or my course any better. If my kids all get within the range that I said they would in their exams that makes my program successful.

Kirsten: Right. So you are entirely judged on those exam scores…

Tom: Entirely. (Tom, government school teacher)

As we can see this dominant culture of competitive performativity elicits compliance through judging teachers by students’ exam results. This affects multiple teaching spaces: the physical space of the school and the timetable, the emotional space of the teachers being constantly under surveillance, and the pedagogical space of what is taught in the classroom on a day to day basis. The main apparatus of power utilised by neoliberal “societies of control” to educate compliance is data (Deleuze 1992).

**Dataphilia**

In an age of “austerity” and the commodification of education, data on student performance in external tests is the prime vehicle for judging teachers’ performance. As Ella, a drama teacher at a government school notes: “The school rides their whole league tables on our marks. We have to be at least 8% above the state average. We go over the data quite a lot”.

This “dataphilia” or “data fetish” originates from private enterprise, which continually aims to increase the speed and responsiveness of a corporation to the market so as to minimise expenditure and avoid loss (Haiven & Stoneman, 2009, p. 1). For example, in 2004 Wal-Mart’s then Chief Information Officer, Linda Dillman, stated that hyper-technology, their “data-driven weapons,” is essential for the company to control their business via “watching everything” (the 460 terabytes of data on shoppers stored on Teradata mainframes) in “real time” so that stores can be restocked and the company can “start predicting what’s going to happen, instead of waiting for it to happen” (Dillman, cited in Hays, 2004, p. 1). As Hays notes, “Such knowledge, Wal-Mart has learned, is not only power. It is profit, too” (2004, p. 1). Likewise, in education, governments and corporations can predict and control educational outcomes to suit their needs and the needs of the market by utilising these “data-driven weapons”.

One central tenet of neoliberal dataphilia is that education is said to be in “crisis” and teachers are “failing” to meet set standards (Davies & Bansel, 2007; Giroux, 2013; Tienken, 2013). As Valli & Croninger (2012) highlight, high stakes accountability policies such as those found in No Child Left Behind and Race-To-The-Top consider “measurable student achievement” as the principal outcome on
which teachers are evaluated (p. 5). This narrows the concept of quality teaching to a teacher’s individual ability to improve students’ test scores. These accountability policies change the concept of quality teaching by ignoring process and collaborative teaching. This is particularly the case with government school teachers (Giroux, 2013; Saltman & Gabbard, 2010). As the following comments show:

There is a lot of pressure to get good grades…and the school’s always putting on that pressure…looking at the data analysis at the beginning of every year, how we went where we fall. (Helen, government school teacher)

My [drama] course is judged entirely on the exams. (Tom, government school teacher)

Many of the teachers we spoke to, particularly from schools located in lower socio-economic areas, but also from more affluent schools, were resigned to this continual surveillance of their teaching and being judged by students’ results. Moreover, data analyses in the form of appraisal systems, target setting and output comparisons are effective forms of surveillance which lead to self-monitoring. For example, Liz, a drama teacher in a low socio-economic Christian Independent school noted that the school’s “curriculum officers” kept a close eye on her programs and her results:

Liz: With our programming it’s very specific and they check all of our programs.

Kirsten: Who’s “they”?

Liz: Curriculum [whispers] officers…so basically we have two people who look after curriculum. We also have to differentiate, which is looking at extension and support in the class, which is [whispers] really annoying. You know everyone has to be treated in the same way. So years eleven and twelve need to be very specific in our programs so I guess that’s where the pressure comes.

Kirsten: What about year twelve exams and NAPLAN [National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy] and all of those sorts of things?

Liz: Oooh yeah…there’s definitely…they want to create a culture of excelling and excellence…yeah that sort of thing. But I don’t know if the pressure is so much coming through to the arts. I think if you were in the core subject areas, you’d be feeling it more.

Kirsten: Right, so that culture, is that because it’s a competitive area around here with all of the different schools?

Liz: Definitely. Actually, speaking of the exam results, the curriculum manager will go through and show us how each school performed…And show where we rank…So yeah, and then they show us on a scale how all of the different subjects…and how well they did, in front of everyone. So I guess there is that accountability.
As we can see from Liz’s comments such as, “You know everyone has to be treated in the same way” and “So I guess there is that accountability”, even though she finds the interference “really annoying”, she is resigned to this constant surveillance. She also self-monitors through whispering when talking about the “officers” and changes her “programs” to suit their requirements. In Foucauldian terms this panopticon of surveillance and self-discipline changes the very nature of teaching. According to Kenneth Saltman (2010), neoliberal high-stakes accountability policies represent an, “unprecedented shift in control over public schools” (Saltman 2010, p. 2; see also Epstein, 2004; Fuhrman, Goertz, & Weinbaum, 2007; Valli & Croninger, 2012). As Ball notes, the act of teaching and the subjectivity of the teacher are both profoundly changed within the new management panopticism (of quality and excellence) and the new forms of entrepreneurial control (through marketing and competition) (2003, p. 219). Denise, a drama teacher from an IPS school explains:

Denise: We get asked to attend a meeting with the Department of Education people. We go over all of our results, our students’ results. I don’t see it as a negative…anymore, because I’ve just gotten used to the fact that that’s just how North Side College works. It’s just how their system works. There’s a lot of top down push and not a lot of push in the opposite direction. In fact there’s none.

Kirsten: No dissent?

Denise: Ripples, but no, it’s well ingrained in the psyche of the North Side teacher that you’re fortunate to work there and if you would like to leave... (Denise, teacher, government school)

Like Liz, Denise (and possibly her colleagues) had “gotten used to” the way the dominant culture of surveillance and competitive performativity, the “system,” worked and there was very little resistance. Neoliberal policies achieve their ends through enculturation that is difficult for the individual teacher to resist (Connoly, 2013; Loh & Hu, 2014), and Foucault’s (1968) concept of panopticism provides an instructive way of considering this.

Panopticism and glass walls

In *Discipline and Punish* (1968/1991) Foucault describes Bentham’s panopticon. Named after Panoptes from Greek mythology, a giant with a hundred eyes, Bentham designed a circular prison with a central tower where a single guard could survey every inmate in the prison. Although inmates cannot know when they are being watched, the mere possibility of surveillance means that they constantly monitor their own behaviour. Foucault describes the panopticon as a laboratory of power through visual means:

The director may spy on all the employees that he has under his order: nurses, doctors, foremen, teachers, warders; he will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose upon them the methods he thinks best. (Foucault 1968/1991, p. 204)
Our research shows that this culture of surveillance can be seen in the architecture of at least one government school:

North Side College is like that. We have got glass walls so most people can see your teaching…Yeah at least half way up is glass walls. You can see into every classroom…The college is quite open … there are no dark dingy spots like I’ve seen in so many other schools where kids can hide. There’s nowhere. No one can hide at North Side. I think we’ve got two stairwells that are not visible. (Denise, teacher, government school)

Denise went on to explain that although teachers knew that they were potentially being watched at all times, after a while they “got used to it.” However, she also reported that teachers were under an “extraordinary amount of pressure” to “perform” at her school, to “join committees” and “become Level Three Classroom Teachers” (“Level Three” is part of a government teacher ranking system: “Level Three Classroom Teachers are exemplary teachers recognised and rewarded for their exceptional teaching practices” (Western Australia Department of Education, 2015). The concepts of panopticism and dataphilia correspond with the teachers’ experiences of being continually watched and judged by their data, with administration even contacting them on their holidays to ask them to account for their students’ test results, as Jo explains:

The numbers would come from admin and I’d get this text [on the holidays]. And then we’d get all this data back and you’d have a scatter plot graph and depending on how close your students’ dots were to the predicted dot was how accurate your marking was. (Jo, teacher, independent school)

Teachers highlighted the fact that the very first thing that occurs at the beginning of every year is a public discussion of the previous year’s data:

So as part of our grades analysis at the beginning of the year, all teachers who teach year twelve students go into the auditorium. Every subject is flashed up on the screen and they are ranked. They are ranked within the school as with the differences. (Denise, teacher, government school)

We do get hauled over the coals if our stats don’t … well stats as in the difference between their exam mark and their school mark. I mean I spent a lot of time at the start of this year really pulling apart those stats. (Claire, Catholic school teacher).

Denise, a drama teacher at a government Independent Public School, related an incident where her top student underperformed by 20%, which dragged both hers and the history teacher’s marks down. The data was projected on a screen in a general staff meeting at the beginning of the year. She describes what happened:

The history teacher and I were just sitting there. All that happens is that people don’t meet your gaze. We got spoken to about those anomalies.
We get asked to attend a meeting with the Department of Education people. They go over all of our results, our students’ results. (Denise, teacher, government school)

The public shaming of “underperforming” teachers at staff meetings was a phenomenon discussed by several participants who taught in schools located in lower to middle socio-economic areas. This was not the case, however, in the wealthy private schools that were flushed with resources and could apparently easily beat state averages because of their upper-middle class clientele. For example, one teacher from a wealthy independent school remarked that her school was not perturbed by published NAPLAN results because their clientele always sat above the state average: “Look in one sense we’re probably lucky because most of our kids sit comfortably above NAPLAN so therefore we can probably pooh pooh it a bit more. We just get a bit despondent” (Gemma, teacher, independent school).

Another of the tenets of neoliberalism and the marketisation of education is the concept of competition. Schools compete with one another for students based on the aforementioned statistical data. In Western Australia the public vs. private schools debate is a regular feature in the news articles and private conversations.

Public vs. Private

In the schools visited for the study, the first thing the interviewer noticed is the space of the school itself. In the context of urban space, Kohn (2004) asserts that the increasing commodification and privatization of public spaces and the parallel exclusion of certain activities and people from privatized public spaces leads to de facto segregation, and thus, by implication, further erosion of democratic rights and processes. This argument can be extended to the school space. The following is an extract taken from one author’s diary when she visited one of the three elite private schools in this study:

Kirsten: Wow! A river-view to die for, St Adrianna’s massive triple-storey neoclassical edifice proudly ascends from acres of manicured lawn and red roses. The students filter across the yard wearing blue boater hats and carrying the latest MacBook Air laptops. All of the girls are beautiful. No bad hair-dye jobs, overdone black eyeliner or pancake makeup here. No obesity either. These kids are well kept. The foyer has three massive chandeliers: “A local mining magnate whose daughters attend the school donated them,” Gemma tells me later.

It is interesting to compare this description of an elite school with one of our participant’s description of her first day at a government high school:

Oh yeah, it’s a public school in a very very low socioeconomic … [large] Aboriginal [population] and there’s a lot of issues with truancy and kids just not showing up. The first day we’re in the car park and there’s a car park designated for the police. [Laughs] So you can imagine I was like, “Oh my god I’m actually going to die.” (Yana, government school student)

According to Leopold (2010) in the US, education “reform” has led simultaneously to both the dismantling of public education and the gentrification
of private schools. This can also be seen in Australia in the comments by research participants teaching in exclusive private schools:

We recently acquired a 900 seat state of the art full proscenium arch fly-towered theatre space, basically, which we’re still learning to play with…and we also have a studio space that can seat about 100 or so…then we have another pure black box space and then we also have an additional workshop space. (Gemma, teacher, independent school)

Elite private schools not only have excellent facilities; they also have the funds to employ experts to manage these, as Gemma explains: “We have a venue manager who is a tech person himself, but if you have major productions which have significant lighting then we’ll hire in another professional” (Gemma, teacher, independent school). In the dominant culture of competitive performativity these wealthy schools are the clear winners as is evidenced below.

Although low socio-economic government and Catholic schools in our study were “struggling to find enough desks for students” (Alecia, government school teacher) or teachers—“I asked for a teacher’s desk in my room and had to pay for it out of my own budget” (Claire, Catholic school teacher)—wealthy independent and Catholic schools were continually adding to their excellent arts facilities:

I think the school is quite supportive of the Arts, certainly given the facilities they’ve provided us with…the music auditoriums…they’ve all been added in the last six months. (Bianca, teacher, Catholic school)

We’ve got a brand new recording studio…We were in Venice for the school trip this year, we’ve got hand-crafted leather masks…(Kate, teacher, Catholic school)

Our new [school] theatre is bigger than the State Theatre Centre (Gemma, independent school teacher)

Although wealthy schools in our study were focusing on “academic” subjects to the detriment of arts subjects, as were government schools, they nevertheless spent money on arts buildings and kept some arts subjects in order to remain competitive. As Mandy, a drama teacher from an elite independent school notes, “We have to have dance to be competitive with other schools and everyone’s offering it now. That’s what the school across the river’s doing” (Mandy, teacher, independent school).

Hand-crafted masks brought home from trips from Venice, new theatres and recording studios, and even gold-leaf tiles in the toilets at one exclusive school, is what cash-strapped government schools find themselves “competing” with. However, according to the Australian Federal Minister for Education, Australia doesn’t have an equity problem: “The OECD says that we are a high equity nation in terms of our students … I don’t believe there is an equity problem in Australia” (Pyne 2013).

Yet the OECD data clearly shows that the Australian education system is deeply stratified (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012). For example, young Australians in the top socio-economic quartile are around three times more likely to attend a private school than those in the bottom
Disadvantaged young people are more than seven times more likely to attend a disadvantaged school than an advantaged one. Australian schools in high socio-economic areas are much more likely to have better quality educational resources (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012). Moreover, regarding equity, the data shows that “if a young person goes to a well-resourced private school or a public school in a high socio-economic area, they are much more likely to do better on a wide range of indicators, including academic performance, entry to further education or training, and post-school employment” (West, 2013). In terms of student achievement in literacy and numeracy, for example, results show clear patterns of disadvantage in terms of gender, race, socio-economic background and geographical location (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2014).

Deleterious Effects of Neoliberalism on Arts Education

In our study lower socio economic schools were losing students, particularly middle class students, which led to fewer subject choices because schools cannot afford to offer classes to small numbers of students. This had a particularly deleterious effect on the arts, and drama and dance in particular, which were often cut from the curriculum because of small numbers and low status. For example, in two of the poorest school in our study, the drama teachers, Alecia and Claire, explain how decreasing numbers have affected both their schools and drama education. Firstly, Alecia discusses how the “white flight” to private schools (Fairlie & Resch, 2002) has affected her low socio-economic government school:

Our school has a high Aboriginal percentage…I think it’s around 25 to 28% Aboriginality and that’s increased as our numbers have dropped because it’s our top end of students who have dropped off and we’ve kept, it sounds terrible to say it, that middle-end, bottom end. The lower demographic of our school has stayed and we’ve lost the cream. (Alecia, government school teacher)

Secondly, Claire describes how, in the dominant culture of performative neoliberalism, drama holds little status:

The main pressure I face as a drama teacher is being respected and valued, as a subject. I asked for a teacher’s desk in my room and had to pay for it out of my own budget. And I know that me being Head of Arts and the drama teacher makes me a very easy target...scapegoat. Every time I speak they just roll their eyes and go, “There’s the drama queen again”. Whereas if I was a maths teacher raising whatever concern or issue it was, I would be listened to and valued, whereas I think I’m a very easy person to pigeonhole, to marginalise and categorise... So [in drama] we’ve gone from having about, usually twenty-five kids or twenty-eight even, year sevens in each class... this year we’ve got fifteen in each class. So all of us in the arts are noticing the small numbers. (Claire, head of department and drama teacher, Catholic school)
In neoliberal discourses “competition” is the sine qua non of “delivering a better education system” (Pyne, 2014). However, in 2013 a report by the Grattan Institute concluded that:

By increasing competition, government policies have increased the effectiveness of many sectors of the economy. But school education is not one of them. The impact of interventions to increase school competition has been marginal, at best… it is not a viable way of increasing the performance of school systems. (Jensen, 2013, p. 295)

According to neoliberal governments, competition in education produces more “choice” and better outcomes for parents and students (Pyne, 2015). However, the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity ultimately restricts choices for students, as Mandy, a drama teacher from an elite school explains:

So when students choose…it’s kind of interesting. As I say our kids go through this counselling process in year ten as to which pathway they should choose. And you could look at that…devil’s advocate I guess…are we going down this pathway so the child will achieve? Or are we going down this pathway so the school will achieve? (Mandy, Catholic school teacher)

Moreover, according to Tienken, this competitive “meritocracy-based system” disproportionately penalizes poorer students who have less access to out of school experiences (such as trips to the theatre or to Venice) either through the family or the school system (Tienken, 2013, p. 295).

**Difference and Repetition**

According to Robinson (2012), recent education reforms support a conservative agenda where difference and critical thinking are “dangerous”: “In the conservative model, critical thinking is horrifically dangerous … Our public schools, unfortunately, have replicated a class stratification on this front that’s been in place since the Renaissance” (Robinson, 2012, p. 1).

Giroux calls this conservative model of education “a pedagogy of management and conformity” that “reproduces” deep inequities in educational opportunities (Giroux, 2013, p. 460). In neoliberal educational reforms competitive performativity results in a pedagogy of memorization, teaching to the test and classroom practices that applaud repetition and conformity. In Loh and Hu’s (2014) study of education in Singapore, they noted that a test-driven approach to pedagogy is expected in a neoliberal school system. Consequently teachers spent most of their “teaching” time doing mandated worksheets and drilling students for examinations because:

Highly visible performative proofs such as worksheets and test results are not only indicators of productivity and output but are also inscription devices that can contribute to a beginning teacher’s self and public image as a competent and performing teacher. (Loh & Hu, 2014, p. 19)

This finding was echoed in our own study where participants reported adopting pedagogy that resembles teaching to the test:
“I essentially teach to the exams.” (Tom, government school teacher)

“In years 11 and 12 it’s very much course-driven… Yeah, so I need to make sure that my top kids… or the top kids… are the best that they can be. Like we’re looking at 92 at least. My goal is always to get that top kid at least at 92 and everything else falls in after that.” (Ella, government school teacher)

Rather than producing greater diversity and choice, “common sense” quasi-marketisation strategies actually produce greater similarity and repetition. Several of the experienced drama teachers we interviewed were also markers for the State’s year twelve final examinations. They noted that even though there were thirty-two texts on the drama set text list, most students in the state wrote about the same two or three texts. These observations are backed up by comments made in the examiner’s report (School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2015) demonstrating that neoliberal reforms have produced similarity rather than difference. This could be for a number of reasons, however, perhaps Liz’s comments below can shed light on this phenomenon:

Kirsten: In an ideal world what sorts of things would you change about teaching drama?

Liz: Okay, more time would be one. What else? My friend in England said that she would get programs that everyone did. They would say, “This is what you’re doing. This is your lesson blah blah blah”.

Kirsten: From her Head of Department or from the Education Department?

Liz: Yeah, like from the curriculum people, so I guess it would be like the Australian Curriculum. But I’d just love…I mean I love creating my own things…You can’t squish being creative into 30 minutes or an hour so you can’t actually put a time limit on it. So it’s not a, “Okay you get to be creative five times a week” you know. So I think having time is something that you need and that’s why I do after school rehearsals for two hours because that’s where the magic happens.

As we can see, Liz would love to be more creative in her drama teaching because “that’s where the magic happens” but in the dominant culture of performative neoliberalism there simply isn’t the time or the space for such creativity. In *Difference and Repetition* (Deleuze, 1994 [2012]), Deleuze asserts that real thinking is one of the most difficult challenges there is. Thinking requires not accepting commonly held “truths” at face value. Thinking requires creativity; it requires art. In the chapter “The Image of Thought”, Deleuze takes aim at the “image of thought” that is common in both popular and philosophical discourse: that of “everybody knows this” common sense doctrine (p. 166). Neoliberal educational policies rely on common sense notions such as: the market knows best, private is superior to public, and high-stakes testing improves student attainment. However, as we have seen, none of these common assumptions are quite as “true” as they seem. Deleuze provides this advice as an antidote for our neoliberal milieu:
The more our daily life appears standardised, stereotyped and subject to an accelerated reproduction of objects of consumption, the more art must be injected into it in order to extract from it that little difference which plays simultaneously between other levels of repetition. (Deleuze, 1994 [2012], p. 365)

**Conclusion**

Our study revealed how neoliberal reforms have changed the way Australian schools operate, and how this affects arts education, in particular drama education. We drew upon concepts such as Ball's (2003) definition of performativity, Foucault’s governmentality and panopticism (1977) and Deleuze’s societies of control (1992) to elucidate the data derived from interviews with drama teachers and their students in Western Australia. What these critical lenses reveal is that education “reform” derived from neoliberal policies combined with the current “age of austerity” has had a profound effect on education in the Western world at the macro level and micro level in the lives of individual teachers and students: resulting in a dominant culture of performativity; a reduction in arts funding; fewer subject choices (with many schools dropping drama and dance); data-driven pedagogy and the constant surveillance of teachers. Furthermore, we noted that the most noticeably deleterious effects of these reforms are on students and teachers in schools from the lowest socioeconomic areas. Our qualitative research project highlights the need for further quantitative analysis into the impact of neoliberal reforms on students’ access to the arts in schools from different socioeconomic areas.
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Section III Conclusion

**Discussion: Implications, limitations and future directions**

The various forms of education or “normalization” imposed upon an individual consist in making him or her change points of subjectification, always moving toward a higher, nobler one in closer conformity with the supposed ideal … There is always an appeal to a dominant reality that functions from within. There is no longer even a need for a transcendent centre of power; power is instead immanent and melds with the “real,” operating through normalization. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. p.143)

This dissertation explored issues of identity and becoming in the context of students’ embodiment of characters from proscribed texts in the drama classroom set in a context of neoliberal “supposed ideals”. I began this thesis with the question: How does the embodiment of characters in set texts in year 12 drama empower and constrain adolescent becomings? In order to answer this question fully I further deconstructed it into four interrelated questions: Is the drama classroom a safe space for heterogeneous adolescent becomings? Which roles and characters are teachers choosing from the Western Australian ATAR set text list for adolescent girls and boys and what constructions of femininity and masculinity do these characters represent? Why are teachers choosing these texts? Lastly, how did embodying these characters from the set text list in ATAR drama influence students’ becomings? In order to answer these questions this required an exploration of gender, text, becoming that was not divorced from our current socio-political context – the “dominant reality”.

Six sensitising concepts arose as I began the research that enabled me to explore these research questions. The sensitising concepts were: senior secondary drama classrooms, space, text, performativity, gender and becoming. Deleuze and Guattari’s rhizome, a non-hierarchical structure, was used to elucidate these six concepts. The rhizome foregrounds complexity and the network between people, ideas and things, such as students, texts, discourses, bodies, spaces and becomings, in a non-linear, polycentric way. Rather than adolescent development (from one stage of development to another — a child to an adult), I viewed the research through the lens of a rhizome, where all of the sensitising concepts are linked and influence each other, but are always in a process of change or flux, never “arriving” or stable.

The research was thus enriched though the utilisation of a critical, post-humanist feminist ethnographic methodology that examined wider issues of power and normalization in neoliberal times as well as notions of becoming. I sought to answer the research question by creating a map rather than a model. Thus I looked at a particular group of experienced drama teachers and their post-compulsory students in Western Australia in 2013-14. These findings are specific to Western Australia in this time period and recognising that there is potential for transferability to other contexts whilst acknowledging that education is always contextually bound. Thus I specifically interviewed the 15 drama teachers (three male and 12 female) and 13 of their drama students (10 female and three male), with the aim of “mapping how things work” – to expose the “connection between fields” – rather than creating a “structural or generative model" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 13). One of the limitations of the findings presented, therefore, are not generalizable to the entire field of drama teachers and students, though perhaps they are consistent with the experiences of many. Likewise the study was not comparative and did not set out to make comparisons.
between text choices and curricula across different states or countries. However, I did intentionally interview teachers and students from a range of independent, government and Catholic schools to capture a range of experiences of becoming and to map how neoliberalism affected the various sectors differently. The aim of the research has not been on drawing causal links between the experiences of students embodying characters from texts, neoliberal assemblages and teaching practices. Therefore I did not utilise a quantitative methodology because I was not seeking specific, narrow, measurable and observable data to answer narrow research questions. This research was a subjective exploration of a phenomenon. Thus quantitative research designs would not fulfil my research aims. To use Deleuze and Guattari’s words, I have sought not to “explore an unconscious that is already there from the start, lurking in the dark recesses of memory and language” but rather I aim to draw a map, to “foster connection between fields, the removal of blockages on bodies without organs” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 13).

Post-humanist analysis, primarily based on Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis, allowed me to “discover and describe the way things are in the world” (R. Connell 2012, p. 5), in a manner that accounted for the often multiple and heterogeneous nature of becoming. The research had three primary aims that revolve around the concept of “becoming” or “becomings”. I utilised a Deleuzian understanding of “becoming” in preference to “identity formation” because it captures the dynamic, multiple and generative nature of identity. Thus I mapped a process of change, flight or movement where “assemblages” (people, things, ideas, powers) interacted with other assemblages to create something new – a new becoming. I sketched the rhizome to show how drama teachers and students networked with others, with texts and characters and with neoliberal education assemblages and were transformed. Because this occurs at a pivotal time in their adolescence the drama classroom was often a generative experience for young people when it was an empowering space.

I highlighted issues of becoming in three ways: 1) theoretical 2) practical, and 3) contextual. The first outcome of this study was theoretical – I drew attention to theoretical, conceptual and methodological tools that would be illuminating for exploring adolescent becomings in the drama classroom in ways that went beyond analysing discourse, and placed emphasis on affect. This is significant because drama emphasises bodily experience, or physical bodies interacting with text and characters in space. The second outcome of this study was practical — I investigated how the drama classroom environment and curriculum influenced adolescent becomings. I explored how the open space, the embodied characters from set texts, and improvised characterisation activities integral to drama uniquely influenced adolescent becomings. I looked at the texts that were available for students to embody in drama on the Western Australian curriculum. I drew attention to why teachers were choosing certain texts over others, how they interpreted and physicalized them in the space of the drama classroom and how this influenced their becomings. The third outcome of the study was contextual – I highlighted specific effects of the influence of the current performative neoliberal education climate on these teacher and student becomings in the drama classroom. Through this exploration of becomings in the drama classroom, as outlined in each of the preceding journal articles, several observations can be made and conclusions drawn. The following presents a
summary of the main outcomes, contributions, implications and recommendations that emerged out of this research endeavour.

**Outcomes**

The outcomes of this research make a timely, significant and thought-provoking contribution to our body of knowledge by contributing to the existing discourse on teacher and student becomings in the drama classroom in three ways.

A. THEORETICAL: Firstly, this study contributed to the existing literature on the intersection between education, gender, sexuality, and adolescence (for example: Beder et al., 2009; R. Connell, 2011; Connoly, 2013; Hatton, 2003; Hickey-Moody, 2013; Hickey-Moody & Laurie, 2015; Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; McRobbie, 2009; Renold, 2013b; Ringrose, 2013). Theoretically my work develops critical and post-humanist feminist approaches for mapping the complexities of student and teacher becomings in the neoliberal and heteronormative environment of the secondary school. Poststructuralism and post-humanism destabilise and redefine the humanist concept of “self”, “identity” and “development”, which is why it was cogent for my exploration of adolescent becomings in the drama classroom. I outlined how post-humanism decentres the subject without erasing its key importance and capacity to transform these structures, but not as a unified subject. The post-human subject in the drama classroom is an interaction of bodies, machines, discourses and effects in the social field of advanced global capitalism.

I add to current research into the impact of neoliberalism on education by drawing upon concepts such as Ball’s definition of performativity and show specifically how many drama teachers modify their praxis in response to performative pressures to produce “good statistics” or appear to be successful. I highlighted how Foucault’s concept of governmentality and panopticism is relevant in Western Australian schools, with increasing surveillance of teachers via dataphilia and even the architecture of the contemporary high-school.

I add to existing research into youth and the arts and I describe how Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis combined with Butler’s theories of gender performance enable researchers to chart the embodied, relational, spatial and affective energies that inhabit the drama classroom. Both theorists attempt to make possible the emergence of new types of decentred subjects, liberated from fixed and unified identities, and free to become dispersed and multiple. Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of becomings allowed me to see identity and gender in movement and in flux, rather than stable and pre-ordained subject positions. It allowed me to become attentive to *folds*: affective connections that produce multi-linear and asynchronous becomings — movements towards new positionings that are continually being arranged and rearranged in the drama classroom.

I also illustrated how Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis proffers many concepts such as: territorialisation, reterritorialisation, lines of flight, assemblages and rhizomes, that are helpful for providing illuminative figurations of how students and teachers interact with neoliberal educational discourses, spaces, bodies and texts. I outlined how Butler’s concept of gender performance is
valuable when examining how students embody gender in the school environment and how this differs from their performance of self and the characters they physicalize from texts in the drama classroom. I outlined how Butler sees gender as a becoming; not a fixed point of subjectivity that is an effect of a number of different desires and forces. I showed that the drama classroom offers students an opportunity to play with gender boundaries and a certain amount of freedom to escape gender norms, even if only briefly. For example, the subversive redeployment of values such as power and control that originally belong to the masculine domain to the witches in Macbeth can be a potestas for adolescent girls. I outlined how the embodiment of characters in the set texts can be affirmative (potentia) or restrictive (potestas) for adolescent girls (and boys). I illustrated how power is negative when it prohibits and constrains; and is conversely positive when it empowers and enables minoritarian adolescent becomings.

B. PRACTICAL: On the level of pedagogy and praxis this thesis contributes to the body of knowledge regarding the potentiality of the drama space for students to flourish at a critical time in their adolescent development. I highlighted how the spatially unique environment of the drama classroom/theatre and the embodiment of a variety of roles and characters is a powerful vehicle for creativity and identity exploration. Creative or “open learning” – where the outcome is unknown — requires an educational climate where students are able to use the senses, imagine, think and reason without having the “answers” already proscribed. This requires teachers to adopt pedagogy that encourages: openness to new experiences, curiosity, questioning and reflecting critically on ideas from diverse sources, a willingness to take intellectual risks and collaborative learning. I showed that these are all attributes of learning through drama and sits in stark contrast to what is measured through high stakes testing.

I underscored the link between creativity and drama where drama classrooms are collaborative and student-centred. Moreover, in the drama classroom the combination of physical activity including “the use of the body and all the senses,” performing, collaborative learning and imaginative storytelling were a positive environment for creative learning. I indicated that the drama classroom is ideally placed to provide students with opportunities for creative learning where students utilise their senses through this embodied practice. However, I also demonstrated that drama classrooms are often reterritorialised by the neoliberal assemblages of the school hierarchy and the need to be taken “seriously” and be identified as a “professional” and not just be a “fun” place where students can be creative. Moreover, this is exacerbated by a proclivity for teachers to “play it safe” in a dominant culture of competitive performativity.

I also examined the limitations and strengths of the popular “classic” plays on the set text list in Western Australia for empowering students at a critical time in their adolescent development when they are exploring issues of identity and gender. While girls’ main criticism of the drama course was that there were not enough female roles available for them, there was also recognition that the female characters were “very stereotypical” representations of femininity, such as “mother” “virgin” and “slut”. Many drama teachers agreed about the lack of female characters; however, their criticisms focused on the restrictive quality (rather than the quantity) of those roles.
I revealed that what is delimiting about set texts themselves are the few stereotypical roles available to young women in particular so that the generative possibilities of the drama classroom are constrained by normative gender roles such as “princess girls” and “grr heterosexual dudes”. Powerful signifiers of sexual regulation used to discipline girls’ reputations at school such “slut” become a restrictive power that limits girls’ options to two binary constructions of femininity. Certain injurious adjectives teachers and students used to describe the female characters in the plays studied include restrictive feminine signifiers such as: “slut”, “bitch”, “crazy”, “pathetic”, “weak”, “anorexic”, “manipulative”, “controlling”, “drunk”, “seductress”, “husband-stealer”, “spinster” and “neurotic”. The paradox is though girls are often the majority in the drama classroom the drama curriculum and its texts are largely fashioned through the lens of masculinity and patriarchy. I showed how teachers’ performative anxieties often overrode concerns with selecting texts that would provide the most generative opportunities for identity development, creativity and collaboration.

It is disappointing to find that of the 24 texts on the current set text list in Western Australia, including texts from indigenous and feminist perspectives, teachers consistently choose the same few “literary canon” texts for their mostly female cohorts. Perhaps girls and boys who do not fit, or do not want to fit, heteronormative constructions of femininity and masculinity would be better served by teachers selecting texts that deterrioralise from these norms. Hickey-Moody takes up the challenge for contemporary arts educators: “We need to value everyday, or popular knowledges (knowledges outside ‘the canon’) as a way of democratizing education and involving those who might be considered on the “margins” (Hickey-Moody, 2016, p. 65).

I found that teachers encountered a number of barriers to integrating creative pedagogy in the classroom such as time limitations, lack of funding and a neoliberal cultural lack of valuing creativity. School communities were seen to value what is tested via high-stakes testing, over identity development. This low status of creative subjects such as drama resulted in the narrowing of curricula, and text selection within existing curriculum. The research also unveiled some of the reasons why teachers select certain texts over others, and what they do with them in the classroom. Teachers revealed that they chose texts because of external pressures for students to get good marks in external exams, and classic texts were seen as a vehicle for achievement in this area.

C. CONTEXTUAL: Thirdly, this thesis contributes to the existing literature on the effects of neoliberalism on western education by utilising qualitative data from a specific group of drama teachers and students. Drama teachers and students embody a multitude of identities in a culture of performative neoliberalism where education, the environment and human beings are commodities. Teachers and students learn to survive and/or thrive in neoliberal educational assemblages because they have connected their desires with those of others in the production of new becomings. I explored how student and teacher becomings are mediated and constituted through the dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. I showed how Ball’s theory of competitive performativity is a particularly useful tool to examine how the capitalist system shapes the desires of its subjects in educational institutions. Furthermore, I argued that the critical and post-humanist frameworks of Foucault, Butler and Deleuze and Guattari could be illuminating when combined to shed light on neoliberal educational assemblages.
This research builds upon previous research (see for example: Beder et al., 2009; R. Connell, 2011; Connoly, 2013; Hatton, 2003; Hickey-Moody, 2013; Hickey-Moody & Laurie, 2015; Jackson & Mazzei, 2012; McRobbie, 2009; Renold, 2013b; Ringrose, 2013) into gender and education.

I outlined how neoliberalism reconfigures constituent subjectivities and their relationships within the drama classroom by way of accountability practices, such as the publication of exam results. One central tenet of neoliberal discourse is that education is said to be in “crisis” and teachers are “failing” to meet set standards. This narrows the concept of quality teaching to a teacher’s individual ability to improve students’ test scores. Many of the teachers I interviewed, particularly from schools located in lower socio-economic areas, but also from more affluent schools, were resigned to this continual surveillance of their teaching and being judged by students’ results. Moreover, data analyses in the form of appraisal systems, target setting and output comparisons were effective forms of surveillance that lead to self-monitoring.

I outlined how the under the metapolicy of neoliberalism, the fluid, post-subject is key to understanding how affective capacities and desires are modulated and manipulated. The research revealed a number of recapturing powers that were both disciplinary and immanent: such as the disciplinary power of the texts on the curriculum and the control of programming by administration, to more subtle immanent powers of “enculturation,” such as a culture of surveillance, competition and performance: a school’s “achievement culture” and its desire to “create a culture of excellence.” I linked neoliberalism with qualitative reductionism in Western Australian schools. The majority of schools in this research displayed what appears to be an obsession with data. Measurable data becomes the sole means of judging teacher success, rather than the “fluffy stuff” such as: creativity, working collaboratively, and kinaesthetic learning.

I discussed how previous research has shown that standardised testing serves an economic agenda with no statistical improvement in numeracy and literacy overall. The OECD data clearly shows that the Australian education system is deeply stratified. In this study lower socio economic schools were losing students, particularly middle class students, which led to fewer subject choices because schools cannot afford to offer classes to small numbers of students. This had a particularly negative effect on the arts, and drama and dance in particular, which were often cut from the curriculum because of small numbers and low status. In this study teachers in the poorer schools, in particular, felt under the surveillance of line managers and the Department of Education, who went over their statistics with “a fine tooth comb.”

Thus my research exposes the impact of performative standardised testing on drama education. The deleterious effects include a shifting of resources away from the arts and towards “academic” subjects that are ranked in standardised tests such as NAPLAN and OLNA. The study also supports previous research that shows that the commodification of education leads to growing inequality, the surveillance of teachers and increased stress. The public shaming of “underperforming” teachers at staff meetings was a phenomenon discussed by several participants who taught in schools located in lower to middle socio-economic areas. This was not the case, however, in the wealthy private schools with extensive resources that could apparently easily rise above state averages because of their upper-middle class clientele. Although wealthy schools in this study were focusing on “academic” subjects to the detriment of
arts subjects, as were government schools, they nevertheless spent money on arts buildings and kept some arts subjects in order to remain competitive.

I underlined how in Western Australia funding cuts and market-oriented ideologies embedded in education reforms have resulted in a dominant *culture of performativity*, fewer subject choices and the hyper-surveillance of teachers and students. This thesis extends previous research by highlighting the affects that these reforms have had on arts education in particular. The teachers in this study noted that drama has a low status in schools across all sectors (Government, Independent and Catholic), because it is perceived by administration as not being *academic*. As previously mentioned, the research revealed that the most noticeably deleterious effects are on students and teachers in schools from the lowest socio-economic backgrounds as arts subjects such as drama and dance are cut from the curriculum so that schools can direct limited funds to more “academic” subjects to improve their published data and thereby remain competitive in the education market.

**Contribution**

The research made several important contributions to the rapidly expanding research on arts education in a neoliberal milieu by drawing upon critical and post-humanist feminist orientations to critique education systems, and focusing specifically on adolescent becomings in drama. First, the research showed how Butler’s concept of gender performance is a useful tool for examining the *performance* of characters from set texts and gendered becomings in the drama classroom. Ball’s conception of performativity is also a particularly useful framework for exploring performative *becomings* in the drama classroom in the context of a culture of competitive performativity that shapes the desires of its subjects. These paradigmatic frameworks, when combined with the theories of Michele Foucault, and Deleuze and Guattari, can be useful in critiquing neoliberal educational assemblages and in indicating emerging de-territorialisations and lines of flight in teachers and students. They provide valuable lenses through which to examine how neoliberal discourses intersect with school assemblages and impact on drama education.

Secondly, the research revealed that the drama classroom is an open, dynamic space where students can embody different identities at a *critical* time in their adolescent development. What is delimiting about this potentiality is the proclivity of teachers and students, as desiring machines, to conform to internalised neoliberal discourses of success and dominant gender norms. The implication is that Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis offers new insights for mapping complex desire-flows and embodied identities through and against the dominant performative and heterosexist culture.

With regard to the Western Australian drama curriculum the research revealed a dominant culture of performativity, fewer subject choices, a “data-driven” curriculum, and the hyper-surveillance of teachers. This data reveals that the most detrimental impact of high-stakes testing and fewer subject choices were on students and teachers in schools from the bottom socio-economic quartile. Moreover, in the encounter between high-stakes testing and creative pedagogy in the current neoliberal zeitgeist, creativity is the clear loser.
In this research I examined the dramatic embodiment of characters from popular set texts and how these are mediated and constituted through hegemonic gender binaries and a dominant neoliberal culture of competitive performativity. What is delimiting about this potentiality are the few roles available to young women, in particular, so that these generative possibilities are constrained by stereotypes such as the virgin and the slut. However, despite restrictive gender norms, students found characters such as Lady Macbeth and the witches to be empowering deterritorialising assemblages when embodied in the safety of the drama classroom, even if they are somewhat reterritorialised by neoliberal constructions of femininity.

Australian teachers operate in a zeitgeist of performative capitalist neoliberalism, which has had the effect of making education a commodity and school branding immensely important to teachers, parents, students and school communities. This results in a reduction of the status of arts subjects such as drama that are not viewed as academic, and are not easily quantified. This research reveals that drama is a subject that celebrates creativity and heterogeneity. Yet it is often reterritorialised by the neoliberal assemblages of the school hierarchy and the need to be taken seriously and be identified as a professional and not just be a “fun” space where students can be creative. Creative lines of flight are also recaptured by the dominant educational culture of competition and success. Nevertheless many teachers persist in rerouting the flow of power toward new and creative constructions.

There are a number of key findings that emerged from the study. First, and consistent with the literature, there is a link between drama and creativity. More specifically, the drama space, the embodied practice of the form and the collaborative culture of its practice stimulated creativity, and creativity was associated with drama as a subject. The research showed that drama classrooms can provide a supportive educational environment for students — safe spaces that engender creativity, lateral thinking and collaboration. This result was consistent across drama teachers and students, and across all systems considered — government, independent and Catholic education sectors.

Processes of normalisation within educational assemblages became apparent. Drama teachers are not immune to the culture of performativity and are both constrained by curricula and pressures to perform, but also work in the drama space to speak back to these. This was reflected in both the teachers and students’ experiences. Although limited in scope, this study suggests that students and teachers believe the drama classroom provides a safe space and a congenial environment to foster creativity and heterogeneous becomings. The irony in this finding is that although drama can equip students to meet the challenges of the 21st century, neoliberal education reforms and the need for corporations to make ever-increasing profits from education have lead to creativity being afforded a low status in schools. Sadly, this is having a direct negative effect on students in the schools in this study, limiting experiences, diversity, choice and differentiation.

Implications
As this thesis has shown, when those who have commandeered education are ideologically driven by neoliberal performative agendas, the arts are at an increased risk of being either marginalised or reterritorialised into the great capitalist machine. Thus it behoves teachers and researchers to collectively consider ways in which they can create lines of flight for students to become minoritarian. Such action is imperative because the integrity of both teaching and the arts is at stake. As teachers relinquish control over pedagogy in the wake of a National Curriculum and increased testing, it is imperative to recognise the unique contribution the arts can make to adolescents in ways that will benefit the entire community. It is critical to reassert that teaching drama is more than galloping through the content in preparation for exams, especially for those students who are already alienated and marginalised because of their gender or gender preferences. It is also important that the process of text selection, the embodiment of characters and the work of teachers is not trivialised or dismissed. It is critical that creative and inclusive arts pedagogies are not sacrificed in the process of getting good grades.

In lieu of a complete reorganising of the curriculum so that it places greater value on creativity and collaboration, what drama teachers can hold fast to is the certainty that congenial environments, collaboration and risk taking, do promote creative innovation, social cohesion, tolerance and diversity, and an “unfolding of the-world-as-it-might-be” (Mangiameli, 2013b). Within classrooms it is possible to provide spaces for the disruption of hegemonic gender binaries and specific norms because the text is merely a blueprint for a performance. How characters and plays are embodied is completely up to teachers and their students as they take on the roles of directors and actors. What is required is that drama teachers have a greater understanding of how their subject can foster creativity and therefore contribute to our “knowledge economy”, add balance through their work to competing agendas, and advocate for the promotion of “difference” in this way.

An important outcome of this thesis is the hope that it will show how the drama space can be a safe and empowering force for heterogeneous adolescent becomings. I hope that it will spark more extensive debate about the reduction to arts funding in education, and the ramifications of decisions that have been made in Australia and internationally. We need to be reminded of the Mirandas and the Zacs who inhabit our classrooms today. We need to ask what kind of impact their embodiment of characters from classic texts will have on them and whether that is the best that we can offer them.

In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari state, “We can be thrown into a becoming by anything at all, by the most unexpected, most insignificant of things. You don’t deviate from the majority unless there is a little detail that starts to swell and carries you off” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987 [2012], p. 541). Perhaps drama classrooms can still provide that “little detail” that propels teachers and students into that line of flight which sees them becoming minoritarian.
Appendix A

Data collection questions:

What is seen, heard, and experienced in the field, these are “the nuggets around which you construct your questions.” (Glesne, 1999, cited in Soyini, 2005, p. 26)

Given that my interview questions will evolve over time, especially during fieldwork, the questions below are just an example of the kinds of questions I asked participants in order to answer my research questions. There are a variety of types of qualitative questions, including the Patton model questions: behaviour or experience questions, opinion or value questions, feeling questions, knowledge questions, sensory questions and background questions; and the Spratley model questions, including: descriptive questions, explanation questions, contrast questions (cited in Soyini, 2005, pp. 27-30). Soyini also suggests other types of questions such as advice, quotation and once-upon-a-time questions (2005, p. 30). Generally speaking, qualitative questions tend to be open-ended, with the aim of eliciting a detailed response. Below is an example of interview questions, divided into two categories: questions for teachers and questions for students. Interview probes, which help clarify or elaborate the question, are sometimes included.

Interview Questions:

For Teachers:

1. “Which texts do you intend to study with your ATAR students this year and why? “Or “What factors influence your choice of texts in ATAR?” This is an example of a background or explanation question. (Elaborating probe: “How important is it for your school to do well in the My School website and the school rankings published in the newspaper? Does this influence the way you teach?”)

2. What female roles are available for girls in the text studied, and how do you understand these? This is an example of a background and an opinion question. (Elaborating probe: Are any of these positive role models for teenage girls, in your opinion?)

3. Someone once said that, “Drama is a safe place for boys to be less macho, and girls to be less girly”. What do you think?

For ex-students:

1. “Which character can you identify with the most in __________________ (the text they studied)?” (Elaborating probe: “Could you explain your response more?”).

2. “How would you describe the female characters in this text?”
3. “How did you perform Dolly (or whichever character they performed from the set-text play) physically and verbally?” (Clarifying probe: “How did you have her walk and talk?”).

4. “Which characters in your play have a lot of the power? Are they male or female? Do you think this is fair?”
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