

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Viirret, Tuija Leena

Title: Face-work in teacher-in-role: Acting at the interface between artistry and pedagogy

Year: 2016

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Viirret, T. L. (2016). Face-work in teacher-in-role: Acting at the interface between artistry and pedagogy. *Applied Theatre Research*, 4(1), 73-87.
https://doi.org/10.1386/atr.4.1.73_1

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Tuija Leena Viirret

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Face-work in teacher-in-role: Acting in the interface between artistry and pedagogy

Abstract

The teacher-in-role (TIR) strategy is used in process drama to strengthen the dramatic experience and promote learning among the participants. In this study, one TIR construct is examined through the lens of Erving Goffman's concept of face-work in order to deepen the understanding of the subtle and vulnerable processes of interaction in process drama. TIR is considered to be an interactive construct in which both artistry and pedagogy are embodied. Face-work is applied in the fictive context of process drama to uncover the interactional potential for learning and creating drama. In addition, the teacher's reflections on his actions as they relate to face-work in process drama are explored. The data of this case study are analysed using applied conversation analysis (CA) and thematic narrative analysis. According to the findings, face-work seems to provide an explicit frame for understanding the interactional procedures and moves in the artistic–pedagogic construct of TIR.

Introduction

The main focus in this study is to explore how the interaction in process drama, and especially in the teacher-in-role (TIR) strategy, is constructed through the lens of Erving Goffman's (1967) concept of 'face-work' and to determine the studied teacher's reasoning behind his acts. The wider framework for this research originated from an interest in doing an in-depth analysis of interaction, artistic–pedagogical procedures and the drama teacher's practical theory in process drama, especially in TIR. Several drama researchers have stated the need for research into elaborate interaction in process drama (Aitken, Fraser and Price 2007; Howell and Heap 2005: 66; Ackroyd 2004: 165). In addition, in recent years, there has been a call to widen the methodological field in drama research (Omasta and Snyder-Young 2014: 17–19; O'Toole 2010: 286–287). In this case study, the examination of the interaction is combined with the exploration of the teacher's reflections through the lens of face-work.

In the next sections, the theoretical frameworks of this study are outlined; they include face-work and process drama. Second, the methodological frameworks are presented, after which an analysis of the selected critical moments in TIR and the teacher's reflections on his actions using applied conversation analysis (CA), narrative analysis and the lens of face-work is presented. In the final section, the risks and potential of face-work in process drama and in the artistry and pedagogy of TIR are discussed.

Erving Goffman's face-work and process drama

Philip Taylor's (2000: 1–6) incisive concepts of 'people', 'platform' and 'passion' as the key elements in drama praxis are easily found in process drama, relating to 'people' as the participants and the teacher and the 'platform' as the stage for the process drama itself. However, to create 'passion' in an educational context is a challenge. The institutionalized framework of a teacher as a leader and the students as the actors sets the asymmetric stage for interaction in relation to the rights of participation or leadership (Drew and Heritage 1992: 49). In process drama, the idea of giving rights for participation and for creating content and form is embodied in its structure of four main phases: drama contract, pretext, fiction (including the varying use of drama strategies) and reflection (Howell and Heap 2001). In addition, the use of drama strategies (conventions), especially TIR, has been found to

strengthen the creation of commitment (O'Neill 1995; Neelands 1990). Maintaining commitment and passion throughout the course of process drama requires shared agreement and understanding. Shared understanding is a consequence of intersubjectivity, which in this study is defined as a 'fabric of our social becoming' in which personal and societal forms of human life are intertwined and expressed in interaction with every gesture of the many actors in it, giving them meaning and significance (Crossley 1996: 173). Thus, teaching in process drama is dependent on the quality of the face-to-face interactions.

Goffman's lifelong research into interaction order, including the concept of face-work he developed in the 1950s, is based on his extensive observations of daily, face-to-face interaction in diverse environments. In creating drama, the goal is to establish a recognizable, believable social situation (Bolton 1992: 2, 11–13). The main interest then becomes the features and tones of the created roles and the face-to-face relationships between them. In drama, the participants have double faces: the face of the self and the face of the role. This prominence makes the study of face-work in drama particularly relevant.

According to Goffman's (1983: 2–3) theory, social interaction transpires in a spatially and temporally demarcated environment in which two or more people are at a face-to-face distance from each other. When we encounter someone, therefore, we form an impression of that person according to his or her reactions and behaviour. Goffman (1967: 5) calls the pattern of verbal and non-verbal acts a *line* – this line, discovered by others, gives the *face* for the person, who then claims for him or herself this image. *Face-work* means that all involved in the interaction are acting in such a way that everybody can keep their face (Goffman 1967: 12).

In groups, the rules of the group and the defined context dictate the quality and amount of the feelings that one has for his or her face and for the other faces involved. The participants' emotions, mood, cognition, bodily orientation and muscular effort have an influence over the interaction order, and as a consequence, one can sense feelings of ease or uneasiness, unselfconsciousness or wariness. One tends to react emotionally to the face that contact with others allows him or her. He or she invests emotions in his or her face; thus, 'a participation in any contact with others is a commitment'. (Goffman 1967: 6; 1983: 3–4.) This theory is noteworthy in the context of process drama. The participation is the first essential precondition and the commitment is the second precondition for creating drama. To create an enjoyable tone in the commitment – which thus is understood as a consequence of 'participation in any contact with others' – many practitioners use an established procedure to set the tone for the rules and define the context: the drama contract (Neelands 1984: 27–31; Howell and Heap 2001: 107–110). Through the lens of face-work, instead of starting drama teaching with the prevailing social value everyone has on their faces, new faces can be created so that participants' faces are 'feeling good' (see Goffman 1967: 6). With new faces, the ambience for learning can be re-created; thus, the drama contract can function as 'dropping' not only the present faces but also the present characterizations of others' stances and status (see Goffman 1983: 8). It is like a 'rite of passage' from one context to another; like creating a *tabula rasa*, a state of mind in which the participants are able to welcome the new, but still unknown, role faces.

Goffman (1983: 6) remarks that the acceptance of given conventions and norms is, in effect, putting trust in them. In practice, the procedure of drama contract is naturally not just a simple trick to get everything in suitable order; instead, its level and quality are dependent on the 'platform' and the 'people'. In this study, the drama contract is seen as a mutual, carefully negotiated commitment of the ways to stand, act and behave in the joint activity.

As the interaction proceeds, the situational effects and additional characterizations will be emphasized, directly influencing the social structure (Goffman 1983: 3, 8). Then, problems can also arise with face-work. When a face has been threatened, there are two basic

kinds of face-work: the avoidance process and the corrective process (Goffman 1967: 15–23). In some cases, there is the aggressive use of face-work, when the threatened person tries to make points and gain the upper hand with the adversary in order to protect his or her own line from inexcusable inconsistency. This kind of behaviour usually needs an audience to witness the event, which can then turn into a game. However, the troublesome situations are carried out with the moves of interchange, where the acknowledged threat to face ends in ‘the re-establishment of ritual equilibrium’. Those moves are challenge, offer, acceptance and gratitude (Goffman 1967: 19–26). In drama, the threatening, suspenseful states of affairs are often desirable in order to create ‘passion’ and provoke attitudes.

As the role-work begins, the face-work in roles begins. In drama, the face-work unfolds in double-frames of role, space and time; also called metaxis or aesthetic doubling (O’Toole 1992: 166–170; Østern 2003: 458, 471–472). Because of the role cover, face-work can be used in a contradictory way. The interactional order can be broken to raise tension; thus, the face of the self and the face of the role are acting and reacting in a way that is intertwined. In the following, after outlining the methodological frameworks of this study, face-work is explored in the critical moments in the drama when the new faces of roles are threatened.

Methodological frameworks

The data of this study consist of TIR episodes in one process drama and a reflective interview with the teacher, both videotaped by the author. This process drama was chosen for three reasons: it is typical in structure with relation to the previously mentioned four main phases of process drama, its composition in TIR demands considerable face-work and the face-work in it is tangible and risky. The participants were adults ($N = 17$), mostly teachers, studying drama education at the Open University of Jyväskylä, Finland. The drama teacher, a qualified instructor with several years of experience, knew the group beforehand. He read and approved the data analysis.

The analysis of the critical parts of face-work was done with the use of applied CA, including rigorous transcription. Applied CA means that the findings of ‘pure’ CA are applied to specific studies and institutional contexts (Have 2001: 3). In short, the main principles of CA are that interaction is a specifically organized, context-shaped and context-renewing phenomenon; thus, the analysis is data-driven (Seedhouse 2004: 13–16).¹

It seems that CA is a rarely used method in drama research outside of a few studies (e.g. Freebody 2010; Jyrämö 2013; Viirret 2013). The focus in using CA here was to analyze the construction of interaction: turn-taking, sequential organization and the interactional procedures through the lens of face-work. In addition, the premise of elaborating on the interaction is that participants’ acts of turn-taking are analytic tasks and thus signals of how they understand the on-going situation (Gardner 2012: 607). The analysis begins with CA, observing the clear features of the interaction, and ends with an interpretation of the ambience, nuances and face-work.

In the reflective interview with the teacher, so-called ‘stimulated recall’ (Patrikainen and Toom 2004: 239, 241), in which he watched his own teaching on the video, was used. The discussed themes emerged with the inspiration of occasions in drama, and the teacher commented on and also told stories about his teaching. The interview can then be seen as a co-constructed discussion about the teacher’s practical theory, a system that is constructed of each individual’s private, personal experiences; knowledge; values; and attitudes, and that forms the internal instructions for his behaviours (Ojanen 2000: 86–89). Therefore, the form of the analysis is individually oriented and primarily focused on the narrator’s thoughts and feelings (Andrews, Squire and Tamboukou 2008: 5–6). The analysis is conducted with the

use of thematic narrative analysis, including features of dialogic/performative narrative analysis (Riessman 2008: 53–54, 58, 105–106). In this study, the analysis shows one example of the practical theory in TIR.

In the following section, the studies of the moves in TIR are presented in extracts 1–4, which were transcribed with the use of CA and then translated from Finnish to English by the author. The signs used in the transcription are explained in Appendix 1.

Threatening and protecting faces in TIR

In drama, anyone can break the interaction order. Extracts 1–4 are taken from a ten-minute TIR episode in which the group and the teacher have new faces in their drama roles. Before this episode, they have re-organized the interaction order with the drama contract and established the fictional framework with drama strategies. During the episode, the dance teacher (the TIR) coaches the villagers (students in their self-chosen roles of farmer, doctor, housewife, etc.) for a dance competition offering a 20-million-dollar award to the winning team.² Thus, the group has peeled off the normal institutional setting of a lesson and made a new setting, in this case resembling an institutional setting, with the dance teacher, who holds a middle-rank position with the second-in-command role (Morgan and Saxton 1987: 42–43; Wagner 1990: 128–129). In Extract 1, the tone of face-work changes radically.

Extract 1. The turning point

Duration (29.04-29.44): 40 seconds

The dance teacher (DT) and the training group of the villagers are standing in line and are about to go on with the final training. Margit, a medical examiner in the village, helps the dance teacher with the CD.

- 21 DT: **can you slow down the volume a bit (.) yeah yep thanks (.) and HEY could you bring**
22 **that [mmm CD-cover also over there (.) yes that (.) could you bring it here so that**
22B [POINTS WITH HIS HAND]
22C [MARGIT BRINGS THE COVER, HANDS IT TO THE DANCE TEACHER, TURNS AND GOES BACK TO HER PLACE]
23 DT: **[yep (.) HEY (.) could you (.) come back (3.0)**
23B [HOLDS THE COVER IN HIS ARM BENT LEFT HAND AND KEEPS AN INTENSIVE EYE CONTACT TO MARGIT]
23C [MARGIT COMES BACK TO THE DANCE TEACHER]
24 DT: **Don't you (.) [now say (.) that what I smelled was just a mistake (3.0) [PEACEFULLY]**
24B [RAISES HIS RIGHT HAND AND HOLDS IT UP WITH THE FLAT OF HIS HAND]
24C [MARGIT LOOKS DOWN, MOVES HER HEAD FROM SIDE TO SIDE AND SCRATCHES HER NECK]
25 Margit: **krhmm**³
26 DT: **[so [(2.0)**
26B [DROPS HIS HANDS DOWN, TAKES ONE STEP TO BE VERY CLOSE TO MARGIT]
26C [MARGIT TAKES A LOOK TO THE TEACHER AND THEN LOOKS DOWN AGAIN]
27 Person 1: **[she smelled booze or [WHISPERING]**
28 Person 2: **[yeah**
29 Margit: **[nn well**
29B [LOOKS STILL DOWN AND WIPES HER MOUTH]
30 DT: **[so [are so are are you drunk (.)**
30B [RAISES HIS RIGHT ARM BENT HAND, POINTING WITH HIS FOREFINGER TO MARGIT]
30C [MARGIT LOOKS QUICKLY UP TO THE TEACHER]
31 Margit: **just a little bit [(.)**

31B
31C

[THE DANCE TEACHER TURNS AROUND AND WALKS FURTHER OFF]
[MARGIT LOOKS TO THE SIDE AND BACK DOWN]

In Extract 1, the institutional frame at work within the fiction is clear. The turn-taking follows the norm of an authority and his team. The dance teacher is dictating the situation by giving orders and asking questions with expectations of obedience and answers. He proves he has the right to ask about Margit's state by saying *don't you (.) now say (.) that what I smelled was just a mistake*⁴ in line 24. There is a long silence before this shocking question (3.0 sec) and two small hesitations in the beginning of it that give Margit a clue to expect more. Margit does not answer – she just clears her throat in line 25, and after the teacher's repetitive *so* in line 26, there comes another long silence (2.0) that is then filled with an insertion sequence where the villagers express doubts about her drinking (lines 27–28). This also gives Margit time to adapt to the changing situation. Finally, the dance teacher overlaps Margit's murmuring and says out loud the exact suspicion: *so are so are are you drunk* (line 30), and Margit admits *just a little bit* (line 31). During all of Extract 1, there is a lot of non-verbal action. Margit is mostly looking down (lines 24C, 26C, 29 B and 31C), and the dance teacher is very expressive, especially with his hand gestures (lines 22B, 23B, 24B, 26B and 31B).

The TIR constructs this dramatic turning point using face-work in a risky way. The suspicion is expressed on record in front of the others' faces. It is an open threat to Margit's face. The question was a planned turning point in the drama, but the student in her role as Margit did not know about this twist. However, straight away, she takes the suspect face that the dance teacher gives to her by staying silent, keeping her eyes down and moving her head from side to side. During the silence, the others give the face of a drinker to Margit. She still tries to save her face by avoiding giving an answer, which somewhat irritates the dance teacher. The question *so are you drunk* increases the tension, and Margit's confession of *just a little bit* creates a denouement. Now, to manage the threat to her face, she can continue with avoidance or start with correction or making points. In Extract 2, the dance teacher's face-work becomes threatening.

Extract 2. Losing patience and committing the group

Duration (29.45-30.33): 48 seconds

31D [A NOICE ARISES]
32 Barmaid: (-- I said that I wouldn't have liked to sell
33 DT: so so you have sold DIDN'T WE MAKE A DEAL ONE AND A HALF A WEEK AGO
34 THAT NOBODY WILL GO TO THE PUB EXCEPT LIKE THE STAFF WHO ARE THERE (3.0)
35 Margit: °yee°
36 Farmer: how will this go on
37 DT: do ya' understand what you have like (.) what will we now do (.) so this is just
38 insane that one doesn't stand by one's promises (.) I really thought
39 that it WAS GONE THROUGH SO MANY TIMES THAT [NOBODY DRINKS SPIRITS FOR
39B [BEATING TIME WITH HIS TALK WITH
40 TWO WEEKS BEFORE THAT PERFORMANCE] SO THERE'S FOUR DAYS LEFT SO=
40B HIS HAND]
41 Margit: =IT WAS JUST ONE LITTLE SHOT
42 DT: IF IT'S A DEAL THAT WE TAKE NOTHING THEN WE TAKE NOTHING (.) or what do you
43 guys think
43B [A NOICE ARISES]

44 voices: like yes (--) every body else (--) only water (--) only coffee we've got (--) everyone
45 has obeyed even the butcher (--) maybe again that fault that runs in her family (--)

The conflict continues. The attack by the dance teacher is very strong, and without the fictional frame, it would be practically impossible, or at least improper, for such an interaction to take place in an institutional setting. Margit's confession and the emergence of 'an accomplice' seem to give the dance teacher the right to nearly lose control, and he begins to shout straight into Margit's face. He expresses anger and disappointment over Margit's break of the 'many times confirmed' agreement (line 39). At first, Margit listens to the accusation quietly, but after the second round of the dance teacher's temper, she even interrupts him with her excuse. Her strong and loud stand can be seen as an act to save her own face and make points with the exact expression of the volume of drinking: *IT WAS JUST ONE LITTLE SHOT* (line 41). In addition, Margit's silent moments can be interpreted as making points – the silence and the shouting are signs of wounded feelings and the others could feel empathy and guilt. However, the dance teacher does not give up, but he instead yells back – aiming to save his current tough face – and raises the stakes by asking the group's opinion. In fact, he has made two allying questions to the group: *what will we now do* (line 37) and *what do you guys think* (lines 42–43). The group is denouncing Margit's act with its own absolute obedience, such as *everyone has obeyed even the butcher* (lines 44–45). The outcry could already be crushing to Margit's face. Nevertheless, Margit stays still. The dance teacher starts to search for an explanation for the drinking in Extract 3.

Extract 3. Searching for reason and solution

Duration (30.34-30.54): 20 seconds

46 DT: so have you got some reason for this (3.0)

46B [MARGIT TURNS HER HEAD AROUND, SQUIRMS, WHINES]

47 Margit: No

48 DT: No-no so you don't even bother to cook up any excuse or

49 Margit: Well I thought that I'm on the back row over there and you don't smell and
50 well it isn't like=

51 DT: =SO CATCH ON WITH THAT OUTLOOK WE'LL SURELY LOSE THE WHOLE GAME (.)

52 what will we now do I JUST CAN'T TAKE ANY

The dance teacher's face-work seems to be non-protective toward Margit's face and strengthening toward his own. In the extract 3 he puts Margit under even more pressure with his question of accountability, with his irritation and with his judging comments. In fact, the accusation to not *bother to cook up any excuse* in line 48 is mocking, and the condemnation on Margit's attitude as a bad example to the others and as a road to loss is crushing: *WITH THAT OUTLOOK WE'LL SURELY LOSE THE WHOLE GAME* (line 51). At this point, or even earlier, in real life, someone might have crumbled. But here, the face-work functions were contradictory: because of the fictional frame, one does not lose face in reality. So, the more one is accused and threatened, the more one can hold onto the safe cover of the fiction. The same applies to the teacher. In the role, he was able to be aggressive and even leave the situation to the group: *what will we now do I JUST CAN'T TAKE ANY* [more] (line 52).

Margit uses all three types of face-work. She tries to avoid the threat with silence, to make points with her body movements (head-twisting, squirming) and voices (whining), and

to correct the situation with excuses: *I'm on the back row over there and you don't smell and well it isn't like* (lines 49–50). This interrupted sentence could have continued: ‘...that one shot would not affect my ability to dance’ – and the account could have been acceptable. But, the dance teacher metaphorically slings mud on Margit’s face and gives up. This turning point of the dance teacher’s implicit handover to the group could be seen as a climax of the entire TIR construct. However, the tone of the teacher’s face-work changes again.

Extract 4. Changing the side

Duration (31.20-31.36): 16 seconds

60 DT: **you don't want twenty million or**
 61 Margit: **oh well yes it does [it (.) was the last time [m**
 62 DT: [so [so (-)
 63 Margit: **no it [surely won't happen again (.)**
 64 DT: [so
 65 Farmer: **how much did you really drink (.)**
 66 Woman 1: **it certainly wasn't just a one shot (.)**
 67 DT: **how how can you know**
 68 Woman 1: **well like doing those kind of moves (.)**

[lines off: 3,36 minutes]

Duration (34.52-35.02): 10 seconds

145 DT: **okay do you want to leave totally**
 146 Margit: **[YE::S if you can manage without me so (.) then=**
 146B [DELIGHTED]
 147 DT: **=I don't know if we do**
 148 Woman2: **we can't let her [go**
 149 Woman3: [yes no::]
 150 Woman2: no::

Extract 4 features short excerpts of the on-going discussion. The teacher’s next challenge *you don't want twenty million or* (line 60) and threat to Margit’s face leads her to finally make an offer, the second move of the interchange. She promises: *it surely won't happen again* (line 63), that is, she ‘can still be used as a responsible participant in the ritual process’ (Goffman 1967: 18–23). The dance teacher subtly changes his interpretation of Margit’s line; that is, he gives Margit a slightly new face of a not-so-bad rule-breaker, and above all, of a necessary member of the team. This fine move with the inconsistency of accusation and concern is observable when he asks about Margit’s desire to leave in line 145 and straight away states that leaving is impossible in line 147 – which is accompanied by three villagers (lines 148–150). These changes of the side are like the fading out after the turning point in the final act. In any case, Margit gets a better face before the entire fiction ends. The move of acceptance stays unclear because of the variety among the villagers’ attitudes, from suspicion to the farmer’s shout of *And we'll dance for four days!* (excluded from the extracts). The teacher ends the fiction at this point, leaving the final move of gratitude incomplete.

After this improvisational scene, the process drama continued for nearly 45 minutes with different drama strategies and diverse reflection. In the next section the teacher’s

reflection on his actions in this TIR episode is explored.

The drama teacher's voice as an artist–pedagogue

The reflective interview was the teacher's narrative about his thoughts during the process drama and about teaching drama in general. He contemplated the totality from many sides and with many themes. In this article, only a fraction of his rich reflection can be acknowledged, considering the face-work in the presented extracts, and in making the drama contract. As the concept of face-work was not used or even known by the researcher in the moment of the interview, the analysis was done in relation to those themes that concerned face-work. The main theme was *atmosphere*. In regard to the drama contract, the atmosphere was discussed according to the aspects of *safety* and *freedom*, with the teacher's words as follows:

. . . that the start would be safe like if surprising events will emerge in drama, so that the gang wouldn't begin marvelling at it . . . like in this drama it will be the point that the dance teacher asks to bring that CD and when they now really went out of countenance that they have the permission to be out of countenance . . . trying to create [the atmosphere] that we know what we're doing . . . It [voluntariness] is like life insurance for the drama teacher so that they aren't forced to do something and can act creatively, and not, like start to fake creative acting, but I feel that it is extremely important also for myself that I don't begin to mind too much . . . that I can, in principle, use any convention or handle any theme without fearing if somebody now thinks something, or is too affected . . . It is everyone's personal liability.⁵

The teacher emphasizes the release of the participants' faces in roles to react in whatever way they feel. Also, for the face of the self, the safety of knowing the frame of *what we are doing* was taken into account. He refers to the institutional setting of the expectations of behaviour in the asymmetric teacher–student interaction: *they are not forced to do something and can act creatively, and not like start to fake creative acting*. It is striking to note how he includes his own face in this frame: *that I don't begin to mind too much*.

The face of the role and the face of the self are present in the teacher's reflection. To sum up, it is important for all those involved that the face of the role can throw itself into the fiction, while the face of the self is conscious about the frame and can safely be responsible for its own face under the role cover.

The atmosphere in the extracts 1–4 of TIR was discussed mostly regarding the aspects of *dramaturgy* and *role* in TIR. The teacher stated the following:

. . . mostly there's a worry that Margit's character is ready to leave . . . one theme is that an outsider [the dance teacher] comes and sets the rules, expecting that everybody is as ambitiously involved as he is . . . that it [the situation] is all the time in danger of being watered down . . . but multiple voices emerge . . . the character [the dance teacher], he tries to keep the situation in hand, he is a control freak and not dialogical at all, but he is approaching with high status, slightly threatening . . .

The teacher did not reflect on Margit's behaviour in the interview except for her intention to leave. He refers to the educational goal of having 'multiple voices', but he states that the main concern of the situation was that the tension would fall. He talks about the TIR from outside, using words like 'he', 'the character' and 'in that role', which could be interpreted as signs of strong involvement in acting and reflecting on his role character, thus

thinking of the episode as a performance.⁶ Thus, the acts of face-work can be interpreted here through the behaviour in relation to the dramaturgy and his role: Instead of being concerned over the student's face of the self, he raises the tension inside the artistic frame. However, his concern about the tension explains the subtle changing of the side in Extract 4. Additionally, in terms of the moves of interchange in face-work, Margit's offer has to be noticed and reacted to somehow, as he did. The teacher highlights also the *respect* both to the face of the role and to the face of the self:

. . . the fictive characters, they have to be respected, like, taken seriously . . . if not, no drama would develop . . . that you wouldn't even by mistake – I don't know how it could happen – like, begin to assess the way of acting . . . it would be extremely destructive . . . so that in this universe there is no other person who could act [that role] in that way . . .

To sum up, in the teacher's reflection, the voices of an artist and a pedagogue are intertwined. He emphasizes safety, voluntariness and responsibility for the face of the self, and he emphasizes the freedom to act for the face of the role. These concepts can be summed up as the right to have double faces in drama. In addition, he is concerned about the tension in drama; that is, both to head toward the pedagogic goal and to take care of the artistry in drama, that is, to maintain passion. His speaking of respect relates to double face.

Faces and face-work in process drama

In Figure 1, the moves of face-work are summed up and placed in the main phases of process drama. This framework assumes that every participant is committed to the on-going action. The ideal process in face-work could proceed as follows:

- Dropping the prevailing faces and giving equal faces, *tabula rasa* with trust, rights and respect
- Imagining possible new faces
- Living freely with new role faces and feeling safety for the face of the self under the role cover
- Dropping role faces, restoring the interaction order with 'normal' face-work
- Reflecting on the experiences of double faces




Figure 1: A framework for face-work in the main phases of process drama.⁷

The essential acts of the teacher in relation to face-work are as follows:

- Before fiction: dis-establishing the institutional asymmetry by re-organizing the interaction order → creating *tabula rasa* for faces with trust and rights
- In fiction: using face-work with trust and rights in the frameworks of artistry and pedagogy

Discussion

In this study, the impact of face-work in TIR became visible. The double frame of the drama context also doubled the layers of face-work. Margit's case provided an example of the strengths and risks of drama education and using TIR. TIR gives direct access to the heart of the topic, but at the same time, it is important to stress the drama teacher's responsibility with sensitive issues. In this study, the teacher provoked the group to express various views about the situation at stake. Thus, though the interaction followed the moves of interchange toward a balanced state in the interaction (Goffman 1967: 19–26), he seemed to be on the edge of threatening behaviour in TIR. If the student in the role of Margit had problems with her own drinking, or if the role cover was not ensured properly, the role could have been hard to live through. Thus, the risk of harming students in the process of creating drama exists, mostly because of the institutional frame of the teacher conducting the task of teaching and the students conducting the task of obeying and learning. As previously stated, with a carefully negotiated drama contract, the interaction order can be re-organized and the asymmetry dis-established. The teacher's metaphor of 'life insurance' is accurate; however, during the action, these agreed upon rules of equality are in danger of being forgotten; thus, the 'old' interactional order takes place, especially if the procedures of cooperative learning in drama are not established or even familiar to the group. Therefore, the situational features are the premise of the interaction and face-work in any drama session and vice versa: the subtle or

radical changes in the interaction reshape the situational features and effects over and over again (Goffman 1983: 2–3).

The use of CA showed step by step how the teacher and the participants constructed the interaction. The interpretation of face-work completed the picture. CA captures the reality in interaction, but it does not allow for diverse interpretations of why the reality is what it is. In the researcher's view, this is a strength and a limitation. The illuminations of what actually happens in the interaction in the context of drama education are valuable. In addition, CA could be understood as an approach to observing and comprehending this realm. For example the theories of 'footing' and 'participation framework' – which are originally Goffman's (1981) concepts – as the status work and the commitment in drama, could be researched in detail with CA. In this study, the teacher was interviewed to explore the question of 'why'. This information widened the picture, but also, interviews with the participants would have been valuable. Thus, for further study, the participants' reflections on TIR episodes could be researched. In addition, the questions of constructing intersubjectivity and dialogue in the interaction of process drama could be elaborated upon.

According to the findings of this study, the first critical issue for the teacher was the establishment of the frameworks for faces of the self: trust and rights in unpredictable drama. Once this was established with the drama contract, another important issue was to show respect to double faces, that is, to the faces of the self as unique human beings and to the faces of the roles as unique characters. Finally, the importance of acts in face-work came into focus in the balance between the fidelity to the fiction with serious acting, the commitment to the educational goal in teaching and the ethics of treating others with respect. As previously stated, the teacher's reflection of atmosphere – including safety, freedom, dramaturgy, role and respect – was the element that directed the teacher's behaviour as taking notice of faces and face-work. The teacher's pressuring and caring acts and his thoughts indicated the artistic–pedagogical principle of maintaining the tension and directing the action toward the educational goal (in this case, of having multiple voices during the session). The notion that the teacher did not reflect on Margit's actions afterward can be interpreted by the compelling character of drama as an art form. In the educational context of process drama, the interface between what is the artistic frame, what is the educational frame and what has actually been the agreed-upon action inside these frames is flexible and difficult to master. As Aitken (2007: 91) states, a shared understanding of the ways in which power can be shared is needed. However, as a last resort, the teacher has the power and the expertise; as Aitken (2007: 91–92) writes, TIR is a 'relationship manager'. In Margit's case, though the teacher was conscious of the artistic and educational goal during the action and had emphasized the importance of voluntariness, it could be seen that there was a risk that in TIR, he would forget that he has the ultimate power and thus, he has to take care of the student's face of the self. To sum up, these findings seem to indicate the complexity of drama teaching with the demands for multi-tasking, especially in the TIR construct. The teacher has to be able to tolerate the anxiety of simultaneously taking care of tension, the goal and the faces, that is, art, education and human beings – or 'passion, platform and people' (Taylor 2000: 1–6).

With face-work, the participants create the atmosphere. In the educational context, the teacher is the key creator. In TIR, when the teacher consciously breaks the 'interaction ritual', he or she can create a fascinating and compelling piece of art in which the participants are also crucial and active creators. At the same time, the teacher's social competence and consciousness in face-work are essential for re-establishing the 'ritual equilibrium'. This concerns the faces of the role and the faces of the self. In this tightrope walk, knowledge of face-work as one human phenomenon in daily and institutional interactions could offer a wider reflective surface for the teacher–artist.

References

- Ackroyd, J. (2004), *Role reconsidered: The relationship between acting and teacher-in-role*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Aitken, V. (2007), The 'relationship managers': Towards a theorising of the Teacher-in-Role/student relationship, *Journal of Artistic and Creative Education*, 1:1, pp. 86–105.
- Aitken, V., Fraser, D. and Price, G. (2007), 'Negotiating the spaces: Relational pedagogy and power in drama teaching', *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 8:14, pp. 1–18.
- Andrews, M., Squire C. and Tamboukou M. (2008), *Doing narrative research*, Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Bolton, G. (1992), *New perspectives on classroom drama*, Hemel Hempstead: Simon & Schuster Education.
- Bowell, P. and Heap, B. (2005), 'Drama on the run: A prelude to mapping the practice of process drama', *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 39:4, pp. 58–69.
- Bowell, P. and Heap, B. S. (2001), *Planning process drama*, London: David Fulton.
- Crossley, N. (1996), *Intersubjectivity: The fabric of social becoming*, Thousand Oaks Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freebody, K. (2010), 'Exploring teacher-student interactions and moral reasoning practices in drama classrooms', *Research in Drama Education*, 15:2, pp. 209–25.
- Gardner, R. (2012), 'Conversation analysis in the classroom', in J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.) *The handbook of conversation analysis*, GB: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 593–611.
- Goffman, E. (1983) 'The interaction order: American sociological association, 1982 presidential address', *American Sociological Review*, 48:1, pp. 1–17.
- Goffman, E. (1967), *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, E. (1981), *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Have, P. T. (2001), 'Applied conversation analysis', in A. W. McHoul and M. Rapley (eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings: A casebook of methods*, London: Continuum, pp. 3–11.
- Jyrämö, P. (2013), 'Näkymiä prosessidraaman reflektiokeskusteluun'/Prospects for the reflective conversation in process drama', in A. Kauppinen (ed.), *Oppimistilanteita ja vuorovaikutusta/Learning situations and interaction*, Helsinki: SKS, pp. 163–176.
- Morgan, N. and Saxton, J. (1987), *Teaching drama*, Avon: Stanley Thornes.
- Neelands, J. (1990), *Structuring drama work*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neelands, J. (1984), *Making sense of drama*, London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Ojanen, S. (2000), *Ohjauksesta oivallukseen/From guidance to insights*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Omasta, M. and Snyder-Young, D. (2014), 'Gaps, silences and comfort zones: Dominant paradigms in educational drama and applied theatre discourse', *Research in Drama Education*, 19:1, pp. 7–22.
- O'Neill, C. (1995), *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama*, Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Østern, A.-L. (2003), 'Writing-in-role and active aesthetic response in drama – Edvard Munch's paintings and diary as pretext', in M. Itkonen and G. Backhaus (eds.), *Lived images: Mediations in experience, life-world and I-hood*, Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, pp. 456–479.
- O'Toole, J. (2010), 'A prelective keynote: IDIERI 2009', *Research in Drama Education*, 15: 2, pp. 271–292.

- O'Toole, J. (1992), *The process of drama: Negotiating art and meaning*, London: Routledge.
- Patrikainen, S. and Toom, A. (2004), 'Stimulated recall opettajan pedagogisen ajattelun ja toiminnan välineenä'/'Stimulated recall as a medium of teacher's pedagogic reasoning and acting', in P. Kansanen and K. Uusikylä (eds.), *Opetuksen tutkimuksen monet menetelmät/The various methods of educational research*, Juva: PS-kustannus, pp. 239–260.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008), *Narrative methods for the human sciences*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004), *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*, Malden MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (eds.) (2012), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, GB: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J. and Stivers, T. (2012), 'Introduction', in J. Sidnell and T. Stivers (eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*, GB: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1–9.
- Tainio, L. (ed.) (2007), *Vuorovaikutusta luokkahuoneessa: Näkökulmana keskusteluanalyysi/Interaction in classroom: The viewpoint of conversation analysis*, Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Taylor, P. (2000), *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Viiirret, T. L. (2013), 'Kun opettaja saa draamaroolin'/'When the teacher has the drama role', in A. Kauppinen (ed.), *Oppimistilanteita ja vuorovaikutusta/Learning situations and interaction*, Helsinki: SKS, pp. 116–149.
- Wagner, B. J. (1990), *Dorothy Heathcote. Drama as a learning medium*, Washington D. C.: National Education Association of USA.

Appendix 1. Transcription symbols (e.g. Have 2007, 215-216; Tainio 2007, 6).

[the point of overlap onset
=	no 'gap' between the two lines
(1.0)	pause and its length in seconds
(.)	micropause, shorter than 0.5 seconds
WORD	especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk
<u>word</u>	some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude
:	prolongation of the immediately prior sound
° - °	relatively quieter than the surrounding talk
> <	speeding up
£-£	utterance with laughter
(--)	inability to hear what was said
[CAPITALS]	researcher's descriptions of non-verbal expressions

Contributor details

Tuija Leena Viirret is a university teacher in drama education at the Open University of the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. She has a long-term experience in teaching qualified, working teachers, who study to gain qualification in teaching drama. Her Ph.D. research focuses on the interactional phenomena in process drama and teacher-in-role.

E-mail: tuija.l.viirret@jyu.fi

¹ For further reading, see e.g. Sidnell and Stivers (2012).

² The teacher assumes that the pretext is originally one of Allan Owens'. The teacher plans the actual process.

³ 'Margit' – a student in a role – volunteered as a 'person with a special task'. The teacher carried out several preparatory exercises and paid particular attention to Margit. Still, the suspicion in line 24 came as a surprise.

⁴ In the analysis, the quotations from transcriptions are in italics and without punctuation, according to the common style of CA research.

⁵ The citations are translated from the Finnish transcriptions by the author.

⁶ We watched the TIR episode silently and attentively. It could be interpreted that the strength of the scene captivated us completely for that period.

⁷ The main phases are applied by Viirret (2013) according to Howell and Heap (2001).