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ABSTRACT

In 1995 an Aesthetics and Arts Criticism substrand was included in The Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework document for schools in Victoria, Australia. The researcher believed that in order to implement the new curriculum requirements and cope with the complexities that accompanied the emergence of postmodern art, teachers would need to alter their practice and find strategies for encouraging greater student participation and critical thinking in art room discussions.

Research of the literature and classroom practice led the researcher to believe that a teaching method called philosophical inquiry, together with a range of strategies inspired by art education theorists and philosophers would assist teachers. The extent to which philosophical inquiry was grounded in existing practice in the art classrooms and whether teachers were employing the content of the aesthetics component of The Arts CSF (1995) was sought through case studies involving observation, transcript analysis and interviews. In order to monitor existing discussion content, the Flanders' Interaction Analysis system (1970) was modified and used to categorise the content of the observed discussions. Specific focus was on the teachers' approaches to discussions and the subsequent student contributions in class.

Following the analysis of the observed sessions, an intervention program was designed. Approaches believed to facilitate inquiry in arts criticism and aesthetics and improve the cognitive levels and quantity of students' verbal contributions during discussions were modelled. The teacher participants were again observed and transcripts of discussions analysed.

A method called "Texting" was devised to compare the data which emerged from the comparison of pre- and post-intervention classroom sessions. It revealed substantial changes in verbal interaction patterns as well as the presence of aesthetic content, philosophical inquiry approaches and postmodern perspectives. Teachers, when interviewed, were able to describe the changes that had occurred as a result of the relatively short, but precisely designed, intervention program.
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INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

It is now widely accepted that thinking and problem-solving activities are enhanced when students think aloud, discuss and communicate their thought processes to others and make their implicit problem-solving processes explicit (Hyerle, 1996). The visual arts provide one avenue for supporting students and teachers when actively connecting information. It is helpful to have a physical object to focus on as students think and talk and learn. The presence of a visual representation permits checking points of argument by looking closer, or seeing something differently once others describe their perception (Perkins, 1994). Many kinds of cognition are encouraged - for example visual processing, analytical thinking, questioning and testing hypotheses. Postmodern artworks provide suitable starting points for philosophical dialogue because they contain issues that are essentially problematic, often focussing on issues where there are conflicting points of view.

Students in art can demonstrate understanding through image making, they do not always need to talk about it. Artists often demonstrate ideas visually without talking about them. Thinking in art is integrally linked with viewing, making and talking. Talking, however, helps students to share, conceptualise, and build upon knowledge gained through art making or observing other artists’ works. The world of art can re-acquaint students with personal experiences as well as introduce them to experiences beyond their limited world. Lipman made an important point for teachers to note:

We have to learn how to establish the conditions and opportunities that will enable children, with their natural curiosity and appetite for meaning, to seize upon the appropriate clues and make sense of things for themselves. ... They will not acquire such meaning merely by learning the contents of adult knowledge. They must be taught to think, and, in particular, [think] for themselves. Thinking is the skill par excellence that enables us to acquire meaning. (Lipman, Sharp and Oscanyon, 1980, p. 13)

If educators take such assertions seriously, then their efforts will be devoted to finding ways of helping their students to improve thinking. The improvement of students’ thinking is an important aspect in teaching students about artistic concepts that require them to think critically. One method of doing this is to foster discussions by using a philosophical inquiry model. This study examines the application of the philosophical inquiry model to the teaching of art in three art classrooms in Melbourne, Australia.
The Victorian Arts Curriculum and Standards Framework (CSF, 1995) curriculum document for Years Preparatory to 10, contains an "Arts Criticism and Aesthetics" substrand which, along with "Creating, Making and Presenting" and "Past and Present Contexts", is described as integral to the arts curriculum (CSF, 1995, p. 11). Students are expected to develop the capacity to talk, read and write about art works. The statement "They learn how social and cultural values and meanings are constructed, challenged and reconstructed" (CSF, 1995, p. 11) appears to be catering for postmodern perspectives. Teachers are expected to have their students engage in arts criticism - describing, interpreting, analysing, evaluating, developing preferences and the ability to discriminate between arts works and to challenge ideas.

In the late 1990s in Victoria, secondary art teacher graduates have, in the main, completed initial degrees in art education institutions that include postmodern theory. They presumably have a different perspective from those trained earlier and from primary level generalist teachers who are expected to teach art. The studio work of recent art graduates is often at the cutting edge of postmodern thought (for example, involving issues of power, gender and social injustice). They are also using materials derived electronically from new technology and mass culture. Specialist art teachers often encourage highly innovative practical work in their classes, yet do not have the discussion skills or methodologies that would assist students to "deconstruct" their own work or that of other artists. Those teachers not trained in postmodern theory would have differing levels of understanding of its scope and implications. It is the view of the researcher that art teachers require specific training to assist them to develop in their students the critical thinking required to handle the complex issues raised by the new aesthetics, such as establishing the 'object' of performance art.

There are several key features to be noted concerning this study. One is the combination of the philosophical inquiry method (Lipman, Sharp, & Osceanyan, 1980) with teaching the requirements of the Arts CSF (1995). The philosophical inquiry approach is widely believed to facilitate sound student discourse (Splitter & Sharp, 1995), a vital component of critical and creative thinking. Involvement in a small study in which art teachers used aesthetics puzzles (Battin, Fisher, Moore & Silvers, 1989) to engage their students in discussions of complex art-related issues (Emery & Wilks, 1994) led to the perception that sound resources and improved facilitation of dialogue could bring about changes to student discourse in art appreciation.

Another major component of this study is an investigation, via non-participant observation, into existing teacher practice in arts criticism and aesthetics in the middle years of schooling (Years 5-10) focussing particularly on teacher-student dialogue. The need for a suitable instrument for
recording the observed classroom discussion became evident during the preliminary analysis of the content of art classroom dialogue.

The establishment of the suitability and the application of a modified Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categorisation (FIAC) system (Flanders, 1970) and the data that resulted, formed the third major component of this study. Fourthly, an intervention program was designed and conducted for the teacher participants, based on the literature review and the perceived needs that emerged from the initial classroom observation. Finally, using the data that emerged from the modified FIAC and semi-structured interviews the discussions of pre-intervention and post-intervention sessions were compared.

There were also four pivotal observations made by educators and theorists during the 1980s and 1990s that acted as catalysts during this study, by providing what Csikszentmihalyi (Snowbird 11 Getty Seminar, 1989, p. 58) described as a "flow" experience, one that made new insights possible.

The first was reported in Perrott (1988). A school principal in Sydney asked a young teacher, as they walked the school’s corridors, to listen to the staff "teaching themselves". This statement alluded to the high levels of teacher talk rather than student talk in most classroom discussions, a factor that prevented student participation in inquiry.

The second observation was made by Sweet (1992) when responding to a document on competency-based education for post-compulsory education in Australia. He warned that the "problem solving" key competency would be pushed into the too hard basket in favour of emphasis on basic skills. The emphasis in the late 1990s on outcomes and basic skills resulted in teacher avoidance of the teaching of broader thinking skills because of "crowded" knowledge-based curricula. Sweet’s prediction was proving to be accurate for all levels of education.

Thirdly, Jeffers’ (1996), following her survey of Texan art teachers, noted that despite all the theorists’ rhetoric about the value of the American Discipline Based Arts Education (DBAE) initiative, which included Arts Criticism and Aesthetics as a major component, few teachers had incorporated its content nor had it had much influence on pre-service preparation of teachers. Art teachers remained primarily concerned about the same issues as ten years earlier - timetable allowances and proper facilities. As the Australian National Arts Profile, released in 1994, had been influenced by the philosophy behind and content of DBAE, these findings were particularly disturbing given the intensive professional development teachers in the US had undergone. This
raised the question as to whether Victorian teachers' attitudes and practice concerning arts criticism and aesthetics would mirror the US findings.

Fourthly, at Harvard University, Perkins (1994) identified reflective intelligence as the mindful, strategic side of thinking that encouraged thinking about art to be broad and adventurous. For Perkins, the role of language in both thinking and visual literacy was vital. His theory provided a link between general philosophical inquiry approaches and visual arts classroom practice connected with arts criticism and aesthetics.

Study Plan

This study is premised on the assumption that philosophical inquiry is a means of fostering better thinking skills that are believed by many theorists to be under-developed as a result of unsuitable classroom approaches to discussion and unsatisfactory curriculum content. Therefore, a background to philosophical inquiry, together with some of the strategies believed necessary to bring about requisite changes in teacher practice and student participation in discussions, is discussed in Chapter One.

It was important to ascertain the extent to which aesthetic inquiry featured in the general literature on art education as well as its contribution to aesthetic understanding in visual arts education. Chapter Two examines the background to the Aesthetics and Arts Criticism strand of the Victorian Arts CSF (1995) by examining and critiquing the American Discipline Based Art Education (DBAEB) curriculum that had influenced the CSF content in the light of developing postmodern perspectives. Research into the approaches believed to foster the inclusion of aesthetics in art education are also examined. Studies of classroom verbal interaction, both overseas and in Australia are reviewed.

Chapter Three examines teaching models relating to aesthetics and arts criticism in Australia. It also describes how a means was sought to evaluate the effectiveness of both modified and new Australian curriculum materials (some designed by the researcher) for facilitating aesthetic discussions in art education.

It was also important to survey previous studies of the skills displayed by teachers when handling art room discussions, their knowledge of the topic being discussed, and the effectiveness of their discussions with students, given certain criteria. Chapter Four describes the studies that influenced the chosen methodology. It includes the rationale for, and application of, the modified FIAC used to categorise the verbal interaction transcribed from classroom observation in this
study. Specific focus was on the teachers' approaches to discussions and the subsequent student contributions in class.

The extent to which aesthetic inquiry was grounded in existing practice in the art classrooms and whether teachers were employing the content of the aesthetics component of the Arts CSF (1995) was sought through both transcript analysis and interviews. The analysis of session categorisation and the teachers' responses to reading the transcripts of their sessions is also discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter Five contains an account of an intervention program designed in response to the findings of the review of the literature (Chapter Two) and the analysis described in Chapter Four. The program comprised four sessions attended by Teachers A, B and C (three hours once a week for four weeks). Approaches believed to facilitate inquiry into Arts Criticism and Aesthetics issues and improve the quality and quantity of students' verbal contributions during discussions were modelled.

Chapter Six describes the post-intervention program observation of Teachers A, B and C and the subsequent analysis of the talk content of their art classes. The findings of the analysis of these sessions and the findings of pre-intervention session analysis are compared. The modified FIAC and an analysis system called "Texting" were used to investigate the findings that emerged from the comparison. Semi-structured interviews with Teachers A, B and C following their reading of their transcripts sought to ascertain the extent to which they could recognise differences between pre- and post-intervention session content.

In Chapter Seven the factors behind the employment of inquiry in art class discussions and the associated role of resources is discussed together with whether the comparatively short intervention program had adequately addressed the teachers' needs that had emerged during the first phase of observation. The major findings that emerged from a comparison of pre- and post-intervention sessions and the new teacher awarenesses and changed classroom practices are also discussed. Chapter Seven also contains recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER ONE
THEORIES OF CRITICAL THINKING AND LANGUAGE

Suppose we reject the assumption that thinking skills can be taught when it is in fact true. How profound might be the consequence of failing to attempt to teach what so obviously should be taught? (Nickerson, Perkins & Smith, 1985, p. 60)

In this chapter the potential of the philosophical inquiry model in relation to arts curriculum requirements is discussed. Its emphasis on developing critical thinking and improving discussion skills meant it was suitable to be adapted, first to arts criticism and inquiry, and second to art teacher education.

In 1994, the Australian National Profiles and Standards curriculum documents (for students in Preparatory to Year 10) were released. The Arts Profile contained a newly delineated substrand "Arts Criticism and Aesthetics". The Victorian Curriculum Standards Framework: The Arts (CSF), the content of which closely resembled the National document, was in Melbourne schools by 1995. It specified the need for teachers to be using strategies that ensured they were:

(a) developing the full intellectual and expressive potential of students;
(b) exploring ways different social and cultural groups engage in, and convey, meaning through the arts;
(c) developing skills and criticism through describing, analysing, interpreting and making judgments about their own and others' art works; and
(d) developing students' understandings of the changing ways that the arts construct, reinforce, challenge and transform values in different cultural contexts. (Arts CSF 1995, p.9)

Research into the effectiveness of Lipman's (1988) philosophical inquiry approach, commonly called the community of inquiry (Wilks, 1992; Sprod, 1994; Milvain, 1995) established that appropriately facilitated discussions of complex issues affecting students' daily life led to three clear outcomes: first, deeper and broader meanings were examined; second, contextualised abstract meaning could result from building on concrete examples; and third, higher order deliberation of issues occurred. Other research (Chervin & Kyle, 1993; Erickson, 1995) demonstrated that very young children could deal with abstraction and were able to acknowledge and consider other children's points of view. As well, Hagaman (1990a; 1994) in the USA, and De Haan, MacColl & McCutcheon (1995) in Australia, had published explorative activities using Lipman's approach as the basis for fostering inquiry in the visual arts.
Philosophical inquiry is critical reflection, or thinking about thinking. Thinking is integrally linked with reading, discussing and seeing, each of which can re-acquaint students with experiences as well as introduce new concepts and ideas that are outside their daily lives. Although a dimension of inquiry is present in every curriculum area, it is only through the conscious development of critical and reflective thinking skills that teachers can assist their students to become engaged in, rather than learners of, their disciplines. Searching for resolution of an issue connected to students' experience provides a starting point for inquiry.

The discipline of philosophy adds the following characteristics to classroom inquiry: (a) emphasis on what might be, as well as what is, the case, (b) the application of logic and the use of criteria for measuring the quality of thinking, (c) creative, as well as critical thinking, (d) concern with matters of judgement and reason rather than fact and unexamined opinion, (e) interest in the discovery of ideas and exploration of meaning, and concepts associated with the problematic in our everyday lives.

As the skills developed in the philosophical inquiry approach were not discipline specific, it was considered that it could become a vehicle to assist art teachers to address the requirements of the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrand of the CSF (1995). As well, it supported the emphasis in current curriculum documents on inquiry learning and the development of the individual in a democratic and pluralistic society. Philosophical inquiry provided a strategy that could stimulate the intellectual discovery and understanding needed by teachers wishing to introduce aesthetics and improve arts criticism approaches.

Twentieth century pedagogical theories from both philosophy and psychology influenced Lipman’s beliefs about the benefits of philosophical inquiry. Some of those theories are reviewed below.

**Theories Concerning Thought And Language**

In order for students to have an art education which allows for real learning in the Vygotskian sense, the effects of teacher and peer collaboration in student learning and the inquiry process must be more fully acknowledged. Changes in curricula will not be enough if there are not effective changes in pedagogy as well. (Hagaman, 1990c, p. 155)

A crucial element in the philosophical inquiry approach is the engagement of students with their peers in the inquiry process. Also important is the use of a stimulus that challenges thinking.
Vygotsky (1962a, p. 94) claimed that the gauge of the child's level of development was not what had been learned through instruction, but the manner of thinking about unfamiliar subjects: "Therefore, the only good kind of instruction is that which marches ahead of development and leads it" (Vygotsky, 1962a, p. 104). He believed that "directed" thought needed to be conscious, adapted to reality, susceptible to truth and error and was communicated through language (1962a, p. 11). He also described it as social and, as it developed, increasingly influenced by logic. Importantly for this study he believed the primary function of speech, in both children and adults, was communication. Vygotsky emphasised the importance of both teacher-student and student-peer interaction in the learning process contending that students performed at higher intellectual levels when in collaborative situations beyond that which they might otherwise be expected to perform.

Crutchfield (1969) suggested that the neglect of the teaching of thinking skills was the result of the assumption that thinking ability was innate and not subject to modification by training. This was associated, he asserted, with the view that the purpose of education was to provide students with a great deal of information and those with intelligence would assimilate it, those without it would not. The alternative view was that thinking skills could be taught.

Lipman (in Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1980) was concerned that although students were capable of thinking about thinking, teachers did not encourage them to think for themselves, form independent judgments or to be proud of having their own insights and points of view. He acknowledged the influence of two of Vygotsky's principal findings (1962a, pp. 58-59). First, although indispensable, processes like inference, association, attention and imagery were insufficient without the use of a sign, or a word, as the means by which we directed our mental operations, channelling the students towards the solution of a problem confronting them. Second, if the environment made no new demand on students, presented no problems requiring the formation of concepts and did not stimulate the intellect by providing a sequence of new goals, then their thinking would fail to reach the highest stages, or would reach them with great delay. Therefore, the major relevant factors in Vygotsky's theory (1962a & b) for this study were the requirement of teacher facilitation of concept formation and the stress on the role of the spoken word to assist this process.

In the 1980s concern about literacy in the United States was expressed in the Reagan administration's call for major improvements in education as a matter of national survival in the increasingly competitive global economy. Entitled A Nation at Risk (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) it called for "radical reform and total restructuring of the educational system" (Brown 1993, p. xii). According to Nickerson, Perkins and Smith (1985),
this was partly responsible for an increasing focus on process in the study of intelligence by cognitive psychologists. They argued that whether or not Piaget's notion of developmental stages and progress through them was accepted, the distinction between concrete and formal operations was educationally significant because many adolescents had not acquired the ability to engage in formal (abstract) thinking. They had simply not been extended to unfamiliar domains.

Bruner (1985) believed that teaching was greatly facilitated by language which was not only the medium for exchange but also the instrument that the learner could use to bring order into the environment. According to him the adult and/or peers served the learner as "scaffolding", until the learner was able to consciously and independently control the new function or concept. This support system made it possible for the learner to internalise both knowledge and critical thinking skills, and to convert them into tools for conscious intellectual functioning.

According to Haynes (1991), Bruner's belief that:

> The pupil should become party to the negotiatory process by which facts are created and interpreted ... not the child inventing or discovering, but the child negotiating and sharing in discovery. (Bruner, 1985, p. 129)

offered a model to cope with post-structuralist relativism. Haynes encouraged teachers to involve their students in discussions at a time when art teachers were struggling to find methods of dealing with postmodern and post-structuralist art.

Nickerson et al. (1985) claimed that teaching thinking should be viewed as complementary to teaching conventional content, believing that thinking skills, like motor skills, could be taught, practised and learned. They concluded that most people had the potential to develop far more effective thinking skills. They also noted that creativity was viewed by many theorists as a special, almost mysterious attribute. While the ability to reason and solve problems via analysis and deduction was generally correlated with intelligence, high intelligence did not guarantee creativity. They believed that certain cognitive styles, for instance a disposition towards problem finding and deferring judgment, bore a relation to creativity. They further claimed creative people valued and sought originality (an attribute not necessarily valued by postmodernists). As a consequence, they believed instruction should foster these attributes and a questioning attitude. In the case of metacognition, the objective was to make one a skilful user of knowledge.

Nickerson et al. (1985) recommended a shift of balance towards attention to attitudes and cognitive styles, as well as careful selection of appropriate teaching strategies, believing the study of the teaching of metacognitive skills was a promising field for research. At the time of their
writing it was a new focus of attention. In the 1990s the teaching of metacognitive skills was becoming an important focus of the learning theorists who were influencing Melbourne’s teachers, for example Howard Gardner at the Using Your Brain Conference in Melbourne (1997).

According to Thomas (in Sharp & Reed, 1992, p. 100), Piaget’s (1972) belief that children passed through stages of cognitive development at certain ages had led him to “discount the idea that [very young] children could enter into social relations in a manner that was relevant to the formation of logical thinking, and taking the other person’s point of view”. Despite disagreeing with Piaget’s beliefs about the limited reasoning capabilities of very young children, Lipman shared two fundamental notions with Piaget - constructivism and the idea of social origins of reason. Lipman (1980, p. 13) claimed that children constructed meanings, they were not given them, nor did they discover them already formed within themselves. The viability of the idea of egocentrism was further undermined by Donaldson (1984), who discovered very young children learned to reason when they had a motive to do so in order to escape their egocentricism.

Lipman feared that Piaget’s stress on concrete over abstract thinking in the early years of childhood could lead to teaching likewise being concrete and not allowing for acceleration of education in thinking. Bloom et al.’s hierarchy of thinking (1956) defined higher- and lower-order thinking and described differences between concepts such as knowledge and comprehension. Lipman (1990) believed that because Bloom’s taxonomy had been interpreted as sequential, teachers had retarded their students by not normally asking for a reason, or encouraging them to think abstractly or express their own ideas. According to Lipman, psychologists in the late 1980s were beginning to recognise that lower and higher order thinking skills should be taught at the same time. He believed that this, along with the understanding that thinking was a process and not a product, was essential. An alternate way of thinking about thinking, according to Lipman, was to replace the hierarchical view with the belief that thinking was creative, complex and critical.

In the early 1980s Feuerstein’s emphasis on mediated learning experiences as a key contributor to cognitive development marked a departure from Piaget. His program emphasised basic cognitive processes and aimed to improve students’ reflective thinking about successes and failures via program tasks and an emphasis on the self as an active generator of information rather than passive recipient (Nickerson et al., 1985, p. 151). Feuerstein’s longitudinal studies (1980) demonstrated that cognitive behaviour could be modified. As a result, the common view of intelligence as an unchanging capacity was altered to a view that saw it as a capacity that grew both developmentally and as a result of deliberate intervention.
Nickerson et al (1985, p. 306) noted that a characteristic of the "thinking about thinking" approach was its frequent recourse to philosophy, believing such programs brought with them a cognitive style of critical thinking and care with language that was fruitful. An approach that had roots in both philosophy and psychology was believed by them to be useful. They further believed that promoting a sense of wonder and satisfaction from productive intellectual activity had not received the emphasis it deserved. A crucial element of the Philosophy for Children program was Lipman’s (1988) belief that a sense of wonder on the part of both the teacher and students was a key to inquiry that led, in turn, to critical thinking.

Prawat (1991, p. 3) believed educators interested in promoting higher level thinking and conceptual understanding in students reflected international assessments that students lacked the knowledge and reasoning skills necessary for effective functioning in the "Information Age". Other researchers (for example, Kurfiss, 1988; Healy, 1991) had expressed concern over a decline in thinking skills in students and the fact that low-level cognitive tasks dominated educational environments. Prawat (1991) and Langrehr (1997) believed that results of recent tests of students thinking skills challenged educators to come up with new and better ways of promoting thinking and understanding. Prawat nominated three major categories to describe the thinking skills approaches that had been developed: Stand Alone, Embedding, and Immersion.

The stand alone approach focussed on the belief that there were common thinking skills that were best taught separately from subject matter content. The embedding approach was, at the time of Prawat’s paper, the most visible (in classrooms) of the three approaches. It called for the infusion of thinking skills into the regular curriculum (Ennis, 1989). It entailed teaching thinking skills in the context of their use or application to specific subject matter. Prawat said that critics of the embedding approach believed that it might be counter-productive to concentrate on the how to aspects of thinking if the what was ignored in the process (1991, p. 5).

According to Prawat (1991) the immersion approach meant more than a shift in attention, representing a different set of assumptions about teaching and learning. Advocates of the immersion approach assigned a higher priority to the role of ideas in the thinking process. Ideas were seen to serve as "lenses" that directed attention towards aspects of the environment. It appeared, using this approach, that it would be counter-productive to have thinkers focus too much on the process when they were fully engaged in trying to think through something. The preconditions for this sort of thinking were twofold: students must feel free to pursue knowledge and they must have the necessary intellectual tools (concepts or ideas). He claimed social and image schemata played a key role in the social process because:
... image schemata are based upon certain common experiences, they provide a 'language' for talking about individual understandings. This, in turn, makes it possible for a community of learners to negotiate some sort of shared understanding among themselves. (Prawat, 1991, p. 7)

Prawat believed this explained why advocates of the immersion approach placed a high premium on dialogue during learning. Using this approach, students' ways of representing ideas must be taken seriously by their teachers. The dilemma for teachers was how to honour students' own efforts to seek meaning "while at the same time initiating them into the interpretative stance accepted by those within the discipline" (Prawat, 1991, p. 8). According to him, although the idea of the immersion approach was relatively new in educational theory, there was general support for the view that ideas, as opposed to skills and processes, should be assigned the highest priority in promoting thought and understanding in the classroom. There was also general agreement that discourse played a key role (1991, p. 8). He believed that because building connections was a strength of the immersion approach, it may be "our best bet for producing transfer".

Advocates of the immersion approach agreed there was a need for a fundamental change in education, while those who believed thinking skills should be embedded in the standard curriculum were less certain about the extent of change required. Advocates of immersion saw a world of difference between existing approaches and curricula developed to teach big ideas and promote conceptual understanding (Gardner, 1997). As well, the discourse-centred mode of teaching placed great demands on both teacher and student (Santi, 1993). The second group tended to assume that higher order thinking could be fostered by adapting existing curricula (Beyer, 1988; Schwartz & Perkins, 1989).

Gardner (1997) believed that teachers could only know whether their students understood if they asked them to perform their understandings. This required both time and feedback. He rejected the prevalent emphasis on "back to basics" and outcomes that was influencing educators in the late 1990s. Stressing that understanding the notion of multiple intelligences was a means and not an end, he cited the acceptance of short answers, text context, emphasis on correct answers and pressure on coverage, as obstacles to understanding. As well as mastering basic literacies, the educational environments that enhanced learning were, according to Gardner: the asking of big questions, involvement in enduring issues, focus on rich generative ideas and topics, knowledge of students' preferences for understanding and assessment that was not decontextualised. Reflecting Prawat's (1991) immersion approach, Gardner described six entry points to rich concepts: narratives, numerical (quantitative), foundational questions, aesthetics, and hands-on (as in children's museums) and co-operative learning (1997). He believed aesthetic inquiry was useful for getting to a core issue and catering for varying styles and rates of development and advocated
the use of works of art as entry points to a moment in time. One recommendation was to use the development of an artistic style as an example of evolution - one of his "big ideas". Creativity in any field was, according to Gardner (1997), achievement in a high level in the domains in an original way.

By the 1990s, the teaching of metacognitive skills, i.e. thinking about thinking, was becoming an important focus of a group of American learning theorists to whom practising teachers around the globe were gaining access. Leading theorists like Gardner, Feuerstein, Perkins, Schwartz and de Bono were regularly delivering papers at "Thinking" conferences for teachers. In Australia, the *Fifth International Conference on Thinking* in Townsville, 1992 and *Using Your Brain*, Melbourne, 1997, were well attended. Teacher educators who had adapted the above-named writer's theories into practical classroom activities, were presenting at the same conferences (for example Robyn Fogarty and David Lazzar at the *Using Your Brain* Conference, 1997).

**Metacognition: The Philosophy for Children Model**

The philosophical tradition of Peirce, Dewey and Ricoeur influenced Lipman as he sought to make his undergraduate philosophy classes meaningful. From Peirce's notion that scientists belonged to a "community of inquirers" and as such should share discoveries and information, Lipman took the descriptor "community of inquiry" for his teaching approach. In Dewey's writings, Lipman found a pedagogy for converting classrooms into such communities of inquiry. Influenced by Dewey's insistence on the importance of experience in learning, he created stories with problematic situations that raised questions about philosophical issues and required the use of philosophical skills. The influence of Ricoeur, the French existentialist, and the field of hermeneutics was evident in Lipman's belief in the necessity of an on-going process of interpretation.

At the *Philosophy: East and West* Conference in 1990, Lipman described the three major beliefs underpinning his Philosophy for Children curriculum. They were, first, a belief that thinking skills could be improved by giving students the opportunity to practice the skills of philosophical inquiry; second, the importance of providing an effective curriculum; and third, ensuring the curriculum was intellectually challenging and stimulating (Lipman, 1990). It was claimed the "give-and-take" of the community of inquiry approach led to student construction of coherent meaning. This occurred when, with the teacher as discussion guide, students sought to make sense of problematic situations encountered in stimulus materials. At the same time the students discovered the diversity of thought held by the other class members.

When considering the competencies required by the aesthetics and arts criticism strand of the 1995 Victorian Arts CSF, five basic elements present in a successful community of inquiry were
believed to assist inquiry in art classrooms. They were (paraphrasing Thomas, in Sharp & Reed, 1992, pp. 101-102):

(a) the involvement of students in the process of inquiry by building on their interests and reflecting on their questions;
(b) valuing discussion, i.e. both talking, and listening;
(c) giving and expecting reasons;
(d) respecting oneself and others as participants of inquiry (an ethical dimension); and
(e) valuing thinking for oneself and 'self-correction' above the relatively sterile idea of formal logic.

Lipman (1988, p. 24) believed it was the disciplines that provided the "languages in which students must learn to think, rather than subjects areas they must learn". Through the provision of appropriate resources, Lipman claimed it was possible to have students think more reasonably and more creatively.

Brown and Palinscar (1989, p. 4) had also found that an immediate outcome of using specific curricular material in conjunction with peer collaboration was the development of a "community of learners" acquiring and sharing a common knowledge base. They discovered deeper thinking and understanding than had previously been apparent in classroom dialogues. The nature of the reading/learning discussions and writing samples collected in their study reflected higher levels of reasoning skills.

Lipman believed (1988) that young children developed language skills by listening to adult conversations, identifying with the speakers, internalising their linguistic behaviours, and simultaneously grasping the logical and syntactic structure of the language they employ. Referring specifically to children's ability to be philosophically creative, a point he believed had been well established by Howard Gardner, he claimed that:

Insofar as children are proficient in ampliative reasoning, this should be good grounds for suspecting that, given the opportunity to do philosophy, they would do so creatively. (Lipman, 1988, p. 181)

Nickerson et al. (1985) agreed with the Philosophy for Children theorists that children were natural philosophers and capable of thinking deeply about matters of philosophical significance. If Lipman’s claim (1988) that young children constructed hypotheses in order to explain their view of the world was accepted by educators, then, it could be postulated that teachers should take students’ questions seriously. They would also need to provide the time and space for students to reason and think things through for themselves.
Lipman’s emphasis on class discussion was based on the assumption that discussion skills were the foundation of thinking skills. The fundamental purpose of his Philosophy for Children program was the strengthening of basic reasoning skills rather than acquisition of knowledge. This approach to critical reflection by individuals had a sound theoretical base in Dewey, Freire and Vygotsky (Splitter, 1991).

However, fostering problem-seeking and problem-solving dialogue that was not totally teacher-dependent would require specific classroom approaches, not necessarily existent in most classrooms (Perrott, 1988; Splitter, 1989; Prawat, 1991). It was further believed that the exploration of issues connected to students’ experience should form the starting point for inquiry and that a lack of knowledge should not stand in the way of their ability to think (Splitter 1991; Lipman, 1985). It followed that teachers would need to ensure their students listened to, and took seriously, the opinions of others. While student thinking in the classroom remained focussed on concrete situations and facts, they would find it difficult to build bridges to new situations.

Haynes (1991) thought Lipman’s community of inquiry approach provided an appropriate forum for critical thinking. She believed its use of questions asked from the time of Aristotle onwards about aesthetics, language, ethics, epistemology and logic, satisfied the narrative that Bruner (1985) had espoused. Haynes believed also, that when Paul (1990) argued for the inclusion of a strong element of critical thinking in school curricula, he had in mind the idea of student negotiation of, and sharing in, discovery.

Teacher controlled question/answer sessions around issues they have chosen do not necessarily create student interest or encourage inquiry. In order for thoughtful inquiry to occur, a cognitive experience must involve students responding with their own ideas, "the very building blocks of inquiry" (Splitter, 1991, pp. 11-12). Although students lack knowledge, Haynes (1991) believed it should not prevent reflection and inquiry. This entailed accepting the constructivist view that knowledge and understanding are the results of inquiry, not the input to inquiry.

Reed (1992), a foundational figure in the philosophy in schools movement, claimed that if teachers lacked an understanding of the role that philosophical inquiry and critical thinking could play, then opportunities to ask probing questions and to dig more deeply into assumptions underlying beliefs were being lost:
It is only when schools of education begin to realise that the good teacher is the good scholar, they would take inquiry and dialogue seriously, and we will see significant progress in education. (in Sharp & Reed, 1992, p. 155)

Susan Gardner referred to Reed's belief in the need for a teacher to use an approach that mirrored "scholarly ignorance" - the admission that there is much they do not know. She believed that, more than anything else, this alone justified the inclusion of philosophy within already overcrowded curricula: "If the teacher already has the answer, why should the students waste time inquiring about something the teacher already knows ... ?" (Gardner, 1995, p.44). Gardner believed philosophical inquiry offered both breadth and depth and meant the teacher, as co-inquirer with their students, could examine all sides of an issue, searching for implications and ramifications (Personal communication, September 24, 1998).

Gardner noted three important strategies associated with leading a community of inquiry: specific training in pushing for depth in the dialogue; assistance in becoming attuned to topics that were philosophically fruitful; and encouragement to maintain focus. She stressed that: "If students are going to learn that it is worthwhile listening to one another, [then] the facilitator must ensure that what the students have to say is worth listening to" (Gardner, 1995, p. 43).

This suggested that teachers, in order to lead a penetrating philosophical discussion, should use a cluster of follow-up questions to an initial exploration of a topic. Gardner labelled this process the second why, claiming that development of this teaching skill took time. She believed it was a key to a process that teachers often failed to achieve with their classes, that of a philosophical level of inquiry, and would therefore need to be specifically developed in teacher education.

There appeared to be considerable theoretical support for the belief that, if teachers wanted their students to think carefully and critically about difficult issues and express their ideas, then they would need to provide an appropriate context. This involved first, the recognition that even very young students were capable of inquiring into abstract ideas; second, appropriate resources that stimulated inquiry would need to be used, and third, a classroom environment like a community of inquiry that fostered exploration of beliefs and values associated with the content of the resources would need to be established. It appeared that if teachers were to recognise the philosophical possibilities of their discipline and facilitate inquiry, then they would require assistance.

Given the above, it appeared feasible that the community of inquiry classroom model that fostered philosophical inquiry, could be used by teacher educators to assist art teachers to develop the
skills required to satisfy the goals of the Victorian Arts CSF’s Arts Criticism and Aesthetics strand (1995, p. 9). If appropriate resources were found, then curriculum content could be used to assist students to explore meaning, analyse events and make judgements, just some of the requisite goals of this strand.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

How many pupils like L. remain unidentified, and with them their specific needs, in art rooms? ... She is already quite critically conscious. On occasions she might struggle for words, leaving sentences incomplete and an idea floating without being fully resolved. ... Nevertheless she perceptually relates her attitudes to those of her father; she can distinguish her needs in her own work from what she discerns as those of her classmates and she enjoys certain artworks in their own right. ... She sees why it is necessary to go and look at original works in the gallery, and feels the need to read around the subject. ... AND YET (sic) she had hitherto revealed none of this in school. (Taylor, 1991, p. 16)

If the statement above was generalisable, then teachers should be catering for the needs of L. and others like her in their art classrooms. This chapter examines two major influences on thinking about art in schools in Australia, the UK and USA: the American Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) curriculum and the postmodern movement in the 1980s and 1990s. The views of supporters and critics of curriculum models proposed for the visual arts in the 1980s and 1990s are surveyed. The concept of philosophical inquiry, as a means of coping with the expanding dimensions of the art curriculum, is examined in the light of suggestions that it is a methodology that effectively handles postmodern theory.

The Discipline Based Arts Education Curriculum

DBAE (1985) was an art curriculum promoted by the J. Paul Getty Trust Center for Education in the Arts and endorsed by the National Art Education Association. In essence DBAE divided art teaching into four content areas: production, criticism, aesthetics and history. It was heralded as a blueprint for art education in American schools in the 1980s (Eisner, 1988; Clark, Day & Greer, 1987). The ideas were not entirely new - antecedents included Barkan's (1962) "Artist/Art Historian/Arts Critic" model for the art teacher and the aesthetic education movement of the mid 1960s (Smith, 1987) - while its packaging and promotion were related to the political situation of the late 1980s. DBAE provided the first real focus on aesthetics as an area of philosophical inquiry in the art curriculum. It was a curriculum given qualified support at that time by Elliot Eisner, Arthur Efland, Rudolph Arnheim and Ralph Smith, leading arts education theorists who had influenced the field since the 1970s.

It is important to note that major exponents of the Philosophy for Children (P4C) program, (Lipman, Reed, and Hagaman), were present at one or both of the two major seminars that set the foundations of the Getty DBAE curriculum model (Snowbird I in 1987, and Snowbird II in 1989). The theories underpinning DBAE are examined in this study because its content influenced
the Australian national visual arts' curriculum document released in the mid 1990s on which the Victorian Arts CSF (1995) was based.

In 1988, Ohio State University (OSU) had conducted an art education venture that involved cooperation between the OSU art education faculty and the philosophy department. It drew heavily on Lipman's advice (as Director of The International Association of Philosophy for Children) concerning the relationship between philosophical inquiry and child development. Most of those involved at OSU were present at the Snowbird II seminar (1989) where progress in the implementation of DBAE, particularly the challenge for pre-service art educators, was examined.

It was agreed at this seminar that more was known about teaching art production than teaching art history, criticism and aesthetics, the three strands that had been given more emphasis in the DBAE curriculum. It was acknowledged that it would take time for teachers to understand the cognitive theories and learning processes associated with art history, criticism and aesthetics and successfully integrate learning across the four disciplines. The discussion centred around whether the application of cognitive theories to art teaching would lead to an inflexible, mechanistic approach to teaching and learning. Learning styles, the need to cater for individuals, and ways of translating the concept of developmental levels into curriculum scope and sequence, were also discussed.

The Seminar group believed that USA's education system in the 1980s had devalued the questioning of deeper issues because of the trends of set curricula, standardised testing and authoritarian control. Given this, they believed empowering students would be difficult, but flexibility and integration were vital. The aesthetics component was proving to be the most problematic because it received little attention in pre-service training. As a consequence, teachers were often afraid to teach aesthetics.

Stewart (Snowbird II report, 1989, p. 43) referred to aesthetics as "troublesome" for teachers because it avoided formulation into concepts, skills and attitudes that could be easily sequenced in a curriculum. However, she claimed aestheticicians had already provided a framework for examining and understanding the meaning of art. They often employed the philosophical inquiry method that provided students with a way of organising their art experiences, encouragement to listen to and consider the ideas of others and examine and clarify beliefs and assumptions these skills, she believed, were important for autonomous thinking that empowered for lifelong learning. Stewart argued that the aesthetics component offered opportunity to engage in philosophical inquiry, but that this would only be if interwoven with historical, critical and studio-based inquiry. She claimed that st
need assistance to recognise there were complicated questions about art and that having the ability to consider different positions would help them examine the beliefs and issues philosophers attempted to answer.

When the Seminar group was considering the insertion of aesthetics into DBAE, Stewart conceded that many teachers suffered from "philosophy-phobia" (Snowbird 11, 1989, p. 44) but believed it was possible to prepare art teachers to be comfortable with aesthetics. In order to achieve this, teachers would first need to be able to recognise a philosophical issue, formulate questions to address it and employ the skills of good reasoning themselves. Some knowledge of the issues historically considered by philosophers to enable them to pursue questions along with their students was also needed. It would also be important for teachers to realise that, while inquiry might not lead to a "right" answer, opinions could be thoughtfully held and closure might consist of agreeing to disagree. Stewart's belief was that if students were to be encouraged to think for themselves, then teachers would need to encourage inquiry and foster student questions about art-related issues.

Stewart recommended pre-service education programs that would provide prospective teachers with experience in inquiry, course work in aesthetics and opportunities to practise the teaching of aesthetics. She discussed the important difference between art criticism's specific requirement of engagement with a particular art object, and aesthetics' broader encompassing of art and art related experiences (Snowbird 11, 1989, pp. 54-55).

Postmodern art was proving a difficult area for teachers to discuss using traditional and modernist approaches. Stewart believed an advantage of the philosophical inquiry approach to aesthetics and art criticism was that teachers did not require knowledge of contemporary theory in order to engage in discussions about artworks with their students. Because contemporary artworks were full of ideas, philosophical discourse was almost natural.

Reed (Snowbird 11, 1989, p. 155) agreed with Stewart that teachers were not trained to relate aesthetics, art history and art criticism to studio art. He believed many lacked knowledge of the history of ideas associated with art criticism and aesthetics. In his view, the community of inquiry in Philosophy for Children offered a methodology that assisted educators to engage students in critical dialogue because it dealt with the perceived problems associated with problematic terminology and the need for specific knowledge. Reed saw a similarity between the "Why?" questions of both philosophers and describing a typical Philosophy for Children session as one in which the ideas the stud
interesting about an issue were first solicited by the teacher and then became the agenda for the discussion\(^1\).

Hagaman (later named McRorie), a feminist philosopher and art educator also at the Snowbird Seminar, supported the use of the Philosophy for Children methodology for tackling the feminist aesthetics associated with postmodernism. Introducing aesthetics via philosophical inquiry, however, meant teachers would have to modify their approaches significantly, especially considering the lack of aesthetics in their backgrounds. It would not be enough simply to tell teachers to listen to their students and encourage them to ask questions. Modelling and guided practice were needed to provide teachers with the skills effective inquiry required.

Many theorists at *Snowbird 11* agreed that aesthetics could be taught through philosophical inquiry, an approach that should be addressed by teacher education. Teachers needed to know how to consciously guide an analytic discussion. Aesthetic questions could be related to art making in order for students to make connections. This would be assisted by encouraging student questions with teachers responding to their questions and guiding the dialogue. What was needed then, in addition to studio studies, was experience in responding to and thinking about questions like "What is art?". They believed the "philosophy-phobia" (*Snowbird 11*, 1989, p. 44) in teachers had to be confronted by provision of grounding in philosophy and in-depth inquiry. Concern was also expressed about the common association of aesthetics with beauty by both teachers and students. This was seen as anachronistic. It was believed important to make a distinction between the content of the discipline of aesthetics and the process of inquiry in order to prevent teachers from interpreting the inclusion of aesthetics in the curriculum as a requirement to teach the historical development of aesthetics.

It was predicted that postmodern art with its new aesthetic domains would prove to be a difficult area for teachers and that traditional and modernist approaches to arts criticism would not be appropriate. An advantage of philosophical inquiry was that teachers did not require knowledge of contemporary theory to engage in discussions about artworks with their students. Because contemporary works contained complex ideas and challenges, philosophical discourse was required.

---

\(^1\) He emphasised that it was not sufficient to tell the teachers to lead the students through inquiry - they needed a model. The inquiry model he was advocating required important teacher approaches: (a) admitting there was something to be gained by the process of inquiry, i.e. the notion of scholarly ignorance, (b) seeing ideas as problematic - curiosity needed a focus, (c) ensuring that student dialogue contributed to the process of inquiry, and (d) being familiar with the rules and processes of the discipline in which the inquiry was occurring. (Reed, *Snowbird 11*, 1989, pp. 45, 50)
Shortcomings Of DBAE

Are we ready as art educators to hear that existing pre-service and in-service professional development programs have had little effect on the teachers lives over the past 15 years? When they say they need help in issues of funding and status how will we help? Will we present yet another curriculum model or the next state wide initiative? (Jeffers, 1996, p. 112)

In 1996, fifteen years after the second Getty Seminar, Jeffers found little evidence of DBAE in the practice of teachers in the State of Texas. Although the findings were from only one state, it appeared this enormously expensive curriculum initiative might have failed to be effective.

In order for DBAE to be accepted and incorporated into art programs it was evident that more than broad-based curriculum guidelines were needed. In the late 1980s cross-disciplinary interaction was not encouraged in the curriculum in the US. As teachers had not been encouraged to think across disciplines they were not prepared for the DBAE approach.

While the supporters of DBAE saw it as an opportunity for the visual arts to regain lost ground in schools, many theorists believed it was not the answer. The major objections to the new curriculum were that, being mainly formalist in its focus, it did not assist with the kind of interpretation that the emergent postmodern art required (Hagaman, 1990a; Garber, 1992; Van de Pitte, 1994). Some theorists and practitioners believed it de-emphasised art practice (Gardner, 1989) while others believed that it undervalued the aesthetic experience (Smith, 1989).

Hagaman (1990a) was concerned that DBAE continued to emphasise the modernist concept of individually conceived and produced end-products while failing to acknowledge the crucial nature of both teacher guidance and peer collaboration in learning. In her view the emphasis on individual production and personal growth that characterised much of what occurred in art education programs at all levels of instruction, resulted from, among other things, misinterpretation of the theories of Dewey and Lowenfeld (Hagaman, 1990b). In acknowledging that the introduction of aesthetics into the curriculum had proved troublesome because few art teachers had models for integrating the content and inquiry processes of philosophy into their teaching programs, she said:

Even those [teachers] who do study aesthetics in philosophy departments have little or no sense of how to reconstruct that experience into something appropriate and meaningful for children in art class. (Hagaman, 1990a, p. 2)

DBAE’s inherent conservatism and apparent indifference to social dimensions separated it from the critical-theoretical orientation that had expanded during the 1990s. Popular culture, feminism, cultural pluralism, multiculturalism and the rapidly emerging field of information technology
(Garber, 1990; Chalmers & Mullen, 1990) were all having an impact on art production and consequently on art education.

Despite DBAE’s calls for "a socially based, socially informed art education that includes art criticism components" Garber (1992, p. 18) claimed that most attention to art criticism in art education was still resulting in an examination of the formal or expressive properties of a work of art. For instance, Feldman’s (1970) criteria for evaluation of art (formalist, expressivist, and instrumental), were still widely used. This, together with the on-going emphasis on self-expression, tended to isolate meaning to within the individual, with an expectation that an individualistic psychology would explain meaning. What was missing, according to Garber (1992), was critical talk about art, because this was a primary means through which ideas, values and beliefs could be conveyed. She saw feminist approaches to art criticism, rather than DBAE, as providing the means through which the broader social context could be considered.

Smith (1989) defended DBAE against its critics. He claimed appreciation was not a cognitive affair but a perceptual approach, perceptual as distinct from affective. He believed emphasis on excellence, initiation into the cultural heritage of western civilization, the teaching of art as a humanity, and progression of art teaching through developmental stages, were the essential components of any art education course. He claimed this view of teaching and learning derived its objectives from the ideas and practice of art history, criticism, and aesthetics and saw DBAE as an antidote to confusion about the basic aims of art education because it stressed the study of art for its distinctive history and value. Smith dismissed the postmodern "instrumental" use of art that assumed it should serve goals of special interest groups, for example feminism and multiculturalism, as largely fuelled by political agendas. He questioned whether such approaches should even be called art education.

Efland (1992, p. 203) challenged what he called Smith’s "Western" and "elitist" view of art education that presupposed one developed the "relevant dispositions" (i.e. ideas, concepts, principles, skills, attitudes and judgments) through the study of art history and criticism. He was concerned that the educational consequences of Smith’s approach would be that art education would continue to devote itself to the cultivation of "worthwhile" aesthetic experiences provided by "exemplary" works with less emphasis on historical or critical understanding and that decisions about worth would be made for, instead of by, the learner (Efland, 1992, p. 204). When a particular kind of excellence was promoted, what was sacrificed was an art education that enabled students to come to grips with art that dealt with the issues of their time. Efland believed an understanding of the social basis for the postmodern critique was needed, but could not see how this critical discourse could proceed in art programs like DBAE where it appeared the central
curriculum issue was still restricted to aesthetic experience as the valued end, while all social issues with which works of art dealt were made peripheral.

Gardner (Gardner & Perkins, 1988) objected to the DBAE proposals for quite a different reason. He believed that production must remain central in arts education. Smith (1989) responded, that although Gardner's view of art education was grounded in insights of both the philosophical and psychological, the psychologist's perspective dominated. He believed the theory of Gardner's multiple intelligences failed to sufficiently emphasise historical and cultural perspectives.

According to Van de Pitte (1994, pp. 6-7), there had been virtually no extended discussion of the new postmodern aesthetics by DBAE's "principal voices" (for example, Clark, Day & Greer 1987). DBAE's creation had resulted from an elaborate collaboration over three years and incorporated feedback from 110 art professionals and educators convened expressly to criticise it. She claimed (1994, p. 7) that DBAE theorists were "trading in old aesthetic ideas most of the time" and that the "recent" theory quoted was "old". She used the references to Beardsley (1958) and Dickie (1974) who, she claimed, represented "traditional aesthetic, philosophical and educational ideas". Van de Pitte questioned why almost forty years of subsequent development of ideas did not figure at all, adding that outdated texts were quoted, with Danto (1981), perhaps the most influential aesthetician of "our times", not mentioned.

DBAE, although launched in 1984, had a predominantly modernist orientation, even though postmodern art was prevalent in galleries and postmodern art theories were being published. This modernist orientation appears to be the result of the prominent role of major art education theorists like Eisner, Arnheim and Smith at DBAE's inception. They variously argued for the importance of historical knowledge, the personal experience approach to art, and modernist ways of looking at art in an elitist and culturally narrow way.

The literature pointed to several shortcomings of DBAE. Although in theory it included all forms of art criticism and aesthetics, the dominant and sanctioned approach was still formalist (Hart, 1991; Smith, 1987). Despite its claim of being comprehensive (Eisner, 1988) its inquiry approaches were believed to lack depth and "its blatant subject-centredness made it an uneasy fit" with the emerging interpretative-hermeneutic paradigm (Pearse, 1992, p. 247). Notions of liberation and empowerment of marginalised people, that were enriching appreciation of contemporary art were missing. Multiculturalism partially fitted into the Habermas' postmodern paradigms (1971) but, even if it could be defined in a way about which there was agreement, postmodernism could not be easily accommodated within any existing paradigmatic structure, including DBAE.
Concerns about the shortcomings described above had been expressed at Snowbird II in 1989. To begin with, it was believed that teachers lacked the strategies and knowledge required to handle the art history and aesthetics components of DBAE and more practical assistance was needed. Secondly, there was a need to engage students in discussions about postmodern perspectives in art theory and practice. The supporters of Philosophy for Children present at the seminar, claimed its philosophical inquiry approach offered teachers who lacked knowledge of art history and aesthetics a means of engaging in discussions about complex issues with their students.

**Postmodernism And Art Education In The 1990s**

Theorists in the 1980s and 1990s and critics of DBAE were emphasising the need for art educators to question traditional western definitions of art, the role of the artist, and the criteria used for judging a work of art. Although there was growing support for a socially critical art education, DBAE did not appear to have offered a helpful structure. This section examines "postmodernism" as a movement and the impact its emergent theories had, and continue to have, on thinking about the role and content of visual arts education.

The term postmodernism was first used in the art community to describe a style of architecture. Other disciplines, such as literary theory, used the term to represent recent notions in aesthetics that opposed concepts fundamental to modernism, such as genre, a style with discrete boundaries. Postmodernism signified much more than the aesthetic.

Another concept associated with postmodern thinking is that viewers interpret art from different perspectives, often to such an extent that they are divorced from the artist's intention. Issues of representation and interpretation are among the more characteristic differences between modernism and postmodernism. Postmodernist thinking has created a sociological climate that is sceptical about modernist concepts such as historical progress and objectivity. The feminist and other critical theorists discussed in this section stress that thinking is shaped in relation to epistemology. Social theory now represents time not as linear but multidimensional, with cultural and socio-economic groups coexisting.

As mass media, international politics and the world economy cause the globe to appear to be shrinking, people are viewed as living in historical and cultural structures that conceptually locate and shape them (Freedman, 1994a). Mass media and computer graphics are creating a hyper-reality where life is viewed as mirroring fantasy rather than the reverse. This is reflected in statements like "That police chase was just like in the movies". As well, social groups previously
excluded from academic discourse have gained legitimacy and now contribute to the way culture is studied and understood.

Postmodern theorists do not begin their analysis with the traditional notion of a subject, but rather with a notion of the subject as part of lived culture or ideology. In an attempt to unearth oppressive elements in democratic society, the idea of deconstruction was developed by Derrida (1972) to expose assumptions, unpack existing structures and describe multiple meanings. This method of contextual analysis is used in, and serves as a discourse that bridges social theory and the visual arts.

Mass culture has enabled new forms of art to infiltrate the elitism associated with art, and build on boundary-breaking forms of pop art (the sixties), happenings, and mixed media with kitsch. Artefacts of the masses have entered the art scene. Postmodern artists are interested in surface, juxtaposition and illusion. Art is used as critique and social commentary with the environment often being the focus. "Masterpieces" are manipulated by computers to undermine modernist notions of self-expression and ownership and imagery and objects are recycled.

By the 1990s the feminist focus in art criticism had evolved into an examination of feminine sensibility, a female aesthetic seen to be necessary because of the qualitative differences in the way men and women perceived difference (Gilligan 1982, 1988). Discussion of the social construction of gender difference and the related question of representation was common. Representation was seen as a reflection of the culturally dominant ideology that constructed and reflected what it was to be female or male within a given culture.

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) contrasted female and male expressions and styles of discourse. The important implications of their findings were that teachers would need to assist females to develop their own "voices". This could be achieved by emphasising connection over separation and collaboration over debate, features of a philosophical inquiry approach. Garber (1990) identified three areas of philosophical inquiry to which feminist theory could contribute. They were: first, female sensitivity and feminist aesthetics; second, criteria for evaluating art; and third, viewer response and suggested classroom applications. Questions raised in these categories provoked critical thinking about art as well as new awarenesses and sensitivities.

From Danto (1981), whose theory was foundational for the interpretation of postmodern art, came the understanding that contemporary art was culturally, philosophically and historically developed. Teachers would need to approach it with this understanding. Thus, interpretation of postmodern art would be puzzling without consideration of its cultural, historical, and
philosophical contexts. Danto’s suggestion that aesthetic understanding was closer to intellectual action (cognition) than to sensory stimulation meant a new aesthetic stance had to be constructed. The date of this claim is significant. It preceded the DBAE curriculum which, as described previously, critics argued all but ignored the call for a new aesthetic stance.

Chalmers and Mullen (1990) stressed that even if socio-cultural understandings of art were missing in DBAE they should not be neglected by art curricula. They perceived a change occurring in approaches to studying art history, criticism and aesthetics and believed that art educators were beginning to address basic curriculum questions like "What art is of most worth?" and "Why?", and that these questions were increasingly answered in terms of cultural heritage. It did not have to be seen by teachers as too difficult a task. By broadly defining and socially contextualising an inclusive definition of art, a range of aesthetic meanings and objects, from modernist abstraction to household decorations, could be examined (1990, p. 189).

Because what was considered to be art was expanding, McFee (1991), like Garber (1992), believed the ability to use aesthetic criteria to symbolise values in human environments was crucial. McFee saw the role of art as being both a content area and learning tool for two main reasons. First, the visually descriptive image was becoming dominant over the written or spoken word, meaning people would need critical skills in order to decode imagery. Second, she believed art offered an opportunity to make qualitative decisions about the environment, and to critique political and other visual persuasions. She believed that these skills were crucial "for citizens in this age of multicultural democracy ..." (McFee, 1991, p. 75) and by developing these skills teachers could strengthen intercultural communication and respect.

For Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) deconstruction offered a means of valuing work other than historically and promoted the development of a language of teaching and learning that depended on the acknowledgment of the voices of others. They believed a postmodern conception of curriculum should involve interdisciplinary content, for example an analysis of the effects of mass media and electronic technology on representations of race, class and gender. This required a shift in the conception of knowledge in education and meant that critical assessment of methods of inquiry, teaching and learning as well as content would have to be included.

It would be necessary for the "building blocks" of curriculum to comprise "sets of issues, themes or cultural phenomenon rather than formal art vocabulary, art styles or canonical examples of art stripped bare of cultural contexts" (Garber, 1992, p. 222). Garber added support to the theorists who called for approaches like the puzzles of Battin et al. (1989) and the helpful role of the
philosophical inquiry approach voiced by Reed, Hagaman and Stewart at the Snowbird 11 Seminar in 1989.

The influential theorist Eaton (1994) wrote that considerations of cultural diversity had affected aesthetics only marginally. She asserted that the basic questions at the core of formalism like: What is aesthetic experience? and What’s the difference between good and bad art?, remained alongside the appeal of "art for arts’ sake". Eaton thought philosophy was more accessible to students when objects from their own cultural experiences were taken seriously. Some of the "old" questions Eaton believed were still relevant included: whether aesthetic value was wholly determined by shape, colour, etcetera; whether the aesthetic was influenced by psychological and political factors; and whether art’s value went beyond perceptual qualities isolated from other human experiences. By the mid 1990s a fact that could not be ignored by educators was that we carry "cultural presuppositions and predispositions" wherever we go (Eaton, 1994, p. 27).

Postmodernism replaced the idea of the productive inventor with that of the "bricoleur" who finds and rearranges fragments of meaning (Pearse, 1992, p. 249). Pearse believed art teachers were struggling to understand the implications this had for professional practice. Although contemporary students "the electronic, plugged in generation", were attuned to postmodernism, art educators had been slow to embrace it or even join in the debate.

As art education theory in the 1990s began to draw on the new sociological and literary theories and postmodern analysis, the questions imposed on art education that theorists and art educators had to confront included: Can we assume that a curriculum represents knowledge? How does instruction affect the knowledge being represented? Can teachers reasonably represent artists in other cultures, places or times? What would a postmodern conceptualisation of cognition look like? and, To what extent are student conceptualisations of curriculum "knowledge" different?

Both feminist and cultural critiques provide discourse for postmodern education. In terms of teaching and learning, beyond the belief that students learn in basically the same way and should be trained using "standard" approaches, is the need for teachers to adopt a postmodern perspective and recognise that socio-historical contexts construct educational conditions. While DBAE promoted a greater distinction between the boundaries of the disciplines of art history, criticism and aesthetics, postmodern theories blur the boundaries and blend them with other subject areas. In DBAE, criticism often focussed on professional critics’ views, and aesthetics was reduced to formalism and expressionism while notions of race and colour were injected into existing curricula instead of conceptualised as unstable, non linear and highly interpretative.
Advisers at *Snowbird 11* had warned that, without proper preparation of teachers to handle all the components of DBAE it would not be taken up. The importance of understanding postmodern art works and finding ways to do so was also crucial. They believed that teacher education held the key to preparing teachers to handle the inquiry approach.

A New Role For Art Education

Serious thought and systematic study of art learning problems should become a higher research priority in art education in order to determine how we can best prepare students to cope with these growing cognitive demands. (Koroscik, 1996, p. 18)

In 1994, the USA National Art Education Association Task Force expressed concern that arts curriculum documents almost exclusively described knowledge and skills to be imparted to students, rather than an appropriate context for learning. It concluded that poor utilization of curriculum guides was probably not due to unworthy course content, but because the means to aid teachers to implement the new curriculum were insufficient. The task force recognised it did not follow that, by simply reading a guide, teachers could teach the DBAE without some form of inservice training and concluded that:

... a curriculum guide that does not include mention of hands-on, inservice training program to explain its premises, its organisational system, its expectations vis-a-vis student/teacher/administration/parent relationships and responsibilities, and its method and emphases on evaluation is an incomplete document. (National Art Education Association, 1994, p. 6)

Jeffers' (1996) survey of Kansas art teachers attempted to discover whether the reforms in the US art education curriculum over the previous ten years had improved the status of art and/or the competencies of art teachers. She suspected that the DBAE had not addressed the issues that art teachers had previously identified as major impediments to their teaching. The philosophy behind the reforms had been that if the curriculum and status of art education were improved, then art teachers would obtain more support.

The findings revealed that pre-service and in-service professional development programs had little effect on the teachers' pedagogy over the past ten years. According to Jeffers (1996), regardless of their teaching experience, art teachers felt inadequate to teach art criticism, history and aesthetics. Given this, she asked:

When they say they need help in issues of funding and status, how will we help? Will we present yet another curriculum model or the next state-wide initiative? ... it appears that Discipline Based Art Education and its components have had little influence on the teachers' pre-service preparation and professional development. (Jeffers, 1996, p. 112)
Areas of concern identified by Jeffers were, on the whole, unchanged from findings of earlier surveys: i.e. lack of funding and curriculum (all groups); low status of art (new teachers); viability of art programs (mid-career & veteran) and lack of implementation of the two new state-wide initiatives - Quality Performance and Accreditation and Outcome Based Education. The study found that: "Significantly, teachers' ratings of their abilities to teach art criticism, art history, and aesthetics - DBAE components were remarkably consistent and relatively low" (Jeffers, 1996, p. 105).

The Getty Center had poured substantial funds into resources and teacher training during DBAE's inception and there were expectations that art education would change substantially. Despite the criticisms of DBAE voiced by some art education theorists, many had supported its content. Jeffers' findings had a profound impact on the researcher. Only 39% of teachers said they used criticism during art classroom critiques. Given a choice of definitions, 55% of the teachers surveyed described aesthetics as "perceptual awareness or sensitivity to beauty", while only 6% defined it as "learning about theories and philosophies of art", while the majority of primary and lower secondary teachers stated they were not inclined to use the term at all.

Few teachers possessed a full understanding of the term aesthetics. Jeffers wondered whether teacher educators were prepared for the results. Since the inception of the DBAE curriculum initiative, the Getty Institute (Los Angeles) and the National Art Education Association (Reston, Virginia) had been monitoring its success and providing support documents as difficulties were identified, but Jeffers' findings removed any reason for complacency about progress. Her study was prompted by the findings of Hobbs (1993) who found that studio courses still made up the majority of hours in the art room, although (as in the 1995 Australian curriculum documents) new curriculum emphasis had been placed on arts criticism, history and aesthetics.

Previous surveys of teachers in the late 1970s and early 1980s had indicated to art educators that teachers had inadequate space, equipment, budget and time for planning and scheduling classes (Jeffers, 1996, p. 101). Additional problems identified in her study included unruly or apathetic students and insufficient time for teachers to practise in their field or attend professional development offerings. However, nearly 80% of the teachers felt confident with their abilities to teach drawing and painting.

Jeffers noted that when teachers sought additional training they specified the following areas: computers (all groups), air brush (new- and mid-career), sculpture etc (new); painting, drawing, art history and aesthetics (mid-career); printmaking and new trends (veteran). Despite the low ratings teachers gave to their ability to teach arts criticism, history and aesthetics, only mid-career teachers
named one DBAE component, art history, as an area they would like to explore further and seek additional training. Teachers continued to see lack of funding and low status of art programs as the major issues confronting art education.

Jeffers concluded that DBAE content had limited relevance in terms of the Kansas teachers’ perceived needs for professional development (1996, p. 112). Her findings confirmed the theorists’ expressed fears at Snowbird II that teachers were not adequately prepared to incorporate the history and aesthetics components into their teaching.

In the same year, Koroscik (1996, p. 5) reported the findings of a study (Mims & Lankford, 1995) that found the average teaching time for art in the nation’s elementary schools was 50 minutes a week and out of this: 50% was studio production, 16% art history, 10% art criticism and 9% aesthetics. In clock hours per year that amounted to: 19 hours to studio practice, 4.5 to art history, 3 to art criticism and 2.5 to aesthetics. This study also revealed that a lack of time was a major barrier faced by art educators wishing to reduce or relinquish the use of a "transmission" teaching model and incorporate the philosophical inquiry approaches. More time, not less, was required to foster deeper thinking about art.

There was a need to build a more convincing case for art being an integral part of the school curriculum requiring an allocation of time, budget and personnel commensurate with that of other subjects. This could perhaps result if art was associated with cognition rather than self-expression. Jeffers believed discussion of questions like "What is art?" should be viewed as an asset, a "strength from which much critical thinking is stimulated and upon which powerful curriculum models are built" (1994, p. 97). Influenced by the writings of both Eisner and Greene in the late 1980s, she referred to the power of the arts to enhance cognitive development, to amplify critical cognition and sharpen views of the world. Jeffers’ surveys of pre- and in-service art teachers found their opinions on the purposes of art included: developing aesthetic or visual literacy, problem solving skills, divergent or higher order thinking, and promoting creativity and self-expression (1994, p. 87).

Jeffers thought it vital that both pre- and in-service art teacher education should include a critical examination of teachers’ views of the visual arts including the historical, philosophical and theoretical contexts in which these views were situated. She believed that art educators at all levels should be searching for meanings and clarify their understandings by asking questions about the purpose(s) of their role in the visual arts and how it related to the purpose(s) of education, the nature of their work and how it related to the nature of schooling in general (1994, p. 91). What was missing in Jeffers’ analysis was an explicit statement that teachers’ should be
trained to help their students to search for meanings and clarify their understandings by having them ask questions about issues.

The Impact Of Postmodern Theory And Practice

The enormity of the changes to the domain of art that had been occurring since postmodern theories began to be published must be stressed. Not only are long held views and traditional conceptions of what comprises art being questioned, but the domain of art now also encompasses literary, cultural and gender theories and it is interdisciplinary, with anthropological, philosophical and linguistic dimensions. Art teachers are also expected to link the study of visual art with dance and music. It is no longer sufficient for art teachers to develop an awareness and appreciation of art, they must further aim for their students to think critically about art and acquire deep (or higher-order) understandings. The multi-cultural and cross-cultural components of art curriculum have also grown (Chalmers & Mullen, 1990; Rizvi, 1994) as has the use of computers.

The role of computers in art demands careful consideration (Bowers, 1988; Thomas, 1998). Issues raised by their use include the citing of the work of art; for example is the art work the CD disk, the programming, or the experience? Other questions include What is the original? and Who is the artist - the designer, programmer or someone else? Although emerging computer technologies offer opportunities for reconceptualising educational experiences in the arts and other disciplines, few art educators are adequately prepared to meet the challenges the information age presents because they have not fully considered the cognitive consequences for their curricula and teaching practices. This includes increasing access to knowledge through telecommunications networks, interactive computers and audio- and video-recordings.

Postmodern questioning leads to analysis of how and why people create meaning and attempt to understand art. Rather than promoting consensus, postmodern inquiry uses conflict as a learning tool and requires discussions about issues of identity and interpretation. The newer accounts of understanding, for example hermeneutics, critical theory, feminist epistemology and post-structuralism, are what Van de Putte described as the "new aesthetics" 2 (1994, p. 9). While

---

2 The critiques of epistemology, foundationalism, essentialism, scientific realism and the like, that are associated with Thomas Kuhn, Richard Rorty, Michel Foucault, et al. suggest, among other things, that all concepts are open, that successful theories manifest (at least internally) value preferences of stakeholders, institutional values, and so on, just as successful art theories (abstract expression, for example) manifest the taste of critics (Clement Greenberg), market forces, and so forth. Wittgensteinian insights are further confirmed by, for example, Danto's use of the likes of Foucault, Rorty, and Germaine Greer and by Dickie's unconscious reinvention of some Heideggerian insights (Van de Putte, 1994, p. 9).
traditional aesthetics asked questions about what made one interpretation better than another, the new aesthetics asks how to adjudicate between conflicting interpretations. It also includes consideration of experience and choices made in the domain of values. Like many others, Van de Pitte believed DBAE did not address the new aesthetics that posed so many challenges for teachers. These limitations were a reflection of the real and fundamental problems with society’s understanding of postmodern art. Fearing that unless art teachers were trained in contemporary aesthetics they would pass on their own misinformed ideologies of art, Van de Pitte (1994, p. 5) offered a summary of the issues art education would need to address, including:

(a) concepts of art are neither precise nor unambiguous;
(b) there are no good reasons for privileging any theory over another;
(c) any art theory understood to be collected theories from past to present will contain internal contradictions;
(d) key terms in aesthetics are only definable by circular definitions;
(e) art works may be considered to be art as a matter of sanction, not logic; and
(f) it may be impossible to discover objective evaluative criteria for art.

The new aesthetics, she believed, effectively served one of DBAE’s chief objectives, that of developing students’ critical capacity through reflective analysis and judgment of artworks. In the 1990s, since the inception of DBAE, postmodern attention to cultural diversity had intensified. As well, there was a growing acceptance of the view that form and content were not separable nor were they easily distinguished from other forms of human concern like politics and religion. Artefacts like quilts, once displayed as decoration, were now displayed for contemplation as art.

Van de Pitte’s theory provided a good starting point for new curriculum content in the field of aesthetics. Accordingly, both teacher educators and school art teachers would need to include approaches that recognised that uncritically examined values associated with their own perspectives tended towards intolerance of other people’s perspectives. As well, an understanding that postmodern art made little or no sense in terms of traditional theories, for example the quest for “flatness”, was needed. Being more interdisciplinary, the new aesthetics obliges viewers to think of art in context and of the forces that determine whether someone is called an artist (Van de Pitte, 1994, pp. 9-12). Further, a new aesthetic awareness better serves one of DBAE’s chief objectives, that is, the development of a student’s critical capacity that is related to reflective analysis and judgment of artworks, as well as aesthetic histories, criticisms and theories.

Acknowledgment that the meaning of language is culturally specific is also important. It is no longer a matter of perceiving that one lacks the knowledge to answer the questions that aestheticians in one’s own historical tradition have raised. One also has to appreciate that very
different philosophical questions engage people operating within different cultures (Pearse, 1992). DBAE, although innovatory in its own right, has been overtaken by postmodern concerns.

As a result of globalisation, contemporary culture is now polarised around issues of ethnicity, race, gender and other differences in identity as well as a general bureaucratization of ideas. Postmodernism has broken down the categories of high and low art associated with modernism. Students need to understand how their own art work fits into the larger historical, cultural and theoretical contexts of art-making.

Efland, Freedman and Stuhr (1996) claimed that art education in the mid 1990s only marginally reflected postmodern perspectives. They challenged curriculum designers to examine the existing approaches to individualism and multiculturalism, believing the modernist idea of promoting individualism through self-expression or the acquisition of cultural knowledge should be challenged as an educational aim. As well, multicultural representation in the curriculum, they said, must be seen as necessarily fragmented and unstable. Concepts such as artefact, appropriation and cultural meaning, interpretation and critique needed to be discussed by students.

Garber (1992) believed that in order for teachers to be equipped to handle postmodern perspectives they would also need to be competent in the following areas:

(a) critical thinking about socio-cultural functions of art connected with issues relating to perception and evaluation of art;
(b) the examination of art comparatively and more inclusively to include non-canonical examples of women’s, folk, and the art of many cultures;
(c) the consideration of art as a multi-dimensional phenomenon rather than a linear or hierarchical one (as per Dissanayake, 1988); and
(d) a classroom teaching method that facilitated the above.

Following a study of teachers and their classes at controversial exhibitions, Jeffers and Parth (1996) concluded that:

... teachers who encouraged their students to confront, inquire into, and explore issues of controversy and/or censorship associated with contemporary art tended to assume a different and more inquiry-oriented pedagogical stance than those teachers who do not encourage such confrontations and explorations. (Jeffers & Parth, 1996, p. 27)

They found exposure to controversial contemporary art resulted in the students’ and teachers’ heightened awareness of controversial social issues, and new ideas, materials and processes. It also brought about perceptual and conceptual shifts. For some teachers, controversial
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contemporary art "presented pedagogical and curriculum opportunities to confront, question, explore and to act" (Jeffers & Parth, 1996, p. 27). Conversely, for others, it presented an opportunity to react or was confusing and possibly harmful to students.

Jeffers and Parth (1996, p. 26) posited some views about why art teachers might be reluctant to deal with controversial art. The reasons given were that the teachers were: disinterested in, or unprepared for, controversial issues connected with the arts; concerned about the "injurious" effects they might have on students and thus became censors. They also believed teachers shied away from contemporary art because it was unfamiliar to them and were therefore reluctant to introduce students to materials that they had not mastered.

However, other theorists believed postmodernism offered many classroom possibilities. Hart (1991) described research by psychologists and philosophers (including her own), that showed that young students could grasp the concepts of comparative, relativist aesthetics and understand that other art systems had different aesthetic criteria to the Western tradition. Studies had shown that students six and younger understood that others often used different reasons from themselves when judging pictures. Erickson (1995) found that seven-year-olds understood that aesthetic criteria were dependent on the artist and viewer. These findings lent support to the idea of introducing strategies like puzzles about art in the early years.

Aesthetics as a DBAE discipline had been the least integrated into classrooms because of its traditionally abstract and general nature; the lack of preparation in aesthetics of most art educators; and the typically dry, academic writing style of many aestheticians (Hagaman, 1990b). The approach preferred by feminist philosophers was the use of conversation as the most effective means of dealing with philosophical issues. This approach contrasted with the idea of the debate, the exchange of practical philosophical moves which, she believed, made it more appropriate for schools. Hagaman saw Lipman's community of enquiry approach as a suitable method for contextualising comparative aesthetics, and one possible solution to the myriad problems of devising curricula responsive to the concerns raised by feminist and postmodern scholars.

Drawing attention to the fact that most in-service and many pre-service art educators were unlikely to be well-versed in feminist concerns and scholarship, Hagaman stressed that university lecturers had the responsibility to deal with these issues in art education courses for teachers. This required a comprehensive curriculum that raised the concerns of feminist art critics for discussion. It was thus necessary for all aesthetic topics to be handled within specific contexts, not as abstract generalities, and in a conceptually open manner.
Eisner (1994), while not denying that social, political, economic and historical contexts enhanced perception of some aspects of a work of art, was concerned. He feared that art education might become little more than a "handmaiden to the social studies", with the trend being to "use works of art as instrumentalities not only to illuminate cultural issues, but to advocate a particular set of political values" (Eisner, 1994, p. 190). He expressed his concerns thus:

What are schools to do? Which values among groups are to be salient? ... And what does one do when values differences among these groups are irreconcilable? (Eisner, 1994, p. 190)

Despite the concerns expressed above, it appears art educators have an obligation to teach the new aesthetics, educate their students to critique the messages of commercially generated cultures and assist them to have confidence in their ability to make judgements about their own values and needs. Art programs will also need to include a study of the impact of art on the quality and meaning of life through history, design, criticism and cross-cultural analysis. This means removing the stereotype connected with individualised studio-based art preparation and identifying art as a central communication system requiring background research and theory as well as curriculum and instruction. McFee (1991, p. 81) asserted that the need for "qualitative and analytical visual literacy in a dynamic, mass-media dependent, multicultural democracy" could be obtained through the comprehensive study of visual art and design.

There was a strong link between the curriculum changes advocated by postmodern theorists, feminist writers, multi- and socio-cultural theorists and the claims about the methodological benefits of the Philosophy for Children approach made by theorists like Lipman and Reed and supported by Stewart and Van de Pitte, Haynes (1995), lending further support for a philosophical inquiry approach, believed that students who were able to discuss these issues in a non-threatening environment would develop deeper insight. With the boundaries between high and popular culture becoming blurred, postmodern art educators would also need to be versed in semiotics and methods for deconstructing social meaning. In the mid 1990s Freedman visited Australia and her message about postmodern perspectives made it clear that previous theoretical approaches in art education required urgent revision.

Art educators, philosophers and Philosophy for Children practitioners were claiming that a relatively simple way of introducing the new requirements, particularly the aesthetics strand, was via the philosophical inquiry method. The philosophical inquiry approach with its encouragement of critical inquiry into issues, fostered the dispositions being called for by postmodern theorists. As well, philosophical inquiry provided a context and structure within which the inquiry could occur. Specific teacher education to implement the new aesthetics was required. The view that a dialectic (or Socratic) method would serve to initiate students into philosophical understandings
presupposed that teachers had critical capacity themselves, were well schooled in the material, and adept at Socratic questioning. Van de Pitte recommended that "... the well-established Philosophy for Children curriculum should be carefully investigated to see whether it can make a contribution to the DBAE program" (1994, p. 12).

Incorporating The New Aesthetics Into Art Education

It is through aesthetics that the questions get asked, the controversies raised, and the values assessed that elevate the business of the arts from production and delectation to a thoughtful, influential force affecting and being affected by the rest of life. (Moore, 1994, p. 11)

By looking, reflecting, asking questions, and learning about historical and artistic practices, we increase the sensitivity of our minds - perceptually, emotionally, and conceptually. Looking more carefully, trying to understand these 'gut responses' with which the simple subjectivist wanted to rest content, doesn't stifle one's reactions, but rather enlivens and enriches both one's interest and responses. (Fengin & Subler, 1993, p. 66)

The inclusion of aesthetics as one of the four DBAE disciplines had found support in the late 1980s, but was seen as problematic. A major concern was how the aesthetics component could be addressed in schools. It appeared that, if arts education was to foster in students both critical thinking and inquiry into issues in the visual arts, then teachers would need to be confident and open-minded enough in their personal philosophy of art to use strategies like acting as "devils advocate" in order to prevent subjective opinion from becoming law. If one believed that aesthetics could be addressed through discussion of ideas about art, then its link with art criticism could be easily contemplated.

Theorists in the UK and USA in the 1990s built on the theories discussed earlier as they sought to help teachers to incorporate the new aesthetics into the art curriculum and overcome perceived difficulties in its implementation. The new aesthetics was reported to be too indefinite and problematic an area for teachers to include in their art room discussions. Although in theory the philosophical inquiry approach had wide theoretical support, it did not appear to be widely modelled in teacher education.

As discussed above, postmodern aesthetic theory challenges the theoretical structure of modernist formalism and the construction of meaning, and with its associated meanings for both individuals and society, it has become the major issue of contemporary art. Although deconstructionist, poststructuralist and semiotic postmodern theories are qualitatively different, they share a questioning of Modernist theories.

Poststructuralism gives primacy to language as a model for cultural reality. Perception and knowledge are modelled on the structure of language, not original to invididuals but culturally coded, for example the creation of false notions of reality for the benefit of one class over another (Risatti, 1990).
Wollcott (1996) believed much could be learned about the ways students make connections between art, their own lives, and the world, by paying attention to their narratives. She claimed that even though there was ample evidence of the postmodern perspectives in scholarly literature, in classrooms, the formalist theories and practices that had characterised the modernist period were still the most popular approach to teaching art. This was because abstract expressionist and many non-figurative works could be dealt with successfully by using modernist theories as a foundation for interpretation. However, contemporary art often involves performance and mixed media, is complex, and does not lend itself to formalist interpretation. It requires "a myriad of access points and interpretative responses" (Wollcott, 1996, p. 74). New approaches that enable students to broaden their experience and understanding are needed to aid the construction of their knowledge of postmodern art.

The knowledge referred to here is concerned with knowledge and meaning constructed in and through relationships among individuals, social structures and cultural artefacts (Hagaman, 1990b). Wollcott believed that by combining modern and postmodern interpretations teachers could avoid the limiting formalist concern. She stressed that unless interpretation was taken beyond formalist traditional questions of how the elements and principles of design related and functioned, students would be left to wonder about the content, and the possible relationship between the elements. Wollcott suggested that Danto’s theory of art provided a basis for interpretation of postmodern art as well as insights not possible with a formalist interpretation. Danto contended that aesthetic understanding was more intellectual action than a mode of sensory action. He believed that understanding contemporary art works required an "aesthetic stance" with an antecedent, a sense of philosophy, history and culture. Theorists like Wollcott hoped that the acquisition of this kind of knowledge would assist students to develop new ways of viewing the world, and also, would lead to students’ critical reflection on their own beliefs and values.

The implication for classrooms was that when choosing contemporary artworks that confronted students with problematic issues teachers would need to present the works in a more studied context. They would not only have to know something about the history and theories of art, but also about the art world in order to be able to teach about, and from, contemporary works of art.

Taylor (1991) reported the findings of a UK study (The Critical Studies in Art Education Project, 1981-1984) that explored the role and implementation of the teaching of art studies in secondary schools. An emphasis on practical work had meant that contemplative aspects of art education had virtually disappeared, leading to a reduction of verbal communication. The more reflective and contemplative aspects of the subject that helped students become more critically aware were lacking. Taylor believed there was a need for teachers to develop and clarify a range of approaches
that would assist their students to become more able to articulate ideas relevant to the arts, broaden their vocabulary and respond to works produced in a variety of eras and contexts, not solely from the viewpoint of western civilisation.

Taylor found that a critical studies approach in which student insights and interests were developed, was generally absent or only haphazardly applied in classrooms. He believed teachers lacked the skills needed to elicit these insights or interests and appeared to assume that students had no valid responses to offer. He attributed the reluctance of art teachers to engage in art history and appreciation to a fear that it would bore their students. Nevertheless, all the evidence from interviews with students made it clear to Taylor that they wanted both explanation and understanding. He believed that approaches that stimulated both teachers and their students would need to be found.

Taylor liked Brighton's proposal (in Taylor, 1991 p. 138), that the "English method", where an in-depth examination of a few pieces occurred, should be applied to the study of the arts. He suggested:

If this were done, it would be possible to study the arts from any culture, because the enquiry would proceed outwards from those works, rather than the majority of works of art past and present remaining irrelevant by being outside the immediate terms of reference. (Taylor, 1991, p. 138)

Brighton had found a consistent failure in art education to engage students in discourse about works of art and believed the consequence was that few had begun to acquire the basic vocabulary or communication skills for them to understand or appreciate artworks (in Taylor, 1991, p. 262).

It was clear to Taylor that teachers could help students articulate and communicate their own understandings and viewpoints by drawing on art history, criticism and formal analysis, as well as finding strategies to aid the focussing on one work of art. This would require:

... a concern with the act of looking - and allowing him or her to approach the work from a number of directions. ... The skilful teacher helps pupils to articulate their own understandings and communicate their viewpoints. (Taylor, 1991, p. 261)

The Critical Studies in Art Education Project had difficulty finding teachers who were using appropriate art-based vocabulary. This led Taylor to believe that courses which better equipped teachers to exchange ideas with their pupils should be offered. These might include the analysis of works in a gallery, where, through the skilful application of language more pupils than would otherwise be the case could learn to "read" works of art for themselves. Through this process, the skills of clarification and classification of appropriate vocabulary could occur.
Importantly, Taylor concluded that teachers needed to be aware that inquiry into art-related issues revealed pupils’ hidden cognitive capacities and involved both teachers and students in deeper conceptual analysis. For this to happen, he believed it was necessary for students to develop a critical language and for teachers to be equipped to bring this about. His conclusions mirrored the theorists in the USA who were calling for similar measures following the release of DBAE.

In the USA, Russell (1991) examined procedures derived from ordinary-language philosophy to find ways to help students investigate conceptual issues in aesthetics, the area in which he believed DBAE had not provided enough assistance at the level of practice. According to Russell, art educators and philosophers generally believed there were two ways of approaching classical and contemporary problems of aesthetics. They involved: (a) the examination of aesthetic theories and the application of these theories to specific examples of art and aesthetic objects, which Russell called the teaching of *philosophical perspectives*; and (b) a “case driven” approach where one began with specific puzzle cases about art and aesthetic objects that were used to develop insights into aesthetic issues and challenge aesthetic theories. This was described as *philosophical inquiry*.

Russell’s *philosophical perspectives* approach encouraged the exploration of answers to questions proposed by aestheticians from past and present traditions, for example, the nature of beauty and the aesthetic experience. This approach presented vantage points that included aesthetic theories (for example, Kant) and aesthetic principles (like the embodiment of the Tao in Chinese pictorial arts). Students would learn perspectives by studying examples that best represented those viewpoints. This approach, he explained, provided students with the depth and breadth of understanding of different vantage points as opposed to pondering aesthetic problems heuristically (1991, p. 94).

The *philosophical inquiry* approach centred around deliberation of philosophical issues in art. It encouraged the exploration of aesthetic questions, with or without knowledge of historical perspectives. For example, students might be given artistic puzzles that included aesthetic questions and brought historical perspectives to light (Battin, et al., 1989; Russell, 1991, p. 95). This model, using examples like the case of a chimpanzee that "painted", raised historical perspectives and questions about the nature of art and the formalist tradition. In addition, students could be taught specific principles of inquiry (for example, using counter-examples, Socratic questioning) traditionally employed by philosophers to answer aesthetic questions.

Russell believed student inquiry aided the development of independent thinking and the ability to evaluate answers to both their own and traditional aesthetic questions rigorously. The purpose of
the inquiry he advocated was critical reflection on aesthetic experience, not the experience itself. Like the postmodern theorists discussed earlier, Russell believed that art education in a multicultural and democratic society should include both the "perspectives" and "inquiry" approaches to teaching aesthetics, but believed the philosophical inquiry approach would be difficult for teachers.

Attempting to identify the principles philosophers employed in their inquiry (although not mentioning postmodern philosophers like Danto, Derrida or Bourdieu), Russell tried to organise these principles into a form that would be useful for teacher educators. Using the principles of philosophical inquiry derived from ordinary-language philosophy he discussed case delineation, concept comparison, and definition⁴ (Russell, 1991, p. 97). He believed these three procedures taught principles, such as the use of examples, that were at the heart of the analytical method, that were closely related by both means (use of examples) and ends (concept clarification), and facilitated learning by using examples that connected abstract thinking to concrete instances.

Russell’s experience of employing these procedures to teach principles of concept analysis to both students and adults had been encouraging. His view was that by identifying and comparing borderline cases and then contrasting them with contrary and model cases, the concept would be clarified. The use of examples was intrinsic to all Russell's procedures.

At the time of Russell’s article, art educators in the UK and USA had already proposed that philosophical inquiry be part of the art curriculum (Stewart at Snowbird 11, 1989; Fisher, 1990; Hagan, 1990a) and teacher-led dialogue was the favoured strategy of instruction in this model. Russell believed an important curricular issue was the appropriateness of these procedures for different developmental stages. He cited Lipman (1988) who, after twenty years of experience using philosophical inquiry, had suggested that children could improve their conceptual and reasoning skills significantly. Subsequent and recent studies, such as Sprod in Australia (1994) and Morehouse in the USA (Morehouse & Williams, 1998) have supported this claim. Russell believed the skills of philosophical inquiry were applicable to any subject area, but that research was needed into the effectiveness of such an approach to skill improvement in concept analysis at all educational levels. He called on future research to help by providing a clearer picture of which aspects of philosophical inquiry could be taught most successfully at different levels.

⁴ Case delineation: clarified a concept by sorting out and comparing different instances or cases. Concept comparison: clarified a concept by differentiating it from similar or closely associated concepts. Definition: clarified a concept by constructing and/or evaluating a definition of the concept according to specified criteria. (Russell, 1991)
Ten years after the Critical Studies in Art Education project, Hickman (1994), in the UK was still stressing that the fundamental issue in art education was to find ways of making art meaningful to students. Like Taylor (1991), he believed that to achieve this, the focus of art criticism and aesthetic response must be shifted back towards students so they would seek further experiences and actively participate in learning about art. In teaching, this would be reflected in focusing on students' initial reactions to art and using them as a starting point for the development of aesthetic understanding. His model was four R’s - reacting, researching, responding and reflecting. For Hickman, the reflect aspect "the fourth R" was particularly important because it referred to:

... what could be seen as one of the principal aims of art and art education: to present alternate ways of viewing the world; to aspire and elevate, and to challenge assumptions. (Hickman, 1994, p. 51)

In the early 1990s in the USA, art education theorists (Battin, 1994; Crawford, 1994; Moore, 1994; Parsons, 1994) were discussing the merits of inquiry via classroom discussions of art works. Feagin and Subler (1993) believed the philosophical inquiry approach was an antidote to subjectivism because it provided first-hand experiences with the arts in ways which showed students their perceptions could be educated and their emotions enriched. However, they believed notions of multiple interpretations and feminist deconstruction might only serve short-sighted self-interest if these approaches were interpreted by teachers as meaning that one did not have to bother to learn anything to appreciate art.

Parsons (1994) believed artworks should be the perpetual point of departure and return for the discussion of philosophical problems. One could not understand contemporary art, Parsons insisted, without some sense of theory and reference to the society it reflected. He was aware that his theory differed from Philosophy for Children's primary goal of developing logical reasoning, in that the abilities he was interested in had more to do with the stages of development in relation to aesthetics. He hypothesised five stages of awareness that contributed to understanding art. They were awareness of: the art work; the artist; the viewer; culture; and the conditioning of perception. According to Parsons, the motive behind promoting cognitive development in art was a principle of the pragmatist tradition that children were actively engaged in making sense of the society they were born into. In the arts this meant they should encounter conceptual difficulties about which they would have to develop theories in order to deal with them:

They may not become self-reflective, systematic, and argumentative philosophers and may not have explicitly formulated general views about art, but they will struggle to make sense of the art they encounter. They will have at least implicit theories about art. And they will probably change their theories as they encounter new types of art or as they develop significant new abilities. (Parsons, 1994, p. 37)
Parsons suggested two ways teachers could help students improve their implicit theories about art using an approach like Lipman’s community of inquiry. First, teachers would have to assist students to articulate and clarify their present theories. He conceded this was not easy as few students were presented with either the stimulus or the opportunity to state their views about art or consider the consequences of these views because the support structure was not established and insufficient time was made available (Parsons, 1994, p. 44). Second, he suggested the resources used by teachers should be provocative and stretch their students’ implicit theories, causing them problems, but not problems that were out of reach. He believed the puzzles’ approach (Battin et al, 1989) which required students to analyse or defend answers to practical problems the cases posed, was sympathetic to his theory and that students’ written work or talk could provoke each other’s interpretations and theories.

Erickson’s (1995) research had revealed that focused activities designed specifically to develop historical/cultural imagination in young children, led to an earlier understanding of arts-related issues than Parsons’ had claimed. Her study offered some support for the notion that very young children were able to understand how artworks reflected broad cultural ideas. She believed the study also provided evidence that students as young as Year 2 were able to consider artworks from the point of view of individual artists and viewers of the past. Erickson (1995, p. 27) recommended that further investigation be undertaken to assess skills like art historical interpretations before and after instruction. Her learning objectives were drawn from theories of both philosophers and educators and she supported the contention that philosophical inquiry would be a fruitful approach in art education.

Moore (1994) had also found that students contributed remarkably sophisticated conversations beyond what both he and their teachers had expected. The justification for the inclusion of aesthetics in the curriculum was already embedded, he said, because, as students experimented with new materials and art forms, they inevitably encountered the question of “What makes a thing art?”, the fundamental definitional issue in aesthetics. Other topics he believed suitable were: textual integrity, authenticity and originality, other cultures, troubling pieces and political, religious and moral contexts. It was pointless, he claimed, to introduce art history without the philosophical dimensions it entailed. He agreed with Crawford’s (1989) view that the dialectical quality of philosophical inquiry made it convenient for the teacher to conduct genuine aesthetic inquiry at various levels of complexity.

Crawford (1989, p. 238) believed that, although early grades were unlikely to discuss the concept of style in abstract philosophical terms, students could recognise and began to talk about similarities and differences in artists’ works from an early age. This sensitivity and verbalisation
would, in turn, form the basis for later, more sophisticated aesthetic inquiry into how we identify an artist's style and what we mean by terms like expressive, imaginative, or original. Because the philosophical inquiry method was dialectical, competing ideas could be compared, with the issues coming from literature, puzzles, or students' experiences. Crawford also advocated engaging students in Socratic-style dialogues, encouraging the reformulation of views that were then scrutinised by the teacher and class (1989, p. 237).

Moore (1994) described the text he co-authored with Battin et al. (1989) as an instance of where philosophers had presented aesthetic issues in a form art teachers and students could fathom rather than them being obscure treatises: "while dialogue is important, the key motivator of the dialogue is the poignant example ... that presents a puzzle"² (Moore, 1994, p. 55). They discovered that students loved puzzles and that their questions without obvious answers enabled teachers to seek the heart of aesthetic issues. They also found a probing attitude towards the arts could be instilled in very young students and that the "curiosity factor" elicited further questions about the facts. Moore stressed that teachers who chose to introduce aesthetics through puzzles needed to move the discussions along intelligently by using appropriate questions and know when to break off. As well they would need to be tolerant, willing to explore uncertain ground, to deviate from lesson plan expectations and be willing to say "I don't know" (1994, p. 57).

This approach meant a radical revision of most teachers' practice. It meant aesthetics could connect art with general instruction in critical thinking, perception and cognition and the postmodern perspective of dealing with the contest of values. For example, consideration of the rights of artists and the prospects of social constraints on public artworks could lead young students to engage in legal, social and political philosophy and induce them to take stands. Aesthetics, like the other areas of philosophy, demanded that ideas were weighed and tested against each other in a continuing reflective dialogue. It was, Moore stressed, the teacher's role to engage the thinking of the students by introducing inherently controversial issues: "The truly philosophical elements in art invite dialogue, critical reflection, give-and-take, and conceptual exploration" (1994, p. 15).

---

5 Puzzles could be easily adjusted to a variety of age and skill levels through reframing. They focussed on a particular intellectual target which changed as questions were asked. Moore used the example (1994, p. 59) of whether a piece of art in a gallery that no-one liked could be great art. Along the lines of Parson's levels of aesthetic development, Moore illustrated what he considered were suitable tasks:

- very young children could look at a series of works and say which they liked,
- older students could imagine they are asked to write a critical evaluation of the work which had been lent to a school. Should the fact that no-one at the school liked it affect their review?
- even older students could consider the case in the light of psychological, critical or political theories or in the light of arguments by Collingwood or Goodman.
Chapter 2  Review of the Literature

Battin (1994) claimed that when aestheticians explored aesthetic issues they either began with a theory - often about what art and beauty were - and attempted to apply it to specific cases, or with specific instances of art or beauty, and attempted to "subsume them under a theory" (1994, p. 92). She believed both approaches were boring for young people because:

... in either approach, aesthetics tends to be theory driven rather than driven to theory; the issues with which it is concerned are ... not issues made pressing by the subject matter itself. ... But if we pick and choose our theories as is convenient, what, exactly, have we learned from them about the works we use them to explore? Thus, aesthetics risks becoming boring, intellectually empty and dreary, because the ways in which it connects theory and artwork don't really tell us anything new. (Battin, 1994, p. 93)

However, according to Battin, when teachers used as a starting point cases that involved problems or dilemmas or quandaries where one first had to tease out the issues, the boredom was removed. Puzzles could introduce the ethical issues associated with the arts and, because they did not have easy solutions, they were intellectually challenging. Like Moore (1994) she believed that in order to interest the students in aesthetics, the teacher only needed to add stimulation in the form of a genuine puzzle (that did not depend on abstract terminology) that often contained a humourous element. Guidance in the form of "prodding" questions was also required (Battin, 1994, p. 89). Battin believed that when a student explored issues in this way with the help of a teacher, he or she was doing precisely what adult aestheticians did. Teachers would need to be able to handle the discomfort of there not being an easy answer. This presented another challenge for teacher educators.

Training in formalist art criticism was not helpful when attempting to understand the new aesthetics. Freedman (1994b) noticed that a focus on the social reconstruction of art education and other school subjects was emerging in teacher education programs and school programs as educators began to work together to develop new understandings. The future of art education, Freedman believed, would depend on teaching visual culture and interpreting social issues, such as those concerning gender. In order to achieve this, teachers would need to deliberately teach critical analysis, emphasising the analysis of visual messages, as well as the formal and technical qualities that enabled those messages. She was disturbed at her findings in a 1995 study that most students surveyed did not want to deconstruct art works and they interpreted advertisements the way the maker intended, rather than critically or from a personal perspective. This pointed, she believed, to the need for teaching critical analysis from the early years of schooling.

6 She used an example (Battin, 1994, p. 90) to show how the puzzles approach made aesthetics 'fun': 'A painter painted an all chartreuse coloured canvas which is hung in a Museum of Modern Art in the name of an art dealer. Has the art dealer been insulted? How?"
Freedman, speaking at The National Art Institute of Australia Conference (Wollongong, 1998) said she believed the consequence of the above should be that inquiry-based questioning became the basic approach to art appreciation. This was because postmodernism required the investigation of representations of reality with an understanding that responding to art involved both cultural and personal interpretation. The need to create a safe classroom environment for analysing visual culture so that students of all ages could understand that multiple interpretations could be enriching was seen as an integral part of this. Freedman believed that teaching students to critique by sitting them in a large group that faced the objects being discussed objectified commentary. Having students take part in small group or paired critiques, on the other hand, was less threatening because it was more intimate and utilized a conversation style that was more comfortable, particularly for many girls (1994, p. 168).

Freedman’s descriptions of classroom dynamics resembled the philosophical inquiry model and the five major concepts of postmodernism (paraphrased below) that Freedman outlined (The University of Melbourne, July, 1996), provided a sound basis for teacher education curriculum content:

a. Social and cultural dimensions are an essential part of aesthetics and the role of the teacher is to analyse art within this context.

b. Change is complex. It often reflects cultural positioning, for example, environmentalism.

c. Concepts such as democratisation and pluralism mean we are not focussing on elements and principles of art, as in the past, but on meaning and there is an intermingling of artist and culture.

d. Truth and values (including aesthetic values) are not standard or absolute. There are conflicting ideas in definitions of knowledge.

e. Multiple interpretations are constructed by the viewer through their experiences.

The rapidly emerging computer technologies were viewed by Freedman as an opportunity for students to learn to deconstruct by appropriating and creating new learning.

Perkins (1994) described "reflective" intelligence as the "mindful self-management and strategic" side of thinking that encourages one to think broadly and adventurously when considering art and artistic concepts. This description provided a missing link between the philosophical inquiry approach where the role of language was vital, and paying attention to art works. Perkins' reflective intelligence required the viewer, in order to think intelligently about art, to develop commitments and strategies for giving thinking more time and thinking in organised ways. He used the phrase the intelligent eye to describe this process.
Because works of art demanded thoughtful attention and also connected with social, personal and other dimensions of life that had "affective overtones", Perkins believed that art provided a context well suited to cultivating thinking dispositions. The intelligence of Perkins' "intelligent eye" required more than experiential intelligence. By cultivating awareness of our thinking, asking good questions, and using appropriate strategies, experiential intelligence could be steered in fruitful directions. Experiential intelligence was, he believed, the base for reflective intelligence. He claimed that by looking longer and in more refined, informed and systematic ways, one could see what was at first missed. Encouraging people to dig deeply into what they knew and reason about what they perceived helped them to come to some specific, articulated, well-evidenced conclusions about the work and the viewer's experience of it.

He also believed speech could change perception. Because with postmodern art there was often little in the work to assist possible interpretations, part of the experience of the work was how it puzzled the viewer and discussions that accompanied this uncertainty. His approach "celebrated broad principles of reflective intelligence" (Perkins, 1994, p. 78) based on experiential intelligence. The following features of art that Perkins believed made it a supportive context for reflective viewing (paraphrased and explicated by the writer) were:

1. **Sensory anchoring:**
   There was a physical object on which to focus and talk about. It provided an anchor for prolonged exploration.

2. **Instant access:**
   The presence of the work meant any point of argument could be checked and new ideas sought by looking closer.

3. **Personal engagement:**
   Works of art were made to draw attention and sustain reflection. Reactions are varied.

4. **Dispositional atmosphere:**
   Examination of art can assist in the cultivation of thinking dispositions - for example broad attitudes. Given time, one could think broadly and adventurously.

5. **Wide-spectrum cognition:**
   Thinking about art not only requires the exercising of pictorial and spatial perceptions, but also other kinds of cognition, such as visual processing, analytic thinking, posing questions, testing hypotheses and verbal reasoning.

6. **Multi-connectedness:**
   Rich connection-making is encouraged, for example, social and cultural themes, philosophical conundrums, aesthetic concerns, personal anxieties and insights, historical patterns, science and mathematics and trends of our times.
Accordingly, increased looking time, keeping engagement with a piece and then making one's looking broader and more adventurous provided an effective way of encouraging philosophical reflection around art works. Perkins' method of looking for the meaning, surprise, mood and motion of a work, and then reflecting on the puzzle it contained as well as reviewing what has been discovered, provided teachers with an effective way of assisting students to look longer and harder at a piece. It also led to the discovery of others' perceptions of the same work and meant a group would reflect on the multiple interpretations of a piece whilst examining technical aspects (Perkins, 1994, p. 21). For example, hearing someone describe Oldenberg's Clothespin (1974, in Perkins, 1994, p. 18) as a couple embracing, changes other perceptions of that piece forever. So, for Perkins, thinking deeply involved both the exercise of logic and the application of knowledge.

In the late 1980s Feldman's criteria for examining an artwork and Broudy and Silverman's "aesthetic scanning" strategy (in Broudy, 1987, pp. 52-55) had focussed on specific characteristics of the art and organised the viewing process in terms of the: (i) sensory properties (shapes, lines etc), (ii) formal properties (how the elements achieved unity), (iii) expressive qualities (meaning, feeling), and (iv) technical properties (medium, technique). Perkins' dispositional approach added mental moves and made looking reflective. According to Perkins, the difference between his approach and theirs was that the dispositional strategy aimed "at a rich and intelligent encounter with a work of art more than a thorough analysis" (1994, p. 78). Although it might be argued Perkins' approach was essentially modernist, it emphasised both the reflective and cognitive dimensions and the multi-connectedness possible through thinking about art.

Like Taylor (1991), Walsh-Piper (1994) believed galleries provided a suitable forum for discussions. The museum educators' role thus became that of increasing student understanding by assisting them to separate and distinguish emotional responses from facts, explain personal interpretations of the work and develop self-awareness of the process of responding to a work of art. The museum educators will have to take an active role in providing modelling of the skills teachers will require. The idea that participation in active discovery is intimately connected to the general increase of knowledge was similar to Howard Gardner's stress on "hand-on" museums as an excellent model for teaching and learning (1997).

Teachers wishing to incorporate the new aesthetics into art education would need to be serious and thoughtful. They would need to develop the sort of curricula that would lead students to increasingly sophisticated levels of philosophical skill and thought. This would require specifically designed professional development.
Strategies For Teaching The New Aesthetics

Many of the theorists above offered strategies that teacher educators could employ when assisting classroom teachers to foster engagement in the new aesthetics in art education. Briefly they were:

1. Taylor's *critical studies.*
2. Russell’s *cases.*
3. Hickman’s *Four R's.*
4. Parsons’ development of implicit theories.
5. Erickson’s developmental theory.
6. Battin et al.'s *puzzles.*
7. Freedman’s *social reconstruction.*
8. Perkins’ *intelligent eye.*

If one added Philosophy for Children’s philosophical inquiry approach to the above, these theories either offered a sound rationale or provided a range of strategies for teacher educators to incorporate in professional development or pre-service training of art and generalist teachers.

The key elements of these theories that could be incorporated into the training of art educators can be summarised as follows:

1. **From Taylor:**
   - developing student interests and insights by applying strategies that encourage in-depth exploration of a few pieces,
   - engaging students in discourse encouraging the use of appropriate art vocabulary,
   - practising the skills above at galleries in front of a few selected works,
   - employing the inquiry approach to discover students’ "hidden" capacities and engage in deeper conceptual analysis.

2. **From Russell:**
   - applying philosophical perspectives and inquiry models,
   - using puzzles, counter-instances and Socratic questions,
   - engaging in critical reflection through "cases",
   - applying the inquiry model at all developmental stages,
   - using examples to connect abstract thinking to concrete instances.
(3) **From Hickman:**
- shifting the focus to student inquiry via "Four R's" - reacting, researching, responding and most importantly reflecting.

(4) **From Parsons:**
- developing students' implicit theories by establishing classroom support for inquiry,
- using provocative resource materials.

(5) **From Erickson:**
- involving very young students who can appreciate both artist's and viewer's perception,
- investigating the role of cultural perspectives and conditioning of perception.

(6) **From Battin and Moore:**
- using puzzles about art that did not rely on knowledge or terminology,
- assisting teachers to handle the discomfort of more than one answer to sophisticated dilemmas,
- providing teachers with questioning skills to move discussion along and explore uncertain ground.

(7) **From Freedman:**
- using inquiry and critical analysis,
- recognising the need to focus on the social reconstruction of art,
- engaging students in face to face discussions and small group critiques.

(8) **From Perkins:**
- exploring the notion of the intelligent eye that develops as a result of reflective intelligence and giving "looking" time,
- making looking broad and adventurous, clear and deep and organised.

**Australian Support For Inquiry Approaches In The Visual Arts**

In the late 1990s in Melbourne a new dimension to the area of this study was emerging. Education Officers at both state and local art galleries (for example The National Gallery of Victoria, The Contemporary Art Museum, Heide Museum of Modern Art) were required to assist teachers to implement the CSF (1995) and the revised version to be released in 2000. Their role was to develop discourse about art works, and they needed new strategies that assisted teachers and the general public to tackle the demands of postmodernism. The approaches the theorists above were advocating entailed changed roles for not only teachers and students, but also for the gallery officers. Apart from their grounding in art theory and history and knowledge about the context, being able to facilitate inquiry and assist students to engage in dialogue about representations, deconstruction, social reconstruction and other postmodern issues was required.
Too often in the arts, particularly the visual arts, the child's personal expression is treated as an end not a beginning. It will probably be given the undeserved accolade of 'creativity'. No serious attempt to develop vocabulary or control over the language of art will be undertaken. (Andersen, 1981, p. 44)

This section surveys the Australian theoretical influences on, background to, and support for, the belief that the philosophical inquiry approach would cater for the requirements of the Aesthetics and Art Criticism substrand of the national and Victorian curriculum documents of the mid-1990s.

Art education in Australia in the 1980s, as in the USA and UK, was either through non-directed self-expressive activities with the focus on "creativity", or, alternatively, highly directed activity. Teachers seemed to assume that studio practice aided the understanding of the sensory, formal and expressive qualities of the arts.

Emery (1979) stressed that the acquisition of aesthetic knowledge and the ability to handle aesthetic topics and make aesthetic judgment were as important as the ability to express feelings about works of art. Andersen (1981) viewed these skills as basic to art education and believed, as did Lipman and his supporters, that the development of higher levels of artistic literacy might be achieved if students were taught analytical and critical skills. Andersen's advocacy for a scientific approach to arts education provided practical advice:

... to articulate their understanding of the phenomenon, validate their judgements by offering observable evidence from the object or events, and to apply this knowledge to a new situation in a way that demonstrated ability to handle scientific concepts, [then] the critic would be totally won over. (Andersen, 1981, p. 10)

Andersen noted that when teaching science, no-one would assume it could be taught without background knowledge, discussion and investigation. He advocated an approach in the arts that focussed on the student's ability to understand and appreciate rather than make or perform. His recommendation that an arts program should provide students with the knowledge and skills to understand and appreciate the arts within an historical and cultural perspective, could be interpreted as an early Australian reflection of emergent postmodern thinking. More than ten years prior to the National Profiles and Statements curriculum documents (1994), Andersen recommended that art teacher education, both pre- and in-service, would need to include curriculum models for aesthetic education in order to provide teachers with the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to effect change.
Ten years before Lipman's community of inquiry model was applied to the arts in Australia (Emery and Wilks, 1994; De Haan, 1995) Andersen advocated that teachers give their students the opportunity to have "encounters" with works of art using the kind of "talk" that provided both the support and acceptance of individual responses. Having the students articulate their understanding was, he believed, the starting point. He believed "talk" aided: the cultivation of specific interest, the heightening of the response, the capacity to articulate the acquired understanding, discussions about perception, the development of critical faculties, and the ability to apply the learning to other situations, adding: "the fact that it is difficult is no reason to avoid it" (Andersen, 1981, p. 14). He also called for research into effective teaching strategies for aesthetic education saying more than lip-service to the importance of the arts in the curriculum was needed.

Andersen described how this could be achieved, first, by demystifying the aesthetic and placing it squarely within the responsibility of all teachers, and second, establishing the contribution that aesthetics, as a conceptual philosophical study, could make to aesthetic education (1981, p. ix). These two points were consistent with the guiding principles for this study. As well, Andersen's stated role for an arts program provided an insightful and desirable summary. Although Andersen was more concerned with aesthetic judgement and valuing rather than aesthetics as philosophical inquiry, he believed an arts program should: (a) cultivate interest in aesthetic knowledge as well as training the senses; (b) concern itself with objects and events from nature and the applied arts as well as Fine Arts; (c) provide analytical and critical skills in relation to the aesthetic; (d) provide a social, cultural and historical perspective for an understanding of the arts; (e) develop the capacity for making aesthetic judgments and establish criteria for aesthetic value; and (f) offer experience in establishing an ensemble of values for making aesthetic judgements about works of art (Andersen, 1981, p. 20). He believed that the above would develop art literacy and thus assist art to be considered part of the core curriculum. Using the six points above as guidelines, existing arts programs could be modified to emphasise understanding and appreciation of works of art rather than production.

In the 1980s, art programs were trying to justify their place in the core curriculum without re-appraisal, re-structuring or re-assessment of the preparation of teachers. Stress was still on the expressive, not the reflective, and due to the impact of the cognitive development theory of child art, creativity was still the major aim of the arts curriculum. Low status was attributed to the arts by administrators (Andersen 1981, p. 36).
Introducing Philosophy To Teaching The Visual Arts

The philosopher Maxine Greene (responsible for the Lincoln Institute's support of the DBAE curriculum in the USA), influenced Parrott, a significant Australian art educator in the 1980s. At a Gifted Children's national conference in Melbourne in 1983 she quoted Greene:

To do philosophy in the domain of artistic-aesthetics is to think about one's thinking with regard to the ways in which engagements with the arts contributes to ongoing pursuits of meaning and efforts to make sense of the world. ... It is, moreover, to examine the possibilities of making available the kinds of insights, the ways of proceeding that might enable students to develop a discriminating and aware apprehension of created things, objects and events. (Greene, 1981, in Parrott, 1983 p. 352)

Parrott (1983) believed that not only was it essential to develop the individual's ability to engage in philosophical thinking and dialogue, but also that aesthetics was the most appropriate way it could be achieved. This conclusion was the result of her work with primary school children and pre-service teachers. She supported Lipman's view that the dialogue involved when engaging in philosophy was possibly the best way of encouraging language acquisition, the logical exploration of concepts, developing perceptive awareness and fostering the ability to find meaning in experience.

According to Parrott, the visual arts field was "finally", in 1983, acknowledging the importance of talking about art. She noted the shift in emphasis that had led to the DBAE art curriculum in the USA, particularly the development from naive to sophisticated learnings in the role of artist, art historian, art critic and aesthetician (Clark & Zimmerman, 1986). Parrott believed aesthetics was fundamental to the above roles and argued that the nature of aesthetics in connection with art should be considered in the light of Ecker's (1973) five levels of inquiry.

Ecker believed that students should be encouraged to talk about art, talk about their talk, be critical of art objects and events and reflect on the nature of the act of criticism. In his five levels of aesthetic inquiry, the language at the higher level referred to inquiry at one or more levels below it. He described this as the "criterion of referential adequacy" claiming that it was this...

---

7 Fifteen years later her view had not changed. (Personal communication at the Australian Institute of Art Educators conference, Wollongong University, NSW, 1998)
8 Ecker's (1973) claim was that, when children's powers of imagination and curiosity were unrestrained, five levels of inquiry could be identified:
   1. creating and appreciating art (production),
   2. criticising art (criticism),
   3. challenging or supporting the judgement of others (meta-criticism),
   4. theorising about the nature of art and criticism, (theory) and
   5. analysing theories and arguments (meta-theory).

Parrott believed it was important to understand the concept of the criterion of referential adequacy because it ensured that any worthwhile inquiry would be grounded in a firm foundation at a lower level. She also believed that it was vital to understand how art works, history and criticism, as well as the roles of the artist, art historian and art critic, were the ultimate referents for aesthetics and the aesthetician. This was the theoretical foundation of Parrott's classroom work that started, in each case, with works of art.

Lipman et al. (1980, p. 31), when describing the theoretical underpinnings of the Philosophy for Children movement, had intimated that involvement with philosophy enabled children to "preserve their natural sense of wonder, their readiness to look for meaning and their hunger to understand why things are the way they are". Parrott (1983) believed the transcripts taken during her research supported this view. The transcripts showed, she claimed, that children were involved in aesthetic inquiry and could understand one another, communicate their ideas in a non-threatening situation, and were prepared to listen thoughtfully to others while giving evidence of their own perceptiveness.

Like the theorists discussed earlier in this chapter, Parrott disputed Piaget's claim that children could not reason properly. She referred to the Philosophy for Children approach as a learning, rather than a teaching method, where the teacher, as talented questioner, elicited maximum participation from the group so that dialogue built. She acknowledged this was not easy and stressed that: "If children are to be involved in authentic work in the classroom, then they must be encouraged not only to want to know but also to think about how to know" (1983, p. 353), a task that she believed her classroom research had proven possible.

The visual arts possess an unlimited supply of examples of works of art which form the basis for discussion of aesthetic issues. Parrott advocated that discussions might commence with:

... a consideration of a work of visual art as an object to be appreciated or criticised, or as an historical or cultural artefact, or in the context of an object of beauty as a candidate for 'enlightened cherishing'. (Parrott, 1983, p. 353)

Important for this study was her belief that discussions about artistic topics could involve students, not only in discussing particular objects, but also becoming aware of the experience of discussion (Ecker's meta-theory, 1973), and the value of the work of art within this experience - i.e. an aesthetic discussion.
There was, however, little evidence that Parrott's enthusiasm about this approach influenced the practice of Australian art educators. The lack of guidance in curriculum documents available at the time, together with what Andersen (1981) had claimed was a lack of adequate teacher education, may have been partially responsible.

Critical Thinking And Arts Education

Ten years later, Boyd, a Queensland art teacher educator, spoke at the Fifth International Thinking Conference (Townsville, 1992). Influenced by USA critical thinking theorists, Boyd asserted that art teachers should be ensuring there was development of logical and rational thinking when their students engaged in the artistic process. She demonstrated ways the visual arts could enhance and develop higher order thinking. She believed the visual arts had been carelessly discarded as a "frill" subject of the curriculum, and that careful and sequential instruction that addressed thinking skills was needed. Emphasis on the art product, she said, implied it was more important than experiences gained through participation in the art making process. What was missing, she believed, were thinking skills such as imagination and inventive problem-solving that were "not just concerned with developing subjective action through feeling, sensing and intuiting" (Boyd, 1994, p. 217).

Like Parrott, Boyd (1994, p. 227) believed the teacher needed to be both the motivator and the manipulator of the contexts and the setting. As well, student curiosity was a major motivation for learning, and asking "why?". Like theorists such as deBono (1985), Howard Gardner (1989), Langrehr (1997) and the Philosophy for Children practitioners, Boyd believed that thinking skills could be improved, but they "needed to be taught and practised to more effectively and efficiently organise and manipulate thinking" (1994, p. 219). 9

The common language of art making, such as beauty, grace, harmony, balance, and ugliness demonstrated, according to Boyd, only one aesthetic mode of discourse. She believed the other kinds of thinking, also associated with the cultivation of aesthetic judgment and which extended interpretation included: receptivity to the sensory qualities of the world; intuitive, global thinking; analytic, linear thinking; attention to fine nuances, and the ability to cope with ambiguity (1994, p. 218). Boyd believed that aesthetic sensibility, an under-developed skill in

9 Boyd drew attention to the possible wide applicability of the following domains:
(i) the use of creative or inventive abilities, (ii) finding expression of histories in our culture, (iii) encouraging the development of critical, problem-solving and meta-cognitive skills, (iv) enabling understanding of oneself, human endeavour and the natural world, (v) building self-confidence, and (vi) a belief in the value of individual and informed responses. (1994, p. 218)
most education programs, led to critical thinking, and that both were necessary for making crucial decisions about many social and environmental issues confronting contemporary society.

Boyd claimed that once it was recognised that the visual arts developed cognitive skills, art teachers could concentrate on providing aesthetic experiences beyond seeking knowledge and would move visual arts thinking into the category of higher order thinking skills (HOTS). She referred to Eisner’s belief that problem solving was a largely untapped area in education, and, like Howard Gardner, she believed that although verbal-linguistic and logico-mathematical thinking (or intelligences) were valued, the development of perceptual skills, or thinking through sensory images, was inhibited in schools.

Although art educators provided learning environments that encouraged HOTS, Boyd thought they failed to capitalise on their studio work space as being an "enriched thinking environment". She described three categories or competencies of thinking skills in the arts: Art Making, Aesthetic Perception and Evaluative Reflection (1994, p. 219), that provided a way of exploring and analysing links between artistic competencies and artistic thinking.

Although one might challenge the choice of thinking skills listed under each heading (see Table 1 below) they provided a wide range of HOTS that were, or could be, employed in the visual arts. Listing such competencies could be produced as evidence of the visual arts’ contribution to the curriculum and to learning, particularly the domains of problem solving, creative thinking, metacognition, and critical thinking. The table contained thinking skills required by, and employed during, engagement with art, providing evidence of the visual arts’ contribution to the development of HOTS.

Table 1: Boyd’s Categories Of Artistic Thinking (1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art making</th>
<th>Aesthetic perception</th>
<th>Evaluative reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discovering</td>
<td>observing</td>
<td>reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>producing</td>
<td>selecting</td>
<td>criticising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing</td>
<td>visualising</td>
<td>reflecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulating</td>
<td>applying knowledge</td>
<td>comparing outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimenting</td>
<td>[c]evaluating</td>
<td>analysing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagining</td>
<td>hypothesising</td>
<td>contextualising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk-taking</td>
<td>discriminating</td>
<td>assessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organising</td>
<td>validating</td>
<td>appraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicting</td>
<td>adapting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliberating</td>
<td>refining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inventing</td>
<td>intuiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving &amp; creative thinking</td>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem solving in the arts was believed by Boyd to empower students because learning to think required practice in taking control of their own thinking and having to make choices. Another factor stressed by Boyd, like the postmodern theorists, was the need for teachers to be aware that students’ frames of reference\[^{10}\] impinging on their problem solving and that knowledge, beliefs and experience all influenced interpretation and understanding. Boyd also stressed that, in order for problem solving to occur, open channels of communication and acceptance were required. At the time of the Thinking conference (Townsville, 1992) Boyd was unaware of the Philosophy for Children movement. Her work, however, provided many of its supporters in Australia, not familiar with Hagaman’s work in the USA, with a new curriculum area for philosophical inquiry. Since becoming familiar with the community of inquiry method, Boyd believed it provided a model that fostered the exploration of ideas she had advocated (personal communication, Australian Institute of Art Educators, AIAE conference, Cairns, 1996).

Boyd believed metacognition was integral to aesthetic perception because it enabled students to go beyond the specific thinking required for a particular task and to examine, analyse or evaluate it. Although aesthetic perception was verbalised, aesthetic inquiry into complex issues was not demonstrated in her examples that illustrated metacognition associated with art production and appreciation. Boyd thought Aland and Darby’s four stage plan for analysis of art (1991, p.9, see Table 2), developed from Feldman’s (1970) model - description, analysis, interpretation, judgment - was a good starting point for critical thinking involved in the analysis of art works. It was the model used by nearly all Victorian teachers and formed the basis of arts criticism approaches in both the National and Victorian arts curriculum documents. Darby and Aland’s texts were still being widely used in most Victorian secondary school art departments in the late 1990s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What can you see?</td>
<td>What compositional aspects can you comment on?</td>
<td>What do you think the work means?</td>
<td>Do you think the work is successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What else can you see?</td>
<td>How has the work been planned and designed?</td>
<td>What messages do you think the artist is trying to convey?</td>
<td>Do you like the work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the art work been made?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What materials and techniques have been used in the process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{10}\] At the end of the 1990s, prior to the CSF review in Victoria, the only Australian state to have grappled with issues of postmodernism in its arts curriculum was New South Wales with its Frames of Reference document.
This model did not explicitly encourage metacognition, the more philosophical level of cognitive activity valued by advocates of philosophical inquiry. Greater philosophical depth could have been achieved had, for example, Susan Gardner’s second why (1995) been added to Aland and Darby’s questions. Despite the above, Aland and Darby’s ongoing contribution to critical thinking and the visual arts was their insistence that students needed to develop their own values and opinions, develop the ability to analyse, interpret and compare different images and be able to respond aesthetically to their environment and its everyday objects and experiences, including those not traditionally acknowledged to be artworks. They also believed it was important to recognise that artistic concepts developed at different rates. Because students learned and expressed in different ways - some being skills oriented, others expressive - both should be valued by the teacher. It was also important that cultural differences were incorporated into teaching techniques.

Marsh (1994, pp. 33-42) developed and trialled what she believed was a new approach to visual arts materials using what she described as a postmodern framework, one that “defines ‘difference’ and presents disputed claims” (1994, p. 33). She believed this would assist student and teacher personal and critical responses to contemporary artworks and the understanding of artworks in their broader cultural contexts. The teaching model Marsh employed was based on Brown and Palinscar’s “Reciprocal Teaching” model (1989), popular with educators trying to incorporate critical thinking approaches into their teaching. In her adaptation of their model, interaction occurred between art works, teachers and students. It was hoped that with practice, students would internalise the practice of personal response to artworks (Marsh, 1994, p. 35). She believed that students would be more critical of their subjective position and of artistic contexts if they could explain or discuss conflicts of values in artwork in a broader cultural context.

In Marsh’s project, the deconstruction of artwork via personal response was not a goal in itself, but rather a framework through which meanings could be interpreted. She wished to take students beyond the personal response model into social theory that she claimed enabled the student to understand the function of the artwork. Marsh acknowledged the influence of the postmodernist Habermas’ belief that a critical science approach should be used to extend the student knowledge to broader cultural contexts. To Aland and Darby’s four stage analysis model, Marsh added the “reciprocal” teaching environment, the theoretical basis of which was provided by Piaget and Vygotsky (1962a). It was described by Marsh (1994, p. 35) as an “expert-led co-operative learning procedure” that provided an introduction to group discussion techniques. The teachers main functions were: (i) modelling: verbal demonstration, (ii) coaching: facilitation of verbal responses, (iii) scaffolding: reinforcing student responses by praise, and (iv) fading: students’
interacting more with the text. Support for the verbal contributors and a social setting appropriate for testing attitudes and beliefs were expected to result from this approach.

Marsh (1994) described her research which required secondary art teachers to act as facilitator/collaborator for the students in a reciprocal learning environment. The teachers were expected to extend the personal response process by applying evidence of artwork to broader cultural contexts in a critical response model. Crucial to the success of the sessions was the relevance of artworks to the students’ world and the teacher’s capacity to act as a catalyst for the research into other artwork:

It is she who will handle the demands of language, of class group dynamics and directions the research might follow. ... But for teachers with a need for closure ... to have clear cut defined meanings emerge, this program’s progress will have frustrations and provide insecurities. ... The initial responses will be personal and sometimes bizarre. But they will also be refreshing, original and direct. The teacher can guide students to broaden their views. (Marsh, 1994, p. 39)

Teachers reported initial resistance to participation by their students, leading Marsh to conclude that changing the frame of a student’s viewing was difficult. The teachers interpreted the program differently, according to their training, experience, beliefs and expectations. Her research showed that the teachers, as facilitators, were unable to provide the scaffolding the students required because of inadequacies in their training. Marsh referred to the National Profile’s (1994) recommendation that teachers engage their students in critical study. She concluded that teachers were in need of assistance and resources to help them teach its requirements. Her recommendation was that resources such as the reciprocal teaching approach to postmodern works could assist this requirement but that it needed to be further developed and trialled.

Reid (1995) claimed that with one or two exceptions, art history was being taught in Australian schools without a critical interrogation of the social context that provided its context and meaning. She found, as had Marsh (1994), that analysis of specific works was usually confined to a description of formal properties. If reference was made to social and cultural factors that might have influenced a work’s construction it was mentioned without questioning whose interests might be served by such visual representations.

Three principles were believed by Reid (pp. 9-13) to form the basis of a socially critical model that would "deconstruct the dominant ideology and gendered relations" that existed in the images of Western art being used in art classes. First, art knowledge was socially constructed by dominant ideology (a view of knowledge that emanated from Habermas, 1971), to serve particular interests. So, it was important to assist students to see what had been left out of the traditional
discourse of art. Second, because the significance of the female image was based on social constructions of gender difference, students would need opportunities to identify the signs and categories used to designate women. Third, a socially critical method for analysis of art work was essential in order to deconstruct the dominant ideology and gendered relations implicit in art images.

In order to attempt a methodological approach that would integrate her principles, Reid proposed that students be provided with a paradigm in which the self-as-inquirer was central to learning (1995, p.13). Her model assumed that teachers regularly used formalist methods of criticism. Two components she believed to be new for most teachers distinguished her approach from other sequential approaches of the formalist type. They were conceptual content and critical dialogue. Reid believed that critical dialogue (discussion and critical questioning) was central to the process of deconstructing the meanings both implicit and explicit in art images. Reid's model (simplified) was first to explore the initial and personal response and then to analyse: cultural and historical contexts, the social relationships presented, and the visual elements, and finally, summarise the analysis.

Boyd, Marsh and Reid all advocated that teachers needed to stimulate the development of their students' ideas and move them beyond their initial responses to art work. They offered strategies for teachers to assist their students to explore how values connected with gender and culture are constructed. Strategies similar to Lipman et al.'s (1980) community of inquiry and Palinscar and Brown's reciprocal teaching (1984) were advocated. As had Aland and Darby (1991), they advocated structured questions and offered guidelines for inquiry.

**Philosophical Inquiry's Contribution To Studying Cultural Difference**

Rizvi (in Gunew & Rizvi, 1994) on examining multiculturalism in the existing practices of arts education in Australian schools, commented that:

> While the rhetoric of arts education recognises the close association between culture and the arts, most teachers of the arts remain reluctant to enter debates about what diversity might mean for curriculum and pedagogy. (1994, p. 50)

For Rizvi, arts education practice in Australian schools was mostly embedded in two American traditions that offered different pedagogy but not content. The first, neo-classical tradition, was based on the view that there was a particular cultural heritage into which every student should be initiated. He believed this view was exemplified by Smith's belief (1989) that it was possible to identify a distinctive set of concepts, skills and values that constituted artistic excellence. The second tradition, the expressive, was based partly on the theories of Rousseau and Dewey, which
viewed arts education as the cultivation of the innate aesthetic capacity possessed by every student. In this model, emphasis was on individual development and maturation rather than universals (Rizvi, 1994, p. 57).

It was the teachers' task, he claimed, to create an appropriate learning environment in which students could explore issues and concepts important for them, but that they should also be expected to take responsibility for the formation of their own judgements and development through dialogue with their teachers (Rizvi, 1994, p. 57). The multiculturalist movement had shown, he claimed, that selection of curriculum content was never neutral, but informed by patterns of power and privilege. His point was that what the teacher judged to be an appropriate aesthetic response from the student was assessed by the teacher within an ideological framework that was itself not subjected to any kind of scrutiny. Given that the neo-classicist approach was unacceptable because it operated as though there was a body of "socially neutral information", the expressivist view could also be criticised for reducing the social to issues of interpersonal relations and a moral relativism that could be culturally quite conservative.

According to Rizvi (1994) it was within these two apparently flawed traditions (i.e. neoclassicism and expressionism) that many teachers sought to revise the arts curricula to meet the challenges of both the new national (1994) and Victorian (1995) curriculum documents. Although the revised curricula included examples of aesthetic traditions of different cultural groups, Rizvi believed it was only in a marginalised manner. He believed that labelling practices like Indonesian batiks and performances by Indian dancers as multicultural, meant the study of the arts continued to be approached in the usual ethnocentric manner, reinforcing stereotypical racist representations.

Rizvi pointed out that the growing realisation that the arts could not be understood apart from the cultural context had been incorporated into the thinking of the Getty Center's (DBAE) curriculum. A major problem associated with the relationship between the arts and culture, according to Rizvi, was that it was based on a narrow anthropological view of the idea of culture. Cultures, he believed, were assumed to be the given upon which pedagogy must be constructed. Of further concern for Rizvi (1994, p. 60) was that teachers were assumed to hold a position of neutrality, "somehow external to the more general processes of cultural articulation in society" and that students were able to suspend their own cultural identity. This led to a form of compliant thinking that often prevented the formation of a critical understanding of social biases.

Rizvi's belief was that "critical imagination" could not be developed in isolation, but only within groupings of persons committed to a common mode of activity, and that it was "important to
equip the students with the critical skills of imagination that might help them deconstruct hegemonic representations" (1994, p. 66). This was a call for approaches like reciprocal teaching, Reid's deconstruction model and the philosophical inquiry model.

The key issues emerging with postmodern art criticism were associated with power, gender, culture and class. The agenda in art thinking was directed at deconstruction of these non-formalist aspects in modernist art. Postmodern artists were not interested in formal properties but they were interested in meanings. This provided an opportunity for philosophy with its questions about the meaning of art works and the way meaning is constructed. Postmodernist art critics and artists had little regard for the intentionality of artists and more interest in how society constructed and generated some art while marginalising other art. This took the focus away from the individual artist to social concerns. The aim was to create a critical citizenry, not self-centred or inward art approaches that were often the consequence of over-emphasis on thinking about art making.

It appeared that advocating reforms to Victorian visual arts education along the lines discussed in this section might be placing unrealistic demands on teachers. The time allotted to visual arts instruction in classes from Preparatory to Year 10 in most schools as well as art teacher education courses at university level, was constantly being eroded. Emphasis was being placed on numeracy and literacy programs by Department of Education policy makers. Although there was little practical assistance available for teachers wishing to implement the content of the new Victorian Arts CSF, if teachers were committed to encouraging imagination, creativity, aesthetic and cultural sensitivities and social criticism, then it was important that they allow "a space to ask how might things be otherwise" (Rizvi, 1994, p. 66).

**Research Into Classroom Dialogue**

In theory, introducing postmodern aesthetic theory into art education appeared possible. In order to incorporate the recommendations and models of the theorists described earlier in this chapter, focus on improving teachers' dialogical skills through specifically designed professional development models would be necessary. It was important to be informed by studies into observing and improving teacher dialogue in classrooms, particularly art rooms.

Eisner (1993) believed a research agenda for art education should include the fine-grained study, description, interpretation and evaluation of what actually occurred in art classrooms. Research into teachers' approaches when conducting discussions and the resultant impact on students is examined in this section. It focuses on theorists who have examined teachers' interaction with
students, perceptions of their students' abilities, and efforts to foster critical thinking skills, in Australia, the UK and the USA. Research into this aspect of art rooms is limited, so studies considered relevant to this study, because of their design or findings, are described in detail below.

Theorists in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s drew attention to the low amount of student talk in the classroom. Barnes and Todd (1977) using sociolinguistic approaches, had noted that the possible reason for the persistent domination of teacher talk was the result of teachers' views about learning and how it was best achieved; namely, by instruction using a transmission model and recitation. Teachers concerned with retaining the role of knowledge provider achieved this by maintaining order through guided discussions.

Flanders (1970) and Dunkin and Biddle (1974) cited many studies which found that the way teachers worded their questions determined whether responses were closed or divergent. It was noted that common teacher questioning techniques encouraged students to attempt only safe answers estimated to please the teacher. It was purported that fear of not being able to respond as expected and the fear of ridicule contributed to impoverished learning environments. These early studies and research that built on them during the 1980s and 1990s is described below.

The 1960s And 1970s

Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (1956) has been used by many researchers as a basis for making distinctions between lower-level and higher-level thinking evident in classroom discussions. Using the Taxonomy, several instruments were devised to measure classroom processes. Some showed that too much teaching was occurring at the lower-level of Bloom's scale. Researchers, using insights from the Taxonomy, found that most classroom education was concerned with facts and knowledge, (Bloom's lower categories), and consequently sought to "improve" student abilities by training teachers to stress thinking skills.

Taba (1966) found that the types of thought processes exhibited in classrooms appeared to be dependent on the nature of the cognitive task. Considerable evidence was advanced to show that

---

11 For example, two major observational systems were based on Bloom's categories: The Teacher-Pupil Question Inventory (Davis & Tinsley, 1968), designed to applied to information and ideas asked for in the classroom by both teachers and students, and the Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive Behaviour (Brown, Ober, Soar & Webb, 1968), designed to applied to ideas and information given. The latter was a sign system with checkmarks given for any type of behaviour encountered during an observational period. Its features and specific descriptors, very close to Bloom's categories, made it useful for examination of teacher and student talk, particularly the levels of cognition represented.
teachers could influence students in their classroom behaviours. When they sought to extend students to higher levels of thought the students usually responded. Teachers generally achieved what they sought from their students. The degree of pupil participation in discussions was found to be positively related to the levels of thought communicated by students. It was not clear, however, whether higher-level thinking occurred because of participation. Taba believed that analysis of the teaching and learning process had revealed the teaching strategies that supported the inquiry method. They included teachers responding to pupil ideas and asking different questions to increase the levels of abstraction.

Cambourne (1971) placed microphones on students in the school, playground and home settings and found that school settings generated shorter and less complex pupil sentences than did the home settings. This suggested the classroom was a context that demanded low verbal involvement on the part of the students despite the finding that teachers used longer and more complex sentences in the classroom than adults in the playground or at home.

Flanders (1970) claimed the categorisation systems he had examined revealed that only a small proportion of the classroom interaction demonstrated higher levels of thinking. He suggested that, if these classrooms were typical, then there was "room for a great deal of in-service training designed to help teachers explore more flexible patterns of classroom interaction" (1970, p. 150). Flanders was interested in measuring whether current classroom practice stressed lower-level thought (i.e. facts and knowledge), whether teachers or trainee teachers could learn to place more stress on higher-level thinking (like analysis and synthesis) and whether their students would benefit from the above. Following several years of observing classroom talk, he suggested that researchers should anticipate an average of 68% teacher talk, about 20% student talk with 11-12% what he classified as "silence and confusion", stating "since power, maturity, authority and initiative usually lie with the teacher, it is not surprising" (1970, p. 101).

Flanders and colleagues\textsuperscript{12} developed the Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) as a system for coding spontaneous verbal communication, arranging data into a useful display, then analysing the results in order to study patterns of teaching and learning via the codes. Once categories for classifying statements were established, a code symbol was assigned to each category and trained observers recorded data by jotting down code symbols.

Flanders believed the researchers who chose to use his system would be those interested in discovering the extent to which teacher initiation coupled with student response (and student

\textsuperscript{12} At the University of Minnesota (Havumaki, S; Filson, T; Amidon, E; Storlie, T. and J.P. Anderson) between 1955 and 1960.}
initiation coupled with teacher response) were related to the kind of thinking that entered into classroom discourse. He claimed that practically every researcher who had analysed classroom interaction reported various reciprocal relationships between teaching behaviour and student behaviour. Most frequently reported was that persistent, active, direction on the part of the teacher produced a pattern of student response rather than student initiation. Flanders also reported (1970, p. 184), that the more teachers "structured" problems and asked relatively specific questions, the more likely their students were to complement this behaviour by following the teacher's lead. On the other hand, teachers could stimulate student initiation by reacting to and making use of ideas expressed by them and by asking more "open" questions, therefore helping them to express their own ideas, at least part of the time.

The FIAC, according to Flanders, adequately represented, in code form, the three conditions that covered classroom communication: teacher talk, pupil talk and silence or confusion. Given valid data, he believed statements like "This teacher asked twice as many questions as he gave directions", or "Twice as many questions were asked in the first observation period compared with the second" could be meaningfully made (Flanders, 1970, p. 33). He saw it as helpful as both a pre- and post- service measure to show whether the participants were learning how to perform particular behaviours while teaching, believing its application was useful for training exercises in which certain behaviours could be practised while other teachers observed. Later discussion of the performance in terms of professional growth and professional goals could follow analysis of the coded data. Ideally, the observation information should be fed back while the situation was still fresh in the participants' memories. An accurate and clear coding of behaviours that tabulated into a display which highlighted desired comparisons was therefore required.

Flanders used the terms "direct" and "indirect" to describe classroom talk:

*Direct influence* consists of stating the teacher's own opinion or ideas, directing the pupil's action, criticising his behaviour, or justifying the teacher's authority or use of that authority.

*Indirect influence* consists of soliciting the opinions or ideas of the pupils, applying or enlarging on those opinions or ideas, praising or encouraging the participation of pupils, or clarifying and accepting their feelings. (1970, p. 109)

The FIAC contained categories for judging student verbal behaviour (as well as teacher verbal strategies provided in earlier instruments) thus making it possible to study teacher-student interaction. Table 3 below contains an abridged version of Flanders' categories (1970, p. 102) which divided teacher behaviours into indirect and direct influence as categories of talk.
Indirect teacher behaviour took the form of high amounts of praise, acceptance and questioning and low amounts of lecturing, directing and criticising, while the reverse was true of direct treatment.

### Table 3: Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories (1970)

#### Teacher Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect influence</th>
<th>Direct influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Accepts feelings</em> (accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone - positive or negative - in non-threatening manner. Includes predicting and recalling feelings)</td>
<td>5. <em>Lectures</em> (teacher facts and opinions about content, expresses own ideas, asks rhetorical questions, cites an authority other than student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Praises or encourages</em> (praises &amp; encourages student action or behaviour, nods head, says Uh-huh, go on, etc)</td>
<td>6. <em>Gives directions</em> (directions, commands expecting students to comply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Accepts or uses ideas of student</em> (clarifying, building or developing ideas suggested by pupil.) Teacher extensions of student ideas are included here, but as they build further it was suggested that category five be used.</td>
<td>7. <em>Criticising or justifying authority</em> (statements designed to change student behaviour from unacceptable to acceptable behaviour e.g. yelling at student, stating why teacher is doing what she/he doing, extreme self-reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Asks questions</em> (about content or procedure based on teacher’s ideas, with intent that student answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student Talk

| 8. *Student talk response* (in response to teacher - teacher initiated contact or solicited response or structured situation - restricted freedom to express own ideas) |
| 9. *Student talk-initiation* (talk they initiate, express own ideas, initiate new topic, freedom given to develop ideas about a line of thought, asking thoughtful questions, going beyond the existing structure) |
| 10. *Silence or confusion* (pauses, silences, times when communication is not understood by observer) |

The interesting features of this system were its initiative and response categorisations. It was expected that teachers would show more initial verbal moves than the students. With the ten category system, an estimate of the balance between initiative and response could be inferred. As predictors of student learning and attitudes, time percentages were insufficient because the *quality* of the statement was associated with educational outcomes just as much, if not more, than the *quantity*. This was a major feature of the Flanders categories. Seven out of the ten categories were devoted to a teacher’s communication moves since they had more authority than the students and "the teacher’s communication, which is a sample of his (sic) total behaviour, will be the most potent single factor in establishing a balance of initiation and response" (Flanders, 1970, p. 36). Three categories were devoted to student moves.
The FIAC designers believed an accurate estimate of the initiative-response balance of classroom interaction could be reached by comparing the teacher tallies in Categories 1, 2 and 3 with those in 5, 6 and 7. When teachers responded to student behaviour in a supportive manner they used ideas expressed by students, praised or encouraged their behaviour, and reacted constructively to their attitudes and feelings (Categories 1, 2 or 3). On the other hand, when they used their authority, expressed their own ideas, gave directions with the expectation of compliance, or were critical of pupil behaviour, then they imposed their own will on the class (Categories 5, 6, 7).

Duncan and Biddle (1974), in their summary of research in the area of student response to teacher indirectness, found teachers in standard classrooms were primarily direct in their operations, but that teachers who were indirect were associated with students who initiated more. It had been found that teachers could be induced to be more indirect by certain training, for example the use the Flanders’ strategy of "teacher acceptance of pupil ideas". Greater acceptance of student ideas appeared to raise student initiations and result in greater creativity. Duncan and Biddle investigated whether this research approach was valid and whether the conclusions that had been drawn were reasonable. Their findings suggested that there was strong support for the approach being valid, claiming that teacher education should be fostering these approaches. Research across thirty years had suggested that casting the teacher in the role of a catalyst for inquiry, coupled with arming them with strategies that raised the intellectual levels of this inquiry, was effective. As well, it appeared the success could be measured.

Although most projects surveyed by Dunkin and Biddle (1974) required fairly high-inference judgements as to the categorisation of the classroom talk observed, the fact that meaningful findings were generated tended to suggest their general validity. The classrooms studied showed a higher frequency of lower-level cognitive processes and involved exchanges of knowledge in particular. They further found that teachers trained to use the Bloom taxonomy could be induced to use of higher-level categories of thinking skills, for example, questions requiring analysis and synthesis. Students of teachers so trained seemed more likely to use higher-level categories in their classroom contributions. The use of modelling higher-level questioning was found to be a successful approach. A pervasive finding was that student use of categories of talk varied with teacher use, that is, if teachers used lower-level questions, then so did their students. There was also evidence that peer group relationships were crucial in the facilitation of high levels of student cognition.
to use of higher-level categories of thinking skills, for example, questions requiring analysis and synthesis. Students of teachers so trained seemed more likely to use higher-level categories in their classroom contributions. The use of modelling higher-level questioning was found to be a successful approach. A pervasive finding was that student use of categories of talk varied with teacher use, that is, if teachers used lower-level questions, then so did their students. There was also evidence that peer group relationships were crucial in the facilitation of high levels of student cognition.

The 1980s

In the UK, Eyers and Richmond (1982) described their study in which a group of teachers in London shared insights concerning the language being used in their classrooms on being shown videotapes of their teaching. They identified three common traits: first, too much teacher-directed closed questioning; second, the tendency to ask questions to which their students, and they, already knew the answers; and third, rather than being neutral, their questions revealed their own value-judgments.

Tisher, Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich (1985) claimed their study showed that teachers rarely asked higher cognitive questions and consequently students did not get much practice at handling them. Like Taba (1966) they believed teachers could be trained to increase the number of higher cognitive questions asked. In their study, 29 primary teachers were trained to use higher cognitive questions using a specially adapted mini-course. Data were obtained about the frequency, nature and cognitive levels of teachers' questions and students' utterances. Audiotapes were made of lesson segments before the training period, 3-4 weeks after it ceased, and a further 8 weeks later. Two independent trained classifiers applied the FIAC model of classification using the expanded teacher questions and student response categories analysed the transcripts of sessions. Bloom et al.'s Taxonomy (1956), was used to categorise classroom verbal strategies. Questions and answers were deemed to be lower cognitive if they involved knowledge, comprehension or application, while questions containing analysis, synthesis or evaluation were deemed higher. It was found that their training program resulted in a significant increase in the number of higher cognitive questions asked by teachers and a corresponding higher cognitive level of student responses. This level was maintained over a three month period. They believed their findings augmented the meagre amount of information about cognitive correspondence of questions.

13 Student answers and teacher questions were classed as congruent when they were regarded as belonging to the same cognitive level, e.g. synthesis or analysis. Overall the results (p. 71) showed significant increases within the experimental group in the proportion of correspondences between higher level utterances of students and teachers from one phase of the study to the next. The number of higher cognitive questions asked by the experimental teachers increased by a factor of two from pre- to post-testing.
The 1980s

In the UK, Eyers and Richmond (1982) described their study in which a group of teachers in London shared insights concerning the language being used in their classrooms on being shown videotapes of their teaching. They identified three common traits: first, too much teacher-directed closed questioning; second, the tendency to ask questions to which their students, and they, already knew the answers; and third, rather than being neutral, their questions revealed their own value-judgments.

Tisher, Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich (1985) claimed their study showed that teachers rarely asked higher cognitive questions and consequently students did not get much practice at handling them. Like Taba (1966) they believed teachers could be trained to increase the number of higher cognitive questions asked. In their study, 29 primary teachers were trained to use higher cognitive questions using a specially adapted mini-course. Data were obtained about the frequency, nature and cognitive levels of teachers’ questions and students’ utterances. Audiocassettes were made of lesson segments before the training period, 3-4 weeks after if ceased, and a further 8 weeks later. Two independent trained classifiers applied the FIAC model of classification using the expanded teacher questions and student response categories analysed the transcripts of sessions. Bloom et al.’s Taxonomy (1956), was used to categorise classroom verbal strategies. Questions and answers were deemed to be lower cognitive if they involved knowledge, comprehension or application, while questions containing analysis, synthesis or evaluation were deemed higher. It was found that their training program resulted in a significant increase in the number of higher cognitive questions asked by teachers and a corresponding higher cognitive level of student responses.

This level was maintained over a three month period. They believed their findings augmented the meagre amount of information about cognitive correspondence of questions.

Fundamental questions for Tisher et al. (1985) were first, how the high degree of correspondence could be explained, and second, should educators expect a correspondence? They observed that it was not necessarily the case that more frequent exposure to higher cognitive questions raised students’ levels of thinking, but that the cognitive levels of their overt responses matched the level of the teacher’s demands more often than previously (Tisher et al., 1985, p. 73). The clarity of a question was influenced by its form and structure and the vocabulary used. For example, if a teacher talked a great deal after a question was asked, or frequently re-phrased a question before students were asked to respond, then the clarity was lost.

Student answers and teacher questions were classed as congruent when they were regarded as belonging to the same cognitive level, e.g. synthesis or analysis. Overall the results (p. 71) showed significant increases within the experimental group in the proportion of correspondences between higher level utterances of students and teachers from one phase of the study to the next. The number of higher cognitive questions asked by the experimental teachers increased by a factor of two from pre- to post-testing.
The significance of the Tisher et al. findings for this study was threefold. First, they found the Flanders’ categorisations revealed the information sought in an efficient and effective manner. Second, they believed it demonstrated that changes in explicit examples of higher-order thinking were possible and this might be attributable to specific teacher education approaches. Third, they suggested that the link between teacher and student higher-order thinking might be less straightforward than a direct correspondence between the cognitive level of the teacher question and the student answer, and that other behaviours by the teacher were important.

In 1987, Good and Brophy revisited problems associated with observation in the classroom and monitoring classroom behaviour that was both rapid and complex. They considered interaction models where categories were checked as classes progressed, and were concerned that events happened so quickly that behaviours could be misinterpreted. They also stressed that past experiences, biases and prejudices could lead to incorrect interpretations rather than an observer objectively seeing, describing and analysing what really happened. Thus, an observer who supported either a didactic or discovery theory would have trouble giving a fair assessment to another approach. They suggested that observers should identify and examine their biases, for example, an observer irritated by a highly vocal teacher may see such teachers as punitive and rigid. Also, they noted that different observers of the same student behaviour had perceived it differently. Often the distinction between the "observed" behaviour and the "perceived" behaviour was lost. Good and Brophy (1987, p. 71) believed "The key to looking in classrooms is student response" and that trying to reduce the complexity of classroom coding by focusing on the teacher alone was misplaced emphasis.

Like Tisher et al. (1985), Good and Brophy (1987) found ample evidence that teacher expectations led to differential treatment of students perceived as high and low achievers. The following prevalent teacher behaviours were noted: students believed to be low achievers were given less time to answer questions; teachers infrequently called on these students to answer questions and also accepted low quality responses from them. As well, they engaged in less direct eye contact with them and were less accepting of their ideas when offered. Good’s previous research had indicated that students were aware of these interaction patterns and their perceptions of their abilities matched their teachers’ expectations. Teachers who held lower expectations for their classroom as a whole taught easier lessons, spent less time on rigorous academic activities and accepted poor performances from their students before moving on to new material.

Differentiation, such as that described above, would affect student achievement both directly, through the opportunity to learn, (differences in the amount and nature of exposure to content and opportunities to engage in various academic activities) and indirectly, through differential
treatment that was likely to affect self-concept and motivation. The following relatively simple suggestions for improving classrooms that featured low expectations and unchallenging routines were offered by Good and Brophy. Teachers were to: broaden the goals of activities to include problem solving; pay more attention to students' ideas and interests; increase opportunities for students to participate actively; and ask students questions that have no easy or correct answer and that can be answered from a variety of points of view. It was important for teachers to have knowledge of the above and to be given strategies that would encourage participation.

Examining Transcripts As A Means Of Mapping Discussions

Dillon's 1988 text contained the analysis of the same five secondary classroom transcripts by eight international research teams (in New Jersey, USA). Each team, although using different methods of analysing the classroom discussions, found that both teachers and students needed assistance to improve their discussion skills. Their findings supported earlier claims made by Flanders (1970) Dunkin and Biddle (1974) and Nickerson et al. (1985) concerning the shortcomings of classroom discussion and ways of overcoming them. The dominant classroom discussion style was found by the Dillon researchers to be the maintenance of tight control via a high quantity of questioning and sustaining feedback. This style was believed to be inappropriate if a teacher's aim was to stimulate a better standard of student talk (both quantity and quality) during classroom discussions.

The postmodern view that one needed to be aware of the personal and social values that individuals held about what was considered educationally significant was stressed by Bridges (in Dillon, 1988, p. 16). This might include, he suggested, becoming more articulate, understanding each other, sensitivity to others' concerns, concern to convert others to a particular opinion, and appreciation of democratic values and processes. Bridges examined the Dillon transcripts to ascertain the extent to which there was evidence of a concern for understanding through teachers' management of discussions. He focussed on the kinds of interventions teachers made to demand, invite, reinforce, draw attention to, or show concern for the presence of reflectiveness, responsiveness, diversity, clarity, evidence and consistency.

The table below (adapted from Bridges in Dillon 1988, p. 26) illustrates the dominance of questioning by the teacher in all five classrooms observed. If the number of questions was used as a benchmark of student initiation, then only in the case of MK's class did students play anything like a significant part in shaping the focus of discussion.
Table 4: Quantity Of Questions Asked By Teachers And Students During Five Classroom Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HK</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher questions</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Key: initials e.g. HK = Teacher)

Bridges' observations highlighted the need for early development of students' experiences in group discussion, the use of subject matter which lent itself to discussion, and the development, in teachers, of the skills in discussion leadership.

The Dillon transcripts also provided evidence that less teacher talk, more student talk, and less teacher "control" of discussions, resulted in student to student verbal interaction. Francis (in Dillon, 1988, p.270), like Lipman (1988), believed the classroom setting should emphasise that discussion was a peer relationship and that each contribution was of value. He claimed that if maximum participation by students was the aim, then teachers needed to recognize the difference between "conducting" and "leading" a group (a conductor was authoritative not authoritarian).

Francis also felt that none of the transcripts contained evidence of successful class discussions because contributions were only made by certain class members in all groups. He claimed the teachers would not know whether the silent students had an understanding that they declined to demonstrate. This occurred because none of the teachers had made the process dynamics of the discussion an explicit task. Francis observed there were no statements in the transcripts aimed at heightening the students perception like: "What do you think about Jo's claim, Sam?", or comments that might enable the students to reflect on their management of the discussion, for example: "Did we get anywhere with that?". Francis believed student feelings of powerlessness led them to either show dependence on the teacher's actions, or alienation from interaction. He stressed the need for in-service training or consultancy support for teachers trying to bring about the requisite changes (1993, p. 278).

Brown (1993) claimed that this powerlessness existed in classrooms he visited across the USA five years later. The more dependent the students became through experiencing "closed" systems, the more resistant they were to taking the opportunity to acquire new skills when the occasion arose. When teachers tried to change the status quo, they often found the resistance too difficult to penetrate and therefore lapsed back to the familiar routine. Brown also quotes examples of many such instances.
Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich (in Dillon, 1988) like Francis above, noted teachers did not know how to improve the quality of a discussion in a more indirect way, such as reacting to preceding utterances. They claimed teachers directed discussions back to themselves by reacting to almost every student response, question or comment, rather than intervening only at key points. Teachers seldom facilitated student-student interaction, and rarely encouraged students to listen to one another or acknowledge others’ ideas, feelings or opinions. Rarely were students asked to clarify or give reasons for their opinions in order to help them enhance the depth of their own discussion. Their findings that only rarely were there incongruences in the cognitive level of teachers’ utterances and their students’ responses and that teachers often accepted low quality student responses, echoed the findings from the 1960s and 1970s described by Dunkin and Biddle (1974). They believed that the mixture of findings led to:

... the common educational presumption "ask a higher level question, get a higher level answer" should be replaced by 'ask a higher level question, get any level answer'. (Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich, in Dillon, 1988, p. 217)

Like Lipman et al. (1980), Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich believed if teachers emphasised preparing students for a democratic society, then the role of a classroom discussion, where the teacher was moderator and the students were participants, was to motivate student participation, whilst fostering and maintaining a positive attitude towards learning (p. 214). They claimed that student utterances in classroom discussions should serve as an occasion for the teacher to keep the discussion focused, maintain and guide the flow of discussion, and increase its depth using more of an "indirect" influence. The teacher should also make explicit reference to the quality of student responses. The tasks and behaviours they believed the discussion moderator should demonstrate resembled Santi’s (1993) five roles for a teacher in a community of inquiry (i.e. facilitator, provoker, modulator, monitor and supporter - see Chapter Three of this study).

Roby (in Dillon, 1988) believed it was crucial for teachers to understand that teaching and learning were created by the discussion, not imposed upon it. Evidence of a dialectical discussion appeared, according to Roby:

... when students develop sympathetic sensitivity towards opposing viewpoints ... Opposing views become alternatives to be explored rather than competitors to be eliminated. ... The initial sense of rightness about one’s own answers merges into a sense of rightness about the process which scrutinizes all answers. (Roby, in Dillon, 1988, p. 173)

Instruction in this pedagogical approach involved a shift of authority from the fixed roles of teacher and student, to flexibility in the learning process. Lipman et al. (1980) had claimed the community of inquiry approach was a means of achieving this shift.
Wood and Wood (in Dillon, 1988) evaluated different teacher styles in terms of their success in encouraging children to talk, show initiative, ask questions and contribute actively to the discourse. They claimed to have rarely encountered question-question sequences in teacher-child interactions where the student asked the second question. This was not due to the verbal inadequacies of students, but because they were inhibited from taking control from the teacher: "After all, he [sic] who questions dictates how his listener will spend his next few cognitive moments, as well as what they will say" (Wood & Wood, in Dillon, 1988, p. 284). They suggested that students acted like compliant listeners but teachers did not.

They also found that students generally answered questions but did not often elaborate on their answers and they almost never both contributed and then followed their contribution with a question. An implication of this pattern was that teachers only got what they asked for. Encouraging questions from the students was not part of a teacher’s matrix of responses (Wood & Wood, in Dillon, 1988, p. 285). They referred to the kinds of questions parents asked their children at home, saying they were often contingent on what the children themselves were attempting to understand, and that such contingency was important in promoting learning and understanding. In school, however, questions were less likely to be contingent upon a child’s line of thought, a fact they believed helped explain why children often appeared more curious, involved and loquacious at home than at school.

As Lipman et al. (1980) purported, Wood and Wood (in Dillon, 1988) found that if the teacher speculated, reasoned or wondered, then the students tended to adopt a similar stance. They believed that, if the results of their study generalised, then the skilful use of more challenging statements might not only encourage students to reciprocate in kind, but also to become more actively involved. They also recommended further study of teachers’ replies to students’ responses. They predicted that, if teachers waited longer following a question, then higher cognitive levels might be obtained.

Swift and Gooding (in Dillon, 1988) found this prediction to be accurate when they measured the length of pauses in the talk of 40 science teachers. They found that by increasing wait time, thus permitting both teachers and students to take advantage of the increased time to reflect, the length

14 They noted (p. 282-284) six major areas of teacher “low control” during discussions which they believed were “flow stoppers”. They were: asking for answers or statements to be repeated and “pardon?”; two choice questions (yes or no), e.g. “Did you have a good time?”; Wh-questions, e.g. “Where did you go? What happened?”; personal contributions - e.g. “Oh, that must be awful”; “phatic” - used to express interest or acknowledge another’s move, e.g. “Oh the beach, lovely. / I see. / Hmm.” and chairing, where the teacher stood outside the conversation keeping control, e.g. “Ok, Sharon, tell us more”.
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of student responses increased. As well, the teachers then asked higher cognitive level questions. Their earlier studies had revealed that teachers talked 87.8% of the time during lessons that the teachers described as discussions. In fact they were "lectures with questions interspersed" (p. 195). They further found that classroom dialogue in middle school science classrooms functioned at the memory level, (Bloom et al.'s lowest category), and resembled recitations. These findings were similar to Brown's (1993). Neutral teacher comments, interpreted as encouraging or "bland", were found to stimulate further discussion, whereas both approval and disapproval squelched further interaction.

A review of the findings of previous research into teacher questions in classroom discussion by Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich (in Dillon, 1988), revealed that documentation gathered for over half a century in normal classroom settings showed that teachers asked many questions but higher cognitive questions occurred infrequently. Unlike Dunkin and Biddle (1974), they found a low correspondence between cognitive levels of teacher questions and student answers supporting Dillon's (1982) claim that a summary of what happens is: "ask a higher level question, get any answer" (in Dillon, 1988, p. 217). Up to 80% of questions asked by teachers required mere recall of knowledge, while only about 20-30% called for higher mental processes. Research into classroom processes had also repeatedly shown that student talk comprised only 20% to 30% of all classroom interaction time. Of that proportion, only 20% was attributed to student responses and less than 10% to student initiation and/or higher level utterances.

It was believed that the skilful use of higher order questions accompanied by adequate wait times, promoted interaction that enhanced both the cognitive and affective climate of classrooms, but there was little evidence of this in the Dillon transcripts. Using alternatives to closed questions was another under-utilised discussion-enhancing skill.

Table 5 below contains a summary of the findings and recommendations of the Dillon researchers that influenced this present study. The table demonstrates that the Dillon researchers found that effective verbal techniques that could be used by teachers to promote interaction were largely absent in classroom discussions.
Table 5: Major Findings And Recommendations Of The Dillon Researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Klinzing and Klinzing-Eurich | * teachers did not know how to improve the quality or increase the depth of discussion necessary for the requirements of a postmodern democratic society  
* up to 80% of teacher questions required recall  
* higher cognitive questions generally led to higher cognitive student responses, longer answers and student/student interaction | * teachers needed to increase "indirect" teaching strategies and make explicit reference to student verbal input |
| Bridges                   | * low ratio of student questions compared with teachers                   | * the need to include interviews of teachers to make proper sense of classroom observations  
* need for apt subject content to aid development of skills of teacher leadership of, and student participation in, discussion |
| Francis                   | * the benefit of teacher as "conductor" of discussions  
* many students excluded from discussions therefore their potential unknown | * the need for teacher questions that include all class members |
| Wood and Wood             | * students rarely asked a second consecutive question  
* students were mainly compliant listeners  
* the style of parent questions (in home) promoted understanding  
* if teacher wondered or speculated the students did likewise | * longer wait time fruitful |
| Swift and Gooding         | * most classroom discussions at recall level                             | * neutral teacher responses led to further contribution by students       |

It appeared that teachers would need to frame questions in ways that promoted the capacity and disposition for students to become more effective questioners. Burbules (1993, p. 99) set out categories of questions that could be used for probing in an open-ended way. While three of these categories (setting a purpose, guiding cognitive processing, activating prior knowledge) were part of the teachers' questioning repertoire, a fourth "Guiding cognitive processing" (for example, "Explain how that works") was the least used in classrooms. A fifth category, "promoting cognitive monitoring", that included questions aimed at helping students to reflect on their own understanding (metacognition), for example asking questions like "Did that make sense or do we need to explore this further?", was seldom employed.
Burbules (1993) described four discernible types of dialogue in the postmodern tradition. His "ideal types", not rigid categories (p. 125), were dialogue such as conversation, inquiry, debate, and instruction. The first two approaches (said to be in the Socratic tradition) were viewed as being driven by questions that led participants through logical steps of argument and proof. The others, (basically the reciprocal teaching model of Palinscar and Brown, 1984), involved modelling, scaffolding, questioning and providing feedback through ongoing interaction between teacher and student.

Treating dialogue as a communicative, symbiotic relationship between equals requiring both emotional involvement and cognitive understanding, Burbules believed genuine dialogue also required mutual respect of the participants. His view of the value of conversation, as described above, closely mirrored Lipman's (1990).

Research Into Art Classroom Discussions

Art criticism, with its inherent opportunities to help students create and derive meaning from visual art, is still in need of a firm foundation alongside other areas of the school curriculum. It deserves our attention. (Chapman & Newton, 1990, p. 168)

Tickle (1984), in the UK, believing that teachers who encouraged exploration, creativity, problem solving, and active engagement in learning were "thin on the ground" (p. 132), examined aspects of practice in art and design classes in Years 9 and 10. He focussed on teaching strategies, teachers' perspectives relating to classroom practices and the resultant outcome on the students' art experiences. Three teachers were observed engaging in the didactic teaching of basic practical skills, while also fostering (or attempting to foster) creativity, problem solving and expression of personal ideas.

Although each teacher indicated to Tickle they wanted creative thinking to play an important part in their students' development and attempted to foster it, their intentions were frustrated by their own beliefs, approaches and interventions. As a result, two curricula emerged - one for the able student, the other for less able. Unequal time was spent with students, with the quality of the time differing according to the teacher's perception of the student's ability. Those deemed "more able" by the teacher were engaged increasingly in the creative elements (Tickle, 1984, p. 144). Students viewed as "less able" by the teachers, in terms of a perceived lack of success in basic skills, had their experiences more tightly structured. This meant the development of many students was inhibited, despite the stated intentions to the contrary by their teachers.
The 1990s

The approaches trialled in some American studies provided postmodern models for research into existing classroom conditions and ways of assisting teachers to include Aesthetics and Art Criticism in the curriculum. An important idea being promoted by art theorists like Hagaman (1990b) and Stout (1995) was that "voice" imparted authenticity in the sense of ownership of ideas.

The research of Bullock and Galbraith (1992) combined teacher voice and classroom observation. They believed that the examination of similar contextualised images of art teaching might reveal a common language of classrooms. This would enable art educators to describe and discuss the content and pedagogical knowledge of art teachers. When they interviewed and observed two secondary art teachers, they discovered an incongruity as each teacher modified preferred teaching theories and beliefs when in their classroom setting. They described it as "dissonance". They believed that if teacher educators wished to understand how art teachers were reacting to the new curricula, then they should assemble a set of descriptive portraits of how teachers view the nature and skill of teaching art.

They used a case study approach in an effort to discover which artistic beliefs and pedagogical practices art teachers formulated and whether teachers' beliefs and practices were student-centred or discipline-centred. The methods and tasks teachers used in order to interpret and teach specific art concepts to specific students were also of interest to them. Bullock and Galbraith focussed on the teachers' "pedagogical content knowledge" that became evident as they integrated content, teaching practices and general classroom processes, believing this element had not been sufficiently respected by theorists in the past.

Bullock and Galbraith (1992) believed the case study research design allowed for the emergence of a common language about classrooms, capturing the complex elements and processes of classrooms and the ways art teachers interpreted content and teaching. They claimed that, by examining cases, teacher educators could begin to generate theories about the processes art teachers used as they reflected and decided upon suitable content and teaching methods in their individual

---

15 "Dissonance" was the term Bullock and Galbraith used to describe the "push and pull" the teachers experienced when relating their personal beliefs and understandings about art and art teaching within their classrooms. They believed it was generated by:
(a) Internal sources - motivated by each teacher's unique background and experience within art education, and
(b) External sources - such as school policy, ongoing external teaching debates, opinions about art education curricula, students' cultural heritages, and lack of students' art background and readiness (1992, p. 95)
settings. They further believed that, although each art teacher's philosophy and classroom knowledge was unique, it was possible to find commonalities and theoretical premises that existed across a variety of settings. This common base could be used by teacher educators striving to bring about change through art teacher education programs.

Stout's qualitative study which she described as a "fine-grained, field-focused study" (1995, p. 170), represented what she claimed was postmodernism's redefinition of how teaching and learning could be examined. Influenced by Hagaman (1990b) and Paul (1993), and reflecting postmodernist thinking about the importance of the individual's voice, Stout asserted that by structuring learning through the conversation mode, some of the hallmarks of critical thinking would be fostered:

"Coming together in a co-operative, constructive manner to talk, and equally to listen, can serve as a catalyst to evoke and sanction otherness - that willingness to value and consider those alternative perspectives ..." (Stout, 1995, p. 176)

What was important in this approach, Stout believed, was that meaning in art, as in life, came in multiple forms from multiple perspectives. This required an open-minded and flexible approach to interpretation and evaluation. In addition, she claimed that as classrooms and culture were not homogeneous, diversity and difference could be handled within the parameters of art education. Conversations assisted students to learn to respond to conflicting views in a rational and patient manner (Stout, 1995, p. 176).

Stout believed her investigative approach was naturally suited to art teacher education and had the capacity to tap into the rich potential of the classroom as a generative source for both theory and practice in teaching and learning (Eisner, 1994; Sullivan, 1996). She described her study as taking a "slice" out of every day events and setting it apart for closer scrutiny. The purpose of the undergraduate course to which she applied her theory was to teach prospective art teachers the various methods and values of teaching art criticism at the secondary school level. The focus was on critical understanding rather than judgment (Barrett, 1994a).

Her students, who studied the theory and practice of critical thinking in the visual arts content area (for example the theories of Hagaman, 1990c; Paul, 1993; Perkins, 1994), were encouraged to raise questions and issues, to agree and disagree and to keep "dialogue journals" that recorded significant comments they made verbally in class. Stout subscribed to Perkins' model of creativity (1981) that meshed neatly with the claims of Lipman et al. (1980) about the community of inquiry and Paul's (1993) traits of mind of a critical thinker. She claimed her students learned that the exercise of art criticism required: tolerance of complexity and ambiguity; the ability to
identify problems; the capacity to examine and appreciate multiple perspectives; a willingness to take risks and accept failure; openness to seek and accept criticism; and a desire to understand.

She claimed Paul’s traits of mind included qualities ranging from metacognition to imagination, and that his critical strategies included everything from meticulous observation to re-thinking. Without these mental qualities and cognitive strategies, she said, there would be "little to fuel higher order understanding in the visual arts" (Stout, 1995, p. 172). This was a crucial claim, as was Stout’s belief that what distinguished her sessions from other forms of discussion was the "ease and familiarity" of the atmosphere that suited those who relished stimulating verbal exchange about art. The aim was for all participants to have equal input, both between and among students and between teacher and student. The conversations were conceived in order to make and find meaning through art criticism (Stout, 1995, p. 176). She believed the philosophical approach and critical processes added a new dimension to how her students’ understood and engaged in art criticism:

... real learning, that is, constructed knowledge, takes place only when students are consciously aware of the processes through which they come to make sense of things for themselves. (Stout, 1995, p. 174)

Students’ evaluation of artworks in Stout’s sessions were guided by questions that would lead to critical thinking and aesthetic inquiry. For example: Does it have relevance to the viewer? Is it culturally transfatable? Does it communicate in an intellectual, emotional or visual way? Does it raise social awareness? Does it stimulate critical consciousness about the world? and Does it make you think and rethink? (Stout, 1995, p. 185).

Stout believed the levels of aesthetic inquiry she found in her students’ journal reflections were new and that her approach was a vital ingredient. She found 89% of her students depicted critical thinking traits of mind, using the large number of questions asked by students as evidence that they were increasingly more curious, generating higher-order questions and raising major aesthetic and critical issues (Stout, 1995, p. 183). Like Boyd (1994) in Australia, Stout believed it was important to recognise the importance of these cognitive strategies for higher-order thinking in art criticism. Her slice of learning contained no qualifiers, statistical analyses or summations. Her qualitative investigation was designed to provide a descriptive sampling - a range of the quality and variety of higher-order thinking generated in a particular setting under particular learning circumstances. She attempted to provide rich description that would help the reader see and understand the depth of sophistication and complexity of thinking that could emerge from classroom conversations structured around a flexible - or organic - model of art criticism.
Tickle (1984) suggested that further scrutiny of classroom experiences for teachers and students was needed and stressed the need to take account of the experiences and perspectives of both teachers and students. His emphasis on ensuring that the thinking of all students was developed was important. Bullock and Galbraith's (1992), case study research showed there were commonalities that allowed for the complex processes of classrooms to emerge. They also successfully combined teacher voice and classroom observation. Stout (1995) admitting she was influenced by Lipman (1988), investigated the cognitive strategies of Paul (1993) and Perkins (1994) and found they added a philosophical and critical approach to art criticism, claiming that these levels of inquiry were new.

**Monitoring Student/Teacher Verbal Interaction In Philosophy For Children Sessions**

The systems that follow were developed by Philosophy for Children researchers. They were seeking ways of representing teacher/student classroom verbal interaction in order to assist teachers to improve cognitive levels of thinking and participation during discussion.

In the 1980s, the British and American theorists discussed in this chapter had come to similar conclusions about what made classroom dialogue educationally valuable. As well, art education theorists had referred to the Philosophy for Children approaches as being suited to teaching the new aesthetics. Three studies from the late 1980s and early 1990s specifically monitored Philosophy for Children classroom discussions: Perrott, a teacher educator in Australia (1988), Chervin and Kyle in Canada (1993), and Pålsson in Iceland (1995). Each system had a specific purpose with a general aim of finding ways of representing teacher/student verbal interaction in the hope of helping teachers to improve levels of thinking during discussions. Although the studies were all in primary classrooms, their usefulness stemmed from the fact that the classroom approaches used by Philosophy for Children practitioners are generic.

Perrott\(^\text{16}\) (1988) wished to find ways of improving classroom communication skills. She believed that transcripts that showed verbal interaction in a classroom were important indicators of features of that context:

> ... such data are recorded absolutely directly. Collected talk is research material that is recorded and can be presented without researcher interpretation or idealisation, and it can be referred to again and again ... (Perrott, 1988, p. 114)

\(^{16}\) Perrott said she came from the tradition of Socrates, Dewey, Bruner, Mackie, Holt, Peters, Postman and Weingartner, Lipman, Vygotsky, and Peirce.
She believed that written transcripts were of interest to teachers and used extracts of classroom discourse to demonstrate ways they could be helped to move away from repressive discourse to constructive learning environments. Perrott argued that a teacher's role was to assist students to develop "their critical awareness, and an ability to question, to create and to innovate" (1988, p. 121). Given this, she asserted, the education and socialisation of students should involve the development of their thinking, understanding, and reasoning skills. The qualities of the mind that enabled the grasping of reasons and principles and linking information, rather than the quantity of a person's knowledge, were the skills she sought in classroom observations.

The research of Bellack et al. (1966) into classroom language had influenced Perrott. It described common patterning of classroom dialogue as an asymmetrical patterning: Initiation (teacher) > Response (student) > Evaluation or comment (teacher), (i.e. IRE symmetry). According to Perrott, substantiation of Bellack et al.'s interaction analysis techniques "in many classrooms in many countries", had confirmed that, as most classroom talk comprised turn-taking allocated by the teacher, spontaneity and unsolicited initiation by students became virtually impossible (1988, p. 116). Using Bellack's IRE labelling, she demonstrated that teacher talk dominated. Perrott claimed the IRE patterning encouraged students to participate in "script-filling" exercises to please the teacher.

Observing Australian primary classrooms, Perrott, like the Dillon researchers, found "an inappropriate balance between teacher instruction and pupil activity and input, with the outcome of high-teacher, low-pupil, performance" (1988, p. 121). Teachers translated or extended student responses into longer, more involved responses by themselves and steered the thinking towards some pre-ordained outcome known only to themselves. This occurred, she surmised, because teacher narration and periods of teacher talk to which students were expected to listen without interruption, were techniques that put the teacher/instructor as expert at the centre of student learning. She described this practice as "piloting", where the teacher guided the students so carefully through a discussion that the answer was almost provided.

Perrott illustrated her claims with extracts of classroom transcripts, claiming that although teachers knew to avoid repeating a student's answer because it discouraged students from listening to one another, few realised that "reformulation" of what the students said had the same outcome. It became the means of transmitting new information rather than having the students' think it through for themselves. Often, student questions were ignored if responding to them meant the teacher could not proceed in the direction intended. Perrott believed that the consequence of the common use of these two discussion approaches (piloting and reformulation) was that teachers had no knowledge of the extent of pupil understanding.
In contrast to the above, Perrott found in a transcript of a Philosophy for Children session, a teacher who was accepting of student responses, expecting the students to translate and reformulate them while still having an input into the flow of the conversation. Perrott noted that, although teachers often expressed the fear that a discussion might "get out of hand", it was important to work against discourse control if the aim was the development of student thinking, understanding, and inquiry (1988, p. 74). She was confident that teacher awareness of the issues discussed above would result in approaches changing from the "transmission" to the "educative" model of teaching (Perrott, 1988, p. 77).

Like the researchers in Dillon (1988) Perrott observed that the by-product of teachers' "holding the floor" was poor student oral contribution, both in quality and quantity, that in turn detrimentally affected the quality of questioning the teacher used because there was no substance on which to build. Perrott believed that the presence of fact checking student questions like "Is he an Impressionist, miss?" was usually evidence that the teacher was instructor and not providing opportunities for students to ask deeper questions and develop their understandings.

Perrott’s transcripts revealed teachers answered their own questions rather than listening attentively and giving their students time to articulate their responses in order to develop their understandings. Thoughtful student answers were rare because speedy responses were required. She believed another indicator of successful inquiry occurred when the teacher referred to "us" indicating a joint venture, for example, "Let’s think about that point a little longer", rather than the teacher maintaining a separate "I" stance (Perrott, 1988, p. 87). Referring to the difficulty teachers had with the wait time, Perrott described their tendency to immediately "fill the space" with rephrased or repeated questions if an answer was not immediately forthcoming. She found that increased wait time resulted in longer student responses, and more student responses before the next teacher intervention. She believed silence was almost unbearable for teachers.

Perrott observed that teachers who consciously employed the techniques of probing and pausing, together with care about appropriate student phrasing and organisation of questioning, had improved the quality of verbal contribution, thinking and understanding. Tickle (1984) had observed that this approach was usually reserved for those students that teachers considered "bright". Significantly, Perrott found that these techniques had assisted students who teachers had described as "slow" or "weak" to become verbal participants. Discussions had challenged more students to participate and teachers moved from "a type of interrogative stance to becoming more conversant in the talk" (Tickle, 1984, p. 91). Her claims echoed what Emery and Wilks (1994) observed in their study of art classrooms.
Prior to the 1990s, the Philosophy for Children movement had generally sought to evaluate the success of its approaches by using the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills (1983) and other traditional psychological tests. If the aim of programs like Lipman's was the effective use of dialogue, then it was vital to find more appropriate methods of analysing student thinking and evaluating sessions. In the early 1990s, Perrott sought a categorisation system that could be used by teachers aiming to improve classroom thinking by assisting their students to verbalise. Her aim was not to develop an impressive scientific measurement system, but a workable, easy-to-use, un-complicated measure that would indicate the sorts of thinking occurring in different sessions. She believed analysis of interactive talk should provide details of talk content that revealed whether sessions designed to enhance participants' thinking were different to other classroom sessions.

In her 1988 analysis, Perrott had found interesting differences in the transcripts of philosophy and non-philosophy sessions (where the skills required to foster student inquiry were not used). She later sought a measure for revealing the characteristics of the dialogue and the kinds of thinking occurring in classroom settings. In 1993 she developed a method of analysis that she called "epistemic analysis", to assist teachers to ascertain the nature, quality, content and form of the talk, in order to discover the epistemic characteristics of the dialogue. She believed it could provide insights into the quality of thought demonstrated by students during one verbal interaction sequence or over time in a number of such transactions, as well as indicate why a session had been less successful than expected.

Perrott preferred epistemic analysis to typology or categorisation systems that attempted to ascertain the nature of thought via analysis of talk. She believed it was difficult to get a "fit" between what occurred in natural dialogue and a category system, and a picture of the dialogue as a whole is usually lost in the process" (1993, p. 45) and that "natural dialogue" was of more use to practitioners, because it could tell them more about the quality of the participants' thinking in context. It could also suggest ways of improving the quality of participants' talk, if this was the teacher's aim, because such analysis concentrated directly on what occurred during a session and could thus provide pointers for how a teacher might go about making improvements.

Although Perrott claimed that a teacher could spot weaknesses she did not interview the teachers involved in the sessions she analysed. She acknowledged that teachers were rarely trained to identify types of thinking or see their own position during a discussion, believing that teacher knowledge of process and content would be pre-requisites to achieving this awareness.
In Canada, Chervin and Kyle (1993) sought an appropriate instrument for studying the oral reasoning of Year 3 and 4 children during Philosophy for Children sessions. They categorised verbatim transcriptions of segments of classroom talk into an ever-expanding list of types of reasoning. Seeking to characterise the students' reasoning as it occurred in discussions, Chervin and Kyle devised a checklist to record the different types of reasoning, for example "formal logic", "counter example" and "insufficient evidence". "Tickled" categories were used to substantiate observation and provide data. They also noted verbatim particular instances of student reasoning. They found the data collected was cumbersome and unhelpful because of its diversity and quantity. Such checklists became unwieldy if one attempted to list all possible instances of reasoning (or other thinking categories) because of the multitude of possibilities. As lists could also be restrictive when instances were made to fit awkwardly into existing categories, there was also concern about meaning and interpretation.

Chervin and Kyle (1993) decided against using pre-determined categories of reasoning. To ensure the exploration of the children's reasoning occurred in an open-ended way, their list of children's reasoning was emergent. They claimed this open-ended qualitative data analysis allowed them to deal with unexpected data. However, a problem inherent in emergent categories was that the possible descriptions appeared boundless.

Palsson (1995), while attempting to research learning outcomes associated with Philosophy for Children in Iceland, argued that interpretative research methodology with its detailed descriptive approach was appropriate for evaluation of sessions where teachers were attempting to establish communities of inquiry. Like Perrott and Chervin and Kyle, he was not satisfied with measuring reasoning by tests and individual performance, preferring to examine the thinking and learning occurring in a classroom. In such quantitative approaches, teaching was seen as causal, and learning as effect, while interpretative research aimed at mapping the interactive structure at the site being studied (Palsson, 1995, p. 33). He believed an interactive research model would appeal to teachers, and it was important that inquiry into classroom discussion patterns should be compatible with teachers' perspectives.

The purpose of Palsson's study was to document the "presence, absence or genesis" of a community of inquiry in two classrooms, by training and then observing teachers. His research activities included being a coach, consultant, substitute teacher and model teacher. His was not only an observational study of a particular context for teaching philosophy to children, but also a study of bringing about such a context. His objective was at least to understand the difficulties he faced, if not solve or remove them (Palsson, 1995, p. 34).
Each lesson was assessed for levels of "success" in teaching philosophy as content and practice. The three criteria that guided the analysis of both the data and each session were: content of sessions, dialogue as a teaching method, and teachers' expectations and perceptions about their own performance. When reporting sessions, Palsson substituted observations by citing typical patterns of interaction. He also reflected on field notes and other experiences on the site, commenting that, as the community of inquiry developed, it became a way of life:

... perceptions of success move from having control, be it over the kids, over the dialogue, or over the content, to respect shown to individuals about their ideas. Success becomes a question of co-operation in coming to grips with the issues, [and] the ideas under investigation. (Palsson, 1995, p. 37)

The philosophical approach required new classroom roles and rules. The teacher's competence was of central importance, as was the process that revolved around the students. Palsson found a teacher's modelling of apt verbal behaviour served as a bridge between explanation and experience (theory and practice). As well, an appreciation of conceptual perplexity linked to "wonderment" was needed. He concluded that nurturing the philosophical was a challenge that teachers were struggling to overcome, and like the researchers in Dillon (1988) felt that a suitable way of monitoring and describing classroom interaction was needed to assist teachers.

Table 6 below contains a summary of approaches to dialogue used by Perrott and Palsson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Non Philosophy for Children classrooms</th>
<th>Philosophy for Children classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perrott (1988)</td>
<td>✓ teacher &quot;piloting&quot; ✓ teacher reformulation of student talk ✓ questions were fact checking not deeper</td>
<td>✓ philosophical topics ✓ more student to student dialogue ✓ acceptance of student answers ✓ expectation that students would reformulate ✓ viewing discussion as joint venture ✓ long wait times ✓ change to interview to conversant talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palsson (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ teachers modelled appreciation of conceptual perplexity and wonderment ✓ new classroom roles and rules for dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of transcriptions of classroom discussions by theorists interested in Philosophy for Children was instructive. Perrott, Palsson, and Chervin and Kyle (1993) had revealed strengths and weakness associated with the examination of transcripts and natural dialogue, emergent and non-emergent categories of talk, and the multiple interpretations of student responses.
Along with research into observation of discussions in generalist and Philosophy for Children classrooms, research into discussions in visual arts classrooms in Australia was sought. Little work in this field was found, however, the studies of Cunningham (1994) and McSorley (1996), although not associated with philosophical inquiry theories, were instructive.

Cunningham (1994) in his examination of the language used by young children to appraise art, found that theory could be derived inductively from the analysis of data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As the examination of student contributions during discussions about art would form part of this study, his findings were of interest.

Transcripts of interviews were analysed from two perspectives by Cunningham, first, to determine concepts discussed, and second, to identify the language used to communicate the concepts. The results of his study suggested there was a need for art educators to focus attention on young students' inherent language base as a vehicle for art appraisal and as a basis for generating language that was art specific. Cunningham warned that, if the lack of critical appraisal of art works demonstrated by the students was inculcated by their teachers, then there were implications for "the promotion of balanced aesthetic appraisal in art classrooms" (1995, p. 9).

McSorley's study of 13 primary school teachers (1996)\(^\text{17}\), found teachers held limited conceptions of the teaching of art criticism. Although these teachers were not trained art specialists, this small study was important. It showed that in order to accommodate the new curriculum demands of aesthetics and art criticism teachers needed particular capabilities and strategies. Her method of reducing the quantity of data that resulted from interviews was also of interest. McSorley referred to Boyd and McCadden's (1993) study in which primary teachers expressed more confidence in teaching art production than critical appraisal. She believed this indicated a probable link between teachers' lack of experience in art history and the quality of teaching in art criticism and aesthetics in schools. She claimed that a greater understanding of teachers' conceptions of the teaching of art criticism was needed. This would serve as a useful tool in the preparation of both specialist art and primary school teachers (McSorley, 1996, p. 161).

In keeping with a phenomenographic research approach that controlled the context (Marton, 1989), McSorley engaged the teachers (the whole staff of a primary school) in conversations about art criticism. Wherever possible, she asked open-ended questions that focussed on the teachers'  

\(^{17}\) She was guided by an approach to qualitative research described as "phenomenography", a form of research which described qualitatively different ways in which people experienced, conceptualised, perceived and understood phenomena. Larsson (1986) differentiated between phenomenology - a study of the world as it is, and phenomenography - the study of the world as it is conceptualised.
conceptions of teaching aesthetics and art criticism, allowing the interviewees to select their own horizon of response. Her analysis of the data involved the processing of the teachers' statements through various stages of selection, elimination, and groupings relevant to the investigation (McSorley, 1996, p. 162). The first phase of the analysis was a selection of statements related to conceptions of teaching art criticism. In the second stage, McSorley searched for relationships among the statements. She then organised the content into categories that she described as "conceptions".

According to McSorley (1996, p. 162) this method differed from traditional paradigms of content analysis in that categories were not speculated upon in advance. She believed continuous checking of statements within their original contexts maintained their primary and intended meanings (p. 162). By then organising the content into categories, McSorley believed she had determined the most fundamental characteristics of the teachers' conceptions. In phenomenographic research, categories of description were viewed as the major outcome of the investigation (Marton, 1989, in McSorley, 1996, p. 162).

McSorley's data analysis revealed six major conceptions of the teaching of art criticism (1996, pp. 163 - 166). It was viewed by primary teachers as being: a selection of artworks for presentation; a stimulation for learning; the demonstration of expertise; the fostering of a learning process; momentary reflection; and joint exploration. However, she concluded that, when compared with the educational possibilities for teaching and learning that art criticism provided, (well documented in literature, for example Barrett, 1994a; Hart, 1991), the teachers' conceptions were limited. She believed this was because their perspectives failed to take into account the "life-worlds of the learners". Some of their conceptions assumed the presence of the learner but provided no clues as to how the learning occurred. As well, their approaches appeared to lack postmodern perspectives, having not taken into account linguistic development in relation to art-specific language. Wider issues, such as multiculturalism and gender equity, were not being addressed. There was no evidence of a set format or procedure for teaching art criticism. These findings were not surprising given that the subjects were generalist primary school teachers.

Of great interest was McSorley's finding that primary school teachers' conceptions of art criticism did not reflect any manner of philosophical or theoretical base from which arts criticism could be taught:

There was no evidence in the conceptions or categories of description that teachers had reflected upon their teaching of art criticism and no stated implications of their roles as teachers of art criticism beyond their claim to foster art appreciation. (McSorley, 1996, p. 167)
She found that if the teachers had art criticism in their pre-service training it was not obvious in their approaches. She called for education departments to monitor and evaluate the relationship between national policy documents and classroom practice, to ensure that aesthetics and art criticism, fields that provided opportunities for students to create and derive meaning from the visual arts, gained a firm place in the school curriculum. McSorley’s research methodology provided a model for reducing large quantities of data while remaining faithful to the original. Although it was a small study, her finding that teachers’ conceptions of art criticism did not have a philosophical base confirmed the concerns of theorists.

The studies described above indicated that, not only was there a lack of critical appraisal of artworks by students, but that this was likely to be the result of particular approaches used by teachers. Further, they support the view that this situation was due to a lack of sufficient assistance for teachers in terms of training in suitable teaching approaches and content of curriculum documents. There were no instances cited where teachers had been observed treating dialogue as a communicative relationship between equals involving explicit attempts to extend cognitive understanding. This had important implications for the requirements of national and Victorian curriculum documents in the mid 1990s.
CHAPTER THREE:
MODELS FOR USING PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY IN ARTS CRITICISM AND AESTHETICS

In order to respond to the major recommendations of Australian government and other reports on the arts in the 1980s\(^1\) and the national and state curriculum documents of the mid-1990s, changes to teacher training models were believed necessary. Professional development programs were required to assist teachers to effectively implement the new curricula (Northfield, 1988; Fullan, 1993). Programs to train both art teacher educators and art teachers were considered the key to success in the process of implementation. From 1995, the Cross Arts Program (the affiliated group of visual and performing arts teachers' associations in Victoria), performing and visual arts teacher educators at universities, the Art Craft Teachers Association (ACTA) and the National Gallery of Victoria Education Officers, all conducted professional development programs to assist teachers with their implementation of the new curriculum initiatives. As well, course study documents to supplement the CSFs were released. The Cross Arts Program maintained ongoing evaluation of its professional development sessions.

No specific reports on the introduction of the new Victorian Arts CSF documents were discovered during this study. A report commissioned by the Department of School Education (DSE) Victoria, on the introduction of the CSFs, contained no specific information about the implementation of the visual arts (Owen, Meyer & Livingstone, 1996). A Course Advisory Committee was set up by the DSE to supervise the writing of units to accompany the Visual Arts component of the new Arts CSF. The aim was to draft units which reflected current practice as well as assist areas where weaknesses were evident. The major weakness identified by the committee in terms of potential teacher implementation of the new curriculum documents was the Aesthetics and Art Criticism sub-strand. Associated issues included: the delivery of content in schools, approaches required to achieve expected outcomes, and whether non-arts trained (mainly primary) teachers were retarding student progress by attempting the strands with little understanding of the requirements.

The Advisory Committee found that the teachers involved in the trialing of materials rarely included postmodern concerns like socio-economic issues associated with art and concepts such as artistic freedom. It was found that students had little opportunity to express their ideas. Generally, students reproduced the teachers' interpretation of a theme, issue or object and not their own. It also found that some of the teachers trialing the new units were resisting the more

---

\(^1\) For example: *Action: Education and the Arts* a report of the Task Force on Education and the Arts (Boomer et al., 1985); *Art for Youth's Sake: Approaches to Teaching the Arts in Australian Senior Secondary Schools* (Owen & Stringer, 1988).
"challenging" units of the Aesthetics and Arts Criticism strand. One explanation offered by a member of the Committee\(^2\) was that school principals had chosen, for the trialing, teachers whom they felt lacked expertise in the arts and needed professional development.

Implications for teacher education were implicit in the recommendations and theoretical discussions which accompanied both the DBAE and postmodern models of art education in the 1980s and 1990s. If teachers were to cultivate their students’ aesthetic interests, then they would need to have their own aesthetic interests cultivated. If teachers were to develop appropriate responses to the arts, then their own responses would need to be appropriately developed. If they were to assist their students to become critical thinkers about arts issues and make rationally defensible judgments about works of art, then they also needed appropriate knowledge and skills. As well, they would need to recognise the values they held before they could handle discussions about others’ perspectives.

**Establishing The Teacher’s Role As Facilitator**

The introduction of Battin et al.’s puzzles approach (1989), Perkins’ reflective thinking (1994), Lipman exercises (1978, 1985), and other theorists’ recommended approaches (discussed in Chapter Two) is described below. The exploration of these approaches with art teachers served as the foundation for the intervention program developed for this study. It was believed by the researcher that these approaches might assist teachers to view themselves, not merely as sources of information, but as important models and facilitators of independent and rigorous thinking which could result from the using the inquiry process.

The curriculum guidelines for the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrand state that students will (a) talk, read and write about artworks, (b) learn how social and cultural values and meanings are constructed, (c) develop preferences and the ability to discriminate between art works and challenge ideas, and (d) reflect and respond to their own artworks and those of others, (CSF, 1995, p. 11). If teachers were to incorporate postmodern perspectives into these guidelines, then they would require assistance in developing appropriate strategies designed to aid successful reflection on, and deconstruction of, artworks. As well, they would need approaches for assisting students to challenge the opinions of others.

The extent to which the success of a discussion could be attributed to the teacher as facilitator of co-operative inquiry was widely discussed in Philosophy for Children literature (for example,

\(^2\) Margaret Stephens, art teacher educator at The University of Melbourne. Personal communication, (22.2.1996)
Lipman, 1988; Sharp & Reed, 1992; Splitter & Sharp, 1995). Given both her review of the literature and experience as a teacher educator, the researcher believed that for successful classroom discussion to occur teachers would need to establish an environment in which their students felt they could discuss and challenge opinions without it seeming like a personal attack.

If teachers wanted their students to become critical thinkers, then first they would need to be able to distinguish what this was and know how to achieve it. Critical thinking includes skills like giving reasons when making statements, self-corrective thinking, reviewing what is said and looking for mistakes in reasoning, ensuring that thinking is sensitive to the context, and asking probing questions, looking for hidden assumptions in what is being discussed. Reed (in Sharp & Reed, 1992) believed the students’ ability to say what had been achieved by a discussion and make suggestions concerning future directions for their inquiry was equally important.

Practitioners who had used Lipman’s community of inquiry approach to develop higher order thinking (for example, Sprod, 1994; Milvain, 1995) were confident that, when students developed the ability to think critically and reason well, they were able to think autonomously when confronted with ethical problems and become critically aware of how they used language. It was also believed that discussion habits such as stating opinions and the airing of too many anecdotes would be replaced by reflective thinking where students, with their teachers, viewed themselves as problem solvers and enjoyed the challenge of thinking about abstract, rather than concrete concepts.

Assisting teachers to build these skills with their students is the challenge teacher educators face. Immersion in the establishment of appropriate classroom settings and dialogue patterns, is one means of obtaining such practice. Santi (1993, p. 21) abridged in Table 7 below, provided a clear description of the teacher’s complex role.

Table 7: Santi’s Categories Of Teacher’s Role During Philosophical Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Help the circulation and comprehension of ideas. Help students see themselves as problem seekers and problem solvers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provoker</td>
<td>Stimulate students to explore and deepen their own positions. Through opposition to given statements offer new cues for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modulator</td>
<td>Foster the cohesion of the discourse and lead the reasoning process towards the most productive direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Control the correctness of reasoning and underline possible fallacies in arguments. Encourage listening to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporter</td>
<td>Support the cognitive operations involved in the thinking process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Santi believed that the extent to which the students’ questioning of others and clarification for themselves occurred was dependent on a teacher’s ability to use the approaches described above. It was therefore important for teachers to recognize that student questions played a prominent role in philosophical inquiry. Nurturing a reflective habit by exploring difficult issues was one way of achieving this.

A "soft" version of Socratic questioning, described by Paul (1993), Fisher (1990), and Lipman et al (1980), is one means of ensuring students are included in discussions and develop an awareness of the process of inquiry. For instance, if the teacher is able to adopt the habit of asking questions like: "Am I right in saying you think...?", or "Are you saying something different to Lee?", then their students should know that their opinions were valued. Secondly, they would be exposed to their peers' viewpoints and begin to recognize that there were many interpretations of complex issues. Importantly, this technique reflects an approach to art criticism recommended by postmodern theorists. It provides teachers with a means of deflecting the discussion back to the students, rather than dominating both questions and answers during a discussion. Having the students raise and explore controversial questions with one another meant they felt empowered to continue their search for meaning.

Susan Gardner's research (1995) extended and supported the emphasis of the Victorian CSF curriculum documents on inquiry learning and the development of the individual. Working in Canadian schools to establish philosophical inquiry as a means of improving outcomes, Gardner offered important cautionary reminders about the role of the facilitator in philosophical inquiry. She warned that over-intervention which could occur as a result of Socratic questioning being too rigorously applied, could prohibit inquiry. Letting go of "the reins of power" if handled appropriately, she stressed, would create an environment in which inquiry would flourish. For Gardner, there were three important aspects associated with successfully leading philosophical inquiry that would need to be included in professional development programs: first, specific training in pushing for depth in the dialogue; second, assistance in becoming attuned to topics that were philosophically fruitful; and third, encouragement to maintain focus (Gardner, 1995, p. 42).

Langrehr (1994), an educational psychologist who worked to assist South Australian teachers develop strategies to include critical thinking in their teaching, stressed the important role of focused questioning in facilitation of inquiry. He believed the mental processes used by good thinkers could be made explicit and taught in classrooms because, as schooling progressed, students gradually lost their ability to think flexibly in their pursuit of the correct answer. Good thinkers, he claimed were quick to recognize relevant patterns in information, asked themselves
probing questions about new information, and constructed clear mental summaries of the key terms and connections. Langrehr believed questioning was a neglected element of good thinking. His three groups of questions, paraphrased below, provided clear examples of the kinds of questions teachers could use to assist their students to dig deeper into issues:

1. Process building questions: for example, "What are five questions you could ask yourself prior to trying to solve a maths problem?"

2. Connection building questions: for example, "What are four properties common to all trees?"

3. Connection flexing questions: for example, "What are five properties of a tree and how could you link them with improving the design of breakfast cereal and the problems of the recession?" (Langrehr, 1994, p. 32)

Langrehr stressed the need for teachers to pay explicit attention to their questioning in class. The fields of aesthetics and art criticism provided complex issues which fostered such questioning.

Unlike classroom discussions which use simple question-answer routines (teacher, pupil, teacher, pupil etcetera) or the IRE pattern (Perrott, 1988, p. 16), one of the strengths of the philosophical inquiry approach is the way it encourages the students to raise and explore issues with one another. Ideally, the patterns of dialogue in a classroom using philosophical inquiry approach are: teacher/ student/ student/ student, or student/ student/ teacher/ student/ student.

Philosophical inquiry provides teachers with an achievable method for assisting their students to examine their personal interpretations of artworks and complex issues associated with the visual arts. As well, its approaches provide a structure which helps build a preparedness to listen to, and attempt to understand, the interpretations of others. Its classroom strategies foster the asking of challenging questions and giving students time to ask questions about the issues under consideration. Importantly for postmodern perspectives, participants involved in discussions of complex issues learn that different problems require different responses and that some can be resolved, some temporarily resolved and others have no resolution. The importance of clarifying one's own terms by accurate communication becomes apparent during discussions.

Models For Incorporating Arts Criticism & Aesthetics Into The Curriculum

Several professional development seminars for teachers were offered in Melbourne when the Arts CSF (1995) was first released. Their content, together with other facilitation strategies described earlier, influenced the content of the intervention program developed for this study. Besides appropriate classroom strategies which fostered inquiry, suitable resources drawn from visual arts examples were needed to stimulate inquiry into artistic issues. Activities modelled in the
seminars aimed to demonstrate that art works, art texts, news items about the visual arts and puzzles, if carefully selected, could stimulate reflection and critical and creative thinking. This could occur through the exploration of a variety of artistic experiences and through discussions of the meaning of concepts like expression, identity and freedom in connection with the arts. Learning to recognise points of view presented by artists, narrators and subjects was an integral part of the above activities.

Combining "Puzzles" And Philosophical Inquiry

In small research studies during the early 1990s, the researcher had examined patterns of teacher/student "talk" (Wilks 1992, 1993, 1994) and found that the discussions held by teachers who were trained in philosophical approaches revealed a shift in the normal discussion pattern of teacher/ student/ teacher/ student to, more frequently, teacher/ student/ student/ teacher/ student where the students were responding directly to one another and participating more in classroom dialogue. It was observed in these studies, that presenting students with open-ended questions and resources which challenged and encouraged reflective thinking were vital elements in critical thinking. When materials presented to the students were sufficiently challenging in both content and questioning, they willingly contributed to a discussion.

In a small study Emery & Wilks (1994) sought to discover whether the puzzles approach of Battin et al (1989) would foster aesthetic inquiry in secondary art classrooms. They wished to establish how and when puzzles were best used in art rooms and the outcomes students were likely to achieve from being engaged in puzzles. They also wished to provide curriculum advice for teaching the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics strand of the CSF.

Six teachers were asked to trial a range of puzzles which comprised a brief scenario and accompanying questions selected from eight topics in the field of aesthetics. The teachers were observed discussing these puzzles with their classes. The sessions were audio taped. The puzzles required students to consider issues in the visual arts about which there was no definitive answer. For example: definitions of art and non-art; cultural, gender and racial factors affecting judgement;

---

3 Emery & Wilks (1994), "Aesthetic Inquiry in the Arts Classroom". Arts educators, artists and gallery owners were asked to provide instances which involved some sort of aesthetic puzzle. A sample puzzle (aesthetic encounter) was included. Responses were prepared for classroom use and trialled to establish whether students understood the puzzles, whether the questions provided were clear and comprehensive, and whether they engaged the students in arguments around aesthetic issues. For example: 1. What is art and what is not art? 2. Ownership and artist rights. 3. Forgery, plagiarism and appropriation. 4. Art, money and meaning. 5. Art that shocks. 6. Culture and gender issues.

4 Topics included: 1. Sensory responses. 2. Constructed values. 3. The viewer, the object, and the interaction. 4. Change and tradition. 5. Experience and power. 6. Commodity worship. 7. Politics, ethics, religion, gender and racial issues. 8. The integrity of the art work.
the value placed on an artworks’ authenticity; ownership; artists’ rights and artistic integrity. One of the puzzles, written by a contemporary arts lecturer, is included below:

**Street Images: Art or Vandalism?**

In 1984, the American artist Keith Haring visited Melbourne. Haring, a white American artist, was trained in an orthodox art school but became involved with street culture in New York (rap music, hip-hop, graffiti etc). As a result, the images that Haring produced seem to combine attributes of two systems that are usually kept separate - art and street subculture. His work borrows from graffiti but is shown in art galleries; it is discussed as art but is visible on the street; he makes paintings for display in museums but also designs T-shirts, watches and streetwear. While in Melbourne, Haring painted a mural on a wall at the Collingwood TAFE on Johnston Street. This mural is now fading. Some people have suggested that the mural should be preserved as the only example of graffiti art by an American still visible on the street in Australia. Others argue that it should fade away, because graffiti was never meant to last.

Questions:

- Do images have to be encountered in an art context (gallery, museum) to count as art?
- Can we interpret graffiti using the value system of art?
- The law calls graffiti vandalism; does Haring’s mural escape this accusation?
- Should we try to evaluate graffiti as art, or is it better to keep it separate?
- Should the Haring mural be preserved or left to fade?
- What kind of preservation would be best - repainting, photographic documentation, oral history?
- How does Haring’s work relate to the graffiti of black urban subcultures? Is he cashing in on it? Is he criticizing the elitism of white museum culture?

(C. McAluliffe, 1994, Department of Fine Arts, The University of Melbourne)

It was expected that it would be difficult for untrained teachers to change their inquiry modes in classrooms where some degree of trust had not already been established in the classroom and where the teacher viewed her/himself as responsible for possessing and transferring the “knowledge”. However, Emery and Wilks (1994) found that, although the philosophical inquiry approach was foreign to the art teachers and specific training would be required, the puzzles’ approach was successful in terms of student engagement in discussions. Teachers liked the content and recognised the benefits of the process of inquiring into interesting or problematic aesthetic issues.

The puzzles evoked reflective and reasoned discussions of controversial issues in art. It followed that, if teachers used resources like these to encourage thinking about issues connected with art and aesthetics, then they would be impressed by both the depth of perception and the insights of their students. Participating teachers interviewed during the study (Emery & Wilks, 1994) admitted they had rarely engaged their classes in aesthetic discussions apart from what was directly connected with their art making. This was due either to their ignorance of the scope of
the field, or to their uncertainty about what was required in the newly emerging national and state art curriculum materials.

Three teachers in the Emery and Wilks study (1994) (Teachers 7, 8 and 9 from Schools D, E and F)\(^5\), were shown the transcripts of their observed sessions and subsequently interviewed. Transcriptions were also made of the interviews. They were asked whether they believed there was a place for puzzles in the art curriculum and whether they would use such an approach in future. Their understanding of the term aesthetics was also sought. Last, they were asked to describe the way they were incorporating the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics component of the CSF (1995) into their program. The teachers' reactions to their own and their students' roles during puzzles sessions, and their existing art classroom practices were revealing.

Their comments provided guidelines for future intervention programs. The teachers recognised the need for a broader definition of aesthetics beyond, for example, the appreciation of beauty. They desired to develop an understanding of what comprised critical thinking in connection with the visual arts and how to infuse it in their art appreciation classes.

The teachers believed the puzzles were an effective adjunct to both their art history and production classes because they effectively encouraged evaluation of both students' work and that of other artists. Monitoring the discussions of the puzzles informed the teachers about their students' thinking processes and the students as individuals. Their descriptions of their "usual" approaches, together with the changes to their approaches and their students' responses were revealing. It appeared that the puzzles approach alone, even without teacher training associated with specific approaches to foster thinking skills, had brought changes in student participation and levels of discussion. They referred to changes in their approaches to facilitation of discussions and the potential of problematic issues to improve thinking about art. The students' willingness to discuss their opinions about complex issues which resulted from the challenges the puzzles offered, and the high cognitive level of discussions that were reported and observed, were positive outcomes of the project. Both students and teachers admitted they were now thinking about issues they had not previously considered.

Five major topics which emerged from the interview transcripts are included in Table 8 below. It contains a summary of the teachers' major points which both reinforced theorists' claims and suggested future professional development requirements.

---

5 Teacher 7, a recent art teacher graduate, trialled the puzzles with a Year 10 at an all boys Independent school. Teacher 8, an art teacher with 20 years experience, trialled the puzzles in Year 9 at an all girls Independent school. Teacher 9, an art teacher with 30 years experience, trialled the puzzles with Year 8s at an all boys Independent school.
### Table 8: Teachers’ Critiques Of Current And Requisite Art Discussion Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher 7</th>
<th>Teacher 8</th>
<th>Teacher 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ reaction to their</td>
<td>obstructed discussion through fear of losing control</td>
<td>did not elicit student comments because she dominated</td>
<td>aware he made students dependent because he built on their contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reaction to puzzle</td>
<td>evidence of reflective thinking</td>
<td>enjoyed issues and ideas</td>
<td>enthusiastic about topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenged thinking</td>
<td>students willing to express opinions and reveal emotions</td>
<td>long, engaged discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new verbal contributors</td>
<td></td>
<td>liked expressing opinions and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enjoyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual approaches to art</td>
<td>most time spent doing ‘prac’</td>
<td>analysis of artworks using modernist approaches</td>
<td>no attempt to improve thinking about aesthetics issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciation</td>
<td>filling out worksheets</td>
<td>time often taken by ‘prac’</td>
<td>not enough time, so ‘prac’ dominated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no emphasis on developing self-esteem</td>
<td>seen as luxury time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences with puzzles</td>
<td>the challenge got students talking</td>
<td>captured interest</td>
<td>developed thinking skills, encouraging conceptualisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach</td>
<td>no need for art theory knowledge</td>
<td>introduced wider issues</td>
<td>new confidence to express opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teachers’ role changed to catering for imaginative approaches and setting context for student questions</td>
<td>helpful for Year 11 &amp; 12 requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of discussion</td>
<td>channel students while allowing the questioning of ideas teachers needed confidence to develop follow-up questions &amp; use student answers</td>
<td>teachers lacked confidence to develop discussions and chose written tasks instead</td>
<td>teacher needed skills to facilitate discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>important that students trusted teacher to accept and appreciate their opinions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was apparent that, in order for teachers to gain maximum advantage from the puzzles approach and content, attendance at specifically designed professional development seminars would be necessary. The teacher’s role had proven to be the key to achieving successful implementation of inquiry into the issues raised by the puzzles. The strategy of shared inquiry was better handled when the teachers established an environment for fruitful discussions.

Stephens, a Melbourne University art teacher educator, and a member of a team writing Course Advice to accompany the Victorian Arts CSF (1995), requested the researcher to review the draft document. Consequently, the researcher provided questions which she believed added the dimension of philosophical inquiry to existing questions in the draft. According to Stephens
during a subsequent interview for this study, the new questions helped her appreciate that the questions in the existing "extension" units of the Course Advice limited student thinking because they:

... lacked depth and tended to 'seal' a conversation rather than open it. I realised your questions provided new engagement with issues and sought students' responses where there was not necessarily a 'right' answer. I also realised that the critical point was in the questioning, including the tone used, and that the direction the discussion took should not be considered in terms of outcome, but rather student response and participation. (Stephens, 22.2.1996)

Philosophical inquiry questions were subsequently added to the Course Advice (1996). For example: "If an object affects your feelings and stimulates ideas, is that enough to enable us to call it art?", and, "Audit your home for objects that might be considered works of art. Is your surfing poster a work of art?".

Stephens felt confident that, with the right questioning, students' intrinsic interest would be aroused, because opinions offered could be based on observation and reasoning rather than the teachers' pre-conceived right answer. However, she found when trialing the materials, that both the content and approach "seriously alienated" some teachers. Their resistance centred, she believed, around the following issues: the questions were challenging their perceptions of art; the content was too difficult for the junior secondary level; teachers felt there was no clear syllabus; no right or wrong solutions were provided with activities; questions were too hard; the discussions would mean there was not enough time for production; and there were no resources to support the questions. Stephens elaborated:

Given these objections it was obvious that the 'controversial issues' approach would be difficult for teachers to adopt. They said to me: 'Our students aren't interested in art anyway, how could we take any time off their making to spend time talking?' I tried to explain to them that the positive trade-off from having discussions about controversial issues would be the students' heightened interest and commitment because their ideas are sought. But, in the end, I would think only about eight out of forty teachers really understood what the benefits would be. (Stephens, 22.2.1996)

She offered the following reasons for the teachers' reactions. In primary schools particularly, few teachers had specialised training and therefore taught almost no art. The meagre amount of time devoted to art in the timetable at both primary and secondary levels was given as a reason against spending time "talking". Teachers felt uncomfortable with controversial issues because of the limits of their own knowledge and were uneasy about handling open discussion topics. They were already nervous about the Aesthetics and Art Criticism component of the Victorian CSF. They believed that the challenging issues, which did not directly focus on an historical approach
where they could find textual back-up, were too difficult to handle. Finally, they felt discussion of such issues was emotionally exhausting.

Stephens also observed an implicit resistance on the part of the teachers to the idea of having to listen to their students' opinions about "big issues". She believed that teachers generally conceived aesthetics to be associated with notions of beauty (or its absence) in art and expression of feelings about works. This brought about resistance to other challenging issues. Her belief was that contemporary postmodern work, with its challenges to modernist perceptions and conceptions and its requirement to discuss confronting issues, was a problem for many teachers. This was particularly so for teachers with little art training and rural teachers with limited access to the city galleries.

Given the response of teachers to the problem-solving approach in art, Stephens (1996) then trialled the new questioning model with second-year trainee teachers. Instead of confirming what they had offered in response to her questions, she would select two or three of their responses and "question them back", that is, ask "level two" questions (Gardner, 1995). This meant the students were informally re-examining both their observation and thinking about works of art and associated issues. Stephens found that following participation in these discussions, students demonstrated, during subsequent conversations, that they were still reflecting on the issues discussed some weeks earlier.

Stephens described the ways her own teaching practice changed. She had begun to use what she called the "probing question" approach and make self-reflective comments, for example, "That was not a very clear description", a process Philosophy for Children practitioners called self-correction. She had begun to emphasise, in teacher education classes, teachers' pre-conceptions about student abilities and end-points, and the ways teachers instilled their values without realising. Stephens also delved more deeply into cross-cultural issues and demonstrated ways that resources, readily available in school settings, could be used to develop problematic issues and concepts.

These approaches, Stephens believed, dealt with the issues raised by postmodern artefacts and artists' statements. There was no resistance from the teacher trainees who reported observing the limitations practicing teachers were placing on their students by their use of closed approaches to discussing and making art.
Visual Arts CSF Professional Development Seminar

In an effort to assist art teachers to incorporate the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrand of the CSF (1995), Emery, at a professional development seminar in 1995, used a "working" definition of aesthetics as "the construction of artistic values" related to experiencing and making art. The aesthetic was further described as a form of both sensory response and knowledge, a branch of philosophy which inquired into aesthetic experience. She believed that through activities based on the discipline of aesthetics, students could be helped to "read" the artworks and the artistic world. She emphasised the need to understand there were complex values that underlay the "contradictory and often confusing language of art" and the importance of recognising not only that individuals constructed their values concerning art, but also what was behind this construction.

Importantly for this study, Emery advocated the need for students to become critical thinkers in art. Resnick's traits of higher-order thinking (in Paul, 1993, pp. 141-142) were introduced. Emery believed higher-order thinking was neglected in schools and stressed that, if teachers wished their students to make reasoned and logical judgments, then they would need to develop strategies to assist them.

At the same seminar, Gaughan, a member of a National Gallery of Victoria (NGV) Education section reminded the seminar of the need to continue questioning until "points of contact" between two opinions expressed could be used by the teacher, as facilitator, to foster further discussion. He stated that, if teachers wished their students to make "creative and conceptual leaps", then it could only be through discussion.

Emery referred to Robert Hughes' preparedness to articulate his opinions about artworks and also to "the power of language". Perkins (1994, p. 11) had illustrated this point by stressing that, once an opinion about a particular art work was heard or read, one's approach to that piece was changed forever.

The same seminar included a discussion of art objects around the city streets, controversial for a variety of reasons. It demonstrated that art in the environment offered opportunities to challenge stereotypical thinking and consider definitions of art and culture. Teachers, in groups, were then given a puzzle and associated questions. One example was Ben Vautier's Nice (1994) in which he presented himself for consideration as a piece of art (in Battin et al., 1989, p. 14). Issues which emerged during discussion demonstrated the practicality of this approach. Questions

---

6 Lee Emery, co-writer with Hammond of the National Profile: The Arts (1994) at the National Gallery of Victoria (10.11.1995)
which arose included: What is art? What is the significance of place and time when examining art works? Is an audience a necessary pre-requisite for objects to be considered art?, and, What is the place of "expert" judgement when judging artistic merit? The teachers were easily engaged by the topic, which, combined with immersion in the philosophical inquiry approach encouraged the expression of opinions.

The key concepts of a philosophical inquiry (see Table 9 below) were also introduced. Compiled by the researcher, they were drawn from what was considered to be the essential characteristics of Stewart’s proposed learning outcomes (1994, pp. 80-82) and the qualities Reed considered necessary for a successful philosophical dialogue (Snowbird 11, 1989, pp. 45-46). It was considered that teachers would need to be able to employ topics which had philosophical depth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For successful philosophical inquiry</th>
<th>¥ appreciate the process of wondering about, and reflecting on, issues and ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teachers &amp; students need to:</td>
<td>¥ value the asking of questions about the nature and significance of objects and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ seek out, and listen carefully to, others’ points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ carefully present and appreciate the process of evaluating reasons and supporting one’s own ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ develop an awareness of one’s values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom approaches which foster inquiry:</th>
<th>¥ provide resources which raise questions about value laden situations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ aim to have students responding to one another rather than the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ allow 1-o-n-g-e-r wait times to give all students the chance to reflect and then formulate their ideas and join the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ encourage, not suppress, discussion of philosophical issues as they emerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ less teacher talk, more student talk - avoid seeking a particular end point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ establish an environment which encourages student questions about issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>¥ model good reasoning, reflection and listening skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "puzzles approach" offered both a starting point and a framework for discussion. The teachers could see that, although some background knowledge would be useful, the issues did not have a right answer. The teachers, none of whom had used either the puzzles approach or the philosophical inquiry discussion model with their students, declared that complex issues usually arose when considering postmodern art with their students. The puzzles contained the issues that challenged the art world in the late 1990s. There was not an aesthetic but a process of inquiry
which continually challenged values. With the approach outlined above, art was both the dialogue and the mediator.

Although no explicit link was made between the seminar activities and the Arts CSF learning outcomes statements, the strategies used during the seminar had demonstrated to the teachers ways they could achieve the stated outcomes.

Combining Approaches And Theories: Art, Philosophy And The CSF

In 1996, Gaughan, a National Gallery of Victoria (NGV) Education Officer, along with a practicing teacher and the researcher, presented a professional development seminar at the NGV which demonstrated how philosophical inquiry could be applied across the curriculum using the visual arts as the resource. It comprised a combination of Philosophy for Children approaches, activities used in the seminar described above and practical application of art education theories, see (a) to (j) below:

(a) The key concepts associated with a philosophical inquiry approach (see Table 9 above). The importance of asking the kinds of questions that stimulate critical thinking (Langrehr, 1994).

(b) Discussion of aesthetics as an issue-centred approach. Russell’s (1991) explanation of differences between the philosophical inquiry and philosophical perspectives approaches to teaching aesthetics, and examples of ways concepts can be clarified (see also Chapter Two). Works from the NGV collection were used to illustrate Russell’s definitions.

(c) The philosophical inquiry and puzzles approach as recommended by Battin et al. (1989), emphasising its value in forcing the examination of theories and discovery of examples which either proved to be complete and consistent or un-satisfactory. Questions believed to demonstrate the broad philosophical issues that could arise from considering artworks using a puzzles approach were based on two sculptures.

---

7 The strategies included: 1. Respond to visual arts works in a personal way. 2. Respond to visual arts works, giving reasons for preferences. 3. Respond to key features of visual arts works. 4. Talk and write informally about personal observations of visual arts works. 5. Use appropriate language to describe ways images and forms are organised to express ideas and feelings in visual arts works. 6. Identify, analyse and interpret visual arts works and discuss responses to these works. 7. Use processes of critical analysis to support personal judgements of visual arts works. (CSF, 1995, p. 1)


Questions which arose included:

What is nude? What is naked?
Which term describes each work?
Is either idealised?
Is either confronting? If so, what is being challenged?
Why are we offended by imperfections or reality in a nude?
Is either work pornographic, or considered so?
If nudity offends some cultural or religious groups, should nudes be discreetly out of sight?
(d) An exploration of Perkins’ (1994) concept of "reflective intelligence". Perkins’ innovative approach to the critical examination of artworks lay in his emphasis on the need to take the time to practice "broad and adventurous" looking and thinking as well as "deep thinking". Going further than Feldman’s (1970) critical response approach, Perkins provided a vital link between the modernist approach of scanning and formal analysis (line, colour, etc.) and philosophical inquiry with its strategies which encouraged postmodern approaches to deconstructing art.

(e) Works from the NGV collection were used to raise the following discussion issues in order to demonstrate the rich field of inquiry offered by aesthetics.

1. What is art? Is it the embodiment of a certain set of formal properties or just what is labelled as art by those who play roles in the world of art?
2. Are critical judgments in any way objective, or are they merely expressions of individual taste?
3. How can non-pictorial works have meaning or make statements about content, representation, truth, reality etc.?
4. What exactly may a performance artist do and not do with and to the work being performed to prevent a forgery?
5. Should art pieces that may cause public affrontery affect their placement in a gallery?
6. How does the context of an art work assist the discovery of an artist’s value systems? What of the viewer’s values?
7. What are the effects on the value of art work that has been copied or restored?

(f) Teachers toured the gallery and devised their own puzzles. For example puzzles were set around: a sign in the contemporary exhibition warning that some works may offend; whether it was reasonable to consider a temperature gauge on a wall a work of art. These were then discussed by the seminar group.

(g) The NGV collection as a source of philosophical inquiry activities associated a variety of curriculum outcome requirements (for example, Arts, Technology, English, Social Science).

(h) An activity where a narrative associated with a work was described to the teachers who were then asked to draw what they imagined the piece might look like. They then viewed the piece at the gallery. Prolonged reflection on, and deep looking at one piece, (Perkins, 1994), was the result.

(i) A sheet containing hundreds of sketched facial expressions was discussed prior to gallery visit as a means of assisting students to examine portraits.
A Lipman exercise (see below) which required decisions about whether various objects should be categorised as art or something else, was introduced. This activity resulted in a discussion of the criteria necessary for an object to be considered a work of art.

**What is Art?**

Suppose that your family is about to move. When the removalists arrive you are the only one at home. The removalists ask you to point out any works of art so they can take special care when packing them. Your problem is - how do you tell art from non-art? Suppose you encountered the following, how would you classify them - art or non-art - and why? Be prepared to give reasons for your response.

1. A rocking chair
2. Your sister’s earrings
3. The family car.
4. The framed reproduction of a Van Gogh painting.
5. The bookends you made at school.
7. The kitchen sink.
8. The wire sculpture you made of pipe cleaners.

(Lipman, 1985, p. 257)

Participant teachers’ positive evaluations of the exercises used during both training seminars described above, together with findings of Emery and Wilks (1994), supported the belief that such approaches would be effective. The activities and teaching strategies used during these studies and seminars provided a foundation for the intervention teacher training sessions conducted during this study, described in detail in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS OF THE OBSERVATION OF VERBAL INTERACTION

The Study Design

The literature reviewed for this study indicates that appropriate classroom strategies coupled with resources which stimulate and foster critical inquiry can provide art teachers with suitable approaches for teaching the new aesthetics. Chapter Three described a study by Emery and Wilks (1994) which reported that three Melbourne art teachers revealed they lacked understanding of the aesthetics component of the draft Arts CSF and appropriate strategies to address it. The teachers also believed that a higher cognitive level in discussions resulted when they used puzzles to raise aesthetic issues. Also, various professional development seminars held during 1995, which introduced many of the activities and approaches suggested by the theorists, had been well received by art teachers seeking to incorporate the new CSF requirements.

The above convinced the researcher that art teachers required specific training to assist them to develop the skills required to manage aspects of the Arts CSF. However, before developing a full-scale training program, it was necessary to investigate current practices in art room discussions. The observation of selected art classrooms was considered to be a necessary first step.

This chapter describes the methodological approaches and means of data analysis chosen for this study. It commences with a description of the general aims, principles and features of the research approach. Details of the researcher’s early classroom presence, the rationale for the chosen ethnographic strategies, the un-structured observation, and subsequent interviews with the participant teachers follow. A rationale for the employment of a modified version of Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC, 1970) is included.

Throughout this study it was important to discover teachers’ perceptions of their art teaching practice. It was believed that concrete incidents of the teachers’ behaviour would assist understanding of the sites observed. It was hoped the participants would feel sufficiently empowered by their experience of semi-structured interviews to see themselves as important informants. Their "voice", i.e. their analysis of observed and reported events and activities, became a critical component of this study.

A naturalistic paradigm (Stake, 1995) which evolves, is reshaped, and constructs experience, suited this study. Naturalistic inquiry determines its course through emergent knowledge and
understandings which are uncovered through investigation. In a naturalistic paradigm the researcher becomes an instrument working through multiple realities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37). In this study, the idea of a large scale and perhaps quantitative study was rejected in favour of an intensive approach which comprised three complementary case studies, each involving the use of multiple methods of data collection. The methodology was predominantly field-based and qualitative and the role of the classroom teacher was pivotal to this study. The teachers, who were involved over a period of two years (1995 and 1996), were willing participants and supportive of the area being researched. Data analysis emphasised the use of rich descriptive methods with structured observation. Analysis of structured classroom data was conducted in conjunction with the field-based qualitative data collection. Literature provided additional frames of reference.

The evaluation of an intervention within a case-study mould enabled a long and intensive engagement with three teacher participants and their classes (viewed as three complementary case studies). An understanding that case studies could legitimately draw on multiple methods (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988), that is, interview, unstructured non-participant observation and structured observation, underlay the study design. Two contrasting research paradigms were used in this study: first, an ethnography comprising unstructured observation was the predominant method of the early stage of the study; second, a more structured approach to data collection which emerged from the first stage. In the later stage, a modified FIAC was applied to transcripts of classroom dialogue and used in conjunction with semi-structured interviews for the major phase of the study. The modified FIAC was applied to classroom recordings rather than being directly "scored" in the classroom as was more usual with FIAC (Flanders, 1970).

In summary, the sequence of research events in this study was:

(a) Preliminary informal classroom observation using experienced art teachers and their classes as "participants". This involved:
   (i) unstructured non-participant classroom observation with the recording and transcribing of observed sessions,
   (ii) analysis of pre-intervention open-ended interviews,
   (iii) structured classroom observation using a modified FIAC observation system to categorise the transcripts of observed sessions.

(b) Designing and conducting an intervention seminar.

(c) Evaluation of the intervention using the same three teachers and their classes as participants. This involved:
   (i) unstructured non-participant observation with the recording and transcribing of observed classroom sessions,
   (ii) analysis of post-intervention open-ended interviews,
(iii) analysis of classroom observation and the use of the modified FIAC system and a process called "Texting" to analyse the transcripts of observed sessions.

(d) Comparison of pre- and post intervention data.

Part (a) is described in this chapter, part (b) in Chapter Five, and (c) and (d) are described in Chapter Six.

Principles Underlying The Study Design

Sullivan (1996), an Australian art educator who had conducted research for Harvard's Project Zero, stated that criteria for effective art education research should, apart from extending knowledge, "involve critical and creative investigation; must satisfy criteria of trustworthiness; should be publicly verifiable, and needs to have commonsense appeal" (p. 5). This suggested that experience, reasoning, reliance on one's tacit knowledge, and reference to other authorities are all important when endeavouring to understand the results of educational research.

Throughout the gathering and analysis of data in this study, the voices of the participants are used for thematic analysis. Themes emerge from interviews, transcripts, written documents and observed behaviours. This research approach, commonly described as grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) enables categories to emerge from the data in field notes. Analysis is suggested by the priorities embedded in these notes.

Miles and Huberman (1984) described ways of generating meaning from data. Their methods of repetition, themes, patterns and noting differences and similarities, were broadly the approaches used in this study when interview material was being reduced (Eisner, 1993; McSorley, 1996). Another of Miles and Huberman's categories, that of making symbols for what was happening, was used when patterns in the transcripts of observed classroom sessions were sought using a modified version of the FIAC (Flanders, 1970). Codified data were employed to describe relationships between, and approaches to, the verbal dimension of teaching and learning.

Data were gathered from both structured and unstructured classroom observation and interviews. Trustworthiness was able to be assessed because there was sustained engagement with sites and subjects, corroboration of participants, triangulation, member checking, auditing, and reflective revision for credibility, validity and reliability. The outcomes of the research, although emerging from specific sites and case studies, could be judged to be relevant to other settings and situations. The instructional models used during an intervention phase were grounded in the philosophical inquiry approach to the teaching of arts criticism and aesthetics (CSF, 1995).
Combining Research Methods

If researchers are concerned about research being scientific, and if being scientific involves rigorous and systematic empirical inquiry that was data-based, then, according to Bogdan and Biklen (1982, p.43), qualitative research (as well as quantitative research) meets those requirements. Qualitative observers use techniques for collecting and analysing data which are well grounded in theory and they are rigorous about keeping records.

According to Eisner (1991), the transformation of numerical data into statistical statements results in a loss of particular focus and what emerges is a description of relationships, almost disconnected from the particulars from which the data were originally secured. He conceded, however, that it could be useful to transform particular qualitative features into generic statements because aggregation was possible through this process, and, through aggregation, a kind of perceptual economy could be achieved. Eisner's concern was important because in this study the qualitative data were transformed into codings to examine whether there were observable trends. In order to keep the flavour of the sites and events in this study the results of the two approaches are presented side by side. However, there are problems when combining these approaches.

When considering combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in one study, there is some danger that, rather than achieving a good hybrid, the combined approach might produce a study that does not meet the criteria for either approach well (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 42). As the two approaches are based on different assumptions, there is also the danger that a study could become more about the research methods than the project being researched (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Morehouse (1995), an eminent researcher in the field of philosophical inquiry in schools, posed the question: if the qualitative and quantitative approaches to research represent different views of the world, then is it possible to simply adopt, at will, portions of the alternate world view? Mixed paradigms, he suggested, might present problems for studies which combine quantitative and qualitative results, such as using qualitative methodology for generalising findings. However, he also stated that combining qualitative and quantitative research in one project, although it might present problems, also offered opportunities on both a philosophical and practical level.

Morehouse believed that practical and philosophical challenges are related to the above. As one of the most salient characteristics of qualitative research is its emergent nature, the findings which emerge from the data and the design of a study are also emergent (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Problems might surface at both planning and results stages. If the researcher is concerned about keeping the design open to new findings and new patterns of
understanding, then the risk is that perhaps there will be no focus and no coherence. On the other hand, if the researcher attempts to control in advance all the questions to be asked, a basic tenet of the qualitative research paradigm is violated. Also, if most of the topics for follow-up are predetermined, then the research design could not be said to be emergent because the emergent design kept the possibility for changes in direction open.

Caracelli and Greene's (1993) research focus was on the challenges and benefits of mixed-method evaluation. They described strategies for successful mixed-method evaluation designs which were derived from, and illustrated by, empirical practice. Sullivan (1996) believed combined research approaches were particularly appropriate in the field of art education. He conceded, that while approaches to research were diversified, there was still pressure for researchers to conform to the conventions of the research community. He stressed the need for art educators to "know the language and tactics of all forms of research" (Sullivan, 1996, p. 14). He argued that there was evidence to suggest that the "reality of research practice" blurred the philosophical distinctions between qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Sullivan also contended it made as little sense to maintain the divide between the two methods as it did to keep the distinction between thought and action or theory and practice. While based on different conceptions of knowledge, such as specific outcomes and precision compared with multiple meanings and authenticity, the "analytic" and "systematic" approaches complemented each other in data analysis. A combination of the subjective and the objective provided a plausible account of the human enterprise and supported the notion of intersubjectivity of individuals and cultures (Sullivan, 1996, p. 16).

When assessing the viability of qualitative findings, Sullivan argued the criterion was not so much whether an outcome was statistically significant, but whether it was meaningful. Therefore, for researchers working from a qualitative perspective, the emphasis on discovery requires vigilance particularly when dealing with issues of validity and reliability which involve:

\[\ldots\text{sound reasoning, systematic analysis and sustained focusing, along with the process of subjecting emerging findings to continual empirical challenge as new observations are brought to bear on existing insights. (Sullivan, 1996, p. 17)}\]

It appeared then, that focussing on the strengths of the two paradigms and using each approach as a study required, was both an appropriate and legitimate source of knowledge in the field of art education.
The Relationship Between Researcher And Participants: In-Depth Case Analysis

I want to understand the meaning of your experience, to walk in your shoes, to understand the world from your point of view, to feel things as you feel them and explain them as you explain them. Will you be my teacher and help me understand? (Spradley, 1979, p. 34)

"Humanistic" research, particularly in the creative arts, recognises the usefulness of the subjectivity of both the informants and the researcher. The interaction between the researcher and the participants in this study was a two-way process (Fielding, 1996, p. 13). It was recognised that the context for the research would have a direct bearing on the behaviour of both. The background of both the researcher and participants could be used to assist the understanding of data.

A purely quantitative method of data collection and analysis was not appropriate for this study. Although it supposedly enables consistent prediction of events, it limits the questions that can be asked, the nature of admissible solutions, and empathetic interaction with teacher participants. Subjectivity, properly construed, allows the development of analytical, conceptual and categorical components from the data itself.

Fielding (1996, p. 14) described two kinds of subjective data. Firstly, the researcher's own feelings and reactions to what was observed, which should be noted in context because they could affect future questions and subsequent actions as well as interpretation of events. Secondly, the subject's expressions/behaviours which may be felt rather than observed or expressed, but are important for providing insights into the meanings of behaviours.

In this study, understanding the context of the observed behaviours and the meaning of specific outcomes for both students and teachers in the observed settings was important. For example, classroom observation presents an opportunity for the development of empathy with the teachers and sympathetic introspection can result from personal encounters. It was expected that understanding would result from knowledge of the teacher participants' classes over a period of time. It was further believed that factual representation could be achieved through the participants' descriptions of their activities together with analysis of data taken from transcriptions of observed sessions.

One way to make subjective data more reliable is to casually observe or interact with the interviewee after the observation in order to informally pick up information (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) suggested that formal confirmation or disconfirmation of
the data with the subject is good ethical practice. In this study, as many opportunities as possible to discuss classroom occurrences with the participating teachers were taken and journal notes were entered either on site or immediately afterwards. As classroom data were gathered and analysed, the teachers were shown transcripts of their lessons and interviews and their comments sought.

To the extent that it was possible to achieve, objectivity and control were preferable when attempting to represent cognitive levels of student/teacher arts-based dialogue and for comparison of sites and approaches. The use of an amended FIAC system, with no predicted outcomes, meant data emerged and were categorised into specific teacher and student verbal contributions as one way of finding patterns in what had been observed.

As indicated above, in-depth case analysis was believed to be more appropriate than a large-scale comparison, aimed at finding similarities across program treatments. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1982), qualitative analysis was not necessarily concerned with whether results were generalisable. They thought care should be taken not to imply other cases are necessarily similar. They believed, however, that a commonality existed between similar settings, for example classrooms, because human behaviour is not random or idiosyncratic. Therefore, concern should not be whether observations are generalisable, but rather to which other settings and subjects they are generalisable.

**Ethnographic And Postmodern Approaches To Case Studies**

Spradley’s ethnographic approach, "the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behaviour" (Spradley, 1979, p. 3) has been adopted in this study where practicable. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described this approach as "naturalistic" because the researcher observed, interviewed, recorded, described, interpreted and appraised settings as they were. Spradley believed ethnography offered an excellent strategy for discovering grounded theory. Reflecting newly emerging postmodern awareness of multiple perspectives, he noted that "every ethnographic description is a translation. As such, it must use both native terms and their meanings as well as those of the ethnographer" (Spradley, 1979, p. 22-23).

Postmodern ethnography is concerned with looking for the ways historical and cultural contexts shape researchers’ preconceptions. By the 1980s postmodern writers were becoming concerned with issues of "intersubjectivity", that is, how the researcher and researched affected each other, how experiences related to data, how meanings were imposed on experience, how data were organised and transformed, and how (in the broadest possible sense) the research act was socially constructed (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The researcher was conscious that analytic researchers, as
outsiders to the culture, do not always understand the concepts and terms used by the informants, for example an outsider might call street kids "swaggies", (Spradley, 1979). The voices of the teachers-as-informants concerning observed and transcribed sessions and interviews (Stout, 1995, Belenky et al., 1986), were believed to add a valued dimension to this study.

Spradley (1979, p. 31) described "informants" as the teachers of the ethnographer. Both the language of the informants and questions which arose out of their classroom cultures without their cultural knowledge being distorted were used in this study. This guided the open-ended, semi-structured approach for the interviews which followed the initial observation phase. The participants (informants) were advised of the extent and intent of interviews, and encouraged to speak the way they would to others in their profession. Questions which sought to understand their knowledge were asked. The strategy of repeating and restating their responses as well as expressing interest and ignorance was employed.

The major components of ethnographic research, that is, field notes, observations, interviews, records, diaries and personal documents, were kept for the purposes of this study. However, due to school timetable constraints and the specific focus on classroom discussions, the observation of each informant, which occurred once a week for an hour, was not in keeping with the degree of immersion in a setting advocated by Spradley.

When both interviewing and observing the teacher participants' classroom discussions, audio-tape recordings were made while notes were taken as each session progressed. As soon as practicable after observation and interviews, clarifying details were added. It was believed that tape recording and transcribing classroom sessions and interviews minimalised the danger of translation errors in what was said. Notes, which were always dated, became a "record of experiences, ideas, fears, mistakes, confusions, breakthroughs and problems" (Spradley, 1979, p. 74). Spradley's belief that noting personal feelings and biases assisted the understanding of the data was accepted and perceptions were duly noted.

During the observation phase of this study, relations with the teachers as participants passed through Spradley's "rapport process", i.e. apprehension, exploration, co-operation and participation. At the beginning of the observations and during first interviews, both parties felt apprehensive. Early unease was not so much due to unshared definitions of interview but the teachers' perception that they were being judged against an unknown measure. Acknowledgment of feelings and descriptive questions eased the tension. It was also found that restatement of what teachers had said was an effective exploratory method because it embodied a non-judgemental attitude and appeared to give the participant confidence as an authority. Using responses such as,
"I am learning from your comments about [a classroom event]", rather than "Why did you do that?", which appeared to contain a hidden judgement, encouraged the teachers' participation.

By the second major interview (following the intervention seminar and the classroom observations that followed), conversations were freer and more open. The participants/informants had partly assumed the role of informant, and as such, had become more frank. They brought forward new information to the researcher's attention and helped the "discovery of patterns in their culture" which Spradley (1979, p. 83) predicted would occur. Apart from increased familiarity, this was helped by two factors associated with the workshop. First, when the researcher became "teacher", the original researcher/participant roles were almost reversed, with the teachers able to become observers. Second, at a later stage in the study, following the intervention, when the skills modelled during the workshop were being successfully trialled by the teachers and they had gained confidence, they began to view themselves as "experts".

Spradley's (1979, pp. 86-91) five categories of descriptive questions\(^1\) formed the basis of the semi-structured interviews which informed this study. Seidman (1991, p.3) advised that the purpose of in-depth interviews is not to test hypotheses, but rather to gain an understanding of the meaning others made of their experiences. Accordingly, it is important to try to establish whether what was being said was true for the situation being examined and/or for other situations, or whether a different meaning or even completely contradictory view would result from another person in the same situation. Seidman asserted that the study must be relevant to participants' reconstruction of their experience. He noted that if interviewing helped the participants to "make sense to themselves as well as to the interviewer, then it had gone a long way toward validity" (1991, p. 17). He believed that in-depth interviews, apart from assisting the understanding of people's experience, enabled an understanding of the difficulties of the change process.

As each interview in the study required a set of instantaneous decisions to be made as it progressed, a structure on which to base those decisions was required. The danger of over-emphasising the emergent with an accompanying lack of focus or method meant that preparation was crucial (Seidman, 1991, p. 30). Semi-structured questions were prepared prior to, and used during, all interviews conducted for this study.

\(^1\) For example:
Could you describe a typical art criticism session? (Spradley's "grand tour" question),
How do you work with students at the kiln? (Spradley's "mini-tour" question),
Could you give me an example of someone who contributes well during sessions? (Spradley's "example" question),
Can you recall any descriptive answers? (Spradley's "experience" question), and
How would you describe a slide comparison? (Spradley's "native language" question).
Chapter 4  Research Methodology and Analysis of the Observation of Verbal Interaction

The Teacher’s Voice

The observation phase of this study led to the development of categories which were used as the basis for further study. It was anticipated that the later categorisation of classroom talk patterns would provide sufficient abstraction and simplification of complex events and allow the re-examination of the ethnographically rich details that had emerged from observation and interview.

Denzin (1995) believed the re-presentation (sic) of the voice and experiences of others required a special way of seeing. Eisner called this the "enlightened eye", a form of connoisseurship that made public what was observed. He described the qualitative research text as a "genre in its own right" (1995, p. 8) where educational researchers created, through their text, concrete experiences that contained cultural meanings and understandings. Denzin’s belief that no text, visual representation or voice can be repeated without a change in context and meaning was important, particularly when considering claims that could be made about classroom data. Narratives, he claimed, represented the preferred path for postmodernist projects because, as an emergent cultural form, they connected persons to culture, history and ongoing group life. Their production and interpretation, he claimed, required a "new version of the enlightened eye, a new form of cultural connoisseurship" (Denzin, 1995, p. 18).

Denzin’s advice was important as the researcher sought a way to "honour" the interviews of teachers who had, over a period of twelve months, been observed, attended an intervention seminar, and then been re-observed. Their narratives, or ways of explaining and describing their experiences were regarded as a vital component of the data that emerged. As a degree of confirmation or generalisability was desired, it was decided to also re-group and de-contextualise (i.e. categorise) the narrative. Denzin noted that transcribed text, albeit in distorted form, provided a moment of history which could supplement existing knowledge, affirm new discoveries, bear witness to understandings not previously known or understood, represent a minority voice in the site studied, and function as an exemplar of a style or form of discourse (Denzin, 1995, p. 15).

According to Denzin, the value of transcriptions remained as long as there were no misconceptions about the "reality" being represented. It was necessary to reduce and then shape the transcripts into a form which could be shared or displayed. Seidman (1991) described how he marked individual passages and grouped them in categories, studying them for thematic connections with the transcripts of other participants/informants. This was similar to the process McSorley (1996, p. 169) used in her phenomenographic study. This method was used in this study when data from interviews were analysed.
Seidman's method of not having a prior set of categories from which to find excerpts in the transcripts was adopted. It was believed important to articulate criteria used for "winnowing and sorting" (Seidman, 1991, p. 100), allowing categories to arise from the passages in the transcripts. It was also important to acknowledge that researchers had certain dispositions that they brought to their reading of transcripts. Seidman's prediction that excerpts from one participant's experience would connect with another's and these excerpts connected with the literature, was also accepted as a basis for data analysis and, indeed, proved to be accurate.

Seidman also warns that when attempting to categorise data it is important not to classify the pervasive data as "dramatic" (1991, p. 101). Also important is his suggestion that contradictory data should be kept in the foreground in order to understand their importance in the face of other data. Similarly, Chervin and Kyle (1993) warned of the danger of force-fitting excerpts into pre-determined categories, believing that, for public credibility, it was important to articulate reasons for selecting passages.

**Ethical Dimensions: Observation And Representation**

Issues of confidentiality arise from a product, its publication, and dissemination of data. The "power" relationships between researcher and the researched and ownership and control of data are other significant factors. In-depth interviews are placed within the life context of the participants/informants and therefore likely to raise sensitive issues. This means the potential vulnerability of the participants/informants should be considered ahead of time. Seidman's (1991, pp. 66-70) pointers for interviewers were incorporated into interviews with the teacher participants in this study. They included sharing experiences with participants on occasions without taking over the interview, asking participants to reconstruct, rather than remember, avoiding reinforcing what participants said unless it served a specific purpose, tolerating silence, and demonstrating concentrated listening and engaged interest. Many of these approaches reflected features of philosophical inquiry.

According to Kellehewar (1993), any claim that observation is discreet is not accurate, neither are claims that it is non-involving, does not disrupt others and is "safe" for both the observer and the observed. It was found by the researcher as observer, that despite being friendly and attempting to reassure the participants/informants they were not being judged, the majority of participants/informants felt "unsafe" in terms of confidence in their teaching. (This was noted in field notes and interviews.) Teachers demonstrated this in a variety of ways, from withdrawal from the study, to unrealistic verbal claims - predominantly self critical - about what was occurring during sessions. The experience of the participants/informants did not appear to be a
factor; two teachers who withdrew during the first stage of observation each had more than ten years classroom experience.

Spradley's (1979) advice to clearly communicate the research objectives and make reports available to participants was followed. Bresler (1996) considered confidentiality should be maintained in both the writing and reporting of information gathered from observations and interviews, i.e. anonymity should be not only for the larger world but also the research setting. Sharing data, however, was important and a sign of respect for teachers and students by allowing others to hear or see their voices in print.

Two major ethical issues that Bresler believed were central to ethnographic research were representation of truth and confidentiality. She believed that existing guidelines for the ethical conduct of inquiry were inadequate for the types of research which examine individuals' "lived experience". According to Bresler (1996, p. 135), while scholarly texts on qualitative research methodologies (for example, Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) emphasised the need for a code of ethics for the qualitative researcher addressing individual rights to dignity, privacy, confidentiality and the avoidance of harm, in the field of art education research, ethical issues had seldom been raised.

The qualitative paradigm requires different ethical considerations from the quantitative paradigm. The very characteristics that typify ethnographic research and make it insightful and meaningful - that is, immersion in the field, close observation of others' behaviours, thoughts and feelings, exposing values and making public what is private - can also make it "painful and harmful" (Bresler, 1996, p. 133). Bresler believed the flexible and evolving roles of the observer required constant sensitivity to others' perspectives and pointed out that the stronger the involvement - for example help, advice, feedback - the more central the ethical issues became.

Bresler's ethical considerations were important for this study in which respect for the participating teachers was paramount. Since the ethnographic methodology dealt with multiple realities that were constructed, there was no single truth available. It was therefore a researcher's decision about whose truth was represented that defined both the research design and data collection, the allocation of time and shape, as well as the form and voice of the research report. Bresler believed that reflecting on "our own problems and deliberations, revealing our errors, mistakes, miscalculations and misjudgments" was useful because others could learn from them (1996, p. 136). This strategy is similar to what Lipman et al. (1980) called self-correction.
In a research project in which Bresler (1996) examined the notion of school art she admitted she had described a teacher's approach as "rote, imitative and teacher-centred" (p. 137) and therefore her own strongly held views had created both a perspective and a message\(^2\). She believed this demonstrates she was using the kind of subjectivism that was:

... the exalting of one's personal orientation so that they are perceived not just as what I feel, think, and believe, but also as what is the only correct way to feel, think, and believe" [so it became] "subjectivism as orthodoxy - what is good and ought to be". (Bresler, 1996, p. 138)

So, while on one level it is the teacher's story, it is the researcher who gives the story "voice".

Given the misgivings of Bresler and others, it was believed there was an obligation to make any report as accurate as possible. As this study emerged, there were transcriptions, codings of transcriptions, interviews and reductions of interviews which all required a degree of interpretation. An experienced colleague (teacher and researcher) was asked to review the notes taken and summaries made and reflect on whether the surface events were being interpreted accurately. The colleague was also asked whether she supported any interpretations made (Seidman, 1991; Bresler, 1996). The following steps were taken:

(a) The teachers observed for this study were asked to read the transcripts of their sessions, interviews and field notes and comment on their accuracy.

(b) An experienced teacher was briefed on methodological approaches and asked to conduct a negative case analysis (Strauss, 1987) of the transcripts of interview. This required the reading of transcripts of the interviews with the informants and then the summaries made of interviews. When a negative instance of interaction appeared it would be noted and the conditions leading to it would be explored.

(c) There were two panels of encoders of the pre- and post- intervention transcriptions, one containing the researcher and a colleague trained to apply the modified FIAC; the other, two colleagues trained to apply the modified FIAC to transcripts of classroom sessions.

\(^2\) Bresler realised that her commitment to the ideal of fine art, and to supportive assistance such as modelling and procedural facilitation rather than rote learning, had resulted in an "orthodoxy". What she perceived as the jeopardised well-being of the students (1996, p. 137) led her to miss the importance of "enculturating children to cultural symbols" [the class members all made similar bunnies at Easter]. She argued that changes in teacher thinking and practice had a better chance if it was based on understanding and addressing current realities, rather than merely pointing at the teachers. A more ethical stance would have been to attempt, via interviews, to ascertain the meanings the arts activities held for the teacher. Bresler admitted her decisions were partly shaped by the lack of need to negotiate data and present the teacher's voice as a major voice.
Unstructured Non-Participant Classroom Observation

This section describes the non-participant observation phase of this study. Profiles of the participants are included below. It also contains an examination of the teacher/student verbal patterns of art classroom dialogue that were observed and their categorisation. First, attempts by the researcher to simplify the classroom talk by categorizing the transcriptions are outlined. Second, the application of, and satisfaction with, a modified FIAC system is described. Third, the content of interviews with the participant teachers following the observation of four sessions is presented.

Preliminary Informal Classroom Observation

To establish the extent to which the new CSF Arts Criticism and Aesthetics component was present in schools it was important to spend time in art rooms. As well, in order to make recommendations concerning approaches which might assist the quality of discussions in the field of arts criticism and aesthetics, it was first necessary to identify the style of existing discussions. It was also essential to comprehend the teachers' understandings about their art room discussions and how they interpreted their students' verbal contributions.

Using an ethnographic approach (Spradley, 1979; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) four art classes were observed in early 1995. Two teachers in School G\(^3\) volunteered to be observed, each conducting two art classes with Year 8 and 9 students with the researcher acting as a non-participant observer (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). There was no previous connection between the teachers and researcher. Observation notes were taken during sessions. However, after observing only two sessions, it was felt notes did not provide sufficient or satisfactory information about classroom conversations. Audio-tape recordings were made of subsequent sessions to allow closer examination of verbal content.

There was no prepared checklist of behaviours used for reference, for fear of excluding any features of classroom activity. It was found that three of the four sessions contained no art criticism discussion, while the fourth featured a discussion of what sculpture comprised during a first class with a new group. The range of talk that typically occurred during the four classes was, in order of frequency: one-to-one teacher/ student talk during application; student/ student chatting while working; and teacher lecture to the class.

\(^3\) Three separate experts had attested that the Art Department of the Preparatory to Year 12 co-educational private school chosen for the observation had an excellent reputation.
These preliminary observations demonstrated the sensitive nature of classroom research. The teachers disliked audio-taped recordings being made of their classes. Although it seemed "mean-spirited", the researcher did not wish to reveal the reasons behind the observation for fear of influencing the session content. As well, the teachers were self-critical of their own classes, most likely because of the researcher's presence, saying thing like: "The kids were ratty today", or, "That wasn't a good example of the pots they usually throw". One teacher said her performance was "not up to scratch".

A section of the observation diary entry during the observations (below), demonstrates emergent awarenesses. It described the teacher's reaction to the presence of the tape recorder and self-criticism. It also demonstrated the delicate nature of observation as described by Kelleheer (1993) and Bresler (1996):

Diary entry May 26, 1995
Both teachers spend very good use of time working with individuals, nutting out solutions to problems arising out of the students prac work. Any discussion was, in the main teacher/student on a 1/1 basis, apart from introductions and pack-up times. Students were absorbed in their work. The luxury of only having 14-16 students produced quality time in terms of input and progress. Questions were asked about form, colour, approach etc with a healthy number of questions being asked, together with suggested procedures.

Teacher 1 arrived to take a Year 7 class obviously a little het-up. ... She worried that permanent records of what she felt was not a good session would result. I taped only her introduction, a couple of sections during the class when she was audible above the noise (1/1 work) and her conclusion.

Teacher 2 explained that she was uneasy because she didn't know enough about my project. She apologised again for the previous day's class content, saying the kids were ratty and so many things were happening at once. Teacher 2 is perhaps now judging herself negatively if she thinks I am not finding what I want to in her sessions. She said she'd love to hear what I was interested in doing or seeing in classes so she could give it a go. I explained that I would like that to happen later, but that, for the moment, I needed to observe classes and immerse myself as much as possible in her current classroom work. Later, if she had time, we might be able to work together. This seemed to suit her as she was busy with reports etc. for the next few weeks.

I feel there are incredible pressures on the staff constantly draining them - reports, curriculum and budget meetings, etc. which means my presence is another pressure. No matter what I say, my presence is seen as a stranger making judgement about performance - something they don't need.

The preliminary observations, although accompanied by observation notes and transcriptions of the audio-tapes were found to provide inadequate information about classroom dialogue. It became clear that systematic research into art class dialogue would be necessary in order to gain knowledge of art room practice, particularly patterns of talk during art appreciation discussions.
This would necessitate long term case studies of teachers in more than one school and involve the observation, recording, transcribing and analysis of discussions.

Non-Participant Classroom Observation

Profiles of participants

Following the decision to formalise observation, six art teachers (Teachers A to F), two in each of three schools in the same geographical area, were observed for four sessions (once a week for four weeks) during the second half of 1995. While not claiming that the six teachers were representative of the larger population, it was believed that sufficient commonalities between similar settings existed (Bogdan & Biklen 1982; Needels & Gage, 1991). The schools were in a south-eastern suburb of Melbourne. Although they varied in size and socio-economic status (see Table 10 below), all had art faculties with good reputations. All six teachers were trained art educators. Their experience ranged from one to thirty years' experience. Some had postgraduate qualifications. Their art classes ranged from 15 to 30 students. Teachers, D, E and F, withdrew from the study at different stages.

Table 10: Profiles Of Schools Of The Participant Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A (Teachers C &amp; D)</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Size of School</th>
<th>Predominant socio-ec. level</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-govt, co-ed</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>mid to upper</td>
<td>various, 15 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B (Teachers A &amp; B)</td>
<td>Non-govt, single sex</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>various, 15-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (Teachers E &amp; F)</td>
<td>Govt</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>low - middle</td>
<td>approx. 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed profiles of the teachers were obtained via interview before the observation period. Appendix 1 contains the survey questions. Information about the number of year levels and subjects taught, school details, qualifications and experience as artist was sought. The teachers were also asked to elaborate on their current approaches to Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and provide brief personal philosophies connected with their teaching.

Teacher A (School B)

(Interview 6.4.95 )

Teacher A (aged 36-40) was Head of the Art Faculty and Co-ordinator of the Senior School at an all girls private school. She taught visual art to Years 9-12, and had taught art for fifteen years. She did not teach woodcraft, technology, metalcraft or photography. Her undergraduate qualification was a Higher Diploma of Teaching: Secondary Art and Craft and she also had an Art Education Graduate Diploma.
Her response to Question 9 revealed a broad conception of aesthetics:

It's a philosophical understanding of, and verbalised discussion of, what is art. It functions at different year levels - it depends on your approach. You can use the same topics from junior to senior levels. At the senior levels it can be more a 1-1 or small group discussion. You would never say 'Today we are going to have an aesthetic discussion'.

We will discuss the design elements, what products they are heading towards, so it's an aesthetic discussion as they talk about their own work and head toward the finished product. At an art gallery it might be more a more formal aesthetic discussion. For example, with the Year 10s we visited a gallery and discussed questions like 'What is art?' 'Is this art?'

Aesthetics is something you utilise always - it's an opportunity to extend understandings. It's not clearly definable, there are no right answers in this field.

I have my set of standards, but students' aesthetic sensibilities may be different. We have to be careful not to try to persuade them to our point of view. There is one student with whom I totally disagree about judgements, I have to get her to show me via illustrations etc what she considers is well finished work etc.

The Year 12s had to set up a talk around their work and the aesthetic in it and present it to invited guests (parents). They did a great job. (Teacher A, 6.4.95)

She taught aesthetics through a conscious creation of opportunities to implement the concept of aesthetic appreciation through classroom work. She believed it was a process. Examples of topics in "aesthetics" she had covered during the year were:

Took Year 11 to St Kilda and looked at the aesthetics of the area. One student chose to sketch junk on the floor as visually she found this more relevant and concrete than a landscape. For her it had 'emotional guts'. Others eliminated elements in the landscape and so created an ambience.

Year 11 discussed Kandinsky to consider music and art. I then had them listen to Enya and interpret the music visually. We talked about the aesthetics of music and abstract these qualities are. They could represent it in any medium. Their work was great.

We had Stelarc (a performance artist) here. The students had to discuss the topic of whether they thought his work was art. Yes, they decided, it was art. They didn't necessarily like it, but they understood what he was saying. They were interested in his philosophy, not his output. The whole day was based on philosophy/aesthetics. (Teacher A, 6.4.95)

Teacher A volunteered to be a subject for this study on hearing about the researcher's desire to observe art classrooms. She was co-operative, enthusiastic about all sessions, and although busy with other responsibilities, carefully planned all observed sessions. She was interested in commencing further study the following year and conversant with local and international curricula and modern art movements.
Teacher B (School B)

(Interview 6.4.95)

Teacher B (aged 36-40) taught visual art to Years P-8 at a private girls school. During her twenty years teaching experience she had taught Fine Arts for only two. Her undergraduate qualification was a Primary Teaching Certificate and she had a Graduate Diploma in Graphic Communication. She did not teach technology, metalcraft or photography.

Prior to the observation period her definition of the term aesthetics was confined to modernist concepts of composition and the appeal of an artwork:

the way things look, whether things are appealing or not. It’s associated with composition, relates to art criticism. You need to know why something is aesthetic, need to value reasons and be able to explain it to yourself. (Teacher B, 6.4.95)

She described her approaches to aesthetics in class:

Mostly general discussion about children’s works of art. When looking at specific painters they go from their perspective of what appeals - they look at the technique and whether they like it or not. The only way they can think at that age, when things are related back to how they feel.

I might give them examples of what has been called a work of art and ask them what they think. We might look at the composition of a particular piece and stress the words they use to describe them - so they have the means to express.

There are always time restrictions - a lot of time is spent talking about the composition and developmental technique and how they develop their art. When I came here they said skill development in art was missing so I am concentrating on that.

I'm trying to introduce different mediums and give them the chance to succeed at some medium and keep the enthusiasm going. (Teacher B, 6.4.95).

Topics in aesthetics taken during year:

That is a bit specific! In Year 7 we looked at Art Nouveau and Art Deco. Part of the task was to describe it and whether the features appealed to them.

The new curriculum is specific about teaching aesthetics and that worries me. Do I know what I am doing here? I ask myself. There are no guidelines. It’s a matter of looking at books etcetera to try to get a response and bring out the ideas expressed in the curriculum guidelines. I don’t like the lack of support and structure. So, I look mainly at children’s own works and talk about them. (Teacher B, 6.4.95).

Teacher B felt inadequate, as a trained Graphic Communication teacher, teaching visual art at the primary level. She felt more comfortable with the secondary classes. She stated she was not knowledgeable in the fields of art history and contemporary art. She did not like the audio tape recorder and did not permit its use during a later interviews.
Teacher C (School A)

(Interview, 1.6.95)

Teacher C (aged 20-25) taught Years 5-8 at a private co-educational school P-12. She had one year's teaching experience. Her qualification was a Bachelor of Education: Visual Arts (BEd) and she was studying for a Postgraduate Diploma in Art History. She admitted to knowing very little about art education theorists. The CSF content was taught during her BEd course, but she believed it lacked a theoretical base. She taught all visual arts subjects.

Her definition of the term aesthetics reflected the modernist view:

Firstly, the students' perception of what they see, whether its their own or artists in the community. It's more their own judgement of a work - what pleases them or doesn't please them. It's related to effort, self-esteem and end product.

It's more the environment they are in, not the way they are acting. I don't think the process of art-making is aesthetic. What you create is the aesthetic, and how you criticise it. I don't want my kids to be working aesthetically - that to me is talking about the end result. (Teacher C, 1.6.95)

Her understanding of its meaning, although appearing to reflect the concept of aesthetic appeal, appeared confused. When asked what practice best described her approach to aesthetics she replied:

We talk about constructive criticism. We make art, talk about it, discuss whether it needs fixing up i.e. whether the end-product can be fixed etc. It's part of a process, the aesthetic is the end result. (Teacher C, 1.6.95)

Topics in aesthetics she had covered recently included:

Year 5: looked at Aboriginal paintings and designed our own products. They were their own symbols, appropriation of others' symbols was not acceptable. So we were looking at an end result, going back, moving on. We look at something we are trying to achieve. This is looking at the aesthetic and seeing what we can achieve.

Year 6: We looked at masks, sketched, used oils and then clay. The aesthetic was the discussion of what makes a mask tribal. Through looking at their own work they were talking about their ideas.

Year 8: Relating to the abstract through sculpture. We looked at particular artists like Arp, Brancusi and then they did their own. To me that's the real aesthetic because we're relating to, form, colour, touch etc.

When Teacher C elaborated, her definition of aesthetics was broader:

---

4. The CSF was available in draft form when she was completing her studies.
I'm wondering whether aesthetics is the feel of the whole atmosphere. I don't know if it refers to just what you see, or related to all the senses. The strategies I use are discussions, especially around their sketch books.

The Year 8s will ask questions like 'What about the sinks, are they sculpture?' So we come up with discussions like this via interactions. Kids love Stelarc for instance. They love the thought of hanging from meat hooks. After discussion they decided it is sculpture, i.e. body landscape. By Year 8 they are beginning to believe that art has no boundaries. The visual arts should be interwoven. I have a real problem with having one room for sculpture, one for painting etc.

Because I have thought about the question 'What is art' perhaps I read too much into what they know because of what they are saying. I think their questions are exciting. The next questions I ask the Year 8s will be 'Why have art?' 'Why have artists?' I don't think they know how to talk about the process of art making - they don't do it without teacher input.

_Teacher D (School A)_

Teacher D (ten years' teaching experience and co-ordinator of middle school visual arts) although she had volunteered to be part of the study was uncomfortable with the researcher's presence and, after two sessions, stated she did not want tape recordings made. As tape recordings were essential for gaining an accurate record of the art classroom talk the researcher withdrew from further observation.

_Teacher E (School C)_

Teacher E (aged 46-50) taught 7-12 at a State secondary co-educational college and had thirty years teaching experience. Four of his sessions were recorded and he was interviewed, but this data has not been included in this study as he decided to retire from teaching.

_Teacher F (School C)_

Teacher F (aged 36-40) taught Years 7-10 at a State co-educational secondary college and had twenty years teaching experience. Although his Principal stated Teacher F was a willing participant he clearly was uncomfortable with the presence of the tape recorder. He began to find excuses for not being available at pre-arranged times and withdrew after three sessions.

**Reducing The Content Of Transcriptions: A Preliminary Coding System**

The outcome of the preliminary observation was discussed above. Following it, a second period of observation was planned. The aim of this phase of the study was to observe a sample of teaching contexts that represented the ways teachers handled visual arts discussions. Credibility and confirmability, as well as the place and amount of intervention, were factors concerning the researcher as she sought a suitable classroom presence.
Art class discussions of Teachers A, B, C and E were recorded during a four-week observation period (mid- to late 1995). Sessions were audio-taped and written copies of the transcripts were made by the researcher. Content was examined in order to ascertain the teacher/student dialogue patterns and session content. Emergent categories were listed beside the transcripts in an attempt to describe both teacher and student talk. For example a content category: (a) "artistic (art) question/statement" was noted if art vocabulary was present, (b) "procedural (pro) question/statement" was noted when a direction was given or a demand made, (c) "artistic recall question/answer" was noted when previous work was discussed, and (d) "artistic knowledge statement" when a fact was given. There were also combinations of the above, for example, "artistic/procedural statement".

With a new group of Year 8 students Teacher C (13.6.95) discussed the content of their previous electives and explored the ceramics room. Table 11 contains a section of this session showing the categories above applied to the teacher and student talk. The numbers signify the order of utterance, for example, (1c) was part of the teacher’s first utterance; (2) under Student Utterance was a student’s response to the teacher’s second utterance. To accurately represent the conversation further, it was found that more categories were needed: for example, (5a) "affirms artistic/procedural question", and (8) "inquiry question". As well, examples of talk and questions, for example, "Would you call that sculpture?" were noted.

Table 11: Early Attempt To Categorize Teacher And Student Talk
(Year 8 sculpture, 15 students. Teacher C 13.6.95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Utterance</th>
<th>Student Utterance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a artistic/procedure statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b art/pro question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c art/pro statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d inquiry question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 art/pro question</td>
<td>2 art/pro statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 art/pro quest</td>
<td>3 art/pro statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 art/pro quest</td>
<td>4 art/pro state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a affirms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b art/pro quest</td>
<td>5b art/pro state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 art/pro quest</td>
<td>6 art/pro state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a art/pro state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b art/pro questions (2)</td>
<td>7b art/pro statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 inquiry question</td>
<td>8 affirmations - &quot;yes&quot; only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Would you call that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculpture?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 art/pro quest</td>
<td>9 art/pro statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 art/pro quest</td>
<td>10 art/pro statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a art/pro statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b art/recall quest</td>
<td>11b recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 art/pro quest</td>
<td>12 art answer/question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another means used to describe the content of transcripts was the listing of teacher and student artistic vocabulary (see Table 12 below). Boyd's (1992) list of vocabulary describing thinking in artmaking, aesthetic perception and evaluative reflection in art classes (see Table One) influenced the decision to list artistic vocabulary used. However, little of Boyd's vocabulary emerged, and it became problematic whether simple words like "tiles" or "colourful" should be included.

Table 12: Listing Teacher And Student "Artistic" Vocabulary
(Year 8 sculpture. Teacher C. 13. 6. 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher artistic thinking and vocab.</th>
<th>Student artistic thinking and vocab.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b technically</td>
<td>4 pottery wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d painting</td>
<td>5b papier mache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sculpture</td>
<td>6 plaster masks wire men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a wire figures</td>
<td>sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b clay experience in sculpture</td>
<td>clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 sculpture</td>
<td>9 plaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 sculptural things</td>
<td>10 the wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 sculpture</td>
<td>11b David (Michelangelo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a wheel craft</td>
<td>12 clay, stone, cement, marble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although many categories were devised, they did not adequately describe the type of talk occurring in the observed sessions. Within any one teacher or student utterance or question there were often many possible categories. The addition of supplementary and more detailed statements and questions, almost to the point of restating the text, was not helpful. With so many categories, the aim of the transcript analysis, to somehow reduce the volume of data, was lost.

As well, attempting to associate teacher talk with the next student utterance given same number, for example, T1, S1, was meaningless, as not all interaction was teacher initiated. It was difficult to decide on what might constitute a "facet" of talk and whether it was a specific interaction around a theme, and also what a "sequence" might be.

A decision was made to display the relative quantity of student talk to teacher talk. This simple format was found to be useful as it offered a clear picture, almost a graphical representation. Table 13 below shows that the quantity of teacher talk was double that of the student talk. It also shows short student verbal utterances and very little student talk.
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The preliminary categorization of verbal interactions raised the following issues for this study:

a. As well as categories of questions and answers, appropriate descriptors for the patterns of talk transcribed were required, and

b. It was important to know whether the teacher was responding to a student question or vice versa.

It was felt that a more systemised analysis of teacher/student verbal communication was required. Descriptors like "teacher asks question" and "student makes artistic statement" were cumbersome and an appropriate descriptive system was needed. Flanders had claimed (1970) that the FIAC system was a suitable measure for observing classroom talk. The findings of the Tisher, et al. study (1985) supported this claim. Flanders acknowledged (1970, p. 126) that sociologists might find his categories too narrow, whilst psychologists might consider them too broad and vague. It was believed, however, that the possibility of subscribing (dividing a single category into additional categories thus providing additional data)\(^5\), depending on the purposes of the evaluation, made it a flexible system.

---

\(^5\) For example, Flanders described research which had divided his Category 3 (p. 132) into four subscripts:
1. Mere acknowledgment.
2. Clarification of meaning.
3. Application of pupil ideas.
4. Questions which made use of pupil ideas.

The advantage of subscribing appeared to be that categories could be collapsed back to a standardised system. It was found that observers could discriminate between all four categories and that it was possible to reduce the number of concepts without eroding the quality of the explanation.
Table 13: Graphical Representation Of Quantity Of Teacher/Student Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher C (13.6.1995)</th>
<th>Students (Year 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make sure your work is stored in consideration of other people's work. It's very important to be considerate. It's your responsibility to make sure your work has your name on it.</td>
<td>We made business cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you all work well together in painting? Are you a nice group?</td>
<td>(G talks about their work.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sculpture it is really helpful to have a group of friends who can help you out - holding things for you, helping you technically, or all sorts of technical stuff. Who enjoyed painting and what did you like best about painting?</td>
<td>We use the pottery wheel and fire clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, did you do anything in painting?</td>
<td>We use paper mache and make faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were they? Were they small?</td>
<td>Plaster masks, wire men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok. What do we do in sculpture?</td>
<td>Not sculpture, clay though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yep. What other things?</td>
<td>Yes. (a few say this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yep. My sculpture group didn't do the wire figures last time, but I like to swap around things as well. People might want to ...</td>
<td>The wheel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- well - who's particularly interested in working with clay? (students indicate) Who's had a bit of experience in sculpture before?</td>
<td>David.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you call that sculpture?</td>
<td>Clay, stone, cement, sandstone?.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other sorts of sculptural things might we use?</td>
<td>Some kind of marble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think ... what do you want to do mostly in work in sculpture?</td>
<td>Some of those metal ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, last group went crook at me because I didn't give them enough time on the wheel.</td>
<td>That big one outside the gallery. It's really big, sort of animal like and it's in the water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now this craft will work best if we all help each other and co-operate. I'm not a really mean teacher, but I can be if I have to be.</td>
<td>It's sort of tiled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All right. If you are responsible here, then I think we'll go really well and learn a lot more.</td>
<td>Yeah, it's really colourful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can think of a sculpture they know?</td>
<td>I think we're talking about different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's it made of?</td>
<td>No we aren't. We're talking about the same thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>It's a mixture of - it's a thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal ones, what can you tell me about them?</td>
<td>Yes, I suppose so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you name one for me?</td>
<td>Tiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it?</td>
<td>Tiles, kind of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiled?</td>
<td>There's one in the library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colourful?</td>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it?</td>
<td>On the wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a thing?</td>
<td>Mosaic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it a sculpture?</td>
<td>It's ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All right, though I had a picture of it (here) but I don't.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's actually called &quot;Angel&quot;! I don't know why it's called Angel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's it made of do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More specific.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's one in the library made out of the same thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts with 'm'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, you got it right. That might be something you forget, but try to remember techniques we talk about all right.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who likes that one?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who doesn't know the one we're talking about, the big one in front of the Art Centre, the big colourful one. Anyone really like it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do, I really love it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who doesn't like it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't care if you like it or dislike it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who doesn't like it, hands up?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why don't you like it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical Considerations

A typical art class with its practical activities and one-to-one conversations was difficult to audiotape. Had the classes only been engaged in a discussion, a sophisticated fixed audio-tape recorder would have been sufficient. But in art rooms, teachers are in and out of kiln areas, pottery wheel rooms and equipment cupboards and frequently have short conversations at work benches as they moved around the room. Following teachers around the room with a tape recorder was intrusive. In the first observation sessions at Schools A, B, C and D some students stopped talking if a hand held microphone was nearby. Remote radio microphones were therefore used to capture the teacher talk while moving around the class and to allay self-consciousness among students. It also made the presence of the observer less intrusive. Subsequently, a decision was made to only codify whole class discussions.

Kellehear's warning (1993) about the intrusive nature of the recorder inhibiting teacher participation proved to be accurate. It was believed to be a major reason behind the withdrawal of two teachers (one from School A and one from School C) and Teacher B reluctantly permitted recordings of classroom sessions. The presence of a stranger and a tape recorder meant the setting was un-natural. Teachers A, B, C and E made comments like "I'm much nicer to the students when you are in the room", and judgments like "This session will not be useful, it's just finishing projects". They felt they were being judged and tried to pre-empt the presence or absence in their lessons of what they believed was being sought by the researcher. They ceased such utterances as familiarity with the observer grew.

Major drawbacks of audio recordings were that adequate sound was difficult to achieve without unwieldy and intrusive technology, and gestures, chalkboard content and visual displays were not recorded. Meaning of speech could also be unclear or ambiguous, for example, "Stop that", and the identity of the speaker was often difficult to establish. The use of a two-track machine where a commentary describing what was happening could be recorded on one track, although desirable, was not feasible for this study. It was believed that taking observation notes to accompany the audio transcript was acceptable. Although video recordings overcame many of the shortcomings of audio recording because they could be viewed with instant understanding of the classroom being observed, it was technically inefficient and not suitable for a single researcher also wishing to make notes. Using one camera with an in-built microphone meant that often either sound or vision was not captured. Multiple cameras and microphones were needed and this was both intrusive and costly in terms of staff.
With or without recordings of sessions, it was considered important to write notes both during and immediately after sessions or discussions with teachers. It was not feasible to have an experienced other observer who could provide verification of the field notes. It was acknowledged that both field notes and the accounts of the person being interviewed were interpretative and consequently, one may never know what really happened during any set observation period (Denzin, 1995).

**Structured classroom observation**

**Modifying The FIAC Observation System**

Classroom interaction analysis is useful whenever it is necessary to record the presence or absence of particular verbal behaviour patterns during a period of observation. Although there are problems associated with analysis of classroom conversations, (and some were discussed in Chapter Two and earlier in this chapter), classroom talk had become a focal point of this study, rendering analysis a vital component.

The aim of the classroom observation was to establish, via case studies, the pattern of dialogue and language used by art teachers and their students during discussions. The major focus would therefore be on the amounts and quality of teacher and student talk, the kinds of thinking being encouraged through art class dialogue, and art-specific vocabulary being employed by art teachers and their students (Boyd, 1994; Chalmers, 1995; Cunningham, 1995).

It was thus necessary to use an observation procedure which was practical and to record events in a way that preserved the original sequence of events. Data would have to be analysed in ways that were consistent with the study design. A gross system which focussed on verbal interaction was needed, and the FIAC coding of classroom verbal communication provided a relatively gross description of classroom interaction, ignoring extraneous events and classroom occurrences.

During the initial observation period the researcher had intended first to observe art appreciation discussions and then establish the cognitive level of verbal utterances being made by teachers and the resulting student responses. However, the numerous categories that had resulted from the preliminary attempt to categorise transcripts prevented meaningful analysis. Flanders' (1970) seven broad categories of teacher talk and three categories of student talk appeared to cover, and simplify, many of the over-detailed descriptors that had surfaced in the preliminary categorization. Its clear and systematic representation of classroom dialogue enabled close examination of the link between teacher and student talk. Student talk in the Flanders' model (see Appendix 2) was
limited to response (limited expression of ideas) and initiation (developing own ideas or line of thought). This was felt to be adequate at least for the early attempt to represent categories of talk. Individual categories could be more closely examined (subscribed) at a later stage if required.

Flanders believed the time and energy involved in collecting and feeding back information were reasonable in terms of expected outcomes and in consideration of existing workloads. In this study, because of limited resources, the researcher would also have to be an encoder. Categories would need to be clearly defined to enable consistent coding when other panel members conducted an independent rating.

Flanders (1970) claimed the FIAC demonstrated the ways teachers’ verbal communication patterns were associated with pupil learning and attitudes toward learning. Further, it showed how the balance of initiation and response varied from class to class, from activity to activity, with subject matter, the teacher’s preferred style of instruction, the age of students, and other classroom characteristics. By tracing this variation, he said, researchers were provided with knowledge about teaching behaviour and about relationships between what a teacher does and how pupils react.

An inquiry pattern was described by Flanders as being quite different to a teacher-pupil short question and short response drill pattern. In order to participate in inquiry the students needed the opportunity to express their own ideas. Most importantly the teachers should use these ideas in the discussion. He claimed that these features of inquiry were usually absent in a teacher directed drill pattern. Short question and response patterns had been observed as a common pattern of dialogue during the preliminary observation period of this study.

For the FIAC to be useful for this study, it would need to be able to easily distinguish between types of classroom communication. For example, Flanders claimed that the presence of an inquiry pattern would mean that categories 3 (accepts and uses ideas of students) and 9 (pupil talk - initiation) would be prevalent, and 6 (giving directions) present to a lesser extent. He suggested that people might be surprised to discover that category 2, (praise and encouragement by the teacher), was usually absent from lessons based on inquiry training (Flanders, 1970, p. 94). The extended teacher initiation (category 5) and student response pattern established early in a session resulted in student dependence on the teacher’s initiative and low level responses (category 8). Creative pupil participation was restricted. Further, once established, this pattern was difficult to change. On the other hand, a more open and responsive teaching pattern early in a discussion or lesson curtailed over-dependence and appeared to be associated with a more flexible teacher approach to the discussion.
During the introductory phase of an "inquiry" session, Flanders predicted that 4 (teacher question), and 8 (student response), (4, 8, 4, 4, 8, 8, 8, 4 etcetera) would be the pattern as features of an issue were brought to the attention of the students in order to focus. But, he warned, if the pattern remained that way after the initial stage it failed to develop into a true inquiry process. If the teacher recognised and made use of ideas suggested by students, such responses would be coded with a 3. Thus a pattern depicting an inquiry process should be something like 9, 9, 9, 3, 3, 3, 9, 9 allowing for easy "reading" of basic communication patterns.

An important aspect of the FIAC was, according to Flanders, that any two variables with high correlation could be combined with little loss of information. In their exploration, Flanders and his colleagues found that "teacher accepts and uses student responses", i.e. category 3, was highly correlated with "asks questions ... with the intent that a student will answer", i.e. category 4. This became an important point when data were examined in this study. When using a modified FIAC it was found this was often the case, particularly when teachers asked a further question after repeating a student response.

Whether questions were open ended or not, they appeared in a FIAC analysis as category 4. It was found that if they were open ended the resulting student responses were usually a category 9. Enlarging and developing the ideas suggested by students would involve a 9 - 3, 3 - 9 pattern. Knowing how to ask open questions and respond to ideas suggested by pupils was, according to Flanders, the first step towards an inquiry pattern.

Flanders' category 3 described teachers reacting to student ideas by acknowledging, clarifying and using them in problem solving situations, as co-inquirers during a discussion. The only conclusion Flanders had been able to make from his studies was that teachers seeking to encourage inquiry were attempting to invite more active student participation and soften their own authority approaches. He believed a teacher who asked questions and built on the concepts and logical connectives that pupils had previously expressed was helping them understand the consequences of their own ideas. This was accomplished because the teacher's questions permitted pupil ideas to be tested within the give-and-take of peer interaction in an active way. These questions could be "open" or "closed", but when they were open, the teacher provided the pupils with an opportunity to express their own ideas. However Flanders found that questions asked by teachers rarely built on student ideas.

Flanders (1970, pp. 280-281) placed patterns of teacher-student dialogue into three levels. Level one patterns were concerned primarily with subject matter and learning which the teacher initiated, directed and supervised, for example, lecturing, drill review and giving directions. Level two
patterns occurred when teachers extended opportunities to pupils for more self-direction and self-expression, including asking open questions, developing pupil ideas, using "because" and praise extensions, and extending directions. (The presence of this pattern was indicated by categories 4, 9 or 4, 8, 9) Level three patterns were complex (Flanders, 1970, p. 287) because the affective and cognitive components of their interaction required some kind of synthesis in order to reach improvements.

Level one patterns predominated in the classroom discussions Flanders observed, easily exceeding more than one-half of the interaction (Flanders, 1970, p. 287). He claimed there was no evidence to show that a teacher could expect to alter student attitudes simply by shifting this balance, even though there was a good possibility that it could be done. This was because pupil self-direction, independence and initiative were learning behaviours that ran counter to the prevailing patterns of dependency (Flanders, 1970, p. 288). He further claimed, that with skilful teaching, students could be assisted to learn to identify problems rather than having them presented, as well as analyse a problem and plan a course of action, rather than follow a recipe.

Urbach changed the FIAC 10 point category into only 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 thus "demonstrating he understood the thrust of the category system as a method of studying the balance of teacher initiation and teacher response" (Flanders, 1970, p.161). He subordinated the display of less essential categories in order to be more efficient. Using the category numbers he tracked instances of classroom talk clearly using a time line display. This display model (see Table 14) made the content instantly "readable" once one was familiar with the codings.

Table 14: Urbach’s Time Line Display Of Drill And Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urbach’s graphic displays where each number stood for a coded instance of talk, allowed the contrast between sessions to be easily seen. Graphical representations of data could clearly show a predominant theme of teacher initiation and pupil response in one graph and the opposite in another.
It appeared that, by using Flanders' categories, descriptions could be built, comparisons made, and inferences drawn about sequences of events. The code symbols provided "vocal shorthand" (Flanders, 1970, p. 120) for describing events and matrix displays exhibited meanings, in terms of communication patterns, which could be read in a matter of minutes. It would mean, at least, that basic elements could be identified by calculating percentages and ratios. This was needed in order to make at least tentative judgments about patterns of talk in classrooms observed. Descriptions that were logically consistent with the situational setting were needed, and the FIAC appeared to be one way of achieving this.

Problems With Measuring Verbal Moves: High And Low Inference

There are problems associated with an outside observer labelling behaviours or making judgments about classroom moves. Dunkin and Biddle (1974) warned that deciding whether a teacher's "influence" was "direct" required a judgment on the part of the observer. Researchers who wished to prove examples of influence, must recognise it was a "high-inference" concept for which it was difficult to provide operational definitions (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, p. 56). As high-inference variables like "enthusiasm" and "clarity" were hard to judge, studies which required observers to use such concepts were unlikely to be objective. Two different observers may claim that they were studying direct influence and yet be reporting incidents of quite different types of teaching.

High inference measures were described by Good, Biddle and Brophy (1975) as either rating scales that characterised the teacher as high or low against variables, or a ranking scale. An example of this was listing teachers in order from "best to worst" according to either general or specific criteria such as "disciplinarian". This process involved high inference because it involved a high degree of deduction on the part of the rater, who must take into account everything observed about the teachers involved and arrive at a judgment in a complex or idiosyncratic way. Good et al. (1975) were concerned that, because high inference measures allowed so much room for judgment, they were affected by the biases of the rater and open to all the drawbacks of any "subjective" rating system when compared with more objective measurement. The warning by Good et al. (1975, p. 39), that reliance on higher inference measures alone would make a study vulnerable to rater bias was noted. An example was the "halo" effect which favoured the teacher, or the reverse (i.e. the students).

Low inference measures, according to Good et al. (1975) were classroom observation schedules designed so that observers could code the frequency and or type of teacher behaviour within a narrowly defined range. Such measures required minimal subjective inferences on the part of the observer, and teacher behaviours were easy to observe and count reliably and frequently (for
example, questions, correct answers, incorrect answers, hand raising, warning and cautions about misbehaviour etc). What was needed, according to Dunkin and Biddle (1974, p. 57), were "clear operational definitions" and data demonstrating that observers could make reliable judgments.

Good et al. (1975) suggested that when both high and low inference measures were used in the same study to address the same areas of teacher behaviour, and investigator's conclusions/codings etc. suggested the same general conclusion, it was likely that both sets were valid. However, when such validity checks revealed contradictions, investigators should attempt to determine the reasons and assess the reliability of each data set. In this study the Flanders' categories were used to establish patterns of teacher/student interaction. The categorizations were compared and combined with teachers' comments concerning the transcripts of their classroom discussions.

Flanders' categories straddled both high and low inference measures. Some categories were low inference, for example, silence or confusion, but most interactions required decisions on the part of the rater which could be considered high inference. It would therefore be important for the researcher to apply categories as a member of a panel and desirable for these categorised sessions to be independently coded by a second panel. A high correlation between the two panels' categorisations would be necessary.

Given a set of teaching events and the application of a measurement instrument, reliability and validity must be a focus. Instruments were valid to the extent they measured what was expected and reliable to the extent that they provided the same scores on repeated applications to same data. Validity could be questioned when instruments suggested repeated inability to predict variables, and if inadequate descriptions were given of the operations that underlay their coding categories. It was important for the researcher to accept responsibility for evaluating the research. Small samples, although reducing knowledge of contextual effects, were believed to be valid (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, p. 82).

It is acknowledged that all research-based knowledge concerning teaching is limited by the advantages or shortcomings of the chosen instrument. Non-participant observation, the term used to describe a situation when an observer recorded and encoded classroom activities (and, for that matter, data analysis, synthesis and interpretation of the results), was believed to be useful for generating hypotheses.

Dunkin and Biddle (1974) believed that the FIAC was useful for describing the levels of thought and the balance between teacher initiative and teacher response and for tracing this balance as it varied with time, instructional purpose and class settings. They warned, however, that its terms
were relative and could lead to over-simplification of complex, interrelated events, thus making it useful only in carefully controlled teaching situations. However, it was precisely this simplification of classroom verbal interaction that attracted the researcher.

Another problem associated with categorisation scales like the FIAC is that they usually involve live observation and making judgments while classes are in progress. Under these conditions observers are required to encode information and make rapid judgments about teaching activities as they witness them. However, the complexity and rapid pace of classroom events, with the rapid exchanges between teachers and students, can easily overwhelm an observer when asked to judge independent aspects of the teaching process. Keeping track of each person who speaks is difficult enough, much less categorising them. One solution was the making of audio recordings. They were believed to provide a stable, static source of data which could be examined many times, allowing rapid exchanges to be studied reliably and allowing multiple aspects of the teacher/student exchange to be studied (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, p. 62).

On balance, therefore, it was decided for this study that the data gathered through a categorisation scale like the FIAC could provide accurate and sequential records of classroom events. Modified slightly it was a relatively simple instrument that was easy to teach others to apply. Transcripts could result from audio recordings made of all observed sessions by a single observer.

**Frequency Data: Units Of Coding**

A problem associated with the coding process was the determination of "units" of time, an important element in coding. Since classroom events have a rhythm of their own, an arbitrarily set time seemed inappropriate. In this study, a decision was made to only encode the transcript sequences that represented a discussion. For the purposes of this study a discussion was defined as talk about art works or theories which involved both the teacher and a full class (that is, not small groups). A minimum "discussion" time of five minutes and a maximum of 45 minutes were set as the "units" of this study. It was believed that later, when coded sequences were examined, percentages could be used to allow for comparison. For example, stating that 20% of the talk in Teacher A's session of 23.8.95 was student talk, or, 30% of the student talk categories in Teacher A's session of 9.10.95 were coded 9, was meaningful despite the length of the discussion. The definition of a classroom discussion so named in this study was acknowledged as subjective.

Because a code was assigned to the type of talk, the number of codes applied to any one teacher or student verbal contribution might range from one, to many, depending on the talk content.
Flanders, in the original model of the FIAC, assigned a category during live classroom observation every two seconds. When discussing appropriate use of frequency data, Good and Brophy (1987), claimed that units of frequency could come from counting the number of behaviours in a category during a session or unit of observation sessions. They believed that valid information about what happened in classrooms could come from looking at total counts (Good & Brophy, 1987, p. 83). They suggested that if comparisons were to be made between teachers or students, then a common frame of reference was desirable. Rates, for example the number per hour, and percentages (that is, actually observed rates expressed as percentages of the total number of times that the behaviour could have occurred), provided two acceptable ways of summarizing data.

It was decided that utterances by the teacher and student would be sequentially labelled T1, T2 etcetera and S1, S2 etcetera. No attempt would be made to track specific student's verbal contributions. The sequence of talk being encoded, for example a sequence of T, S, T, S, T, S when compared with T, S, T, S, S, T, S, T, S, S, T, could be significant without the need for needing to know which student was speaking.

**Coding Pre-Intervention Sessions: Applying The FIAC To Art Room Discussions**

The researcher observed, audio-taped and transcribed all the negotiated classroom sessions and was able to recall specific classroom "instances" when assigning codes. According to Dunkin and Biddle (1974, p. 79) reliability of coding systems came from asking two encoders with the same experience to code the same samples, for example, similar training and the same classroom event. This was the method used in this study. Two panels each comprising teachers with similar teaching experience coded the same transcripts. It was believed that if the researcher worked as part of a panel (Panel One) biased encoding could be countered as far as was possible given the limited resources. A second panel (Panel Two) independently encoded a percentage of all transcripts.

The FIAC was applied to all the pre-intervention lesson transcripts of Teachers A, B and C. They were initially encoded by Panel One (the researcher and a colleague). Both panel members had thirty years teaching background (classroom teaching and teacher education) and previous research experience in the field of examining the content of classroom talk. The technique used was not a direct application of Flanders' model because the categorisations were applied to written transcripts, not recorded live as a session progressed.
Categories were not assigned according to a time limit, but rather to a change in the category of talk. This meant that one instance of teacher or student talk could have a single or several categories. As discussed above, identifiable units (Perrott, 1988, p. 16) were segments of the classroom discussion where the teacher discussed an issue with a class of students for five minutes or more. Segments of speech, whatever length, only received one category for as long as that category seemed apt. For example, a teacher statement was only assigned one category 5 coding if all its content was considered to pertain to "giving facts or opinions about content or procedure".

Examples of classroom talk that Panel One at first found difficult to place were:

(a) teacher statements that appeared to be "neutral banter" on first reading;
(b) student questions that requested clarification of procedure and instruction;
(c) verbal habits of teachers like saying "right", but not as affirmation;
(d) procedural instructions by teacher; and
(e) teacher statements which, although not questions, required a student answer, for example, "So you see what is meant".

At first Panel One created a new category for (a) i.e. "neutral banter", instances of (b) as "student questions", and put an asterisk next to instances of (e). However, this was unwieldy, and on re-examination of the FIAC category descriptors, it was found that all the above (i.e. a to e) could be fitted into the existing ten categories. Panel members sometimes had to make assumptions about the intention of a student or teacher utterance. For example, a teacher saying "Yes" might mean either an affirmation, an indication that she wanted the student to continue speaking, or a request for a student to answer. The researcher's presence during transcribed sessions meant that very few instances were categorised via assumptions as their context was known.

Flanders' Category 2, "Praises or encourages student action or behaviour", at first seemed too broad and so Panel One divided it into 2A, simple praise like "very good" (with no building), and 2B when praise was built on by the teacher. However, re-examination of these teacher verbalizations revealed this separation was unnecessary as most 2Bs were more accurately a category 3.

Following coding of several sessions it was found that no examples of talk were listed under the FIAC category 1 "Accepts feelings". It was decided that if, in the future, any such interaction occurred, it would be categorised as 3 or 5.

As no category 1 and only one category 10 coding (Silence and Confusion) move had been noted during the trial categorising, category 1 of the Flanders' model was changed to "Silence or
confusion", and Category 10 was changed to "Student procedural questions" of which there were many examples in the preliminary transcripts. Nothing like this category existed in Flanders' model. Panel One re-examined the trial transcripts using the amended categorization. The reworded FIAC together with the new categories resulted in a satisfactory coding process with all classroom dialogue able to be accommodated.

The modified categorisation model was then set out as in Table 15 below. Each horizontal row represented categories of teacher or student talk. Teacher and student categories remained separate and teacher talk remained separated into indirect and direct influence descriptors.

Table 15: The Modified FIAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Silence or confusion</th>
<th>Teacher Indirect Influence</th>
<th>Teacher Direct Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Praises or encourages</td>
<td>Praises or encourages student action or behaviour, (included uh-huh, go on etc)</td>
<td>5. Lecturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarifies or builds</td>
<td>on student response or behaviour. (if extends at any length &gt; 5)</td>
<td>Facts and opinions about content, expresses own ideas, asks rhetorical questions, cites authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asks questions</td>
<td>about content or procedure based on teacher's ideas, with intent that student answer</td>
<td>6. Gives directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>directions or commands expecting students to comply. Includes classroom organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Authority &amp; discipline statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intended to change student behaviour from unacceptable to acceptable behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Talk

| 8. Student response     | result of teacher initiation or teacher structured situation - limited expression of ideas |
| 9. Student initiation   | expresses own ideas, initiates new topic, develops a line of thought, asks thoughtful questions |
| 10. Student procedural questions | requests for clarification of instruction or procedure |

While categorising the first transcript, Panel One had some difficulty becoming accustomed to applying the categories. It was felt the Flanders' wording, or descriptions of categories were not stated clearly enough for easy application. The modified FIAC model re-worded and clarified to facilitate coding appears below:
1. Silence or confusion

**TEACHER CATEGORIES**
2. **Praises or encourages** - student response, action or behaviour
3. **Clarifies or builds** - on student response, extends student ideas
4. **Asks questions** - about content or procedure, intends student response
5. **Lecturing** - facts and opinions about content, expresses own ideas, gives own explanation
6. **Giving directions** - commands to which students are expected to comply
7. **Authority and discipline** - statements intending to change student behaviour from unacceptable to acceptable

**STUDENT CATEGORIES**
8. **Student response** - result of teacher initiation or teacher structured situation, limited expression of ideas
9. **Student initiative** - expresses own ideas, initiates new topics, develops line of thought, asks thoughtful questions.
10. **Student procedural questions** - request clarification of an instruction, etc.

Using segments of one of Teacher C’s transcripts (17.9.96), the three stages in analysing each teacher’s transcript is demonstrated below. They were:

1. **Coding the transcript.**
2. **A comparison of quantity of teacher and student talk represented in columns.**
3. **Matrix display of coding.**

**1. Coding the transcript**

The excerpt below illustrates the method of assigning categories to a transcript. All transcripts were first categorized in the following manner:

*T19* He signed it. 5
*S22* Yeah, ok, so I could go out and sign it. 9
*S23* It’s not his art, he didn’t make it or construct it. 9
*T20* All right, so you have to actually construct it rather than 3 - what if you went out and got rubbish out of a bin and stuck bits of work together, like just you know, you didn’t make it? 4
*S24* If that was all it was, it’s not a (inaudible) 9
*S25* It’s not all about putting things together though, if you portray an object in a different way then that’s still art, the way that maybe people portray things, like putting them in a different background, putting them in a different area or a different environment than it’s used to, then you can call that art and that’s, even if it’s just the one object, you know. 9

*T21* Does anybody agree or disagree with anything? 4
*T23* Yeah, on a canvas actually. 3

It can be seen that T20 (the twentieth time the teacher spoke) was assigned two codes, 3 (clarifies and builds) and 4 (asks questions). S25, the twenty-fifth time a student spoke, was categorized as a 9 because the student expressed her own ideas and developed a line of thought.

**2. Comparison of teacher/student quantity of talk**

Table 13 contains a transcript separated into two columns, one containing teacher dialogue and the other, student dialogue. The transcripts of all sessions were treated this way.
3. Matrix display of coding

Table 17 below contains a matrix demonstrating the recording of classroom discussions using the modified Flanders’ model. The modified Flanders’ categories are shown on the horizontal axis and each vertical column indicates either a teacher or student contribution. All classroom transcripts were coded using this matrix. The “x” demonstrates the recording of an instance of a coding representing a teacher or student verbal contribution. Individual students were not identified. Patterns of talk were easy to see using this format. The sequence of verbal contributions determined the number assigned to instances of talk (T1, S1 et cetera).

Table 16: Matrix Showing Modified Flanders’ Categorisation Applied To Art Class Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study the instances of coding were portrayed with figures representing the nominated category rather than an ‘x’. Urbach’s display method (in Flanders, 1970) influenced this decision. All transcripts were coded in the way Table 17 below demonstrates. At the final stage of data analysis the categorisations of all observed sessions were converted to graphs. This table shows a variety of instances of teacher talk and a predominance of category 9 student talk.

The coding of transcripts for this study included: (a) a set of categories, each defined clearly, (b) a procedure for observation, (c) a set of ground rules which governed the coding practice, (d) steps for tabulating the data which aided description of the original events, and (e) Panel One’s suggestions for Panel Two to facilitate application. As the coding was done from transcripts rather than during a class, they served as a concrete record to which panel members could refer and check content as required.
Table 17: Matrix Display Of Coding Using Numerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the modified Flanders’ categorisation system, phrases, sentences (including questions) and silences were counted as phenomenal units. The panel members practised recognition under the researcher’s supervision. It was found the categories were self-explanatory and could be used reliably.

As all panel members came from similar teaching backgrounds, they shared a vocabulary for describing and understanding classroom events. Once familiar with the codings, for example asks a low-level question = category 3, they began to discuss sessions using statements like: "There were lots of 3s and 8s", meaning, "There were numerous low-level questions and answers".

Good and Brophy (1987, p. 80) had warned that the use of structured, standardized observation instruments could not guarantee against coding inaccuracies and that coders needed to check their reliability occasionally. Checking the same tapes or transcripts was a way of refreshing memories when disagreements were discussed. "Common disagreement" was described by Good and Brophy as where an interaction was coded differently. Precisely such a situation emerged during this study concerning the different interpretations of the word "good", where one member of a panel saw it as praise, the other didn’t. If encoders identified, and were able to agree on, how to resolve sources of disagreement, it was believed that unreliability, in the sense of coding disagreement, could be eliminated.

Flanders (1970, p. 45), commenting on the placement of teacher questions into categories, used the following ground rules. A category 2 should be used if a question was intended to praise; 3, if it was based on ideas previously expressed by students; and 4, if it represented a genuine request for participation. At best, the teacher’s intention could only be guessed at, but during trialling, the FIAC was found to be workable because the categories were clear and understood by the
coding panels. The advantage of coding after the event was that panellists could discuss definitions when there were conflicting views.

Panel Two cross-checked 25% of all Panel One's session codings. Both members of Panel Two had over twenty years classroom experience in schools and teacher education. It was decided that if a discrepancy of over 25% was discovered, then a review of all coding would occur.

During this study, all transcripts were checked in the following way:

1. Panel One's initial categorisation. Categories were assigned and definitions re-examined to clarify categories initially marked with "?".
2. Panel One randomly re-checked initial categorisations following all coding.
3. As codings were entered onto data charts, categories were re-checked by Panel One for accuracy.
4. Panel Two independently encoded 25% of the subjects' transcripts (i.e. 6 of 24) at both the pre-intervention and post-intervention stages.
5. Codings by Panels One and Two were then compared. When a discrepancy was found the panels moderated and an agreed coding was assigned.

Panel One provided Panel Two with the following guide to be referred to when assigning categories:

a. Questions sometimes not treated as questions if rhetorical or stating facts. i.e. 3.
b. Statements treated as questions if expect a verbal answer. i.e. 4.
c. Category 5 given if teacher goes on to new topic after a 3 even if relatively short.
d. Different or individual students not indicated unless they continue on. This is indicated by "contin".
e. Category 9 not usually assigned for recall.
f. Numbers only counted once even if there might be a few examples, for example, two questions.
g. Sometimes, inaudible student contribution is judged as a 9 if the response from the next speaker makes it clear that it was a 9.
h. Inaudible teacher comment judged by student response.
i. Sentences with more than one part could have more than one number. eg., "Ok, was not a good painter, 3 then what was he?" 4.
j. Category 5 used when teacher talk was not a "lecture" but was not speaking in response to what student had said. i.e. new point.
There was less than a 5% discrepancy overall between Panel One and Panel Two’s codings. All
differences were eliminated during the moderation process.

**Qualitative Analysis Of Pre-Intervention Categorization**

In Flanders’ (1970) exploration of coded classroom talk, the following trends were noted:

1. An inquiry pattern would be marked by the presence of 3 (clarifies and builds on student
   response) and 9 (student idea, develops a line of thought), open questions by the teacher
   and utterances (for example, acknowledging and clarifying student utterances) which led to
   student expression of ideas and co-inquiry. Inquiry patterns were not short question/short
   answer sequences.

2. Patterns where inquiry was absent were usually indicated by category 5 (extended teacher
talk) which led to student dependence usually indicated by code 8 - low level response.
   Teacher questions did not build on student ideas.

3. Lesson patterns where inquiry was present may have begun with an introductory phase of 4
   and 8, but this changed to 3 and 9 as student ideas were used by the teacher. If the 4 and 8
   pattern remained, then inquiry and higher level response was not occurring.

4. Teacher questions rarely built on student ideas (i.e. 3 and 9) although this appeared to be
   the key to inquiry.

5. Categories 3 and 4 were highly correlated.

The codified transcripts of the discussions of Teachers A, B and C were examined to ascertain
whether the patterns described by Flanders (1970) in (a) to (e) above were present, and if not, to
establish what patterns were present and whether there were similarities between the codings for
the three teachers. A brief description of each teacher’s pre-intervention sessions follows. Some
examples of dialogue are included.

**Pre-Intervention Session Codings Compared With Trends Noted By Flanders**

*Teacher A*

23.8.95

This session was marked by a series of teacher questions, some which sought extension, for example, "What sort do you mean?", but short student answers followed. Most teacher utterances were 3 and 4, some combined with 5 (teacher lectures). There were 22 instances of 8 compared with ten category 9s. 88% of this session comprised teacher talk with 16 instances of teacher lectures and acceptance of low level student response.
25.8.95  
Very similar pattern of dialogue to previous sessions. The class again discussed its installation. There were 23 category 8 and 19 category 9s. Student creative suggestions were coded 9 although none was an extended response.

31.8.95  
This time there were many more category 8 (35) than category 9 (15) codings. The session was marked by short teacher and student utterances as it was preliminary to a practical session. Students were asked to make decisions about their materials and intended activity.

18.9.95  
The class was discussing the placement of parts for an installation created by them. The teacher’s open questions which were coded 4 and often 3, 4 like “What do you think?” and “How can we balance...?” led to 25 student utterances being coded 9 while only five were category 8. Teacher categories 4 and 6 (gives direction) often led to student categories 8 and 10 (procedural question).

Teacher B

12.9.95  
This coded transcript featured mostly 3, 4, or 3, 4, 5 teacher utterances and 31 student category 8 responses. The 7 category 9 codings resulted from teacher questions like “What else could we focus on?” Teacher utterances were long when compared with the short student contributions.

18.9.95  
There were many instances of 3 4 teacher codings in this session. On six occasions when a student contribution was coded 9, it was preceded by a teacher coding. For example:

T5 Right, it does help you with your imagination. 3 Why else might I have done it? Yes A? 4
S6 To see different tonal shades. 9

Another feature was the long teacher spoken contributions (6-8 lines of transcript) and short student contributions (half to one line of transcript).

10.10.95 (a)  
There were 25 category 9 student contributions and 14 were coded 8. The 9s resulted from the teacher’s open questions like: “What do you think, do you think what he does is art?” or when the student utterance was used, for example:

T36 Or new medium to work in? 4
S36 Like when we do it in school, you how we draw in sections and that, it becomes a part of art that wasn’t there before. 9

T37 Right, uh huh. 3 Yes? 4
S37 I really, I strongly believe that it is art, because art is something that anyone can do it, it doesn’t matter whether it is good or bad it is art. Like if it’s a drawing or ... 9

T38 It’s an expression of your own imagination. 3
S38 Yeah, yeah, and that it sort of shows a style that is unusual. And, like what he is doing is like, his type of art, I mean we might not call it art, but it’s art to him. 9

Teacher utterances coded 3 and 4 led to either an 8 or a 9.
10.10.95 (b)

Notably there were 55 student utterances coded 8 (only 6 were coded 9). There were 14 teacher utterances coded 5 (lecture). It was a session in which a new topic was introduced. Student contributions were mostly just a few words as in the following excerpt:

T21 Right, as you have to find out, well, just say we are going to put out some sort of pamphlet for our cruise advertising our cruise, 3 what type of things do you think need to be included in that? 4

S22 A boat. 8 (laughter)

T22 Possibly! 3
S23 Cost. 8
S24 Clothes. 8
S25 The length of the journey. 8

T23 Right, the cost is important. 3 Quiet, could we just have our hands up? 6

S26 The scenery, What should be seen and ... 8

T24 Attractions, right. 3
S27 Itinerary. 8

The transcript read like a short question and answer quiz.

Teacher C

25.5.95

Only a brief discussion. Most student moves were categorised 8. Teacher utterances were mainly 4 or 3, 4. The session was marked by the teacher building on what student said but not by way of encouraging the student to say more, rather as a reason for further explanation. Pattern of coding was therefore: 3 5 6/8/3 3 5 6/8.

13.6.95

This was first time the teacher had worked with these students. A very long session was marked by the first 33 student utterances being coded 8 in response to teacher 4’s requiring low level responses. The session then transformed and for the next 30 student utterances there were 12 coded as 9 as the teacher explored the question “What is art?” with the class. Teacher utterances throughout were 3 or 3, 4 with few exceptions, and questions were opened ended during the latter segment of the class. There were a few student sequential student utterances as the topic had captured their interest:

T40 Was it photographed in a toilet? I just whipped there one day and took a photo. 3 Where else might it have been? 4

S53 They might have taken it out and cleaned it up. 8

S54 Yeah, they didn’t just take one off the wall. 8

S55 He just put his signature on it. 9

T41 That’s really important, what she just said. 2 Would you like to say it again? 4

S56 Um, someone has put their signature on it. 8

T42 There’s a signature on a urinal. Somebody has got a urinal and signed it. “There’s my sculpture.” 3 Do you want to know something about this work? 4

S57 There was a group, and there was this guy - I can’t remember his name - it was said to be Surreal wasn’t it? It was Surreal. 9

27.6.95

Categorization was marked by 3s, 3 and 4, or 4s. Only four category 9s were assigned (14 category 8). Mainly short utterances by teacher and students. Class unsettled. This resulted in seven category 7 (discipline statement) codings.
28.6.95

There were no 9s coded for this session. Teacher questions indicates she was seeking particular responses. Example of dialogue pattern:

\[ T19 \text{ What don't you like about that? 4} \]
\[ S11 \text{ It looks like an elephant. Ugh. 8} \]
\[ S12 \text{ It's a cow. 8} \]
\[ T12 \text{ A cow. 3 You guys know about that colouring technique, what's that called? 4} \]
\[ S13 \text{ Cross hatching. 8} \]
\[ T13 \text{ Cross hatching. Good. 3 And what's that other word to describe that effect? 4} \]

Summary Of Pre-Intervention Findings

As Flanders (1970) had found, no instances of prolonged co-inquiry marked by 3 and then 9 were found in any of the transcripts. Brief instances of higher level co-inquiry were noted on just a few occasions as teachers discussed topics like "What is art?" or asked "What do you think?" (although there was no attention paid to art specific vocabulary). The lack of inquiry appeared to be because discussions were teacher led and dominated in terms of talk quantity. Teachers seemed, on the whole, content to accept short student responses. Sessions were mostly short question/short answer sequences.

Duncan and Biddle (1974) believed the FIAC categories: 3 "accepts and uses ideas of students", "praises or encourages" and 4 "asks questions", although mutually exclusive in terms of definition, could be used together, for example, accepts ideas, encourages response and asks a question (3, 4). Data collected in this study showed their prediction was accurate. The panels frequently combined categories 3 (accepts or uses ideas of student) and 4 (asks questions); "Oh I see (3), and how was that achieved?" (4). Although originally problematic for the panels, the combination of 3 and 4 revealed important information about how teachers operated when attempting to elicit answers from their students. This is discussed more fully in Chapter Six.

Although categories 3 and 4 were frequently combined, there appeared to be no connection between these codings, no matter what pattern, and the response that followed from the students. Most sessions observed during this observation period featured discussions associated with practical work. Teachers, rather than building on student responses as a means of extracting student inquiry or expression of ideas, used this approach (often coded 5) to build further on specific topics or answers they appeared to be seeking.
Pre-Intervention Open Ended Interviews

When transcripts of all sessions were prepared, each participant was given a copy of her uncoded transcripts and then interviewed (Teachers A and B on 16.11.95, and Teacher C (6.12.95). Five initial key questions were prepared. They were open-ended and fell into Patton's categories of experience/behaviour and opinion/value questions (in Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 90). Since the purpose of the interviews was to gain an understanding of the teachers' experiences and perspectives, elaboration and clarification probes around the key questions were used as necessary. Emergent questions were sometimes asked as the interview proceeded. Answers would require the teachers to give opinions, describe experiences, express values and reflect on their sessions.

The questions were:

1. On first reading the transcripts what were your thoughts?
2. When you reflected later, did you still feel the same way?
3. What have the transcripts shown you about yourself as a teacher?
4. Have the transcripts shown you anything about your students?
5. Describe your sessions in terms of content, and activity.

It was found the participants were able to recognise some of the discussion patterns noted in 4.3 when they read the transcripts of their classroom sessions. Their perceptions are presented below.

Following the interviews with Teachers A, B and C the transcripts were examined to see whether generalisable trends had emerged (Seidman, 1991; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994; Emery & Wilks, 1994; Bresler, 1996). The approach used was called "phenomenography" by McSorley (1996) and "unitizing the data" by Lincoln and Guba (1985). It involved processing the teachers' statements through various stages of selection, elimination and groupings relevant to an investigation. Larsson (in McSorley, 1996, p. 162), described the process of discovering categories as "empathetic and comparative". The first phase of the analysis was the selection of statements related to the teacher participants' comments on their teaching. In the second phase, relationships among their statements were sought. These were then organised into categories or themes. This method differed from paradigms of content analysis where categories were speculated on in advance, and was chosen largely because of difficulties described by Chervin and Kyle (1993) when they undertook studies of dialogue in the field of philosophical inquiry.

The transcript of the interview with Teacher A was used to trial this method. Useful but emergent categories which would accurately represent the content of this interview were sought. It was hoped the emergent categories would also be appropriate for the content of the interviews of Teachers B and C.
The content of Teacher A's transcript was re-assembled into two columns under two headings. The table below shows the transcript placed under the exploratory heading "Teacher comments on own performance" on the left hand side. On the right, extracts believed to still accurately represent the contents of the teacher's comments were placed under the heading "Discussion approaches and habits". Sections that were considered relevant for this study were highlighted in italics.

As the table below shows, most of what the teacher said was considered relevant and was therefore highlighted. Her comments demonstrated that she was reflecting on the classroom dialogue and was aware of the content and processes of her teaching.

**Table 18: Reduction Of Teacher A's Comments On Her Discussions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher comments on own performance</th>
<th>Discussion approaches and habits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt I was affirming, and I was pleased with my teaching approach, but I was surprised how consistently I used that approach that I would always begin with a compliment, so I was pleased from that point of view, so it was an interesting experience.</td>
<td>I was surprised how consistently I used that approach that I would always begin with a compliment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sense of ownership, the fact that the girls really feel they own the work, I was really thrilled with. They do totally feel it is their work and I think that I should never pursue ownership of the student's work. The concept of facilitation should really be very much part of education.</td>
<td>The concept of facilitation should really be very much part of education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The categories that emerged from reading and organising the transcript in this manner were:

1. Discussion approaches and habits,
2. Expectation of student performance,
3. Teachers' views on their approaches to and in art education, and
4. The Curriculum Framework (CSF) and the project.

The transcripts of interviews with Teachers B and C were then treated in a similar manner to that of Teacher A. It was found that categories 1, 2 and 4 accommodated the content of the transcripts of all three teacher participants. Category 3 was assimilated into the other categories.
Table 19: Reduction Of Transcripts Of Interviews Under Three Emergent Headings

1. Discussion Of Teacher’s Approaches and Habits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was surprised how consistently I used that approach that I would always</td>
<td>I speak in disjointed sentences and my grammar is 'slangy'. It's a wonder they understand anything I say. But they seem to talk to me the same way.</td>
<td>I couldn’t recognise that as my teaching style, little comments where I cut the kids off, or where I would just put in a word, I tend to correct them quite a lot on that [lack of proper terminology]. They say they are using paint and I’ll say &quot;It's ink, it is not paint!&quot;. Um, so I do that sort of thing, and I know, actually, I don’t think I actually do that enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begin with a compliment,</td>
<td>... ‘right’ is very abundant but is used both as confirmation of something correctly stated, and of personal confirmation of what I have said, or that they have understood my statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I obviously had end aims that I wanted to achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some ways I am encouraging them not to think, but be more intuitive -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just responding and allowing things to happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Expectation Of Student Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hope the girls don’t see that all the affirming that I do &quot;Well she affirms all the time so therefore we look for the affirmation&quot;.</td>
<td>For example when that student said that &quot;Some people think that music and drama should be called art too, but they aren’t permanent&quot; I should have said it is the performance that is not permanent but the musical score and dramatic script are permanent. I should have made sure that was made clear and not assume that because I had made that connection in my mind that they could make it too and it didn’t need to be said.</td>
<td>We do a bit [of evaluation] in our sketch books ... I actually got them to fill in a sheet, and this was more for report writing, and also just for my own feedback to know what they liked doing and where they described their favourite work that they’d done and why they liked doing it and what technique they liked, so I think that’s important. They don’t even realise they are evaluating as such, but they are still keen to know what mark they got.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was surprised at how much I was prepared to speak and how little I let the kids get away with speaking, just through grunts or ininations. I am going to demand complete sentences and develop the oral communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CSF, The project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after Year 10. It becomes far too directive ... with the criteria all laid out, so it's all set - I was really pleased with their work, in terms of the CSFs, how I perceive their concepts, presentation, all of those difficult columns in terms of outcomes, I think they were achieved.</td>
<td>because the tape is running, you don’t want a statement on it that might be wrong. I felt uneasy about the taping process. Self analysis is always hard - even more so when you feel you don’t have the experience and formal training in the area in which you are being 'assessed'. The introduction of the CSF and its expected outcomes in the area of &quot;Arts Criticism and Aesthetics&quot; and &quot;Past and Present Contexts&quot; have really complicated things for sure.</td>
<td>we don’t [take notice of the CSFs] in writing our curriculum, and that’s a problem I have,... we should take more notice and be more structured ... we are re-writing our curriculum statements so we are referring to that a lot more. the statement said something about criticism and then it said aesthetics are this and this and this, and I thought 'hang on!'... I think it’s a really valid area from what I can tell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Using the same categories and maintaining the highlighted text from transcripts of the interviews with Teachers A, B and C, charts which combined their responses were created. Table 21 above shows brief extracts from the teachers’ transcripts reduced in this manner under the three emergent headings. Their content provided a vast quantity of significant feedback for this study. Appendix 3 contains the completed summaries of the three teachers’ interviews following the initial observation period.

The interviews exposed assumptions about student abilities similar to those noted by Taylor (1991), for example:

"My independent workers are real independent workers. They don’t need me to talk to them about their work." (Teacher B);

insights into their teaching practice, for example:

"I was surprised at how much I was prepared to speak and how little I let the kids get away with speaking, just through grunts or intonations." (Teacher C);

and comments about the research itself, for example

"I felt uneasy about the taping process. Self analysis is always hard ...".

Reading transcripts and checking interpretations

It was important to ensure the interpretation of transcripts and interviews was as accurate as possible. This was done in two ways. First, the observed teachers were asked to check that transcripts of class sessions and interviews were accurate. They were given the reduced versions to read and asked to comment on whether they believed the reduction was a reasonable representation. Second, an experienced teacher/researcher checked whether claims the researcher made about the transcripts of interview seemed accurate.

It was possible that, having read the records of interview, the participants might wish to present themselves in a particular way, perhaps claiming they didn’t say/mean various things in connection with recorded statements. They were given the notes, with the comment: "Here are my notes of our conversation/interview and the reduction I have made. I would welcome your comments", with no undertaking that the notes would be added to or altered. It was important to establish that the records were fair and reasonable, not infallible. Any comments made by the teacher participants could be addressed during a follow-up discussion. However, only one teacher responded, saying, "Thanks for the opportunity to review my words". Audio-tapes or written notes (Teacher B) of the interviews exist for confirmation of content.
It will be shown that the subjects' comments concerning the content of the pre-intervention session and interview transcripts guided the future direction of this study. The teachers' "voices" (Spradley, 1979; Stout, 1995; Belenky et al., 1986) were valued.

**Negative case analysis**

Concerned that the reduction could be regarded by outsiders as biased, a research assistant read and checked the content of the full interviews for negative or counter-instances (Strauss, 1987). This process was designed to uncover biased or inaccurate representation in the reduction of transcript content and point to instances that might require further explanation.

An experienced teacher/researcher was briefed on the methodological approaches of this study and then asked to conduct the negative case analysis by reading transcripts of interviews with the informants and then the summaries that had been made of interviews. Claims, summaries and reductions made by the researcher were checked and the reductions were judged to reflect the content appropriately.

**Teacher Awarenesses Emerging From Pre-Intervention Interviews**

The analysis of the art teachers’ responses to their pre-intervention lesson transcripts revealed their beliefs about the shortcomings of their approaches to discussions. In keeping with the study design the excerpts of the teacher’s comments are included to illustrate the points made.

**A. Discussion approaches and habits**

*Classroom Questions*

The teachers referred to problems with questioning, noting they were either asking closed questions or seeking a certain end point. For example:

"I feel that I directed them ... I obviously had end aims that I wanted to achieve". (Teacher A)

"Being junior school trained I present quite simplistic questions", "Jumping from one level to another [Prep to Year 8] so questioning style gets 'hung over' ... I would be general instead of giving detail", "I'm looking for definite answers with my questions", "I should have phrased the question differently - I am at a starting point with these questions". (Teacher B)

"I'm just trying to get a big question to them to just start considering what art is". (Teacher C)
Quantity and quality of student talk:

The teachers believed they were doing too much of the talking, that their discussions lacked depth and focus and that their students were not given sufficient opportunity to contribute verbally or develop their vocabulary. For example:

"I need to think about how to develop the public speaking in them",
"I also realise how little feedback I get from the students",
"I seem to be manipulating the students ... the kids thought they came up with the idea, but in fact I had put it in earlier on ... they must have been able to conceptualise what I perceived",
"In retrospect I'd love to know how they felt about what they have gained ... we didn't go into the depths ... in fact I slacked off on this element of it". (Teacher A)

"I speak in disjointed sentences and my grammar is slangy. It's a wonder they understand anything I say. They seem to talk to me the same way",
"I accept their responses fairly curtly and then I give my own opinion. Does this override their own feelings?",
"I take a lot of statements made by the girls at face value instead of trying to clarify the validity of the statement I assume they are making the underlying connection",
"In Art some students with learning difficulties express themselves better",
"It appears to be quite a juggling job to keep my thoughts in order when jumping so frequently from idea to idea - and sometimes I drop the balls". (Teacher B)

"I'll say 'It's ink, its not paint'. I don't think I say that [i.e. clarify terms] enough",
"little comments where I cut the kids off",
"I probably don't look at the vocabulary, actually, and I think that needs to be developed",
"I'd like to teach them different words so that they feel artistic, I think that's really important". (Teacher C)

Support offered to students when speaking:

The teachers were able to describe both positive and negative instances of their roles as facilitators of discussion. For example:

"In some ways I am encouraging them not to think, but be more intuitive",
"I realise the amount of 'me' that was required to start this exercise",
"like a therapist I seem to affirm what the student says before I question the student in order to solicit the next step". (Teacher A)

"I expect them [as senior students] not to expect a pat on the back but rather to be self critical",
"'Right' is very abundant, but it is used both as confirmation of something correctly stated and of personal confirmation of what I have said." (Teacher B)

"The conversation [I had] with the girl had a lot to do with artists ... particularly rewarding for the other kids just to hear the art conversation". (Teacher C)

B. Teacher expectation of student verbal contributions

The teachers realised how careful they needed to be if they did not want to dominate discussions with their students. They referred to vocabulary and pointed to instances where their expectations
were low or where they believed they had sent the students clear messages. They also realised the extent to which students were dependent on their dominance:

"I was surprised at how much I was prepared to speak and how little I let the kids get away with speaking - just grunts and intonations. I am going to demand complete sentences and develop their oral communication".
"I hope the girls don’t see all the affirming that I do [and say] 'Well she affirms all the time so therefore we look for the affirmation'".
"The kids are very, pliable. You have to be very, very careful when talking with them". (Teacher A)
"I should ... not assume because I had made the connection in my mind that they could make it too and it didn’t need to be said".
"If you define things too much they give you what you said - that’s how I justify what I said about being vague!".
"Even a conclusion you might come to in a discussion, it’s hard to realise you might not be doing the right thing, it’s even harder to make a conscious choice to change".
"A lot aren’t willing to change or manipulate an idea. There is not much evidence they are prepared to take risks and think".
"In the junior classes you don’t expect that much detail in their answers in terms of their art elements. You can say "harmony" or "contrast" but don’t go past the level of criticism or analysis of their work ..." (Teacher B)

"Now that they’ve [Year 5] learned to go Munch, Van Gogh [i.e. use the correct pronunciation] they remember it and it’s one of their favourite things". (Teacher C)

C. The National Arts Profiles and Victorian Arts CSF curriculum

The Victorian Draft CSF was available in 1994, with final version distributed to schools in 1995, the year of the pre-intervention observations. In 1995, when the Stage One observations occurred, the researcher wished to establish the extent to which the participants were aware of the Victorian CSF curriculum content and whether there was evidence of this awareness in their art classroom approaches.

The interviews revealed the teachers had diverse knowledge of the curriculum documents; however, their teaching content and approaches did not necessarily reflect this knowledge (Bullock & Galbraith, 1992). They gave the constraints of daily classroom and school routines including interruptions to the curriculum (e.g. excursions, special assemblies, Tournament of Minds' practices) and timetabling problems as the reasons behind any lack of implementation.

Teacher A was aware of the new CSFs, had audited her curriculum and to some extent had re-written the curriculum to fit the requirements. Specifically, she said, the new requirements had led her to be more aware of the historical aspect of art education because of its inclusion in the new documents, but made no explicit mention of the Aesthetics and Arts Criticism dimension. She referred to a staff meeting where the new Arts curriculum had proven to be a "powerful tool" which helped her defend the place of art: "The CSF is good, it's nice to have it".
"... we did look at some bits and pieces all the way through it."
"I was really pleased in terms of the CSFs, how I perceive their concepts, presentation, all of those difficult columns [in the document] in terms of outcomes." (Teacher A, 16.11.95)

Teacher B stated she had been given the task of designing the art curriculum despite knowing little specifically about Arts CSF content:
"... its expected outcomes in the area of Arts Criticism and Aesthetics and Past & Present Contexts have really complicated things for sure",
"It was a shock to have to go into the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics sort of thing in my teaching. I have tried to base my curriculum around the CSF." (Teacher B, 16.11.95)

Teacher C had conducted an audit of the new document and believed she was teaching most of its' content:
"We don't [take notice of the CSF] in writing our curriculum, and that's a problem I have - we should take more notice and be more structured ... Is there really a difference between art criticism and aesthetics? ... we need to call it aesthetics because in the past art criticism has not been taught in full or as it should ...
"I am not sure why the heading of art criticism and aesthetics needs to be given two explanations - surely both are pretty tied in with each other?" (Teacher C, 6.12.95)

Summary Of Teachers' Responses To Pre-Intervention Transcripts

The teachers recognised they had problems with questioning, noting they were either asking closed questions or seeking a certain end point to their discussions. They felt they were doing too much of the talking during discussions which they believed lacked depth and focus. Further, they believed that they did not give their students sufficient opportunity to contribute verbally during discussions or to develop appropriate "art" vocabulary. They pointed to instances where their expectations of both vocabulary and general dialogue were low. Both positive and negative instances of their roles as facilitators of discussion were described, although they recognised the difficulty of facilitating a discussion leading to inquiry, recognising the extent to which their students were dependent on their verbal dominance. The teachers had diverse knowledge of the curriculum documents, however, they noted that their teaching content and approaches did not necessarily reflect this knowledge.

Summary Of Pre-Intervention Findings

The table below contains excerpts of the summaries of the major points which emerged from the examination of the pre-intervention coding (left column) and the major common points made by the teachers about their transcripts during interviews after the pre-intervention stage of this study
The extracts of the summaries are verbatim. There were notable commonalities.

Table 20: Summary Of Pre-Intervention Categorization And Interview Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings Of Pre-Intervention Transcript Categorizations</th>
<th>Summary Of Teachers’ Response To Pre-Intervention Transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no instances of prolonged co-inquiry marked by 3 and then 9 in any of the transcripts. Brief instances of higher level co-inquiry were noted on just a few occasions.</td>
<td>Recognised they had problems with their questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, rather than building on student responses as a means of extracting student inquiry or expression of ideas, used this approach to build further on topics or answers they appeared to be seeking.</td>
<td>Felt they were doing too much of the talking during discussions which they believed lacked depth and focus. [They noted] they were either asking closed questions or seeking a certain end point to their discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers seemed, on the whole, content to accept short student responses. Sessions were mostly short question/short answer sequences.</td>
<td>They recognised the difficulty of facilitating a discussion leading to inquiry recognising the extent to which students were dependent on their verbal dominance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions were teacher led and dominated in terms of talk quantity... there was no attention paid to art specific vocabulary.</td>
<td>Did not give their students sufficient opportunity to contribute verbally or develop art specific vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the initial observation and transcription of sessions and interviews the researcher reflected on what she believed was known about the teacher participants. These reflections are italicised below.

Teacher A:

*Mature and experienced. Deeply involved with the development of her students. Showed she was interested in the thinking process through her emphasis on the complexity of the product and her interest in personal development. Totally immersed in the subject of art. Operated with a sense of emotional well being of the students which did not necessarily encourage independent thought. Showed an awareness of the need to facilitate better thinking and discussion habits, but not how to do it. Aware of the dependency of the students she was supporting.*

Teacher A wrote comments at the end of three session transcripts. They demonstrated her ability to reflect on both process and content in her teaching:

23.8.95
I’m exhausted reading it. I realise the amount of ‘me’ that was required to start this exercise. I also realise how little verbal feedback I get from the students - I think I am going to demand complete sentences and develop the oral communication.

31.8.95
I am happier that I am only assisting problem solving here and that ideas and directions are coming from the students.
It's interesting to analyse my teaching style. Almost like a therapist I seem to affirm what the student has said before I question the student in order to solicit the next step. I seem to be manipulating the students, sometimes guiding them. I seemed to have interfered more at this finishing stage, but in retrospect that was necessary to complete the task.

Teacher B:

_Mature and experienced. Attending to detail. There was evidence that she was trying to improve the students' critical thinking about the arts but that she lacked the requisite skills. She used the terms 'self-critical' without providing evidence of understanding what it might mean. She clarified things for the students without asking them to do any thinking first._

After the interview Teacher B was aware of the need for independent and creative thinking:

_I think all educational thinking has been aimed at the left brain in the past. Reading and writing has been what is valued, especially past Year 2. Before that level teachers have been prepared to look at the student's art - their visual contributions are valued as communication. Later it is all geared towards written work. The kind of thinking you do in art is creative. You need to use your imagination to create new things or extend old. ... There is more stress being put on the thinking process, but it is important to help students cope with technological changes._

Teacher B used the interview as an opportunity to comment on her participation in the project. It revealed the vulnerable position she felt placed in as informant:

... because the tape is running, you don’t want a statement on it that might be wrong. I felt uneasy about the taping process. Self analysis is always hard - even more so when you feel you don’t have the experience and formal training in the area in which you are being 'assessed'. No-one likes to make a fool of themselves, especially when it is being recorded for posterity. It meant I was trying to say the right thing and doing it worse than I normally do.

Teacher C:

_Younger and and less experienced than Teachers A and B. Passionate about her art teaching, but lacked the strategies to bring about change in the classroom. No real sense of control over, or understanding of, the process of thinking. Little understanding of the need for active thinking. Strong focus on product. Nervous about her lack of experience. The content of the CSF was introduced during her final year at University. When she audited the document she believed she was addressing its content._

In summary, analysis of data collected from transcripts of the first stage of observed teaching sessions had produced the following three generalisable trends:
1. Teacher domination of discussion.
In most instances there was a very high percentage of teacher talk in comparison with student talk, even in sessions where "discussions" were supposedly occurring.

2. Restricted teacher questioning techniques.
There was a tendency for teachers to: ask closed questions and answer their own questions; steer students in discussion to their own point of view; and solve artistic problems for their students.

3. Low level student participation.
Teachers tended not to give their students the time during discussions to formulate considered answers. They did not encourage questions about any issues other than concrete task-related factors, and rarely expected them to use appropriate "artistic" vocabulary to describe work, activity or tools. Students were not encouraged to interact verbally and tended to show little preparedness to think through problems, preferring to ask the teacher for answer.

On being shown the transcripts of their sessions and interviewed in depth about session content, the teachers had referred to many of the features outlined above. They also expressed a desire to change both their own and their students' discussion habits.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE INTERVENTION SEMINAR

Analysis of data collected from transcripts of the first stage of observed teaching sessions had produced the following three generalisable trends:

(a) teacher domination of discussion topics in terms of verbal contributions, with teachers frequently building on what students said rather than encouraging the students to do so;

(b) teacher questioning techniques that did not appear to be aimed at extending the students' thinking, with most teacher questions being closed with a specific response or recall sought; and

(c) low-level student verbal participation in terms of both quality and quantity of talk, with teachers accepting short student responses to their questions.

Few observed sessions contained inquiry because students were, in the main, not challenged by the teachers' questions or given the time to offer considered answers. Most issues discussed were task-related, with students showing little willingness to think through problems, preferring to ask the teacher for the answers. Students were rarely pressed to use artistic vocabulary or name specific art works, art movements or artists and very little art criticism, art history or aesthetic inquiry was present in observed sessions.

On being shown the transcripts of their sessions and interviewed in depth about session content, the teacher participants made reference to many of the features outlined above. Interviews with them had established they wished to develop strategies that changed both their own and their students' discussion habits.

Given this, the researcher designed a training program. It was based on the literature concerning resources and approaches for engaging students in arts criticism and the information that had resulted from the initial observation, interviews and coding of transcripts. Preparation for the program involved the design, adaptation and selection of curriculum materials believed appropriate for training teachers to apply philosophical inquiry when teaching arts criticism and aesthetics. Some of the approaches and resources believed useful were described in Chapter Three. Although the class sizes, ages of students, and session aims of Teachers A, B and C varied, the approaches demonstrated during the intervention program, although specific in aim, were generic in application and could be applied broadly.

The approaches modelled during the intervention program included:

(a) strategies that assisted the teacher to become facilitator rather than dominator of classroom discussions;
(b) ways of facilitating student questioning and increasing cognitive levels of student verbal contributions; and

(c) the identification and use of resources that raised philosophical issues associated with artists, art works and the art world.

(Lipman, 1980; Reed, 1989 at Snowbird II; Santi, 1993; Stewart, 1994)

Emphasis was placed on the importance of providing activities that catered for learning styles which fostered creative and critical thinking in the fine arts (Russell, 1991; Lankford, 1992; Perkins, 1994). The resources used included:

(i) selected exercises from Lipman’s Philosophy for Children Program;

(ii) the puzzles approach of Battin et al. (1989);

(iii) Russell’s case clarification approaches (1991);

(iv) Langrehr’s (1994) and Susan Gardner’s (1995) questioning approaches;

(v) Perkins’ (1994) dispositional strategies for reflective intelligence; and

(vi) Boyd’s (1994) list of vocabulary associated with art making, aesthetic perception and evaluative reflection.

Seminar sessions of approximately two hours were held once a week for four weeks in late July and early August 1996 (Tuesdays July 23 and 30, August 6 and 13). Although the focus of the sessions was on the visual arts, it was believed the presence of other interested participants would assist discussions. An invitation was extended to other staff from the schools of Teachers A, B and C interested in philosophical inquiry. Six other teachers, together with three trainee teachers attended the four seminars, taking the seminar group to twelve.

Details of the four week seminar program considered to be a crucial element of this study are included in this chapter. In order to tap into the unique components of this study, a narrative account of both the session content and the researcher’s and participant teachers’ reactions to the seminar sessions is also included. The researcher’s personal reflections, written immediately after each session, demonstrate her perception of the degree to which content was effective.

The teachers’ comments (below) are drawn from either the transcripts of the seminar sessions, their written evaluation following the four sessions (see Appendix 3) or comments made informally after sessions. The teachers often trialed the activities and approaches modelled in the intervention between sessions.
Week 1 (23.7.96)

Content of Week 1 Intervention Session

1. A cartoon that showed a student imagining an image quite different from what the teacher intended, (although accurate in terms of making meaning from what the teacher had said), was used to make the point that teachers should not make assumptions about what their students are thinking or perceiving. The importance of hearing students describe their thoughts and perceptions, rather than assuming they are thinking or understanding what the teacher intended, was stressed.

2. De Haan and Havinghurst's (1961, in Marland, 1972) six domains of learning\(^1\) were introduced in order to make the point that too little emphasis was placed on creative thinking, mechanical skills, and talent in the fine arts, particularly in the general classroom. The importance of providing activities that cater for all learning styles was stressed.

3. Russell's (1991) two definitions of philosophical approaches to art were introduced:
   (a) The philosophical perspectives approach that encourages students to explore answers to questions posed by aestheticians and other thinkers, for example, "What makes an art object beautiful?" So, it is the examination of aesthetic traditions and principles (for example the writing of Kant and Collingwood).
   (b) The philosophical inquiry approach that encourages students to explore aesthetic questions with or without knowledge or historical perspectives. Artistic puzzles (for example, Battin et al., 1989) confront aesthetic questions and bring light to historical perspectives. Using this approach students can be taught specific principles of inquiry that have been employed to answer aesthetic questions (for example, Dewey, Lipman, Socratic questioning).

   The key concepts of the philosophical inquiry approach and the benefits of its methodology were introduced.

4. An exploration of Santi's (1993) teacher facilitation approaches believed to foster better student discussion input and content (see Chapter Three).

5. Specific strategies for teachers to employ to encourage abstract thinking and include the more reluctant thinkers included:

\(^1\) The Six Domains included: 1. Intellectual ability. 2. Creative thinking. 3. Scientific ability. 4. Social leadership. 5. Mechanical skills. 6. Talent in the fine arts.
(a) an activity that evoked words to describe varieties of thinking. Terms like imagination and perception were investigated (Wilks, 1995, p. 21);

(b) an activity to encourage opinions about non-threatening situations with no right or wrong answer. It was used to demonstrate the need to establish a trusting environment so that students would contribute verbally (Wilks, 1995, p. 20);

(c) the "Thinking About Thinking" (Lipman, 1974, p. 9) exercise that further engages participants in metacognitive and abstract thinking; and

(d) the "What Can And Can’t Happen?" (Lipman, 1980, p. 5) exercise that required definitions and reasons to be given for opinions.

6. An art related activity ("What is Art?", Lipman, 1976, p. 257) that involved establishing the criteria required for calling an object a "work of art". This exercise led the group into discussion about a fundamental issue in current art appreciation, that of the difficulties faced by the art teacher when dealing with the minimalism or mystery of postmodern art.

Researcher's notes

Judging from the positive comments received from the teachers after the session and the spirited and involved nature of the participation, the session was of interest. The teachers were keen to try activities, particularly the Lipman "What is Art?" activity with their classes. Teachers were asked to keep notes on student responses during their trialing of the strategies, noting their successes and frustrations, and share these during the second session. Their comments appear below:

No other in-service, and I have attended many in my time, has developed me so significantly in such a short period. I now realise things I need to do to encourage the students to contribute. I could hear myself when you described that teacher who repeats what the students say and then goes on to do the talking rather than let the students speak. I am going to try it with one of my better groups until I get the confidence to tackle the more reluctant classes. What you showed me during that session also made me realise that when I looked at the transcripts of my earlier sessions I had not been able to evaluate what was happening effectively - I could not see what I was doing to diminish their contributions. (Teacher A, 25.7.96)

Following the first session (25.7.96), Teacher B indicated she had found it refreshing and helpful to her professional development, particularly the important role of using open-ended questions. She was keen to try some of the activities. We had discussed the importance of hearing what the students have to say during a discussion and she said she was aware that some students did not contribute verbally during her discussions.

Teacher C said: "You have shown me through this discussion just what a dictator I am during a discussion" (26.7.96). The work of some of the quieter members of her classes had shown her:
the extent to which some of the silent members of the class were thinking artistically, in some cases better than those who contribute in class and whose opinion we always hear. (Teacher C, 26.7.96)

She said she realised her discussion model had not given these students the opportunity to contribute verbally in class.

**Week 2 (30.7.96)**

*Researcher's Notes*

Teachers commented on a new awareness of student talk occurring in their rooms and their own role as facilitators of discussions. Teacher B described a philosophical discussion she had with her class after the first session during which students discussed the notion of "existence" quoting the well known adage: "... if a tree falls in a forest and no-one sees/hears it ... et cetera" (Teacher B, 30.7.96). She said she was amazed to hear them discuss such a deep topic.

Teacher C described a Year 11 class she had conducted between sessions saying:

> I'm finding your seminars so worthwhile. I love it when I have a class like this - they were so keen to put forward their ideas and they made some excellent observations. They showed a particular interest in performance work, so we might go that way for a while. (Teacher B, 30.7.96)

The class was a new group having their first art appreciation class for the semester. She had:

> ... briefly explained to the students the philosophical approach to art and some pointers for having a discussion (as opposed to a "lecture"). My attempt was at a casual introduction, reassuring them of the importance of having an opinion. (Teacher C, 30.7.96)

Teacher A had also used the Lipman "What is Art?" (1976, p. 257) exercise and described:

> A really interesting response, students initially seemed to be self-conscious. After I assured them I wasn't going to "correct" their answers, they got right into the discussion. We followed up by a discussion of the answers [the students had to ask the questions in the exercise]. These guys communicate with each other pretty well. Two of the eight students were pretty quiet - one gained confidence throughout and had some really worthwhile ideas. (Teacher B, 30.7.96)

Teacher A also described a discussion she had around a slide of a postmodern painting. She withheld details about the work and asked: "What could this painting mean?" She found there was interesting construction of meaning throughout the discussion. She also referred to her awareness of her questioning techniques.
Content of Week 2 Intervention session

1. Two strategies that aimed to prepare students to view a painting in the gallery in detail rather than spending only a short time in front of any given work were introduced. (a) A sheet providing a myriad of different facial expressions (Morris, 1992) was suggested as a focal point for students when looking at visual art works. (b) The narrative associated with a painting in the National Gallery Of Victoria was read. The teachers were asked to sketch what they believed the painting might look like and then compare their sketches with the original. The teachers checked their own sketches with the original. The activity encouraged imagination, thinking about composition, and visualisation.

2. A list of vocabulary containing words describing art making, aesthetic perception and evaluative reflection (Boyd, 1994). The teachers were asked to tick the words that described the activities they had been involved in while doing the exercise. The aim of this exercise was to assist the teachers to see the extent to which critical thinking skills are employed in the art classroom. It was suggested that explicit reference to the vocabulary should occur in class so that students actually hear and begin to use the appropriate vocabulary describing their artwork. (The teachers admitted to rarely naming the skills as a result of a belief that "doing" was sufficient. There was acknowledgment of the need to both model art-related vocabulary and encourage the students to use it.)

3. The facilitation of using student questioning as a basis of inquiry was modelled using text from Lipman's *Harry Stottlemair's Discovery* (1974) as a source. Questions that emerged from the content of the passage were invited. The questions were then listed on the board with the teachers' names in brackets at the end of the question to illustrate the importance of giving ownership of the inquiry to the students and starting inquiry with student questions. The importance of recognising questions of philosophical potential and the important role of specifically designed (or selected) resource materials was discussed.

4. A "case clarification" activity (based on Russell, 1991) was presented using pictures of paintings from the National Gallery of Victoria. Russell described four different categories that could assist the clarification of concepts:

(a) **Model cases** - instances that clearly illustrate a concept on a conventional basis normally without question. (Blake's *Antaeus Settling Down Dante and Virgil*, Roe 63, 1757-1827, was used to illustrate a work generally accepted as good art.)

(b) **Contrary cases** - instances that clearly do not exemplify the concept. (A sculpture considered beautiful, *Circe*, Mackennal, 1893, was compared with Corlett's *Connoisseur 11*, 1984, often described as ugly.)
(c) **Borderline cases** - instances that exemplify the concept only partially. (Arkley's *Muzak Mural - Chair Tableau*, 1980-81, was used to demonstrate a borderline case between sculpture and painting.)

(d) **Invented cases** - instances that try to clarify the concept via imaginary instances. (For example, the question: Imagine a world without art - how would that affect the human condition?)

The aim of this activity was to demonstrate how visual arts works can be used to explore concepts. The extent to which artworks could be discussed and appreciated without the possession of historical or theoretical knowledge, and the point at which these factors were needed for appreciation or understanding, was also explored. The teachers were asked to try to look at the works via their grandmother's eyes, an exercise that attempted to extend their awareness of others' points of view. (The group appreciated the advantage of using "cases" to assist the formulation of definitions.)

5. The role that knowledge plays in appreciation of art works could be illustrated by looking at Oldenberg's sculpture *Clothespin* (1974 in Perkins, 1994, p. 19) without the title. The importance of changing the approach to artworks by listening to the student's ideas, descriptions and feelings was emphasised. Once the title was given, the viewer stopped searching for meaning - prior to that perceiving an embrace was as legitimate as the clothes peg.

6. An aesthetic puzzle featuring sculptor Peter Collett's *Connoisseur II* (Emery and Wilks, 1994) was introduced:

"The Connoisseur II" by Peter Corlett

*(Fibreglass re-inforced polyester resin, National Gallery of Victoria)*

He said it made us confront our own body image. How embarrassing!

You know he is a real person, he lived around the corner from the sculptor. Used to chat to him at the local milkbar. Talk about the footy and tell jokes. He was also a connoisseur, of many things, wine, art, antiques. What made him do it? None of us could imagine ourselves modelling for this type of sculpture, we were all too fat, too wrinkly and downright ugly.

Sculptures should be beautiful, you know like Michaelangelo's "Pieta" or Rodin's "The Kiss", romantic and uplifting. You wouldn’t want to take this one home to meet your mum. I had seem something similar to Corlett’s sculpture, a Duane Hanson, but this was initially humorous.

The connoisseur was confronting in his nakedness. Even his y-fronts were embarrassing, they reminded us of our dad’s. We all agreed that they wouldn’t have had the gall to pose for such a public image.
Questions

Why had this man done it, did he think he looked good, did he not care that he would be on public display in the National Gallery of Victoria? What would his neighbours say? What would his children say? Wouldn’t he be embarrassed that people would recognise him and make fun of his fat belly?

Do you think he did it for a dare?

This sculpture is one of the most popular artworks in the National Gallery of Victoria. How can this be so? Aren’t the most famous artworks always beautiful? Popular celebrities are usually beautiful, just think of Sophia Loren or Elle.

What do you think about this work? What do you think makes an artwork popular?

Discuss the qualities of this sculpture that make it so confronting.

(Susan Paterson, LaTrobe University, Bendigo)

The puzzle raised the notions of confrontation, embarrassment, ugliness and associated issues. It led to a discussion of why particular artworks are considered confronting as well as expectations of beauty and the place of reality in works in a gallery.

Sections of a transcript of a dominating teacher using the "Connoisseur 11" puzzle (Wilks, 1995, pp. 40-44) were read to illustrate approaches that impede the role of the teacher as facilitator of student discussions. A transcript that featured a teacher trained in the philosophical inquiry approach treating her students as valued contributors during a discussion of another puzzle was also read to provide a contrast. The difference in talk patterns was discussed.

Week 3 (6.8.96)

Researcher’s notes

At the beginning of the session the group discussed processes and beliefs connected with the facilitation of philosophical inquiry. They used points raised during earlier sessions to support their comments. One teacher brought in a list of the questions her Year 4 students had asked about the mind and it was discussed how she would proceed next. A Year 8 teacher asked whether she could take her students into the Year 4 classroom to discuss their questions with them. Teacher A said she tried a discussion with her Year 12 group who said they did not like being asked such questions "because they made them think and they did not have time for that!

During the discussions, Teacher C said she was not happy with the idea of having discussions with students on topics they knew little about, and therefore they would not be getting anywhere
in terms of content. The group responded by emphasising the value of getting the students to first think about issues. They felt that factual knowledge, for example historical facts, could be introduced after the personal approach had been encouraged.

Content of Week 3 Intervention session

1. The categorization of two classroom discussions using the amended FIAC was demonstrated (teacher one had no philosophical inquiry training while teacher two was trained). Content of teacher and student talk was compared. The increase in the quantity and quality of student talk during the philosophical discussion was evident in the transcript content.

2. Perkins' (1994, p.5) dispositional strategy - reflective intelligence - was introduced (see Chapter Two, p. 46). It highlighted the value of using art works as a base for inquiry.

3. Specific student questions raised around a work in the National Gallery of Victoria (John Brack, Collins Street, 5pm, 1956) were shown. The students' questions demonstrated both depth and breadth of inquiry. Examples were: "Why has he used a small range of colours?" "Why are the faces featureless?" "What does the painting tell us about Melbourne in the 1950s?"

4. A videotaped art classroom session was shown. The (American) teacher demonstrated how she encouraged her students to look more closely at art (Getty Center, 1994). This led to a discussion of participants' experiences when visiting galleries and the need to give the viewer time to work things out prior to being told too much about the work. They believed the facts and knowledge could come later. The teacher in the video employed strategies to encourage her students to think about art and talked about her progress and changes she had observed in her students' input. (The group was critical of the teacher's approach to questioning, for example too directional, no wait time, steering towards a particular end point. They commented that her interaction with students showed she was not really listening or following on from what students said. They also felt the volume of work being covered meant nothing was covered in any depth.)

5. The group was asked to discuss the McAuliffe puzzle: "Street Images: Art or Vandalism" (see Chapter Three, p. 93) in pairs and to take particular note of whether the questions provided at the end of the text were suitable, whether the content was appropriate and the issues that arose from the topic. The group reconvened to discuss these issues.
Week 4 (13.8.96)

Content of Week 4 Intervention session

1. Exercises (Lipman, 1978) that involved discussion of concepts such as appearance and reality (p. 157), perception and attention (p. 53), and the distinctions between artist and crafts-person (p. 134) were used.

2. Specific approaches and strategies were modelled during discussion of unfamiliar postmodern artworks to demonstrate the usefulness of the philosophical inquiry approach. The important role of both the teacher's questioning and the need to encourage student questions was the critical issue.

3. The problems associated with the current General Achievement Test's tick-the-box approach to analysing art was examined via a recent newspaper article. (This method of testing comprehension and opinion was believed by the teachers to be an inappropriate evaluation measure.)

4. Lankford (1992) was introduced. Attention was drawn to his levels of understanding: "foundations", "vivid cases" and "complex issues" in the light of the philosophical inquiry approach.

5. The multiple roles of the teacher in a philosophical inquiry session (Santi, 1993) was revisited. (It held more meaning to the group than when first introduced.)

6. The group members were given evaluation sheets to complete. (See Appendix 4).

Researcher's Notes

During the session Teacher C demonstrated she had thought deeply about the approach both in comments she made about techniques and the way she felt she would apply the Lipman materials she had been given to consider during the week. She told an anecdote about a student teacher who had asked her about questioning approaches and needed an answer quickly as the session was about to start:

She told me what she was going to do and I stopped and said "Oh no, I don't think you should be saying it exactly that way". And then I was thinking "How should I say it?"... Then I got tired and confused because of all these [training] sessions I've been going to... It showed these sessions had an impact on me, to make me think twice before I tried to answer what she said. Normally I would have gone "Just do this or that". (Teacher C, 13.8.96)
Teacher A said the approach demonstrated during the sessions "has opened my eyes completely" (15.8.96). She was wanting to plan philosophy sessions to do with her Year 9 classes and asked for some guidance. Teacher B stated that she would not be using materials like Lipman's, but would employ the discussion techniques. She felt she was already asking more open-ended questions and listening better to her students.

In this final session the teachers' questions indicated what the major hurdles would be for them as they began to implement what had been modelled during the seminar sessions. This included being able to:

(a) selectively step back from a discussion to allow the students to express themselves while at the same time maintaining rigour and keeping the discussion moving;
(b) develop the skills to assist the students to become vocal inquirers, for example, asking one another questions, checking for consistency and accuracy; and
(c) help the students to take responsibility for their thinking.

**Teacher Evaluation Of Intervention**

The extent to which the teacher participants felt the intervention program assisted their art room discussions was of interest. The questionnaire distributed at the end of the fourth session (13.8.96) asked for comments on the structure and content of the program and the aspects found to be most and least helpful.

The teachers were also asked for any suggestions they may have for modifications of the program. The summary below is based on their written responses.

**Organisation of program:**

Excellent, as in many ways it seemed to respond to the pace and needs of the group. The organisation, as with the structure, was comfortably suited to the needs and pressures of the group. (Teacher A)

Seemed to be well organised, with clear presentations and take-home information. I appreciated the adaptability and consideration when organising to watch my classes. (Teacher B)

Liked the practical nature of discussion and examples given. One session per week kept the flow of interest, but sometimes did not give time to try things out. Relevant handouts and logical structure to each topic discussed. Ideas reinforced, looked at and expanded. (Teacher C)
It appeared that the workshop’s flexible and responsive structure fitted the needs of the group. The art specific discussion activities, the group interaction and the awareness of their own and others’ teaching were listed as positive aspects of the four sessions.

Helpful aspects:

Questioning skills, contact with references to expand reading, excerpts from relevant texts, discussions with group. (Teacher A)

I think [the program added] to my general awareness of my teaching and discussion methods. I did not pursue philosophy in teaching and therefore don’t feel compelled to implement it into all my teaching. However, I’m experimenting with it with some pleasing observations. I’ve been especially lucky that it has been art related. (Teacher B)

Particularly good related to art (my subject) and how the concepts projected through art reinforce the value of the Key Learning Areas. Liked the group discussions we had and interaction between us - insight into how others perceive and bring forward things we don’t even consider. (Teacher C)

Further assistance desired:

I would like to view [a video of] an Australian teacher running a session as I still felt apprehension after the sessions. It would seem quite artificial and difficult to introduce the conundrums [puzzles] into the curriculum. Time is too short. However, designing conundrums around curriculum already established is more interesting. (Teacher A)

Probably need more guidance on dangers in my own teaching. During the workshop discussions theories work very well. How does this fit in with twenty-six 12-year-olds? (Teacher B)

Demonstration tape of philosophical inquiry in action would be more relevant [than the Getty video] to the Australian scene. We seemed to be able to pull apart the demonstration as not being really good examples of the process - at least not how it [a lesson] was perceived to be effectively run by us. (Teacher C)

Teachers A and B, at the time of the evaluation, showed some signs of apprehension about the application of the new models that had been modelled. Teacher A believed puzzles would need to be specifically designed to fit her curriculum, but would add an “interesting” dimension. Teacher B, who wondered whether the theory would fit the practice, indicated she was trialing the program content. Teacher C’s point that a videotape of an Australian session would be more relevant was accompanied by her recognition that the seminar group had been able to analyse the Getty "model" and ascertain what the philosophical inquiry approach would have added to the lesson. Appendix 5 contains the feedback received from Teachers A, B, and C on the evaluation forms.
CHAPTER SIX
COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-INTERVENTION ANALYSES

Comparison Of FIAC Categorisation

Following the intervention seminar (July/August 1996), the researcher, as non-participant observer, observed four sessions conducted by Teachers A, B and C. The observation period was a month (late 1996), once a week when possible. The three teacher participants were working with different classes to those in 1995. The age range was from Year 5 to Year 11. The aim of the observation was to check for the presence of intervention seminar content in the teachers’ approaches to discussions and to establish whether patterns of teacher/student talk had altered. The modified FIAC was again employed to facilitate the analysis of the post-intervention sessions. Transcripts were categorised by Panel One as for the pre-intervention sessions (i.e from transcriptions) and Panel Two audited 25% of these categorisations as described in Chapter Four.

It was believed important to establish the extent to which the coding patterns differed from the pre-intervention sessions. Coding of the post-intervention transcripts revealed a significant increase in the number of student utterances coded as 9 (student initiative) and many fewer coded as 8 (student response). There did not appear to be any noticeable change to patterns in any of the teacher categories.

In order to carry out a comparison the data were graphed and pre- and post-intervention transcript data were compared. The modified FIAC category data were first converted to numerical counts for each of the eight sessions for Teachers A, B and C. These were then converted to percentages. For example in the table showing the pre-intervention summary of communication (see Table 21, p. 173), Lesson 4 of Classroom A (Teacher A) had 8 teacher utterances categorised as category 3 "teacher clarifies or builds". This comprised 9.3 percent of the total categorizations for that session.

The percentage of categories for both the pre-intervention and post-intervention sessions was also calculated. So, for Classroom A (Table 21), there was a total of 69 instances of category 3 over sessions 5 to 8. This represented 18.2 percent of the total of verbal communication classified as category 3 for Teacher A’s post-intervention sessions.

Table 21 (p. 173) contains the modified FIAC of pre-intervention sessions of Teachers A, B and C converted to percentages. Each lesson is shown separately and then the percentage for all four sessions is combined.
Table 22 (p. 174) shows the FIAC data for the post-intervention sessions organised similarly.

The information in Tables 21 and 22 for Teachers A, B and C was then converted into simple bar graph form, with pre- and post- intervention sessions shown together to allow comparison (See Figures 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix 7).

Pre- and post-intervention percentages were then converted into graphical representation (see Figures 4 and 5).

Figure 4 (p. 175) shows both pre- and post-intervention classroom communication for all three classrooms. It shows individual sessions and a comparison between the three teachers' sessions.

Figure 5 (p. 176) contains a graph that shows a combination of the data emanating from the three classrooms at both pre- and post- intervention stages of this study.

**Discussion Of Data**

For the purposes of the Tables and Figures, student category 9, i.e. students' expressing their own ideas, initiating new topics, developing lines of thought, and asking thoughtful questions, was reduced to "Student initiative/higher order". Student category 8: student talk that was the result of teacher initiation and represented a limited expression of ideas was labelled: "Pupil response/lower order".

Distinct patterns were observable when data were converted to Tables and Figures. Significantly, there appeared to be little variation between percentages and graphs for Classrooms A, B and C when pre-intervention sessions were examined, and very little variation between the post-intervention session percentages and graphs. On the other hand there was a marked difference between pre- and post-intervention session data for individual teachers and when percentages were combined.
## Table 21: Summary of Pre-Intervention Classroom Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Contusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher's Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student's Procedural Questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Contusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher's Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student's Procedural Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom C</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Contusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher's Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student's Procedural Questions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All Classrooms</th>
<th>Lesson 1</th>
<th>Lesson 2</th>
<th>Lesson 3</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Contusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher's Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student's Procedural Questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 22: Summary of Post-Intervention Classroom Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom A</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Confusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher’s Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student’s Procedural Questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom B</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Confusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher’s Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student’s Procedural Questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom C</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Confusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher’s Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student’s Procedural Questions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total All Classrooms</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of Communication</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or Confusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher Praises or Encourages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Clarifies or Builds</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Asks Questions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Lecturing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher Gives Directions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher’s Authority &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Response / LO Thinking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Initiative / HO Thinking</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student’s Procedural Questions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4: Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Classroom Communication
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% Of Classroom Communication
CLASSROOM A (Teacher A)
As Table 23 illustrates, there was little to note concerning category 1: less than 2% of classroom moves, both pre- and post-intervention; but much to note about some of the changes in the student categories.

Table 23: Pre- And Post-Intervention Codings, Teacher A
(Percentages have been rounded off)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or confusion</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher praises/encourages</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher clarifies/builds</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher asks questions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher lecturing</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher gives directions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Teacher authority and discipline</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Student response/lower order</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student initiative/higher order</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student procedural questions</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher categories
The quantity of "praise" or "encouragement" was negligible: 2% pre- and 4% post-intervention. Category 3 (Teacher clarifies/builds) represented a substantial percentage of teacher A's classroom communication. There was a difference of 7 percentage points in this category, increasing from 18% pre- to 25% post-intervention. As well, "teacher asks questions" (category 4) represented a significant proportion of both pre- and post-intervention session communication. There was only a 3% variation here, the post-intervention sessions being higher (20% to 23%). "Teacher lecturing" comprised a small percentage of classroom communication, but reduced from 9% to 4%. As well, "teacher gives directions" was only a small percentage of the communication: 4% pre- and 2% post-intervention. Less than 2% of session communication both pre- and post-intervention comprised "teacher authority and discipline".

Student categories
There was a marked variation in student response coded as "lower order" (i.e. category 8), between pre- and post-intervention sessions, reducing from 22% in the pre- to 8% in the post-intervention sessions. Again, a marked variation was evident in the "student initiative/higher order" moves (i.e. category 9), which increased from 18% in the pre- to 33% in post-intervention sessions. There were fewer "student procedural questions" in post-intervention sessions: 1% (5.5% pre-intervention).
Discussion
The reduction and comparison of modified FIAC to percentages made the patterns of interaction clear. However, merely examining these figures which show comparatively small percentage changes in the teacher move categories (categories 2 to 7), a reader would be at a loss to explain the marked changes in student communication patterns: nearly 1/3 as many lower order student moves and almost twice as many higher order utterances being categorised in post-intervention sessions.

CLASSROOM B (Teacher B)

Table 24: Pre- And Post-Intervention Codings: Teacher B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or confusion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher praises/encourages</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher clarifies/builds</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher asks questions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher lecturing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher gives directions</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
<td>&lt;4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher authority and discipline</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Student response/lower order</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student initiative/higher order</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student procedural questions</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher categories
Table 24 shows that the amount of teacher "praise" or "encouragement" was negligible, less than 2% pre- and post-intervention. A difference of 3 percentage points in the category "teacher clarifies/builds" (3) was discerned, decreasing from 21% pre- to 18% post-intervention. This category represented a substantial percentage of the overall teacher communication. The "teacher asks questions" (category 4) represented a significant proportion of both pre- and post-intervention session communication. There was a 4% variation here, with the post- intervention sessions being lower (20% to 24% pre-intervention). "Teacher lecturing" comprised a small percentage of classroom communication, increasing from 8% to 9%. Less than 4% of session communication was coded "teacher gives directions", with only fractional difference between pre- and post-sessions. Only 2% and less than 1% were categorised as "teacher authority and discipline".
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**Student categories**

A variation, reducing from 29% in the pre- to 22% in the post-intervention sessions (much less a difference than for teachers A & C) was evident in the "student response/lower order" category (category 8). However, there was a marked variation in the categorisation of utterances judged to be "student initiative/higher order" (9), increasing from 7% in the pre- to 18% in post-intervention sessions. "Student procedural questions" increased from 3% pre- to 5.5% post-intervention.

**Discussion**

There were only slight changes in quantities of teacher categories 3 and 4 between pre- and post-intervention codings. The reasons for the marked changes in the student communication pattern, with almost three times the quantity of "student initiative" codings in post-intervention sessions, required further investigation.

**CLASSROOM C (Teacher C)**

**Table 25: Pre- And Post-Intervention Codings: Teacher C**

(Percentages have been rounded off)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or confusion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher praises/encourages</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher clarifies/builds</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher asks questions</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher lecturing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher gives directions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher authority and discipline</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Student response/lower order</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student initiative/higher order</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student procedural questions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher categories**

Table 25 demonstrates that the amount of teacher "praise" or "encouragement" was negligible, 4% pre- and 3% post-intervention. There was no difference in the category "teacher clarifies/builds", being 17% for both pre- and post-intervention. This category represented a substantial percentage of teacher classroom communication. A 5% variation in the category "teacher asks questions" was noted, the post-intervention sessions being lower (19% to 24% pre-intervention). The asking of questions represented a significant proportion of session communication. "Teacher lecturing" comprised a small percentage of classroom communication, increasing from 4% to 6%. Category
6 (teacher gives directions) comprised approximately 5% of session communication with only a fractional difference between pre- and post-sessions. Roughly 2% (pre-intervention) and less (post-intervention), was coded "teacher authority and discipline".

Student categories
There was a marked variation in "student response/lower order" categories (8), reducing from 32% in the pre- to 18% in the post-intervention sessions. A marked variation was noted in the "student initiative/higher order" category (9), increasing from 6% in the pre-intervention, to 28% in post-intervention sessions. "Student procedural questions" comprised 4% and less.

Discussion
The slight changes in the teacher categories could not explain the marked changes in student communication patterns. There were nearly half as many "student response" utterances post-intervention and almost five times as many "student initiative" utterances categorised.

Combining results for Teachers A, B and C
An examination of a combination of sessions (see Table 26) was meaningful because in most cases there was less than a 5% deviation between classrooms. There was one exception only: the quantity of category 8 codings (student response) for Teacher B showed a smaller variation from pre- to post-intervention than for the other two teachers.

Table 26: Combination Of Coded Pre- & Post-Intervention Sessions (Classrooms A, B & C) (Percentages have been rounded off)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or confusion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher praises/encourages</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher clarifies/builds</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher asks questions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher lecturing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher gives directions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher authority and discipline</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Student response/lower order</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student initiative/higher order</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student procedural questions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was 1% or less interaction coded as "silence or confusion" in both pre- and post-intervention sessions.
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Teacher categories

The amount of "praise" or "encouragement" was negligible, less than 3% in both pre- and post-intervention sessions. There was only a small difference in the category "teacher clarifies/builds", being 19% for pre- and 20% post-intervention. This category represented a substantial percentage of all teachers' classroom communication. "Teacher asks questions" represented the other significant proportion of session communication. There was a 2% variation here, the pre-intervention sessions being higher (23% to 21% post-intervention). "Teacher lecturing" comprised a small percentage of classroom communication, decreasing from 7% to 6%. "Teacher gives directions" formed only approximately 4% of session communication with only fractional difference between pre- and post-sessions. "Teacher authority and discipline" comprised 1.5% and less.

Student categories

"Student procedural questions" comprised 4% and less. There was a marked variation in student response/lower order coding, reducing from 28% in the pre- to 16% in the post-intervention sessions. A marked variation in the "student initiative/higher order" coding was also observed, increasing from 10.5% in the pre- to 27% in post-intervention sessions. These latter two results appear in the Table 27 below:

Table 27: Variations In Student Categories 8 And 9 Pre- And Post-Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>A, B, and C</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student (8)</td>
<td>28 - 16 (-12%)</td>
<td>22 - 8 (-14%)</td>
<td>29 - 22 (-7%)</td>
<td>32 - 18 (-14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (9)</td>
<td>10 - 27 (+17%)</td>
<td>18 - 33 (+15%)</td>
<td>7 - 18 (+11%)</td>
<td>6 - 28 (+22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Apart from a 7% variation in category 3 (teacher clarifies or builds) in Teacher A's sessions and a 5% variation in Teacher C's category 4 (Teacher asks questions) there were only differences of one or two percent in all teacher categories. Given this, the pre- and post-intervention session variation of 12 to 17% in student categories 8 and 9 were significant enough to warrant examination of the texts of transcripts and interviews. The overall increase of 17 percentage points in student communication classified as "initiation" between pre- and post-intervention sessions warranted further investigation.

It was believed a closer examination of the text and verbal patterns of transcripts and interviews with Teachers A, B and C would add a much needed qualitative dimension to the analysis of data.
Pre- And Post-Intervention Classroom Communication By Word Count

The researcher was interested in representing the difference in quantities of teacher and student talk in pre- and post-intervention sessions discerned during observation. Pre-intervention and post-intervention classroom transcripts were first arranged into columns, (see example below) and compared for sheer volume. In most instances the trend was for there to be roughly twice as much teacher talk as student talk in pre-intervention sessions. As well, the length of teacher moves was much longer in most instances. In post-intervention sessions, there was much less overall teacher talk and student moves were often at least as long as the teacher's.

Tables 28 and 29 represent the volume of teacher and student talk of Teacher B's pre-intervention session for 12.9.95 and a post-intervention session on 13.9.96. The text has been used to demonstrate the relative talk quantities and is not intended to be read. T6 = teacher move number 6, S14 = student move number 14. The moves are sequential.

Table 28 contains the pre-intervention transcript (12.9.95) and demonstrates the large quantity of teacher talk compared with that of students. Teacher verbal utterances were long while student responses were short.

The post-intervention session (Teacher B, 13.9.96) reveals a different pattern for teacher/student talk with the same year level (See Table 29). Apart from the quantity of student talk increasing dramatically their verbal utterances are longer and the teacher utterances are shorter. The text has again been reduced in size to demonstrate the relative talk quantities and is not intended to be read.

Although there were many variables operating on teachers and their classes, a changed pattern in the volume of teacher and student talk across all three teachers' pre- and post-intervention sessions had been noted during examination of transcripts. It was believed worthwhile to represent, then analyse, the volumes of talk during all pre- and post-intervention sessions via a word count.
### Table 28: Teacher B's Pre-Intervention Session 12.9.95 Comparing Teacher & Student Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 Can we just stop for a minute? Because we ... all right. It's hard for me to stop you while you are in the middle of something, but because we actually have some people who have actually finished all the bits that we should be up to by now I just have to 6 ... shhh, girls, 7 ... I just have to stop you just to show you what we are going on with next. Now I have had a few comments about this er-arrangement that I have over here. But, kind of basically what this was about in the first place. Now can you all just stop, except those of you who are printing something at the moment, and come over and have a look at what I have got on the bench over here. 6</td>
<td>S1 It's a castle, my god. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Can you stand back? It's hard for me to talk about it E when you are sitting right in front of me. 7 Can you just move across to the side? 6</td>
<td>S2 It could be a ghost. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3 As you know, what we have been looking at so far this term is what? 4</td>
<td>S3 It's a castle. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 Still life, and we did start off with a floral arrangement to do it. Now this is another arrangement that I have got for still life. 3 Can you stop rolling a minute? Thankyou. 7 Now we had a few comments which is, was, indicated kind of why I had done it like this.3 Somebody said it was like a parcel, or what did you say? 4</td>
<td>S4 Aladdin’s castle. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5 A castle or a parcel? 4</td>
<td>S5 It's a castle or a creative ... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6 Ooooh, or a ghost! 3 All right because it's covered up like this it does lead to that mysterious sort of idea that what really is it, or what's under it, and we have an artist that's called Christov (Javochev? checks in book for name) who is a Yugoslavian artist, and he did this in that he wrapped up things and portrayed them in that manner, because of the mysteriousness about it. He wrapped up like 2 miles of coastline along Australia, 5 did anyone ever see it? 4</td>
<td>S6 Or a factory. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 Right. (moving on rather than affirmation of student comment) 3</td>
<td>S7 Looks like some bottles with a sheet over it actually. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8 Well he does make um drawings of things as if they had been wrapped in, up as packages, 3 so that's one thing I was going to ask you to do is to find out a little about Christov. I'll write up his name on the board and you can put it into your diary, to see if you can find out anything about him, but he did do this sort of thing, by wrapping things up and portraying them in this more mysterious manner, and it's also a good way you can work with tonal value. Now I have covered this up with like a gauzy sort of material, so that we can get the light going through it, so we have areas that are kind of transparent looking and others that are more kind of opaque. 5 What does that mean? 4</td>
<td>S8 Or a factory. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9 Can you see it? 4 (continues next page)</td>
<td>S9 Ok. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S10 Still lifes. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S11 Flowers. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S12 A Castle. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S13 A castle. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S14 Was he the one who wrapped up something really recently? 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S15 Yes, that ad - United Airlines. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S16 A house. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S17 Some castle, Buckingham Castle? 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S18 Castle, castle? 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S19 See through. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S20 No, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S21 Not see through. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S22 Like the first shapes and then the shading on them on the dark ... S23 Well, well, the outline of it. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S24 The shadows. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S25 Shadow. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S26 Shapes. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S27 White. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S28 One shape or something. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S29 I don’t know, I just did. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S30 If you were over that side it’s that, if that one was over this side it could be that one. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S31 Yes, um etc. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S32 Yes. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S33 Yeah, but you can’t tell what bit you are doing, because you don’t know what the things are. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S34 That’s a Schweppes bottle, that a ... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S35 No, what I mean is, if you’re gonna, um, if you have to draw it in ten minutes and then you are going to take it away ... 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S36 That’s what you did last time with the vase and then we didn’t know what was going on. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S37 We did, we did (laughs) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S38 Do we have to do it this session? 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S39 Will it be up next session? 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S40 Unless somebody wrecks it again! 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T10 That's right, not see through. More opaque.
Now I've used a number of different things
over there. You can kind of see the outlines
of some of the objects that I have used, but
others of them you can't really tell what it is.
Now it was slightly different before, but
when people were looking in there for
newspapers we kind of moved it. Now when
you look at it, and will go to probably try
and draw it, it is hard sometimes to draw
drapery like this, which is what you call
material hanging over things. What would
we focus on to draw first?
T11 What first shapes? What were you looking
at? 4

T12 Right, you could focus on the general
outline around the outside. What else
could you focus on? We've just answered
that one. Why don't you come around this
way to look at it from over here.
T13 Well, that's probably one of the last things
we would be looking Come on, when you
look at it, what is the first thing that strikes
you?

T14 It's white. (laughs) One shape, or where we
could actually start. All right, why did you
pick that? 4

T15 Right. 3

T16 All right. Well we are all looking basically,
can you see where I've pulled in the tops and
you get those oval elliptical shapes? 4

T17 Because they are solid sort of shapes, that's
a good way where you could start, on the
solid bits, because you know they are placed
so far apart or so high from each other, so
you can kind of start by drawing those
e elliptical, oval shapes and then get the
drapery from there and it should build into
what I've got sitting down there. 5 (sees
students still printing) Girls you were only
meant to finish the one you were doing and
then come and look.

T18 And you have printed more than one and
you are inking it up again.
Anyway. Ok, so that's what you are going to
do is draw this. But the first time you draw it
I want you to try and draw it in about ten
minutes. Just to get the composition of
where the things are in relation to each other.

T19 But, the whole idea of it ... 3

T20 No, I'm not going to take it away. I just
want you ... 6

T21 The vase was taken away because the flowers
died. That's why I said we had more than ten
minutes to draw that arrangement as well, we
actually had nearly two sessions, you know
... 3

T22 This one here, I just want you to get the
shape, the general shape of it and where you
can see the solid lines coming down and
around that form the drapery. If you look at
it, it forms shapes within itself. 5
### Table 29: Teacher B’s Post-Intervention Session 13.9.96 Comparing Teacher and Students Talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1</strong></td>
<td><strong>S1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok girls, now we have all been looking at the - El, 7 we’ve all been looking at the different pictures for a few more minutes now. Is there anybody who would like to tell us um something about the picture that struck them the second time that they looked at it that they didn’t see the first time. E? 4</td>
<td>Um the first time I- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2</strong></td>
<td><strong>S2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just a minute, could you please come over here so you can show the girls what picture it is and tell us the name of it. 6</td>
<td>This picture is called Man Pointing and it’s a man, pointing. (class laughs) And he’s really skinny and the thing I noticed was that on his face he’s got all the features that you can all see at first, ‘cos he’s got eyebrows and wrinkles and stuff. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T3</strong></td>
<td><strong>S3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok, thank you. J. 3 Can you come over here as well. When I call you just bring your picture over here so everybody can see what you are talking about and tell us the name of it please. 6</td>
<td>I chose this picture. It’s A Self Portrait of the Artist as an Old Man and um the first time I saw a lot of the lines on the face and the lines in the clothing and everything, but the second time I noticed that a lot of his arms and the ankle and around the ear area had a lot of minor detail that I didn’t notice that made it look a lot better. Because on one foot you could have just one line but with lots of lines it makes you see the ankles really clearly. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T4</strong></td>
<td><strong>S4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you J. 3 Yes Z? 4</td>
<td>Well this is called The Kiss (giggles) and um well the first time I looked at it I just thought oh there’s two people kissing but then the second time you see a lot more texture and lots more- like there’s a long shape here that’s a figure and form and it looks- 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T5</strong></td>
<td><strong>S5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just a minute please. S will you sit up straight. If you fall over you will break your neck. 7</td>
<td>And it really looks nice. (Called out as she described) 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T6</strong></td>
<td><strong>S6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washshohve?? 3</td>
<td>- realistic except like here. (giggles throughout because of the subject matter) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T7</strong></td>
<td><strong>S7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know what an example of- ? 4</td>
<td>The name of this is Study For Wash- something. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T8</strong></td>
<td><strong>S8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s like stippling. 3 does anybody know? 4</td>
<td>Yep, um first time I saw this I only really saw one lady up there. And the second time I looked at it I sort of saw lots of ladies dancing and I saw a band and a conductor and all these people. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T9</strong></td>
<td><strong>S9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s it called? 4</td>
<td>When you look at it far away it’s like more clear and when you look at it up close it’s just solid dots. That’s really interesting to look at this particular pattern and how it changes what you see. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T10</strong></td>
<td><strong>S10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who was it? 4</td>
<td>Stippling. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T11</strong></td>
<td><strong>S11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. 3</td>
<td>Oh what’s that patching- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T12</strong></td>
<td><strong>S12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok, so you think for the- 4</td>
<td>It’s like aboriginal- 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T13</strong></td>
<td><strong>S13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right. Thankyou. K. 3</td>
<td>No, no it’s the Impressionists, like them. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T14</strong></td>
<td><strong>S14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolithic cave paintings. 3</td>
<td>No, it’s like, oh- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T15</strong></td>
<td><strong>S15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thankyou. 3 Yes F? 4</td>
<td>(lots of guesses as girls try to recall and search notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T16</strong></td>
<td><strong>S16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thankyou. 3 Yes S. 4</td>
<td>Oh, Pointillism. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T17</strong></td>
<td><strong>S17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Pieta by Michelangelo. 3</td>
<td>Oh I was close. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T18</strong></td>
<td><strong>S18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was it about the eyes of woman that caught your attention do you think? 4</td>
<td>It’s really good, like you guys at the back of the room see it really well, and close up it looks really awful. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T19</strong></td>
<td><strong>T20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s looking down. Right thank you. 3 I’ll just stop that there because what I want you to do is talk to the person next to you about the picture you have in front of you and see, no, just a minute, and see if when they look at it they can see something different to what you have actually seen yourself. So either in groups of two or three lets have a look at the pictures and talk about it with the person next to you about you. 6</td>
<td>We’ve all had a chance to look at the pictures and discuss what we saw. 3 Now do you think everybody saw the same things in the picture? 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T21</strong></td>
<td><strong>T22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes F? 4</td>
<td>Ok. Anybody else have anything else to add to that? 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T23</strong></td>
<td><strong>T24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right, and K?</td>
<td>So what does that indicate, do you think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T25</strong></td>
<td><strong>T26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, do you think if you looked at it for long enough you could come up with some sort of reason for that?</td>
<td>(continues next page)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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S19 Well I’ve got Home to the Warriors by Mes-
o-lite caveman, what is it? 8
S20 Mesolithic Cave paintings, and the first
time I looked at it I thought it was just lines
and patterns but then when I actually looked
at it I noticed they were people and that what
I was seeing was changing. It look like this
person here is carrying sticks and stuff and
it looks like he is going to a camp fire or
something like that and as H said, if you
really look at this one it’s got like depth in
it. 9
S21 Ok, well I have this picture and it’s got two
musicians which are on a funerary banquet.
And well the first time I looked at it, the
colours ad the texture of the colours on the
clothing that they were wearing really kind
of flashed to me and but when I looked at it
the second time I actually thought about the
tomb of the leopards, first of all I thought it
was, like the picture was called like that,
then the second time you can see the texture
of kind of a rocky surface. So then I noticed
that it was probably like an aboriginal
painting, not aboriginal but on like a
painting on a wall or a rock. 9
S22 Well, I chose this picture and I think it’s
called Pieta. 8
S23 This is called Pieta and it’s by
Michelangelo. And the first time I looked at
it I thought it looked fairly rude, and then I
looked at it again and I saw (giggles) the
thing that caught my eyes were the eyes of
the woman, the legs of the man and the
background, the thing that they are sitting
on and the ribbon around the woman’s neck
or her chest and the woman’s breasts. 9
S24 Because (giggles) you can’t see them
because she is looking down. 9
S25 No (collective) 8
S26 Some people would see certain things in the
picture, like some people saw the
background in the picture and others saw
different things because they looked at
other things. 9
S27 You sort of see the main bits, like things in
the middle or (inaudible) 9
S28 Um, well at first I saw the men and then tried
to make out what they were doing. 8
S29 I was looking at the positioning, like why
are they in the position they are in as much
as other things. 9
S30 That you don’t realise why you are looking
at art the way you do. 9
S31 Yes. 8
Table 30 demonstrates first pre-, and then post-intervention word count totals for Teachers A, B and C for each of the eight sessions coded and graphed.

**TABLE 30: Pre-and Post-Intervention Classroom Communications by Word Count**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-INTERVENTION</th>
<th>POST-INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>59.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>88.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>70.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>44.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>77.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>65.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>77.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>85.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>75.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>68.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>81.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>75.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 4</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>75.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTALS</strong></td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>72.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom A, B, and C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Percentages Of Teacher And Student Pre- And Post- Intervention Communication By Word Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Pre-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
<th>Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (%)</td>
<td>Students (%)</td>
<td>Teacher (%)</td>
<td>Students (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL A,B,C</strong></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 shows the percentages (rounded off) of teacher & student communication by word count. Pre-intervention totals show the teacher talk to be 70% to 75%. (This figure was very close to that quoted in Dillon, 1988). Post-intervention: Teacher A's talk was reduced by 20 percentage points (i.e. to 50% from 70%) and student talk increased by 20 percentage points. Teacher B's
talk reduced by almost 30 percentage points (44% from 75%) and her student’s talk increased by just over 30 percentage points. Teacher C’s talk was reduced by just over 10 percentage points, (64% from 73%) and student talk increased by just under 10 percentage points.

Tables 28 and 29 above, which showed the segments of Teacher B’s transcripts presented above with teacher/student talk compared in columns, typified the changes observed across all three classrooms.

Using all measures there was little variation within the four pre- and four post-intervention sessions. This therefore meant that for each teacher both the pre- and post-intervention information could be meaningfully aggregated. The aggregated data showed that the percentage of teacher talk decreased from 73% to 52% and student talk increased from 27% to 48%.

Preliminary Analysis Of Transcriptions And Session Content

A belief behind the content of the intervention seminar was that through the use of specific and relatively simple verbal strategies teachers could increase student verbal contribution to discussions. The literature (for example, Flanders, 1970; Lipman et al., 1980; Dillon, 1988; Perrott, 1988) had shown it was widely believed that sessions could become teacher/student co-inquiry into complex issues if teachers:

(a) deflected the analysis of concepts back to their students by using simple questions like “Why do you think that?”;
(b) increased their acceptance of student responses by saying "Yes" or "Uh-huh" or built on students' answers so that the students continued the inquiry;
(c) restricted their “lectures” about facts and knowledge; and
(d) employed a range of resources that raised discussion to conceptual analysis therefore shifting cognitive discussion levels to abstraction.

Methods of achieving the above, plus a range of relevant classroom resources, had been modelled during the intervention program attended by the teachers participating in this study.

The modified FIAC, when applied to transcripts of observed sessions, had revealed a much higher frequency of 9s (i.e. students express own ideas, initiate new topic, develop a line of thought, ask thoughtful questions) in the post-intervention sessions. An increased percentage of student talk and less teacher talk was also apparent. It was believed that closer examination of the texts of the transcripts would perhaps show the presence of the elements described in (a) to (d) above.
The comparison of the pre- and post-intervention codings had also indicated that categories 3 (clarifies or builds on student responses) and 4 (asks questions about content or procedure based on teacher's ideas, with intent that student answer) appeared in roughly the same proportions. It was thus necessary to re-examine the verbal content of transcripts to ascertain whether there was a difference in the verbal content of these categories and/or a difference in the strategies and resources used by the teachers.

In the post-intervention transcript categorisations, only rarely was either a 5 or 2 alone followed by a student category 9, and so there was no further examination of these categories. The analysis focussed on the verbal content of teacher talk categorised as 3 and/or 4.

Flanders' (1970) rationales and predictions about talk patterns were found to be both helpful and accurate as they had been for pre-intervention transcript analysis. Insofar as the modified FIAC could be judged to be similar to the original, his discussions of studying categories 3 and 4 also provided guidelines for deeper analysis. Flanders' discussion (1970, pp. 132-3) of the ways teachers made use of student ideas was helpful because transcripts of the teacher talk in the post-intervention transcripts had revealed that category 9 codings for student utterances were often the result of a teacher merely saying "Yes" or "Uh-huh".

Both Flanders (1970) and Perrott (1988) had observed that teachers who made use of student ideas were probably directly encouraging the further expression of such ideas, and the simple act of turning the ideas of one student into a question for another, expanded group participation in an active way.

Flanders' (1970, pp. 40 - 45) four categories of teacher use of student ideas (coded as either a 3 or 4) were: (a) mere acknowledgment, (b) clarification of meaning, (c) application of student ideas, and (d) questions that used student ideas. Although the use of these skills was rarely discerned in pre-intervention sessions, instances of all four categories were found in teacher questions and approaches in post-intervention transcripts.

It was significant that, in each category of teacher talk illustrated below coded 3 or 4, the student response was coded 9. Categories (a), (c) and (d) above have been applied to Teacher A's (22.8.96) session to illustrate Flanders' point. The table below shows the teacher talk and the resultant student response.
### Table 32: Modified Flanders’ Sub-Categories Applied To Teacher A’s Post-Intervention Session (22.8.96)

#### Flanders’ Sub-Category (a): Mere Acknowledgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T10</th>
<th>S10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. 3</td>
<td>Um the way her hand is on the wall, looks as though she is waiting or kind of pausing. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>S13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah? 3</td>
<td>She looks happy because of the colours used 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23</td>
<td>S23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uh huh. 3</td>
<td>In that way it would be art. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T26</td>
<td>S27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mmm. C?</td>
<td>I think every one of these things could be described as art because they have been formed by someone. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Flanders’ Sub-Category (c): Application Of Student Idea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T16</th>
<th>S16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The green and red. 3</td>
<td>I think the dark colour, the darkness around her eyes and also the darkness around the pillar. (inaudible) I don’t know it’s a really strange green, it’s not dark in some places and it looks like it’s going darker. Yeah, I don’t know. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>S22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok, it’s a copy of the original. 3</td>
<td>Well it still could be art in a way, like it may just be a photocopy, or someone’s actually copied it on to another thing but it’s not always going to be exactly the same and it’s also a photo or something of it, so just say like photography, that’s a way of art. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Flanders’ Sub-Category (d): Questions That Use Student Ideas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T33</th>
<th>S36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Um. That’s a very good point isn’t it? 2 It’s a fine line. 3</td>
<td>(inaudible - something about the original idea and the skill involved) That’s where the saying “It’s in the eyes of the beholder” comes from. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T34</td>
<td>S37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So you think there’s a skill element in it making it art? Ok. 4, 3</td>
<td>Sometimes it can, even before it went through the machine ... 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T36</td>
<td>S39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and you were also saying at one stage that the feeling is very different in the photocopy to that one so the emotional qualities are different. 3</td>
<td>But you still get some of the same qualities. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining teacher talk and the resultant student talk in this way it became obvious that teacher categories 3 and 4 were correlated. When combined they often formed either a clarification, a question, a rhetorical question, or an implicit encouragement for the student to continue speaking. It was felt this combination of categories 3 and 4 meant teachers were acknowledging and using student ideas. It also appeared to be a successful means of encouraging both good quality and longer student responses.

In order to investigate further the preliminary analysis of teacher moves illustrated in Table 32 above, the pre- and post-intervention session transcripts for Teachers A, B and C were divided
into two columns. The teacher utterance immediately preceding a student categorisation of 9 was placed on the left hand side and the student verbal contributions coded 9 (or a series of student contributions that included a 9) were placed in the right hand column as Table 33 below demonstrates:

Table 33: Extract Of Post-Intervention Session Of Teacher C Showing Teacher Utterance And Resultant Student Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (17.9.96)</th>
<th>Students (year 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2 Right, you want to produce art, but you don’t want it to be bought and sold. 3</td>
<td>S2 Make it ugly. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3 But it could still show your emotions so they wouldn’t want to buy it. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S4 You just don’t put it up to sell. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4 All right, another one. 3</td>
<td>S5 Yeah, my mum does that. She doesn’t put it up for sale. She does it for her own enjoyment, so you can easily, like if you don’t want to sell it, you know, you can put it in galleries but not to sell. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7 All right, something controversial. 3 Can you guys think of any works that have been controversial? 4</td>
<td>S9 Yes. Peter Collett’s naked Queen and Prince Phillip. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18 Yes, I showed you that last time. 3 And why is this controversial do you think? 4</td>
<td>S2 1 I don’t think- I mean it looks good but it is not really art, he hasn’t done anything. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S22 Yeah, ok, so I could go out and sign it. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S23 It’s not his art, he didn’t make it or construct it. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the pre- and post-intervention sessions were analysed in this manner. This method of displaying transcript data offered quick visual access to the textual content of patterns of teacher/student talk. It was found that, in all but a few instances, category 3 and/or 4 teacher utterances were followed by a student contribution categorised as 9. Although significantly fewer student contributions coded as 9 were found during analysis of the pre-intervention session transcripts, teacher utterances 3 and 4 were the common teacher verbal contributions.

A comparison of the textual content of both pre- and post-intervention transcript categories 3 and 4 and 9 was considered to be the only means of accounting for, and describing, any changes that had occurred. The following section describes the initial analysis of post-intervention transcripts and some teacher reflections made either during post-intervention classes or during the intervention seminar sessions.

Teacher A

As discussed in Chapters Two and Four of this study, the teacher’s perspective gained via interview or personal communication during the observation period was an important factor. Following her post-intervention session of 28.8.96 Teacher A discussed the benefits the
philosophical inquiry approach had for specific students in her class because of its emphasis on open-ended discussion:

What I found really interesting was N ... she never speaks up. She never participates. She really was involved and really pursued that, really you could see the light in her eyes. So she obviously likes the questions to be open-ended rather than being confined. I think that’s just fantastic ... I mean we have always assumed that she was really slow, but in fact, we just had no idea of where she was at, because we have never opened up that door. I was so excited at hearing N contributing I could hardly concentrate on the session. She’s normally very disruptive ... So there’s really something going on. I’ve been so unfair, even to do it to some students is unfair. That was so fantastic. I can’t believe it. There’s absolutely no way I’m going to start an art class without it. (Teacher A 28.8.96)

This comment also reflects Teacher A’s recognition that there were students who had rarely previously contributed to discussions.

The following notes were written by the researcher following the transcription of Teacher A’s session of 22.8.96. Many of the teacher’s verbal skills and dispositions modelled during the intervention seminar were noted:

At one stage during the discussion she said "So I’m just repeating what you said. My apologies. So is what away are the colours ...?" (T15) Previously she had the habit of repeating what students’ said and then building on their contribution with what she wanted to say.

Although not waiting long for students to finish what they were saying she was inviting students to build on others’ points of view to stimulate the discussion: "Would somebody else like to expand on that?" (T20).

She sometimes built on what was being said often indicating to students who appeared interested in speaking to have a turn by saying "Mmm" or "Yes".

She was supportive of the students’ contributions and encouraged them to build on their own opinions. For example: (T12) "Both of you have actually got a very good and individual interpretation and both of them are correct. X would you like to expand on your interpretation of the colours?".

Some student contributions started with "I think" (S20, 21, 22).

On several occasions students explicitly responded to one another, for example: "I’ve got the opposite to that" (S7).

She appeared to recognise that the students had valid and valuable opinions and that their interpretations of issues were worthy of consideration. For example, she asked the students: "So it can be manipulated to be art?" (T24) and "So you think there’s a skill element in it making it art?" (T34).

Both Teacher A’s approaches and the student verbal contributions noted above represented elements not previously observed in her classroom. Five categories of teacher dialogue and three categories of student input reflecting the content of the intervention program (session: 22.8.96) were extracted from the transcript and placed into Table 34 below. The lesson topic was "What is
art?", a topic modeled during the intervention seminar because it promoted inquiry into aesthetic issues. (Twenty four Year 9 students were arranged around two long tables, approximately half spoke during the session.) The left hand side of the table contains brief descriptions of the kinds of teacher approach and student skills observed. The right hand side of the table contains extracts of teacher and student talk.

Table 34: Teacher Approaches And Student Verbal Moves Noted During Post-Intervention Session (Teacher A, 22.8.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher approach used</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Using Perkins' (1994) suggested approach to examining artworks</td>
<td>&quot;Now I would like you to have a look at it and let your eye focus on that piece and look at the elements ... How would you describe the atmosphere he is using...?&quot; (T4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Using &quot;inclusive&quot; statements</td>
<td>&quot;Could someone follow through in what S was saying?&quot; (T7), &quot;S, you were saying something too?&quot; (T23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Using &quot;reflective&quot; statement/question</td>
<td>Used &quot;uh-huh&quot;, and &quot;yes&quot; to indicate that she wanted students to continue (T10-13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Farrer in Dillon, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Building on student ideas</td>
<td>&quot;Both of you have actually got a very good and individual interpretation and both of them are correct. X would you like to expand on your interpretation of the colours?&quot;, (T29) &quot;So you’ve got two moods running parallel here, so two interpretations&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Supportive of student views expressed</td>
<td>&quot;That’s an interesting perspective, yes. A very good way of thinking&quot; (T7), &quot;K mentioned one was more valuable ...&quot; (T33), &quot;H, did you want to expand on that?&quot; (T29), &quot;So you think there’s a skill element in making art?&quot; (T 34).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student discussion skills

| F. Building directly on peers’ statements                                            | "With what S said" (S12), "What was G saying about the Photocopies?" (S23), "I’ve got the opposite to that." (S7)"I think it looks different to that" (S29). |
| G. Demonstrating metacognitive awareness                                             | "What I am thinking of ..." (S27). Student contributions 20, 21, 22 all started with "I think ...".                                                                                                     |
| H. Showing an awareness of conversation process                                      | "I’m just back to the thing about how we copy in art" (S40).                                                                                                                                           |

Teacher B

When Teacher B’s post-intervention transcripts were examined and compared with pre-intervention sessions, changed patterns of classroom talk were noted. Post-intervention transcripts revealed that students frequently built directly on one another’s comments. Teacher B often used Perkins’ (1994) reflective approach for deep and prolonged looking and students were encouraged to describe work content without interruption. Students’ opinions were respected and they were treated as co-inquirers with something of value to contribute. There were also teacher questions that probed the meaning of terms and elicited elaboration of reasons. Students’ verbal
contributions were beginning to show signs of independent thinking. These features were all present in the transcript of a Year 7 post-intervention session (13.9.96).

The categories used to describe Teacher A’s approaches are used below to exemplify Teacher B’s approach and the resultant student responses.

Category A. Using Perkins’ (1994) second look approach

The extract below demonstrates Teacher B’s use of Perkins’ approach and two student responses:

T1  Ok girls, now we have all been looking at the - El, we’ve all been looking at the different pictures for a few more minutes now. Is there anybody who would like to tell us um something about the picture that struck them the second time that they looked at it that they didn’t see the first time. E?
S8  Yep, um first time I saw this I only really saw one lady up there. And the second time I looked at it I sort of saw lots of ladies dancing and I saw a band and a conductor and all these people.
S9  When you look at it far away it’s like more clear and when you look at it up close it’s just solid dots. That’s really interesting to look at this particular pattern and how it changes what you see. (Year 7, 13.9.96)

The transcript of the session of Teacher B’s session of 13.9.96 contained reflective comments she made (to the researcher) at the end of the session. She had used Perkins’ (1994) approach during the session and appeared pleased at the results:

I read a story about him [Klimpt, to Year 5] that was simply told, that he was interested in colours and things like that. At the end one girl came up with: "It’s like a funeral." I hadn’t told them that was the last painting he had done before he died. She picked this up just from looking at it. I got them all just to look at if for like three minutes without saying anything. Another student said "These arches look like they are walking", and she said "It is like they are protesting". This was similar to the notes the critic had written about what it was about. ... The students also said it looked like aqueducts, which the notes said they were as well. So they kind of picked up on these images or ideas by themselves. Afterwards I said ‘Well that’s really funny because that’s what he said about what he was trying to portray through that particular piece of art’. (Teacher B, 13.9.96)

Category C. Using "reflective" statement/question

Similar to moves commonly used by Teacher A, Teacher B used the technique of employing: "Thankyou. Yes X?" (T13, T15, T16, T19) in order to prevent herself from dominating the talk.

Without building on what students had said she used the students’ names as an indication they should contribute:

S27  You sort of see the main bits, like things in the middle or (inaudible)
T23  Right*, and K?
S28  Um, well at first I saw the men and then tried to make out what they were doing.
T23  Right*. E?

1 (* The the word "right", was used as encouragement, like "OK" and was not intended to signify "correct".)
Category E. Supportive of student views expressed

Teacher B treated the students as people with something worthwhile to say:

S29 I was looking at the positioning, like why are they in the position they are in as much as other things.
T24 So what does that indicate, do you think?
S30 That you don’t realise why you are looking at art the way you do.
T25 Well, do you think if you looked at it for long enough you could come up with some sort of reason for that?
and
T22 Ok. Anybody else have anything else to add to that? (Teacher B, 13.9.96)

At the end of her session on 13.9.96 she referred to the intervention seminar’s influence on her strategies and the independent thinking demonstrated by student input:

It was surprising that it just sort of came out of um, only because I was aware of what you [the researcher] were doing. But I wasn’t sure with this philosophy idea whether it was along those lines but it was a good discussion. It was coming from them about what they thought about different things without me saying ‘This is what he tried to say’ but it was coming from what they were seeing. (Teacher B, 13.9.96).

Category F. Students building directly on peers’ comments

Eight consecutive student moves followed from the teacher’s use of a challenging question taken from a Lipman exercise:

T21 Ok, girls, I’m going to ask you once again, can you pay attention to something without perceiving it?
S44 No, I don’t believe that, because if-
S45 It’s like judging a book by its cover. I think.
S46 I think if you are looking at something, you can be looking at it but you might not be like taking it in. Like if you are listening to something, like if someone is talking-
S47 Tell us why you think that you can.
S48 Well, I don’t think that you can, I don’t think you can see every single thing in one look.
S49 Yes, you have to look lots of times and every time you see something new.
S50 I spose.
S51 Like with this one for example study for whatever that says, I don’t think - if I saw that I would just see people there and lights, but you would have to have more looks than just one-
S52 You’d have to have more looks than one to realise the whole picture. (Teacher B, 13.9.96)

The following extended extract of Teacher B’s classroom discussion with Year 5 (11.9.96) illustrates that the students had developed the confidence to say what they thought and were displaying their awarenesses of the art world as a result of her questions. It shows Teacher B treating them as co-inquirers and probing for meaning of terms and elaboration of reasons:
Are you going to try and clarify that for me L?
Klee's paintings look like little children's paintings or they look very sweet and they have rhythm, and like they are not made by children.

In the museum in Paris, not the museum, art gallery, on the second floor there's this little room and in it is a painting "Bathers at Avignon" and I think they look like Klee's work.

Are you talking about the style in the way they are rounded and soft looking?
No, the reason I'm talking about that is because they are more modern.

In what way do you think they are more modern?
Well they're not really.
They are more realistic.

Or, what's another word for that?
Humane.

Humane in what way?
They all emphasise bodies.
They don't have sort of communication, they have humans in them but especially this one, all these have nature in them and this one is pictures of humans showing nothing about them, they don't have other things about them.

Who agrees with 4 that they are not showing anything about humans?
I believe that they are symbol-like. There's more life in these pictures and I quite like that part.

Who knows a word for that?
Abstract.

These are more abstract would you say then? Because we've come across that word now in a lot of different ways, like when they are not life-like. But are we talking about abstract with these pictures?
I think that Klee uses more definite shapes. Like with Mondrian's work you can't really see what that thing really is, but with Klee's works you don't have to keep wondering what it is because you know what it is.

The content of the discussion and the student and teacher verbal contributions provided a stark contrast with the content of Teacher B's pre-intervention sessions.

Teacher C

A transcript from Teacher C's Year 11 class (17.9.96) showed features of the intervention program and approaches not observed in her pre-intervention classes. A summary of skills noted follows using some of the categories applied to Teacher A's session (Table 34):

Category D. Building on student ideas

Teacher C showed respect for student opinion:

Is this maiming his body, do you think, do you know? Is it actually doing any damage to him? And does that matter?
Well, it's his body, so he can do what he wants, but it's ... I don't know it just seems ...
I think maybe it's the opposite, maybe he's got a concentration, better control over his mind because if he can do that and um have that pain endurance sort of thing.
She requested a student elaborate on what he had said:
S60 I can’t see it as art. 9
T44 Justify yourself thanks. 6
S61 Because it just seems like some sort of action or self-mutilation, but not really you-know, it’s kind of something to purposely attract attention. I can’t see any beliefs or anything behind it. It just seems like a senseless action. 9

She sought student input:
T26 Don’t look at me, I don’t know all the answers. I mean, let’s maybe work this out, because that’s a very famous piece. 3
S33 What’s the piece, what was the final thing? 10
T27 The final thing is just the memory and the photographs, but the photographs weren’t sold in the gallery afterwards like some people do. So who is he poking at do you think? Who is he trying to provoke? 4

Category E. Supportive of student views expressed

Teacher C commented on students good thinking:
S17 Performance art. 9
T15 Yes, performance art, and that’s what we are actually going to look at. 3 And once again, the way you guys discuss art has been really good, ...

Category F. Students built directly on peers’ statements

S62 But there’s a wide range of beliefs behind it. 9
S63 Um, not necessarily, it just doesn’t seem like it has any meaning to it. It’s- 9
S64 It’s just like he’s doing anything to get attention. 9
S65 (contin) - to disgust. 9
S66 I think it’s like theatre. It’s more theatre. I’ve been doing that in drama, talking about all these times, and it seems more like theatre than art, art’s like ? to me. 9

Teacher C reflected on her sessions following the intervention program (11.9.96). She indicated (and the transcripts supported this observation) that she was finding it more difficult to apply the philosophical inquiry approach to her junior classes than her senior secondary class:

I think I can see what I’m doing that’s different between the Year 7s and Year 11s. With the Year 11s I really value what they think and I encourage them to explore issues. I’m not sure with the Year 7s how to be more philosophical, like I only have a short discussion and get them started with their prac work. Perhaps I don’t value their ideas as much, or give them a chance to express them. Next year I want to introduce more discussions about issues that can be discussed. (Teacher C, 11.9.96)

The analysis of one session per teacher participant in the manner described above revealed that the intervention seminar had influenced each of the teachers’ classroom approaches. There were observable changes in the pattern of classroom dialogue, cognitive levels of discussion and resources used.
Detailed Analysis Of Post-Intervention Sessions: "Texting" Transcripts

The preliminary examination of one post-intervention session for Teachers A, B and C had revealed the presence of the strategies modelled during the intervention program and Flanders’ (1970) four categories of teacher use of student ideas. Further analysis was conducted to ascertain the extent to which the five teacher approaches (A to E) and three student discussion skills (F to H) outlined in Table 34 above were present in the other post-intervention sessions as well as the pre-intervention sessions for Teachers A, B and C. The specific verbal strategies teachers used to encourage students to participate in discussions were also sought.

The transcripts of all sessions had already been:
(a) coded using the modified FIAC,
(b) reorganised into columns of selected teacher and student verbal contributions (as illustrated in Table 33 above),
(c) analysed in terms of quantities of teacher and student talk compared (Tables 28 and 29).
This information allowed the retrieval of fine detail and/or quick reference to gross patterns of teacher and student talk as required.

The five teacher verbal approaches and three student discussion skills noted during Teacher A’s post-intervention session of 22.8.96 (see Table 34) were used with slight changes made to category descriptions. Category A was extended to cover instances where either an activity or resource that had been modelled during the intervention program, was used. For pre-intervention sessions this category was assigned if a teacher used a question like "What is the definition of sculpture?" or an activity that resembled those modelled during the intervention seminar (see Chapter Five). This included content like a discussion about whether you can pay attention to something yet not perceive it. Category B was made broader to include an instance where a teacher asked a question where there was an intention that students would respond.

The right hand column of Table 35 below contains the categories used to check both pre- and post-intervention transcript content.
### Table 35: Texting Categories Created From Preliminary Analysis Of Post-Intervention Session Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher approaches noted</th>
<th>Extended category used for audit of all sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A 22.8.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Presence of activity of resource modelled during intervention, e.g. (Perkins' 1994 deeper looking)</td>
<td>A. Use of resources or strategies demonstrated in intervention e.g. puzzles (Battin et al., 1989); Perkins' (1994) deeper looking: Lipman exercises or &quot;Big&quot; questions like &quot;What is art?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Using &quot;inclusive&quot; statements</td>
<td>B. Using &quot;inclusive&quot; statements or asking a question with the intention that a student will become involved in the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Using &quot;reflective&quot; statement/ question (Farrer in Dillon, 1988)</td>
<td>C. Using &quot;reflective&quot; statement/ question (Farrer in Dillon, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Building on student ideas</td>
<td>D. Building on student ideas, treats students like people who have something valuable to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Supportive of student views expressed</td>
<td>E. Supportive of student views expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discussion skills (22.8.96)</td>
<td>Student discussion skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Building directly on another’s statements</td>
<td>F. Building directly on another’s statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Demonstrating metacognitive awareness</td>
<td>G. Demonstrating metacognitive awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Showing an awareness of conversation process</td>
<td>H. Showing an awareness of conversation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All pre- and post-intervention sessions were then audited for the presence of categories A to H. The analysis was conducted jointly by the researcher and the colleague who had carried out the negative case analysis for this study. Instances of Categories A to H were noted via an identification like T6 or S22 as indicated below. Units of talk were only coded A to H when a category was relevant. This process was called "Texting" for the purposes of this study. (This meant not all talk was given a category.) The analysis of one session, analysed on page 201, appears in Table 36 below.

### Table 36: Texting Of Individual Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texting of Teacher A</th>
<th>Verbal contribution no.</th>
<th>Session: 22.8.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher approach used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>T 5 17 18 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T 5 12 20 25 29 31 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>T 9 10 11 13 14 17 18 20 22 23 26 27 28 29 30 31 T32 34 37 38 41 46 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>T 6 9 15 21 24 31 32 36 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>T 12 15 17 27 31 33 42 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discussion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>S 7 8 9 10 11 13 14 16 17 20 21 22 23 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 46 47 49 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>S 7 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>S 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of the findings of this analysis are described below. The various treatments the transcripts had already undergone (a to c above) each contributed to the new analysis. The interviews with teachers, described in depth in the next section of this study, were later used to inform this analysis. The teacher's sessions are discussed separately. Teacher A's pre-intervention session of 23.8.95 and her post-intervention session of 22.8.96 were used to trial this method.

**Trial session one**

**Teacher A 23.8.95 (Pre-intervention)**

Session content: The teacher introduced the idea of making an installation piece, examined some examples of installations in a text book, and then had the students consider what their installation might comprise given a specific topic.

In this session nine student responses had been coded 9 using the modified FIAC. They resulted from questions like: T7 "What are the elements that make it visually consistent?" and T31 "What's another way of doing it?". Notably all student responses were only one sentence in length. The teacher contributions were comparatively long.

Represented via Texting (see Table 37) the extent to which categories (A) to (H) were present was clear (each instance of verbal utterance that fitted a Texting category was numbered).

**Table 37: Texting Of Teacher A's Pre-Intervention Session Of 23.8.95**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texting of Teacher A</th>
<th>Verbal contribution no.</th>
<th>Session: 23.8.95</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher approach used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>T2 3 6 7 8 10 12 24 31 34 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>T36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discussion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>S33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only teacher categories with Texting instances noted were (B) where one instance was noted, (D) where 12 instances of teacher builds on student contribution were noted, and (E) where there was one instance. The text content of instances of building on student ideas showed that student responses were short and were often built on by the teacher in order to make the point she wished to establish. For example:  

T11    ... What makes them visually consistent? 4
The teacher’s last comment (above) appeared to be an accurate summary of the session. During the subsequent interview the teacher had noted this pattern to her dismay.

This pattern continued through the session to the extent that there was four times more teacher talk than student talk. She was aware of the dominance of her talk as the following demonstrates:

T13 [A long "lecture"] ... I think we're going to have to get hands on because you all seem to be a bit phased-out. There will be nothing on the tape except my voice.

**Trial session two**

**Teacher A 22.8.96 (Post-intervention)**

Session: Students were asked to explain the mood of a piece, why they had that feeling, and how it could be explained. There was a further discussion about whether a photocopy was art as she elicited the criteria for calling something art.

Texting revealed 24 reflective statements (C) and 36 student builds (D). T15 illustrates a teacher statement that was both C and D:

T15 Yeah. So, it is interesting. You are saying that the same subject matter can have varying interpretations according to colour. So, I’m just repeating what you said, my apologies. So, in what way are the colours - what colours make it happy, what colours make it gloomy?

T20 shows how she invited student builds: "Would somebody else like to expand on that? Anybody else? Yes H?" Teacher A said during interview (4.9.96) that she kept the list of questions that aimed at inviting student input (distributed during the intervention) with her during discussions and used them as often as possible.

An examination of Teacher A’s questions showed she was asking open questions and treating the students as experts with minimal input herself. The student responses were much more prolonged than pre-intervention sessions and the content was associated with analysis of ideas and complex issues. For example:

S19 With the reproduction, we thought that the print might not be art, the art could be in the frame however, it could be ornate...
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T20 Would somebody else like to expand on that. Anybody else. Yes H? 4
S20 I think that all of it could be thought of as art if you look at the lines in them.
   You could say like this lines art and ... 9
T21 Yes, so you think that the element of design and the personal involvement is
critical for it? 3
S21 Um, I think everything except the reproduction in the frame is art. I think the
frame is because some individual designed it, but the reproduction is just a
copy of a painting. 9
T22 Ok, it's a copy of the original. 3

Student reflective statements like S7 "I've got kind of the opposite to that" and S14 "I think it
looks different to that. It looks so gloomy" were also present. Often the students began their
responses with statement like "I think", e.g. S 16, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28. This was also new.

When the content of the Texting for 23.8.95 (Year 10) was compared with Texting of Teacher
A's post-intervention session of 22.8.96 clear differences were discernible. In the following table
which contains this comparison, the 1995 session codings are on the top line in each category.

Table 38: Comparison Of One Pre- And One Post- Intervention Session (Teacher A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texting of Teacher A</th>
<th>PRE - Session: 23.8.95</th>
<th>POST - Session: 22.8.96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher approach used</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pre Post</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>T5 17 18 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pre Post</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>T5 12 20 25 29 31 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Pre Post</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>T9 10 11 13 14 17 18 20 22 23 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 34 37 38 41 46 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Pre Post</td>
<td>T2 3 6 7 8 10 12 24 31 34 35</td>
<td>T6 9 15 21 24 31 32 36 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Pre Post</td>
<td>T36</td>
<td>T12 15 17 27 31 33 42 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student discussion skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pre Post</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>S7 8 9 10 11 13 14 16 17 20 21 22 23 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 46 47 49 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Pre Post</td>
<td>S33</td>
<td>S7 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Pre Post</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>S40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substantial increases of Texted instances are noticeable in Categories C (Teacher uses reflective
statement) and F (Students build on what other students have said). There were no instances of
either category in the 1995 session. There were also increases in categories B (uses inclusive
statements) and D (builds on student ideas).
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Following these findings all the pre- and post-intervention sessions for Teachers A, B and C were Texted.

**Comments On The Texting Process**

(1) The content of the two groups of sessions (i.e. pre- and post-intervention) was, with one or two exceptions, totally different in every aspect of teacher verbal behaviour and resources.

(2) The sessions that were classified as a discussion varied considerably in length.

(3) An instance of a direct student response to a teacher verbal utterance was not a category. (These utterances were frequently coded 9 using the modified FIAC in post-intervention analysis.) Emphasis was placed on the extent to which students' built on an idea offered by another students' idea.

(4) Categorisation was relatively subjective with informed guesses about teacher intention sometimes made by the coders. For example, categories B (Using inclusive statement), C (Using reflective statement), and D (Building on student idea), could perhaps have been interchangeable at times. For example a teacher utterance like: "So it's the famous artistry of the time?" asked following a student contribution and indicating that the/a student should continue might only have one category assigned. But, an example like "Yes, you won't find it in a gallery. Why?", categories D and B might be assigned. However, a decision was made to assign only one category to avoid double counting.

(5) Although Texting was a high inference measure (Good et al., 1975) a second panel was not asked to check the codings as had been done for the modified Flanders' categorizations. Had contradictions emerged, the investigators would have attempted to determine the reasons and assess the reliability of each data set. In this study the Flanders' categories and the other methods of analysing the transcripts, combined with teachers' comments concerning the transcripts, combined to form a unified picture.

Despite (1) to (4) above, patterns of talk, including similarities and differences contained in the transcripts and illustrated by the Texting process, were graphically clear. The tables containing the complete Texting (Tables 39 to 44 below) illustrate why the matrix displays were useful.

Discussion of the findings of the Texting analysis and examples of specific content of all sessions for Teachers A, B and C (as well as examples of dialogue) has been included in Appendix 5. The content of the transcribed texts of all sessions was always returned to for checking the accuracy of
other forms of analysis. Instances of dialogue remained important throughout the Texting of the sessions for Teachers A, B and C.

TEACHER A

Comparing Texting of Pre- and Post intervention sessions

In all four post-intervention sessions Teacher A used resources modelled during the intervention. There was a marked increase in the instances of Teacher category C (uses reflective statement/question), D (builds on student ideas) and E (supportive of student views). Both Pre- and post-intervention sessions contained many instances of Student category F (building directly on another student’s statement). There are a few instances of category G (demonstrating cognitive awareness) or H (showing awareness of conversation process). See Tables 39 and 40, p. 205.

TEACHER B

Comparing Texting of Pre- and Post intervention sessions

In all four post-intervention sessions Teacher B used resources modelled during the intervention. There was a moderate increase in the instances of Teacher category C (uses reflective statement/question), D (builds on student ideas). Post-intervention sessions contained many instances of Student category F (building directly on another student’s statement). There are quite a few instances of category G (demonstrating cognitive awareness) but few H (showing awareness of conversation process). See Tables 41 and 42 on page 206.

TEACHER C

Comparing Texting of Pre- and Post intervention sessions

Teacher C only used resources modelled during the intervention in two post-intervention sessions. There was a moderate increase in the instances of Teacher category C (uses reflective statement/question), and E (supportive of student ideas) with more instances of D (builds on student ideas) noticeable. All Post-intervention sessions contained many instances of Student category F (builds directly on another’s statement). See Tables 43 and 44 on page 207.
### Table 39: Texting Of Teacher A's Pre-Intervention Sessions

Each instance of categorised talk is marked with an X.
(1 = Session 23.8.95; 2 = 25.8.95; 3 = 31.8.95; 4 = 18.9.95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Verbal contribution Pre- intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student discussion</th>
<th>Verbal contribution Pre-Intervention Teacher A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 40: Texting Of Teacher A's Post-Intervention Sessions

Each instance of categorised talk is marked with an X.
(1 = Session 20.8.96; 2 = 22.8.96; 3 = 28.8.96; 4 = 4.9.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Verbal contribution Post- intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxx xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxx xxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student discussion</th>
<th>Verbal contribution Post-intervention Teacher A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41 and 42: Comparing Texting of Pre- and Post intervention sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Verbal contribution Post-intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each instance of categorised talk is marked with an X. (1 = Session 1-3; 2 = Session 4)
### Tables 43 and 44: Comparing Texting of Pre- and Post intervention sessions

#### Table 43: Texting Analysis Of Teacher C’s Pre-Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each instance of categorised talk is marked with an X.

(1 = Session 25.6.95; 2 = Session 21.8.96; 3 = Session 28.8.96; 4 = Session 30.8.96)

#### Table 44: Texting Analysis Of Teacher C’s Post-Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each instance of categorised talk is marked with an X.

(1 = Session 21.8.96; 2 = Session 28.8.96; 3 = Session 30.8.96; 4 = Session 31.9.96)

#### Table 45: Verbal contribution of Pre- and Post- intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 46: Verbal contribution of Pre- and Post- intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 47: Verbal contribution of Pre- and Post- intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 48: Verbal contribution of Pre- and Post- intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Texting

Although instances of talk represented as an "x" on a matrix do not show content/quality/length of utterance but rather an instance of classified talk, the following generalisations could be made from studying the Texting of sessions. Instances of Teacher categories C (uses reflective statement/question), D (builds on student ideas), and E (supportive of student views), increased in all cases, most significantly Teacher A.

An examination of Student categories F (building directly on another student's statement), G (demonstrating cognitive awareness), and H (showing awareness of conversation process), revealed that only changes in category F were significant, particularly in the cases of Teachers B and C. There were few instances of categories G (other than one session of Teachers B and C) and H.

Tables 45-47 below show an abridged version of the major teacher and student talk patterns in the pre- and post-intervention Texted sessions for each teacher. Fuller details and examples of talk are in Appendix 5.

Table 45: Teacher A's Pre- And Post-Intervention Strategies Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher A PRE-INTERVENTION</th>
<th>Teacher A POST-INTERVENTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.9.95 Questions used to involve students. Short student responses.</td>
<td>20.8.96 (pt 1) Students compared artworks at start of session. Teacher used open questions and encouraged student contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.8.95 Questions sought student response. Student answers brief.</td>
<td>20.8.96 (pt 2) Students treated as &quot;experts&quot;. Students encouraged to build on what others, or they, said. Teacher often said &quot;Yes&quot; or a similar reflective comment as a prompt for student to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.8.95 Some teacher questions were inclusive. Short student answers.</td>
<td>22.8.96 Students treated as experts. Long student utterances. Students built on each others' verbal moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8.95 Topic sparked student discussion. Short student moves.</td>
<td>28.8.96 Long and thoughtful student responses. Use of artistic vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9.96 Most student moves were 9s. Students reflecting and problem solving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 46: Teacher B's Pre- And Post-Intervention Strategies Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE-INTERVENTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>POST-INTERVENTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.9.95</td>
<td>13.9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short student responses.</td>
<td>Used &quot;Thankyou&quot;, &quot;Yes&quot; to encourage student contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher accepted non-reflective responses.</td>
<td>Long student utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.9.95</td>
<td>Correct names of artists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher sought specific answers to questions.</td>
<td>Treated students as interesting contributors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.95</td>
<td>11.9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Good discussion resulting from teacher questions.</td>
<td>(1) Sustained and consecutive student responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short student moves.</td>
<td>(2) Students treated like experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Teacher seeking specific information from students.</td>
<td>Challenged students with critical thinking problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative student responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used Perkins' &quot;deep looking&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many more student than teacher verbal contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More and longer student utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher asked challenging questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students building on each others' contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher respect for student responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 47: Teacher C's Pre- And Post-Intervention Strategies Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher C</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE-INTERVENTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>POST-INTERVENTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5.95</td>
<td>21.8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many teacher questions expected recall response.</td>
<td>Less directive in terms of expected student answers to teacher questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher encouraging student thinking, accepting brief answers.</td>
<td>Teacher responsive to student answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct vocabulary pursued.</td>
<td>28.8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.6.95</td>
<td>Teacher trying to include students but not offering cognitive structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly knowledge seeking closed questions.</td>
<td>30.8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct vocab pursued.</td>
<td>Students offering creative (but short) responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6.95</td>
<td>17.9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher accepting brief answers.</td>
<td>Many high quality student moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student contributions encouraged.</td>
<td>Used questioning techniques demonstrated in seminar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.6.95</td>
<td>Successful engagement with topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short student responses accepted.</td>
<td>Students asked to expand on answers. Apt vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher respects student opinion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Comparison of Pre- and Post-intervention Analyses

Possible Generalisations Emerging From Analysis Of Transcript Content

The analysis of the pre- and post-intervention sessions using the modified FIAC codings, Texting, and comparison of talk quantities had revealed relatively consistent changes in patterns of teacher and student talk. Broadly, these were, for the teacher: asking open questions about issues that had conceptual and/or challenging dimensions; using reflective and inclusive verbal strategies; less teacher talk with resultant increased student talk during discussions. For the students, changes noted were: longer individual verbal contributions; responding directly to one another and building on what others had said; and, many student responses containing expression of their own ideas, developing a line of thought and asking thoughtful questions (amended FIAC category 9). The disappointing lack of metacognitive/reflective talk (categories G and H of Texting) most likely reflected the lack of emphasis this activity was given during the intervention program.

Summary of transcript analysis

The methods used to re-examine transcript content were applied in an attempt to understand the patterns of talk, particularly the teacher moves, that had brought about the observed changes. The approaches modelled during the intervention seminar were found to be present in the teachers’ verbal patterns and their use of resources in the post-intervention sessions. Summarised this meant the teachers:

(a) treated students with respect, indicating they believed they had something valuable to contribute to discussions,

(b) used simple verbal cues like: "Yes", "(student name)"; or even just a nod to encourage student talk and extricate themselves from the discussion,

(c) used the discussion approaches and resources modelled,

(d) fostered high quality and stimulating artistic discussions,

(e) introduced complex issues associated with art history, art criticism and aesthetic inquiry, and

(f) modelled and encouraged the use of appropriate artistic vocabulary.

The students were found to be:

(a) offering both creative and critical contributions during discussions,

(b) contributing noticeably longer and sustained verbal utterances,

(c) responding directly to one another’s comments, and

(d) enthusiastically participating in discussions of complex issues.
When interviewed the teachers were able to point to all the changes to their classroom discussions that the researcher considered significant. The post-intervention topics and inclusive verbal approaches used by teachers were occasionally observed in pre-intervention sessions, but were never sustained nor systematic. The pre-intervention sessions were all marked by much more teacher talk and short unexamined student responses. There was a marked and consistent vastly increased volume of reflective student talk evident in post-intervention sessions. Open-ended questions, resources that interested the students, and simple teacher verbal cues, appear to have been responsible for the above.

Sections of one pre- and one post-intervention session of Teacher B have been included below to illustrate some of the changes described above. The student talk is italicised in each extract.

**Pre-intervention session: Teacher B 12.9.95 (Year 8)**

T3 As you know, what we have been looking at so far this term is what? 4  
S10 Still lives. 8  
S11 Flowers. 8 (laughter)  
T4 Still life, and we did start off with a floral arrangement to do it. Now this is another arrangement that I have got for still life. 3 Can you stop rolling a minute? Thankyou. 7 Now we had a few comments which is, was, indicated kind of why I had done it like this. 3 Somebody said it was like a parcel, or what did you say? 4  
S12 A Castle. 8  
T5 A castle or a parcel? 4  
S13 A castle. 8  
T6 Ooooh, or a ghost! 3 All right because it's covered up like this it does lead to that mysterious sort of idea that what really is it, or what's under it, and we have an artist that's called Christov (Javocek? checks in book for name) who is a Yugoslavian artist, and he did this in that he wrapped up things and portrayed them in that manner, because of the mysteriousness about it.  He wrapped up like 2 miles of coastline along Australia, 5 did anyone ever see it? 4  
S14 Was he the one who wrapped up something really recently? 9  
S15 Yes, that ad - United Airlines. 9  
S16 A house. 8  
S17 Some castle, Buckingham Castle? 8  
T7 Right. (moving on rather than affirmation of student comment) 3  
S18 Castle, castle? 8  
T8 Well he does make um drawings of things as if they had been wrapped in, up as packages, 3 so that's one thing I was going to ask you to do is to find out a little about Christov. I'll write up his name on the board and you can put it into your diary, to see if you can find out anything about him, but he did do this sort of thing, by wrapping things up and portraying them in this more mysterious manner, and it's also a good way you can work with tonal value. Now I have covered this up with like a gauzy sort of material, so that we can get the light going through it, so we have areas that are kind of transparent looking and others that are more kind of opaque. 5 What does that mean? 4  
S19 See through. 8
Post-intervention session: Teacher B 13.9.96 (Year 7)

S20 Mesolithic Cave paintings, and the first time I looked at it I thought it was just lines and patterns but then I noticed they were people and that what I was seeing was changing. It look like this person here is carrying sticks and stuff and it looks like he is going to a camp fire or something like that and as H said, if you really look at this one it's got like depth in it. 9

T15 Thankyou. 3 Yes F 4
S21 Ok, well I have this picture and it's got two musicians which are on a funerary banquet. And well the first time I looked at it, the colours ad the texture of the colours on the clothing that they were wearing really kind of flashed to me and but when I looked at it the second time I actually thought about the tomb of the leopards, first of all I thought it was, like the picture was called like that, then the second time you can see the texture of kind of a rocky surface. So then I noticed that it was probably like an aboriginal painting, not aboriginal but on like a painting on a wall or a rock. 9

T16 Thankyou. 3 Yes S4
S22 Well, I chose this picture and I think it's called Pieta. 8
T17 Yes, Pieta by Michelangelo. 3
S23 This is called Pieta and it's by Michelangelo. And the first time I looked at it I thought it looked fairly rude, and then I looked at it again and I saw (giggles) the thing that caught my eyes were the eyes of the woman, the legs of the man and the background, the thing that they are sitting on and the ribbon around the woman's neck or her chest and the woman's breasts. 9

T18 What is it about the eyes of woman that caught your attention do you think? 4

As previously discussed, the number of teacher categories labelled 3 or 4 in the modified FIAC analysis was almost unchanged in post-intervention session categorisations, but the content of teacher talk was quite different. The use of "Yes" as either an invitation to speak or an encouragement for a student to continue speaking, or the use of a student's name indicating they should contribute was commonly given a category 4. As well, there was evidence that encouragement, very simply given, for example by the teacher merely saying "Mm" or "Uh-huh" (categorised as a 2, 3 or 4), resulted in sustained student contributions. These were the strategies teachers used to "extract" themselves from dominating the discussions.

In conclusion, although generalisations are possible, it must be stressed that each teacher changed in individual ways. However, it was significant that during interviews following their reading of the transcripts for their sessions, each teacher stated they had been under-estimating the capabilities of their students.

Post-Intervention Interviews

Following the intervention seminar and the subsequent four sessions observed, Teachers A, B and C were interviewed. Questions were semi-structured (Seidman, 1991) and sought to ascertain whether the teachers were aware of any differences between the post-intervention classroom transcripts and those of the sessions prior to the intervention. They were asked to comment on their spoken contributions, teacher/student talk patterns and content of utterances. Whether the
teachers had perceived changes in their approaches to discussion was of interest, as was whether they would perceive the role of new resource materials or changes in the way they presented familiar resources.

The phenomenographic method (McSorley, 1996) was used to ascertain the major points emerging from the post-intervention interviews. The transcripts were reduced to segments believed relevant for this study in order to show the teachers’ perceptions of the skills and approaches present (See Table 48 below). To demonstrate the validity of this approach for the purposes of this analysis the following analogy is offered:

A group of painters was given a colour they had not seen before and their work was observed to see if the new colour appeared. If questioned about the presence of the new colour they should be able to refer to its presence, refer to the changes using the new colour has brought about (perhaps even improvements) and be able to look back on their previous work and see what was missing in terms of content and achievement. A researcher interviewing this group could thus concentrate on matters concerning the use of the new colour rather than other classroom events.

A negative case analysis (Strauss, 1987) was performed on the reduction. A complete set of transcripts of the post-intervention interviews with Teachers A, B and C together with the reduction was given to an experienced colleague who had partaken in other aspects of this study\(^2\). She was requested to read the transcripts of interviews and then assess the reduction for accurate representation, noting the presence of any counter-instances that might show the reduction to be biased. No counter-instances were found.

Three sub-categories: Teacher Skills, New Classroom Approaches and Student Skills, that emerged from the content of teacher interviews were used to represent the content:

A. **Teacher skills:**
   - Questioning and facilitation
   - Practice: Realisations about, and limitations recognised

B. **New Classroom Approaches**
   - Puzzles/controversial issues
   - Open environment
   - Place of discussions

C. **Student skills:**
   - Discussion skills
   - Depth of discussion
   - Individual students

Table 48 shows an example of reduced content. Appendix 6 shows the full transcript reductions.

\(^2\) This included the auditing of the reduction of pre-intervention interviews and the Texting.
### Table 48: Example Of Reduced Content Of Post-Intervention Interviews

| TEACHER SKILLS                | Teacher A                                                                 | Teacher B                                                                                                               | Teacher C                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Questioning and facilitation  | "I have to really consciously think about questioning mode..."            | "I’m … not necessarily leading the conversation, I put in relevant questions for them to talk about, but they are talking more. The other ones [pre-seminar transcript] I was the star and this time they are." | "With the Year 11s I really value what they think and I encourage them to explore issues. I’m not sure with the Year 7s … Perhaps I don’t value their ideas as much, or give them a chance to express them. One boy and a couple of girls came out with some really interesting long statements, it’s like ‘wow’. I’m looking forward to reading what they said because they capture the essence." |

| NEW CLASSROOM APPROACHES     | Teacher A                                                                 | Teacher B                                                                                                               | Teacher C                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Puzzles/controversial issues | "Today when I put up two controversial pieces… I didn’t try to explain them at all, I didn’t need to." | "We started talking about all these pictures and I wanted to go from talking about pictures and building their ability to describe and form an opinion about the actual pictures into that more philosophical aspect of perceiving, and you know I was trying to get that kind of flow into it." | "I would like to think that I am posing questions that allow kids to respond with more than the one word answer." |
|                               | Teacher used the conundrum approach applied to own resources.             | "I used it as a vehicle to find out different things about them, like with the younger children, if they could recognise elements ..." |
|                               | When planning lessons the teacher used the seminar puzzles to assist with questioning because it was not yet instinctive. |                                                                                 |

| STUDENT SKILLS               | Teacher A                                                                 | Teacher B                                                                                                               | Teacher C                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Discussion skills            | Previous pattern t/s/t/s, now there are times when the teacher merely says "uh-huh" and several students respond: "Now that is really different and they are completing sentences and building on top of each other and that is good." "They just want to burst out … offering opinions - so you have to go with the flow." | Some students 'seem to be guiding the conversation and then they can sort of bounce off things that the other students have said..." "they look [at artworks] better now … and can discuss more in terms of artistic terminology, like we talk about an element or composition, and I think that [approach] has developed." | "When I read it I thought, 'Oh, they did contribute' a reasonable amount and like it when I see S S S, but then within the classroom context it means that sometimes they are just talking over without being selected or without allowing somebody else to finish. They are not really being considerate." |
Summary Of Post-Seminar Interview Content

The teachers' reactions to reading the post-intervention transcripts showed they responded in their own way, with varying awarencsses, to the teaching and learning processes and changes that were occurring in their classroom discussions about art. They demonstrated individual personal growth, yet remarkably similar awarencsses about their students' capabilities and the approaches they had employed to bring about this knowledge. Selected teacher comments to illustrate the above were placed under the three headings that emerged from the reduction are in Appendix 8. Tables containing a summary of the main points made by the teachers appear below.

A. Teacher Skills: Questioning and facilitation
Table 49 contains a summary of the questioning and facilitation skills Teachers A, B and C recognised they had developed or still lacked. The transcript analysis and the teacher interviews had demonstrated that substantial changes in questioning and facilitation of inquiry had been achieved. The table demonstrates the teachers were all able to point to the limitations their previous approaches to discussions had imposed and describe their new facilitation skills.

Table 49: Teachers' View Of Their Questioning And Facilitation Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Skills: Questioning And Facilitation</th>
<th>Skills Recognised By Teachers To Be Present Or Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>if there were large tracts of her talk, then she was not asking open questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still offering her opinion too often during discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>would need to provide the necessary framework to assist students to question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because students were still motivationally dependent she would have to hold back input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>inserting questions rather than dominating discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attempting to discover what the students knew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previously had &quot;told&quot; facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exposing students to artistic vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult nature of keeping a discussion flowing but speaking less was a relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students enjoying the discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previously had own discussion agenda around which discussions hinged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needed to facilitate focus and move students on from only expressing own opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>encouraged the Year 11s but not the Year 5s to explore ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attempting to pose questions that elicited longer student response and the giving of reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>still imposing her opinion too often during discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>believed the younger students would rather do prac than talk but that she could apply prac discussion approaches to general discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. New classroom approaches

Table 50 below contains a summary of the new classroom approaches modelled in the intervention seminar that Teachers A, B and C claimed to be employing.

Table 50: Presence Of Classroom Strategies Modelled In Intervention Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Classroom Approaches</th>
<th>Skills Recognised By Teachers To Be Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>- puzzles approach to artworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- used examples of questions used in intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- compared two artworks, long and deep looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- previously taught art history sequentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>- moved students from only talking about art to forming their own opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a very young class (Year 2) was engaged in meaningful discussion about &quot;What is art?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- using Perkins' (1994) approach to deeper looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- students attempting to distinguish between perception and attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- slower contributors more vocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- having a discussion before prac had now become a habit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>- new topics like &quot;What makes something art?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers A and B had specifically introduced puzzles and many of the resources demonstrated in the intervention. Teacher C discussed controversial art topics with her students.

C. Student skills: Discussions and depth of inquiry

Table 51 below shows the perception of Teachers A, B and C concerning the discussion skills their students were developing and the depth of inquiry occurring.

The teachers noted that students in all classes were enthusiastically contributing to discussions that challenged them to think deeply about issues associated with arts criticism and aesthetics. All three teachers referred to individual students’ development and were able to point to ways the philosophical inquiry had facilitated their confidence to contribute in class.

Table 53 (at the end of this chapter) shows that all three teachers were aware of the benefits of creating an open environment for discussions and the opportunity this provided for their students to take a greater part in classroom inquiry. They also had renewed respect for the role of discussions in developing cognitive skills. Teachers A and B saw themselves as co-inquirers with their classes.
Table 51: Teacher Perception Of Student Discussion And Inquiry Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Skills: Discussions And Depth Of Inquiry</th>
<th>Skills Recognised By Teachers To Be Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>noted when she said &quot;uh-huh&quot; students built dialogue and were keen to offer opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students showing skills of argument &amp; questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students saying much more than pre-intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open environment leads to respect for others' opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previous non-contributors now vocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fundamental aesthetic topics being examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>students guiding direction of, and active during, discussions if she gave them the opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student art vocabulary improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surprised at depth of inquiry and insight students were capable of and how they led the other students to inquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>noted there were deep thinkers who asked relevant questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surprised at depth of discussion and logic students were capable of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previous non-contributors noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>liked seeing the student/student/student talk pattern and the student ideas being discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>commented on positive aspect of one student explaining a concept to another and that students' verbal contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unusual questions being discussed and unusual responses resulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>noted some long student statements that captured the essence of the topic under discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post-intervention interviews revealed that the teachers were aware of changes in student/teacher talk patterns. They often referred to specific instances of these changes in the lesson transcripts. The following further points were noted about the informants following the transcript analysis and interviews.

Teacher A

Teacher A displayed a mature and holistic approach to students with emphasis on assisting their personal independence. Her quite specific analysis of her own practice focussed on this. She was able to see that thinking processes would vary according to the end point of the task. She noted that her students had lacked questioning skills and she was grappling with the issue of the link between emotional support and thinking dependency. She was aware that she had not given the students time or scope to develop the styles of thinking that would support independence. She saw a link between her focus on the art product and dependency. This dependency included and hindered the process used to independently create a product. She was now including specific activities to build the skills she believed her students lacked and was relying on the facilitation model demonstrated during the intervention program.
Teacher B

Overall, Teacher B displayed substantial personal growth as shown in her reflection on what happened in the classroom following her successful trialling of approaches and activities demonstrated in the intervention seminar. She was able to facilitate and let the dialogue grow, often offering excellent prompts and she described the benefits these approaches offered the students. Some of her statements, however, made it appear that she believed it was changes in the complexity of her language, rather than the process that she was facilitating, that had brought about the changes to discussion patterns.

Teacher C

Teacher C appeared to be more excited about her participation in the study than reflecting on the kinds of thinking occurring. She was very supportive of individual's personal development and may perhaps have been confusing this with helping them to "think". There was evidence of her intention to change and she showed awareness of what might change, but there was not much evidence in the transcripts that she was implementing change. It appears she had not yet developed a good grasp of the complexities or processes of thinking and so her reflection did not lead to critical analysis of what really happened. She recognised her lack of appreciation for the cognitive capacities of her younger students (Years 5 and 7).

Summary Of Post-Intervention Findings

The analysis described in the earlier sections of this chapter revealed that the use of specific strategies and resources, together with the provision of opportunities to explore interesting ideas and build knowledge, resulted in both teachers and their students revealing a preparedness to analyse problems and thus better develop their thinking skills. It should be noted that the capability of the participant teachers and their students was not being questioned.

Although the changes observed in the teaching approaches and student responses in the classrooms of Teachers A, B and C differed, the common elements noted were:

(a) an increase in open questions and verbal strategies like teachers' use of student contributions and use of more inclusive, reflective and supportive comments;
(b) the increased number of student builds on other students' verbal contributions;
(c) use of activities modelled during the intervention seminar that led to analytic thinking about issues associated with art works and aesthetic issues other than content and style;
(d) longer discussions and longer individual student contributions;
(e) no instances of student questions being used to commence a discussion about a resource; &
(f) some student utterances classified as metacognitive awareness and some instances where there was explicit reference to the discussion process.

Analysis via the modified FIAC and Texting had shown, by graphical representation, fairly consistent patterns for each teacher during their pre-intervention sessions and fairly consistent changes during their post-intervention sessions. It was necessary to examine the verbal content of the codings, to ascertain what features of coded talk had caused the changes noted in (a) to (f) above.

(a) *An increase in open questions and verbal strategies like teachers’ use of student contributions and use of more inclusive, reflective and supportive comments.*

During the pre-intervention sessions some questions, statements and reflective comments were classified as a build or inclusive or even supportive. A question that might have been classified as open by the researcher was "How does the use of yellow stippled paint make you feel?" because an answer was sought to a question posed and there was some choice. According to Sigel and Kelley (in Dillon, 1988, p. 111) questions like this are direct and closed and part of a passive exercise set up unwittingly by the teachers where students are not expected to inquire. Sigel and Kelley claimed that when questions like this are used during a discussion, the students might receive, maintain and even process a message but they are not engaged mentally. To be part of open-ended inquiry required active participation, and the only way this would occur was as if the students were engaged or "activated" by the mental activities demanded by inquiry (Sigel and Kelley, in Dillon 1988, p. 111).

For Teacher A’s question to be classified as open and divergent, it would need to be "What can you tell me about the yellow stippling in this painting and how it makes you feel?" Using five categories, Sigel and Kelley (in Dillon, 1988, p. 110) gave examples of what they considered to be closed and open versions of verbal strategies that included questions and reflective statements. Sometimes the semantic difference was only slight, but the intention and effect were vastly different. In Table 52 below the researcher has used Sigel and Kelley’s categories substituting verbal content relevant to this study.
Table 52: Modified Version Of Sigel And Kelley's (in Dillon, 1988) Categories Of Verbal Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>closed (convergent)</th>
<th>open (divergent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>The painting is sad because it is grey.</td>
<td>There are other ways the greyness of the painting might affect us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct</td>
<td>How does the greyness of the painting make you feel?</td>
<td>What can you tell me about how the greyness of this painting makes you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect</td>
<td>I wonder if the painter meant us to feel sad when she used grey.</td>
<td>The painting is very grey. I wonder how this makes the viewer feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td>The painting is grey. The mood created is depressing.</td>
<td>The painting is grey and it makes us depressed but we might have some other feelings about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>Tell me why the painting is grey.</td>
<td>Tell me about the greyness of this painting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was not the intention of the researcher to again re-examine the transcript questions this time using the categories above. However, it was believed the fairly subtle semantic differences illustrated by the content of Table 52 provided an explanation for the changes that were noted in the post-intervention verbal strategies. This was because the teachers' questions and other verbal strategies closely resembled Sigel and Kelley's open (divergent) examples. The verbal strategies listed under the column labelled "closed" were described by Sigel and Kelley as distancing, i.e. their intention is that messages already presented are verified. On the other hand, the "open" verbal strategies stimulate problem solving. They demand active engagement by the students.

Developmental levels need to be considered when considering that conceptual understanding is sought through inquiry. However, the researcher considered the age group of the students involved in this study meant they should have been able to think and reason logically and answer questions requiring inferential reasoning. (This included, perhaps with the exception of a few individuals, the Year Five students taken by Teacher B during post-intervention sessions.) Both the literature and classroom observation carried out for this study had demonstrated that teachers of students of all ages should use questions that are complex, involving cognitive, social and affective dimensions if their intention is to enhance their learning.

Sigel and Kelley (in Dillon, 1988, p. 119) had seven rules for a teacher wanting to achieve good inquiry. They have been re-stated below with the researcher's additions indicated [hence]. They go some way to explaining differences noted between pre- and post-intervention sessions given that the intervention had, to various degrees, addressed these issues. During inquiry:

(a) a question should be asked for a reason;
(b) the questioner should have the purpose of the question in mind;
the question should be appropriate for the cognitive level of the student being neither too easy or too hard to provoke thinking;
(4) the inquirer [both teacher and student] should listen to the response [and indicate explicitly that this has occurred];
(5) the inquirer should ensure he/she understands the response; and
(6) questions should move the discussion forward.

In Chapter Two the benefit of using Susan Gardner’s (1995) "second why" approach was discussed. Sigel and Kelley (in Dillon, p. 114) warned that although follow-up questions might suggest to a student that an elaborative response is required, if the inquiry continued in this way, a student may feel they are on the spot. The inquirer may then be seen as non-accepting and critical leaving the student wondering what they said wrong. This emphasised the delicate nature of inquiry and might explain why the teachers were rarely observed using this approach.

In summary, a combination of open questions and inclusive verbal strategies with the use of resources that contained issues that challenged student (and teacher) thinking was believed to be directly responsible for increased student participation in discussions. Flanders’ (1970, pp. 40-45) four categories of using student ideas\(^3\) either separately or combined (categories 3 and 4 of the modified FIAC) provided another way of representing these teaching strategies.

(b) The increased number of student builds on other students’ verbal contributions.
(c) The use of the activities modelled during the intervention seminar that led to analytic thinking about issues associated with art works and aesthetic issues other than content and style.
(d) Longer discussions and longer individual student contributions.

Points (b), (c) and (d) above were considered to be inter-related. An increased quantity of students’ building verbally on one another’s contributions (Texting category D) was one of the significant changes noted when pre- and post-intervention patterns were compared. This change was not only in the frequency, but also in the quality of talk content and the length of students’ verbal contributions. This increase in student participation was believed to have resulted from the teachers’ use of elements of philosophical inquiry. Their use of strategies like puzzles that raised questions from aesthetics and their investigation into the meaning of words like perception, appeared to be responsible for students’ enthusiastic and prolonged engagement.

\(^3\) Flanders’ (1970) four categories of teacher use of student ideas: i.e. mere acknowledgment, clarification of meaning, application of student ideas, and questions which use student ideas, were found to be the strategies directly responsible for the increased student participation in discussions.
In turn, student participation resulted in longer sequences of questions and longer discussions. The students' response to topics and discussion techniques appeared to boost the teachers' confidence concerning the facilitation of discussions and they used more (B), (C), (D) and (E) Texting moves to further extend the discussion and encourage student inquiry. The content of these Texted categories closely paralleled Flanders' four categories of teachers' use of student ideas. The content of the sessions led the researcher to describe post-intervention sessions as demonstrating teacher/student co-inquiry.

(c) No instances where student questions were used to commence a discussion about a resource.

Complex issues and postmodern topics were frequently used as stimulus at the start of post-intervention sessions. During post-intervention interviews the teachers said their discussions about concepts and issues, rather than all discussions about art appreciation being tied up with production, were new. Their fear that the students would not be interested in "talking" during art classes because they only wanted to produce, had dissolved. The non-threatening inquiry approach led to the exploration of complex issues as an introduction to many of their post-intervention sessions.

However, a cornerstone of the Philosophy for Children program (Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1980) is to have the students ask questions about a resource as the starting point of inquiry. Although this method was modelled during the intervention seminar when the teachers were invited to ask questions about a resource in order to commence a discussion, there were no instances of this approach observed in post-intervention sessions. The teachers used the resources modelled but asked the questions that led to the inquiry. They appeared to feel more comfortable using Perkins' (1994) reflective model. They used strategies like small group discussions of puzzles or artworks that were then shared in a whole class discussion. This was the technique used to make sessions more student-centred.

(f) Some student utterances classified as metacognitive awareness and some instances where there was explicit reference to the discussion process.

The Texting analysis of Teacher A's pre-intervention session of 22.8.96 had revealed two instances of metacognitive awareness coded as (G):
There were also numerous occasions where students said "I think", "we thought" etcetera (not coded as G, but often as a builds, F, depending on the context). This style of participation represented unusual verbal approaches for the students in Teacher A's class. When pre-intervention sessions were checked for all three teachers, two G's were coded in one session of Teacher A (31.9.95) and one for Teacher C (13.6.95). Post-intervention session analysis showed a slight increase in instances coded G in Teacher A's sessions (seven overall). Teacher B's post-intervention two sessions on 13.9.96 revealed five and 16 instances respectively coded (G). The strategies used in these sessions were Perkins' (1994) deeper looking (13.9.96: 1) and the question of whether something could be perceived without attention being paid to it (13.9.96: 2).

In terms of the coding of instances of H (showing an awareness of the conversation process), there were none in pre-intervention sessions and only a few coded in each teacher participants' post-intervention sessions. For example: Teacher C's session of 17.9.96 (Year 9):

S73 Yeah, but I mean, Ok, I was going to say something about communicating. Like when I first said, you know, she baked a cake for god or something. ... but because she is putting it abstract to the normal thing, like to the norm, that's plainly a difference ... .

These comments were made during sessions where the topic under discussion was enthusiastically embraced by students and where there was a large quantity of student builds (F). It was not an approach that had been explicitly discussed in the intervention program but it was known to be a result of student engagement in discussions (Flanders' 1970, Sprog, 1994). Instances of the kind of Texting codes (G) and (H) were considered by the researcher to be at the end of the chain of verbal contributions that became more prevalent with the presence of increased opportunities for students to co-inquire with their teachers. As Bridges noted (in Dillon, 1988, p. 22) during his analysis of classroom discussions, it would be a mistake to apply criteria of quality that are too demanding and look for "too much too soon".

It must be remembered that it was quite a considerable achievement for Teachers A, B and C to have elicited discussions of conceptual issues from so many students. Bridges believed this teacher role was essential if students were to develop a sense of responsibility for its quality. The teachers were still mainly concerned with the necessary preliminaries of the development of classroom discussions and taking their classes beyond the "guessing game" (Bridges, in Dillon, 1988, p. 24) question/answer style.
Through their supportive and reflective comments the teachers were showing concern for the enrichment and refinement of thought. Student statements like those categorised as G and H were an advanced way of showing a sense of ownership of the discussion.

Checking For The Presence Of Philosophical Inquiry Approaches

In 1994 the researcher, in a small project, listed fundamental skills and dispositions she believed teachers would display if engaging in philosophical inquiry, and checked the content of classroom talk prior to and after a training seminar (Wilks, 1994). This list was used in the present study to check for the presence of the philosophical inquiry approaches modelled and practised by the teachers during the intervention seminar. The colleague who assisted with the Texting analysis and had checked pre- and post-intervention interview and transcript content, was asked to observe for instances in all pre- and post-intervention transcripts (as far as it was possible to ascertain from a transcript) of the 12 approaches and skills (See Table 53 below).

The skills and dispositions are listed below in the left hand column. The instances noted in the transcripts of pre- and post-intervention sessions appear in the columns beside the behaviour (Y equals "Yes" and O equals occasionally) if the behaviour was noted in transcripts. The data produced by this exercise supported the findings of the analysis reported in detail above.

Although a relatively crude measure, the exercise above pointed to what appeared to be the virtual absence of the philosophical inquiry skills and dispositions in pre-seminar transcripts and their presence in post-seminar transcripts.
### Table 53: Transcripts Of Teachers A, B And C Checked For Presence Of Philosophical Inquiry Approaches

(y = yes, instances noted, o = occasionally)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher approaches to discussion</th>
<th>Pre-int A</th>
<th>Post-int A</th>
<th>Pre-int B</th>
<th>Post-int B</th>
<th>Pre-int C</th>
<th>Post-int C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. asks challenging and probing questions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. emphasis on critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. relaxed, inviting atmosphere</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. focus on process and discussion content rather than seeking a particular endpoint</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. encourages and explores student ideas and concepts</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. teacher the facilitator, not the director of discussion</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. teacher a good listener</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific discussion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. does not superficially judge merit of contributions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. encourages students to build on what other students say and respond to them</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. wait time for student contributions is substantial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. encourages input from reluctant students</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. encourages students to struggle on with response rather than filling the gap for them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. encourages student questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SEVEN
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has translated the concepts and theories of the literature concerning the supportive role of both the inquiry method and the discipline of aesthetics into an art education setting. Building on the philosophical inquiry method, appropriate verbal behavioural patterns of both teachers and students have been developed and the effectiveness of a variety of approaches demonstrated.

In this study, it was important to know the methods and tasks art teachers used to teach art concepts and whether these approaches were student or discipline centred. As well, it was important to discover how information related to these issues could be integrated into a framework of teacher education. It was believed that if tertiary art educators were to understand how teachers reacted to new curricula orientations, interacted with their classes and considered their roles, then descriptive portraits (Stockrockl, 1986, in Bullock & Galbraith, 1992) like this study of selected teachers, were needed.

The CSF (1995) Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrate described in the 1995 curriculum document as "integral to a strand at all levels [of Years Preparatory to Year 10]", stated that students should:

... learn how social and cultural values are constructed, challenged and reconstructed. Students engage in arts criticism as they describe, analyse, interpret, evaluate, develop preferences and the ability to discriminate between arts works and challenge ideas. They reflect on and respond to their own art works and those of others (1995, p. 11).

During the pre-intervention observation phase of this study students were rarely engaged in any of these requisite activities. The requirement to respond to their own art works and those of other artists was the only aspect observed in most classes and this was not conducted in a way that led to sustained student inquiry. The researcher believed this was the case for the following reasons. First, the class content that was observed represented the teachers' conceptions of what their art classes should comprise, based partly on what they thought was expected by their students. Second, the requirement to foster analysis of how cultural values were constructed and reconstructed required knowledge that the teachers did not possess and/or skills they could not utilise. Third, ensuring that students engaged in challenging ideas as well as the analysis, interpretation, evaluation and discrimination of both artworks and ideas, required approaches the teachers did not employ.

Given the curriculum was new, it could be argued that it was unfair that the presence of these skills should be expected so soon after its release. However, an audit of the curriculum
documents the teachers were addressing in 1995, the year they were observed, showed their schools had introduced The Arts CSF and they were expected to achieve its outcomes.

As discussed in earlier chapters, the presence of the Arts Criticism and Aesthetics Substrand in the Arts CSF (1995) was influenced by the DBAE curriculum from the USA. Aesthetics was added to art history, criticism and production to form the four aspects of the art education program. DBAE content had been driven by theorists steeped in modernist traditions rather than "practising" art educators and theorists familiar with, or supportive of, postmodern perspectives. Although many theorists believed DBAE did not exclude postmodern perspectives, the Getty Center was criticised for its failure to provide sufficient assistance for teachers to handle curriculum requirements, particularly the aesthetics component. Theorists like Stewart (1994), Van de Putte (1994) and Walker (1996) believed the discussion of complex issues and multiple perspectives, necessary for facilitation of aesthetics beyond notions of beauty and consideration of the complexity of postmodern art, required skills of inquiry and reflection that the art teachers in the USA were not equipped to foster. However, the researcher believed aesthetics was precisely the field that made art education a suitable avenue for pursuing the improvement of cognitive levels of thinking. Art also had an affective dimension that enriched the potential for creative thinking and engaging curriculum content.

Jeffers (1996) found that despite the substantial amounts of money and time spent on teacher education in connection with DBAE, very little had changed in art classrooms in the USA. Teachers were still most concerned about timetables, equipment and space or saw production as the key role of art classes. As had been predicted, mainly by Philosophy for Children practitioners involved in the Getty DBAE Seminars (1987-1990), namely Lipman, Hagaman and Reed, the teachers were found to be struggling to apply the aesthetics and arts criticism requirements to a crowded curriculum where art making dominated. This was despite substantial theoretical reporting on the benefits of employing the DBAE in its entirety.

The Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrand in the Victorian Arts CSF contained the requirement to teach postmodern perspectives like the reconstruction of societal values and concepts. Analysis of content alone and what was commonly described as art appreciation, was no longer sufficient. Victorian art teachers were generally trained in methods of imparting knowledge associated with production and art appreciation, not in-depth concept analysis or valuational reconstruction. The imparting of knowledge was the major approach observed in the ethnographic pre-intervention observation of three art teachers in this study. It was believed that, for teachers to develop skills in conceptual analysis and involve their students in this process, they would need teacher educators to explicate appropriate methods by both example and description.
Structured analysis of the transcripts of lessons during pre-intervention observation was conducted via the modified FIAC's (Flanders, 1970) reduction of classroom talk. When the data were represented using a matrix style, it was found to be both easily read and meaningful. Panels of co-encoders also remarked on its easy access and application. Using the teachers’ impressions of their transcribed classroom sessions provided a supportive reinforcement of the data provided by the modified FIAC matrixes. The teachers’ insightful comments and willingness to engage in training to improve their skills guided the emergent study model.

The analysis of the transcripts of pre-intervention discussions revealed that the three teacher participants lacked the skills to bring about the changes in classroom discussions required to implement the Arts CSF (1995) requirements. They appeared to be unaware of strategies they might use to raise levels of inquiry. In many instances they demonstrated insufficient knowledge of their subject area, with any topics that might be considered to be aesthetics almost entirely absent. Over the initial observation period of a month, art history and criticism were rarely attempted.

A phenomenographic reduction of interviews with the teacher participants (McSorley, 1996), provided descriptive portraits of the three classrooms. This method revealed that, having read transcripts of their classroom discussions, the teachers were able to diagnose the absence of higher levels of cognitive inquiry. They also noted the extent to which they dominated discussions and lamented the fact that they were content to accept low-level thinking. The teachers recognised that this was demonstrated by poor use of vocabulary by both themselves and their students and short student verbal responses to their closed questions coupled with their own long verbal moves.

Following the pre-intervention observation and interview phase of this study, the teacher participants were interested in undertaking professional development in order to gain some of the skills they believed they lacked. It was believed that what was needed was an approach to investigating the ideas of aesthetics and arts criticism that integrated knowledge with vitality and rigour. Practical advice on facilitating philosophical inquiry (for example: Lipman, 1980; Reed, 1989; Santi, 1993; Gardner, 1995 and the researchers’ own experience) and art education theorists (for example: Boyd, 1994; Perkins, 1994; Stewart, 1994) provided a scaffolding for the intervention program that followed.

Hagaman linked the Philosophy for Children (Lipman et al., 1980) community of inquiry (i.e. philosophical inquiry) approach with art education, claiming that it resulted in fruitful discussions of "Big Art Questions" (Hagaman, 1990a, p. 6) with fundamental aesthetics issues emerging from texts. The collaborative approach of the Lipman program was believed to provide the scaffolding
Bruner (1985) considered vital for supporting individual achievement. Also, a small project involving aesthetic inquiry in junior secondary art classrooms (Emery & Wilks, 1994), had shown promising results in terms of both content and student involvement. When interviewed, the teachers involved in the 1994 project indicated that art production acquired new meaning when tradition, culture and contemporary issues (i.e. the issues of aesthetics) were examined through a philosophical puzzles approach (Battin et al., 1989). Their students responded positively to the philosophical inquiry and puzzles approaches.

Two other theorists from the USA were of major influence in terms of the direction pursued in this study. The practical dimensions of the Perkins’ (1994) theory of reflective intelligence, and Russell’s (1991) philosophical concepts "cases" approach, provided meaningful ways of introducing aesthetic inquiry to practising art teachers. As well, studies already completed in Australian classrooms by Parrott (1983) and Perrott (1988) reported improvements in classroom dialogue following the employment of a philosophical inquiry approach. The emphasis placed by Boyd (1994) on the vast list of both critical and creative cognitive skills offered by well conducted art education was another important influence.

The philosophical inquiry method was believed to provide a key to assisting skill development. Combining this with theories concerning aesthetics in art education, critical thinking, and improving cognitive levels of discussion with practical activities she had trialled in professional development seminars, the researcher conducted a four-session intervention program. Classroom approaches believed necessary for bringing about changes in the ways the art teachers handled their discussions were modelled.

The teachers were again observed for four weeks and interviewed once they had read the transcripts of their post-intervention sessions. The modified Flanders’ categorisations were again applied to the session transcripts. A new method of analysing transcript content, "Texting", was used to verify the findings of the FIAC analysis. Patterns of talk were found to have altered across all participants’ sessions. Not only were the teachers found to be using resources modelled in the intervention program, they were using the discussion approaches believed to facilitate higher level inquiry. Students were verbally participating more in terms of quantity, and the quality of their responses was markedly changed. The teachers, when interviewed, were able to describe the changes and give reasons why they believed they had occurred.

Post-intervention session analysis revealed that classroom talk was taken to higher cognitive levels of understanding (as attested by the findings of the modified FIAC analysis of transcripts). It was found that when discussions were facilitated appropriately, for example when sessions
involved modelling, scaffolding questioning and providing feedback, there was ongoing interaction between the teachers and their students as they became co-inquirers. The teachers, to varying degrees, were engaged in the requirements of the CSF (1995) Arts Criticism and Aesthetics substrand during the post-intervention observation period.

Teacher A’s post workshop interview (4.9.96) contained a summary of what she believed had changed in her classroom discussions and what had brought about these changes. The researcher believes extracts of her interview, (a) to (g) below, summarise the achievements of the intervention program.

(a) Reference to the increased amounts of student talk, the new discussion pattern and the quality of student contributions:

What I did notice was the fact that before the [class] tailed off, they virtually didn’t complete their sentences and it was definitely teacher/student/teacher/student whereas now you can actually get a block where there is the teacher only making a sound like an 'Uh-huh' in response and then you might get several students responding. Now that’s really different and they are complete sentences and all building on top of each other and I think that’s much better. So I am backing off. But I get very disappointed when I see the five or six lines that are me speaking.

(b) Reference to the usefulness of "Socratic questions" during facilitation:

... there was a great list [of questions that the researcher provided] and I went through it today in the hope that it might help me with the kind of questions I ask, make sure I go back to their replies.

(c) Reference to specific skills that class was developing:

And I think that these kids will be able to ... argue with me and say 'But I think this is ok’ and be able to question it and I think that’s important. And that’s what I complain about the girls is that they don’t question me enough. But then, I see now that I have to provide the framework. Or the school has to, not just me.

(d) Reference to the standard of inquiry occurring:

It’s really profound. You know I think that what the Year 9’s were saying concerning the um role of the importance of art, when we wrote up a number of different points on the board, I think they were very good. I think that they came up with the fundamentals of what makes a successful artist, what’s taken me nearly half a life time to work out they did in art class!

(e) Reference to the supportive environment:

So you have to go with the flow of it. I should have expected it. This group likes to talk ... they really respect each other’s opinions. So it is an open environment, so knowing that, I thought I went in there feeling very confident ...
(f) Reference to new awareness of student capabilities:

... she obviously is profoundly interested in this sort of search for the meaning behind art. It came through clearly in the last class ... and I have taken another look at her in the class because it was not something that I expected from her.

(g) Reference to use of new resources to foster analysis and inquiry:

... it's like learning to teach again, so yes, it does, it has, it took me a long time to think up that twenty minutes today. ... The conundrum type things [puzzles]. I went back and looked at the form of those to write that sheet up for the [class] in an effort to clarify what sort of questions I could do with them

I have never put Jill Orr and Stelarc together, nor had I put the artists last week together, and I think that was one thing that I commented on about the sheet, that I have to make it relevant to the kids, I can't just take it out of a book.

This is far more profound and valuable to the [class] in that it fills in that critical thinking and the aesthetic analysis.

This study has demonstrated that carefully chosen strategies and activities can assist teachers to change their discussion approaches so that they include their students in ways that challenge them to analyse issues associated with the art world. The use of philosophical inquiry approaches combined with a range of appropriate challenging resources had led to the analysis of complex concepts contained in the field of aesthetics.

Profound changes in student response patterns and cognitive levels resulted from the use of the approaches described above. Changes were noted in the quantity and quality of student contributions during discussion. The aggregated increase in quantity of student talk during art appreciation discussions was 21%. Changes were also noted in student discussion skills: they built directly on their peers’ statements rather than waiting for the teacher to speak, and they demonstrated metacognitive awareness and reflective thinking during discussions. There was also a 16% aggregated increase in the number of student statements coded as "Student Initiative/Higher-Order Thinking" (modified FIAC category).

It was believed that the relative simplicity of the model that had brought about such definite changes was significant. Since the 1960s, theorists had claimed that if teachers changed a few discussion habits, if they: increased wait time; were able to recognise and ask open-ended questions; showed interest in what the students had to say; and offered challenging resources; then their classrooms would become inquiring classrooms. The intervention program has demonstrated easily implemented and practical ways the teachers could become facilitators of inquiry, building on their students' contributions.
Chapter 7

Summary and Recommendations

The conditions that were found to be necessary for changes to occur were also, like the method and resources, quite simple. The keys were: the establishment of a nurturing classroom environment through the use of specifically designed activities, teachers who were prepared to encourage the students' inquiry, and the belief by teachers that cognitive levels of operation in the visual arts could and should be raised. The visual arts offered an unlimited supply of examples of works and issues that could easily form the basis for involvement with, and discussion of, aesthetics. Discussions could be developed in a way that the students could be involved, not only with the particular art object or situation, but associated values, cultural issues, historical contexts, interpretations and political dimensions.

One need only visit a few art galleries today, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, to know that reflection is required to understand the diverse contexts and meanings of postmodern art. The categories "high" and "low" art have been broken down, and visual artists, musicians, performers and technologists, individually or collaboratively are expanding the traditional artistic media. Photojournalism, fashion, posters, multimedia events and graffiti are now displayed in galleries along with traditional forms. These new avenues, with their relationships with mass media, offer challenges for art educators. Today's educators are required to assist students to: develop the skills of applying reason and critical judgment; respond creatively and positively to ambiguity; and attempt to understand the roles that values, subjectivity and objectivity play in art making and art appreciation. Traditional content and knowledge-based teaching approaches will not build these skills.

Discussions related to the field of aesthetics, coupled with philosophical inquiry, equip students to meaningfully explore issues such as ethics in art, ownership and originality. It was found in this study that students from primary classes who were trained in philosophical inquiry could discuss these issues and evaluate the adequacy of competing responses. It was believed that, as a regular part of their art class experience, students should be engaged in verbal analysis and interpretation of art. Students in Years 5 to 10 in this study, were given the opportunity to become familiar with, and engaged in, discussions about the questions of aesthetics through the inquiry method. They demonstrated they could increasingly use accurate vocabulary and apply aesthetic criteria during discussions related to quality, standards and cultural perceptions of art.

Recommendations Specifically Relating To This Study

Any professional development program or teacher education model in the visual arts should aim to assist teachers to identify not only aesthetic qualities of artworks, but also the inherent philosophical issues. Teachers would need to develop the skills to inquire into the complexities
of the artworks and encourage their students to do similarly. This latter approach has not been stressed enough in previous models. Art teacher training should include not only the study of major theories associated with critical inquiry (for example, Lipman, 1988; Paul, 1993; Gardner, 1997; and Perkins, 1988) but also the components of the curriculum that require its use. Teachers would also need to be assisted to develop strategies and recognize appropriate resources for implementing new models of inquiry in their lessons.

Teachers should be aware of the importance of asking open-ended questions or questions that call for student analysis, synthesis, interpretation or evaluation of ideas. Questioning aimed at driving students towards deeper understanding or comprehension of resources rather than factual recall should be their aim. However, merely asking higher-order questions is a necessary, but not sufficient, strategy if teachers desire higher-order answers (Dillon, 1988). Encouragement for the students to ask questions concerning the issues under discussion is also important. Students need support from the teacher to clarify and expand on their ideas. Teachers need to provide conceptual bridges to help students move from their present to new understandings. They also need to be conscious of the importance of giving reasons for opinions and ensure that sufficient time is spent on discussions. Another important indicator of good inquiry would be the students’ ability to describe their own thinking.

The grasping of concepts can be aided by both verbal and visual stimuli. There is an urgent need for sound resources that provide teachers with a guide to using the visual arts as a stimulus for critical thinking, with suggestions for integrating the materials into the art curriculum or across other learning areas. Guidelines that facilitate good discussion habits and encourage the exploration of concepts and higher-order thinking should be incorporated. Questions could be provided to guide discussions that encourage the exploration of meaning and a search for understanding. Some suggested follow-up or extension activities could also be included. Stimulus material must be chosen carefully to ensure it helps students to: move easily into the arena of critical thinking; explore the uniqueness of a variety of experiences; reflect on what it is to be a person; examine the nature of our society compared with others; and discuss the meaning of concepts like identity and expression.

Philosophical inquiry provides a methodology that assists the students to examine personal interpretations as well as appreciate and understand different points of view. Using the visual arts as the stimulus, and philosophical inquiry as the approach, enhances skills such as the ability to: understand how aesthetic values are socially constructed; identify and reflect on major issues; draw comparisons between personal experience and fictional depictions; use evidence from the artwork
to support opinions and draw conclusions; and recognise the points of view presented by artists, peers, critics and art commentators.

It is expected that, if the above occurs and remains part of their education, then art teachers will acquire an enriched background in the arts and new teaching approaches, while their students will develop abilities, on top of their art making, for examining and discussing art. It is hoped that other outcomes would be that students would develop an interest in reading further on complex artistic topics that would assist them to gain further understanding of their own and other cultures (in the broadest sense), for example art journals and art websites. Students must be taught to think for themselves and the visual arts provides a provocative arena in which this challenge can occur.

Naturally, the above would require adequate funding for teacher training, curricula and resources. This would only result if there was a long-range implementation plan and the expectation, by departments of education, that the changes should occur because of the educational benefits. The longer the training program, the more lasting and successful will be the impact. However, it should be noted that, although the training program that was conducted in this study was relatively brief, it was effective, at least in the short term, because its content was meaningful and appropriate to the teachers’ needs.

A broader study, where transcripts of many more art classroom sessions are reduced to matrixes similar to those used in this study, is required. The modified FIAC and Texting proved to be relatively simple methods of tracking classroom talk and showing major trends and did not require many personnel to administer them. The findings of a broader study could add weight to the researcher’s assessment that new methods of training art teachers to be better equipped to teach current curriculum requirements are required.

**Broader Recommendations**

When we shift from content to process, and particularly the processes that are bound up with inquiry and critical thinking, a different picture emerges, one which suggests a more constructive approach to the curriculum. On the one hand, the "dimension of inquiry" is inherent in every discipline. ... To involve students in inquiry is to invite them to become practitioners in the disciplines, rather than learners of them. (Lipman 1987, in Splitter 1989, p. 5)

The use of the modified FIAC as Texting as means of gathering information about classroom discussions need not be restricted to art rooms. These methods of data analysis could be used to
provide an indication of whether classrooms generally are conducive to developing a "literacy of thoughtfulness" (Brown, 1993, p. xiii).

The kind of literacy the researcher believes necessary is what Brown (1993) proposed. It goes beyond basic reading and writing ability to the ability to think critically and creatively, solve problems, exercise judgment, and continue to apply these skills throughout a lifetime. In the following, Brown laments what he found following an extensive tour of American schools that had claimed to be encouraging higher-order thinking:

... none of the school-reform initiatives, [with the possible exception of establishing a kindergarten based around Montessori and whole-language approaches] has yet changed the way students and teachers read, write, talk and think. ... no reform has penetrated to the heart of the literacy question.

The state has reorganised departments, changed educational appointments, set up programs, added personnel, lowered various ratios, created more tests, strengthened compulsory attendance laws, improved certification requirements, developed new procedures for performance evaluation, trained people in instructional management, raised graduation requirements, offered more scholarships, mandated new studies of school organisation, and raised teachers' salaries. States can do these things. But can they change what really matters - how people read, write, talk with each other, how they discover and wrestle with ideas, how they strengthen, broaden and deepen their literacy? (Brown, 1993, p. 30)

Something like what Brown’s (1993) literacy of thoughtfulness is needed if we want teachers to enhance their students’ abilities to: think critically and creatively; reason carefully; inquire systematically into important matters; analyse, synthesise and evaluate information and arguments, respond to humour; and communicate effectively to a variety of audiences in a variety of forms.

To check whether a literacy of thoughtfulness was being encouraged one would need to visit classrooms and examine the verbal interactions between teachers and students. Active and enthusiastic participation of students in discussions (and less teacher talk); the students responding to one another; extended wait time for responses; the presence of good natured inquiry; and the teacher appearing to be also a learner; would all be evidence of the presence of good discussion elements.

First, however, the classroom environment needs to be one that nurtures the development of a positive self-concept and reflective, but rigorous discussions. Research into the middle years of schooling (Hill & Russell, 1999) has stressed the need to develop a sense of personal identity in students through experiences that engender social acceptance among peers. In a recent study (Leckey, 2000) it was demonstrated that the philosophical inquiry approach offered a supportive
and inclusive context and the opportunity for students to develop the capacity to respond constructively to the world around them. Properly executed, philosophical inquiry means that teachers and students will listen to one another carefully, and acknowledge and support one another’s views with the encouragement of multiple perceptions and the tolerance of ambiguity. This association needs to be further investigated.

School policy documents should include an expectation that teachers would show an interest in, and inquire into, fundamental curriculum matters, argue about them and use the skills and dispositions they should want to develop in their students. These skills: problem solving, reasoning, analysis, questioning, collaborating, and democratic decision-making, are encouraged by philosophical inquiry. Time constraints is the reason most frequently given for not using instruction methods more conducive to thoughtfulness. Teachers feel they must cover an already ever-expanding list of topics and attempting to establish good thinking practices would be just one more. The researcher believes they need to reflect on what they are attempting to achieve in the limited time they do have. As philosophical inquiry fits into already existing programs, the time requirement should not be an issue.

Teachers in this present study noted they did not expect enough of their students conceptually and cognitively. They also were concerned that their students would not want to discuss issues because they came to art rooms to "make". This could be due to the treatment of disciplines as unconnected self-contained units separated by bells and subject teachers with knowledge seen as "disjointed and final, rather than connected and built on false starts [and] creative leaps forward into the unknown" (Splitter, 1989, p. 4) and partly because subjects are failing to connect with students' interests. The claim that higher-order thinking should wait until "basics" are in place is not accepted by many theorists today (Lipman, 1988). Thankfully, the middle years of schooling (Years 5 to 10) are currently under scrutiny in Victoria, and philosophical inquiry is recognised as an approach that caters for the needs of these years.

Teachers who do not experience any active learning in their own education tend to lack the confidence to "have a go" at implementing inquiry approaches. Practical and theoretical training programs for teachers must be established to assist their introduction. Inadequate teacher education approaches are those that predominantly model talking to, over talking with, with the same reasons given (i.e. lack of time and too much to cover) for the lack of inquiry models.

Active learning and critical thinking can be evaluated in a way that is compatible with many assessment systems that emphasise content. Close scrutiny of the current Victorian CSF document (1995), revealed the skills developed through inquiry satisfied many requirements of all
subject areas. Most schools with critical thinking programs in their curriculum have developed ways of assessing student progress that satisfy current curriculum requirements (Wilks, 1995). Curriculum policies about critical and creative thinking, problem solving and inquiry that are weak, or framed in terms of skills and subskills (for example, lower and higher-order skills), are hard to implement. Policy documents need to be accompanied by guidelines that address the implementation of critical thinking and inquiry requirements. The way problems are defined and student progress is gauged needs to be discussed by schools as the new methods are introduced into their curricula.

Any organised learning needs to foster the sequential development of process-based skills along with those associated with the development of knowledge. Students need to be encouraged to think their way through activities and see themselves as inquirers. Fundamentally, all disciplines are languages in which students must learn to think, rather than subject areas they must learn (Lipman, 1988).

Postscript

At the concluding stages of this study a new Victorian Arts CSF (2000) was released. "Arts Criticism and Aesthetics” is listed along with "Arts Contexts" under a new substrand "Responding to the Arts". The goals and requirements were slightly reworded but the requirements remained the same as in the 1995 document.
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APPENDIX ONE:

Survey questions used during interviews with teacher participants prior to the first observation phase

1. Age?
   20-25  26-30  31-35  36-40  41-45  46-50  50-60

2. Where and when did you do your Visual Arts training?
   Years? Name of course e.g. 1965-9 BA Dip Ed
   Undergraduate: Victoria Interstate Overseas

3. Have you completed any Postgraduate Arts Education training?
   If yes, which institution, course and years attended.

4. Can you remember the names of any Visual Arts or Arts Education textbooks that were required reading during your undergraduate training?

5. Which Year level/s are you currently teaching?

6. Which of the following do you teach?
   Woodcraft Graphic Communication Ceramics Design
   Painting Textiles Printmaking Sculpture Art History Technology
   Art Criticism Metalcraft Aesthetics Other?

7. Please describe your current school. e.g. government, single-sex girls, P-12

8. How many years have you taught Visual Arts (Years 7-12)?
   Less than 5  6-10  11-15  16-20  21-25  26 plus

9. The new CSF document uses the term "Aesthetics and Art Criticism" as a sub-strand. What do you understand the term "aesthetics" to mean?

10. What practice/s best describe/s your approach to aesthetics?

11. Could you briefly outline 3 topics in aesthetics you covered this year.

12. Could you describe one session named in question 11 in detail e.g. subject matter, teaching strategies, number and participatory mode of students, materials used etc.
APPENDIX TWO

Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Talk</th>
<th>1. Accepts feeling. Accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone of a pupil in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>2. Praises or encourages. Praises or encourages pupil action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, but not at the expense of another individual; nodding head, or saying &quot;Um hm?&quot; or &quot;go on&quot; are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. Clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a pupil. Teacher extensions of pupil ideas are included but as the teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>4. Asks questions. Asking a question about content or procedure, based on teacher ideas, with the intent that a pupil will answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Lecturing. Giving facts or opinions about content or procedures: expressing his own ideas, giving his own explanation, or citing an authority other than a pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Giving directions. Directions, commands, or orders to which a pupil is expected to comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Criticizing or justifying authority. Statements intended to change pupil behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Talk</td>
<td>8. Pupil-talk—response. Talk by pupils in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits pupil statement or structures the situation. Freedom to express own ideas is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>9. Pupil-talk—initiation. Talk by pupils which they initiate. Expressing own ideas; initiating a new topic; freedom to develop opinions and a line of thought, like asking thoughtful questions; going beyond the existing structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>10. Silence or confusion. Pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no scale implied by these numbers. Each number is classificatory; it designates a particular kind of communication event. To write these numbers down during observation is to enumerate, not to judge a position on a scale.*
### APPENDIX THREE

Extracts of Pre-intervention Interviews with Teachers A, B, and C

#### Summary One: DISCUSSION APPROACHES AND HABITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was surprised how consistently I used that approach to begin with a compliment...</td>
<td>I speak in disjointed sentences and my grammar is 'slangy'. It's a wonder they understand anything I say. But they seem to talk to me the same way.</td>
<td>I couldn't recognise that as my teaching style, little comments where I cut the kids off, they say they are using paint and I'll say &quot;It's ink, it is not paint!&quot;... I don't think I actually do that enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it should be an initiation rather than a total direction... I feel that I directed them.</td>
<td>'right' is very abundant but is used both as confirmation of something correctly stated and of personal confirmation of what I have said, or that they have understood my statement or comment. The whole issue has made me insecure - I'm not Art trained and it might be obvious.</td>
<td>within sculpture I probably don't look at the vocabulary, actually, and I think that needs to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I obviously had ends that I wanted to achieve.</td>
<td>It appears quite a juggling job to keep my thoughts in order when jumping so frequently from idea to idea - and sometimes I drop the balls.</td>
<td>I'm reasonably demanding of getting the kids to speak, I won't just sit out of the class and talk to them... &quot;Blurb, blurb, blurb, this is what sculpture is&quot;, or &quot;This is what art is&quot; because it's a journey for me as well and I - they've got such fresh ideas, they're coming in to the art world...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to think about how to develop the public speaking in them</td>
<td>I don't have a Fine Arts background to be able to draw on the skills of art history confidently so I tend to be vague. e.g. when I was talking about Christo I would be general instead of giving detail. I'm not confident to do that because my background is Maths and Graphics... I have trouble with the names of artists. Perhaps this is a disadvantage.</td>
<td>I'm just trying to get a big question to them to just start considering what art is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly the historical part wasn't covered as much.</td>
<td>my questioning technique... between the Prep to Year 8 classes... jumping from one level to another so questioning style gets &quot;hung over&quot; - both ways. (eg. more complex questions asked to younger and simpler to older grades)... jumping from idea to idea, place to place and media to media in one day. No wonder questioning technique gets hung over.</td>
<td>[the discussion about what sculpture is] that's sort of my set intro where we won't do any [practical] art that session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some ways I am encouraging them not to think, but be more intuitive. Just responding and allowing things to happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td>art appreciation is so integral to the methods and everything that we learn, the interests that the kids have and how they then develop their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it [the transcript of sessions] certainly reflected a lot of my philosophy of art.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I like to teach them different words so that they feel artistic, I think that's really important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I realise the amount of 'me' that was required to start this exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also realise how little verbal feedback I get from the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happier that I am only assisting problem solving here [specific session] and that ideas and directions are coming from the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching style - almost like a therapist I seem to affirm what the student says before I question the student in order to solicit the next step.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I seem to be manipulating the students, sometimes guiding them. I seemed to have interfered more at this finishing stage, but in retrospect that was necessary to complete the task.

I really did somehow plant that in, I mean the kids thought they came up with the idea, but in fact I had put it in earlier on,

... they must have been able to conceptualise what I perceived.

The concept of facilitation should really be very much part of education.

Sometimes I'd prefer to stay at a distance, because I'm not always right, and the girls don't offer the resistance to my ideas.

In retrospect, I'd love to know how they felt about what they have gained from it. ... It is good for them to think about what they have gained.

... we didn't go into the depths of why any piece worked and why another piece didn't. In fact I think I really slacked off on this element of it.

[saying that they] think that anything that is creative is art. It brought up the point that maybe I should have phrased the question differently - to decide what elements should be there to say it is good art. I didn't say that just because it is creative doesn't mean it is good - I am at a starting level with these questions.

When the tape isn't there I'm louder and so are they. A perceptive student even mentioned that. ... My louder voice is probably mostly a control thing.

With my questions I'm looking for definite answers - something specific. I have in my mind what I want them to say, so we're jumping around till I get that answer before I move on. And in some ways that means that some of the answers I get are discarded and not extended.

Not being Fine Arts trained myself I have difficulty with names of artists and lack ability to extend theory.

being junior school trained I present quite simplistic questions.

I take a lot of statements made by the girls at face value instead of trying to clarify the validity of the statement. eg. "music & drama aren't permanent art" I should have clarified that the performance isn't permanent - but the score and script are - like videotapes of Christo's works. Do I assume they are making the underlying connection I have?

I accept their response, fairly curtly and then give my own opinion. Does this over-ride their own feelings? I expect them not to expect a pat on the back but rather to be self critical. That's perhaps influenced by my expecting more of them as senior students, and I expect that of myself.

In Art, some students with learning difficulties express themselves better.
### Teacher A

I was surprised at how much I was prepared to speak and how little I let the kids get away with speaking, just through grunts or intonations. I am going to demand complete sentences and develop their oral communication.

Probably the sessions at the beginning were the best part, where we began the class and they actually discussed where they were at and where they were going to head for the rest of the day.

the sort of characters they chose and the input they put into the personalities, and the writing about it - all of that I hadn't preconceived. So there was a growth within there

I hope the girls don't see that all the affirming that I do "Well she affirms all the time so therefore we look for the affirmation." I hope it does not become such a pattern

the kids were very pliable, that you have to be very, very careful when talking with them. I guess that's what's happened ... the kids are much more malleable than I thought and I think that teachers have to be aware of that and they have to make sure they never lose sight of this ... if I lost sight of that they would end up producing exactly what I wanted them to reproduce.

### Teacher B

In the junior classes you don't expect that much detail in their answers in terms of their art elements. You can say 'harmony' or 'contrast' but don't go past that level of criticism or analysis of their work or other art.

For example when that student said that "Some people think that music and drama should be called art too, but they aren't permanent" I should have said it is the performance that is not permanent but the musical score and dramatic script are permanent. I should have made sure that was made clear and not assume that because I had made that connection in my mind that they could make it too and it didn't need to be said

My independent workers are real independent workers. They don't need me to talk to them about their work. I let them have the freedom. If you define things too much they give you what you said - that's how I justify what I said about being vague! With me it's more a matter of trying to guide what's missing. ... It doesn't appear that attention and time are evenly distributed. These girls achieve in spite of myself.

When the students talk individually to me I feel they are prepared to say more than they would in a public arena. But now this has been brought to my attention, I want to know more.

Even a conclusion you might come to in a discussion, it's hard to realise that you might not be doing the right thing. It's even harder to make a conscious choice to change.

### Teacher C

... now that they've learned to go 'Munch', 'Van Gogh' [using correct pronunciation] they remember it and that's one of their favourite things they did this year was the works influenced by those artists.

[the kinds of thinking that occur in art are] Creative, design. In terms of "Do these colours go together?" Is there balance, harmony, scale etc. Evaluative thinking. But it is hard to get rid of the student's original idea. A lot aren't willing to change or manipulate an idea.

There is not much evidence that they are prepared to take risks and think
**Teacher A:** after Year 10. It becomes far too directive ... with the criteria all laid out, so it's all set

I was really pleased with their work, in terms of the CSF's, how I perceive their concepts, presentation, all of those difficult columns (in curriculum document) in terms of outcomes, I think they were achieved.

we did look at some bits and pieces [of the curriculum requirements] all the way through it.

---

**Teacher B:** It was a shock to have to go into the Art Criticism and Aesthetics sort of thing in my teaching. I have tried to base my curriculum around the CSF's. When I came here there was no curriculum. I was brought in to develop skills at the primary level. ... I can teach. I know that!

The introduction of the CSF and its expected outcomes in the area of "Arts Criticism and Aesthetics" and "Past and Present Contexts" have really complicated things for sure.

I think all educational thinking has been aimed at the left brain in the past. Reading and writing has been what is valued, especially past Year 2. Before that level teachers have been prepared to look at the student's art - their visual contributions are valued as communication. Later it is all geared towards written work.

The kind of thinking you do in art is creative. You need to use your imagination to create new things or extend old. ... There is more stress being put on the thinking process, but it is important to help students cope with technological changes. But teachers are still more inclined to accept the written reports about this issue.

because the tape is running, you don't want a statement on it that might be wrong. I felt uneasy about the taping process. Self analysis is always hard - even more so when you feel you don't have the experience and formal training in the area in which you are being assessed'. No-one likes to make a fool of themselves, especially when it is being recorded for posterity. It meant I was trying to say the right thing and doing worse than I normally do.

---

**Teacher C:** I do need to do that [evaluation] more with sculpture, but because I'm only over there two lessons a week I just don't, because I just don't see the room.

we don't [take notice of the CSF's] in writing our curriculum, and that's a problem I have, ... we should take more notice and be more structured ... we are re-writing our curriculum statements so we are referring to that a lot more

I've been reading through it in the last few weeks [because asked to], so I have more of an idea of what aesthetics are ... a little bit vague, that section is a little bit confusing, so, some was really good and I just thought this is what I'm doing anyhow

the statement said something about criticism and then it said aesthetics are this and this and this, and I thought hang on! ... I think it's a really valid area from what I can tell.

Is there really any difference between art criticism and aesthetics? ... we need to call it aesthetics because in the past art criticism has not been taught in full or as it should.

I am largely addressing the expectations of CSF's in this area - and perhaps as a result find it non-threatening and logical

I'm still not sure why the heading of art crit and aesthetics needs to be given two explanations - surely both are pretty tied in with each other?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. The organisation of the program.</th>
<th>Q2. The structure of the program.</th>
<th>Q3. What were the areas that held the most gains for you and why?</th>
<th>Q4. What were the least useful parts of the program?</th>
<th>Q5 Can you suggest any changes modifications, or areas to include in future programs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Excellent, as in many ways it seemed to respond to the pace and needs of the group. The organisation as with the structure was comfortably suited to the needs and pressures of the group.</td>
<td>Questioning skills. Contact with references to expand reading. Excerpts from relevant texts. Discussions with group. The opportunity.</td>
<td>Possibly the Conundrums. It would seem quite artificial and difficult to introduce these things into the curriculum. Time is too short. Designing conundrums around curriculum already established is more interesting.</td>
<td>I would like to view an Australian teacher running a session as I still felt apprehension after the sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Seemed to be well organised, with clear presentations and take-home information.</td>
<td>Workshops seemed to be well structured. I appreciated the adaptability and consideration when organising to watch my classes.</td>
<td>I think to my general awareness of my teaching and discussion methods. I did not pursue 'philosophy in teaching' and therefore don't feel compelled to implement it into all my teaching. I'm experimenting with it with some pleasing observations. I've been especially lucky that it has been art related.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I probably need more guidance on dangers in my own teaching. During the workshop discussions theories work very well. How does this kick in with 26 twelve year olds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Liked the practical nature of discussion and examples given. One session per week kept the flow of interest, but sometimes did not give time to try things out.</td>
<td>Relevant handouts and logical structure to each topic discussed. Ideas reinforced, looked at and expanded.</td>
<td>Particularly good related to art and how the concepts projected through art reinforce the value of the KLA's. Liked the group discussions and interaction between us - insight into how others perceive and bring forward things you didn't even consider.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration tape of philosophical inquiry in action would be more relevant to the Australian scene. We seem to be able to pull apart the demonstrators as not being really good examples of the process - in how it was perceived to be 'effectively' run by us.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FIVE

Detailed results of "Texting" analysis

1. Teacher A Pre-intervention sessions

(The content of Teacher A's session 23.8.95 was discussed in the body of this study).

Teacher A Pre-intervention 25.8.95 (Year 10)
Session: The discussion of the proposed construction in class of an installation representing the theme "Tolerance".

Teacher questions resulted in 17 student utterances coded 9 (modified FIAC) and included teacher utterances like:

T11 ... how can you get around the problem? 4
T17 Now L, what was your idea for a mask? 4
T18 On the face. 4 (reflective)

but they did not lead to any exploration of concepts. The teacher admitted during interview (16.11.95) that although she had said things like (T8) "Ok, it's for you lot to make a decision", her method was in fact to sow the seeds early in a discussion and later make it look as though the students came up with the idea. The eight student utterances coded F (under Texting) represented students interacting as they discussed the content of the installation piece.

However, no student elaboration was sought by the teacher. The students demonstrated creative thinking frequently in the session but their verbal moves were only brief with one exception:

S22 I want to um put basically black and white, an image, like I'll show you it's easier, black and white on both sides, and then placing them around here, I don't know if you have seen them, they are like circles or geometrical um, I can't explain it, it's like a really complicated design on a black and white checked background. 9

The teacher in a subsequent interview (16.11.95) admitted that she could see that frequently, the ideas the students gave her, were in fact those she had implanted earlier.

Teacher A Pre-intervention 31.8.95 (Year 10)
Session: Students discussing the placement of their installation pieces.

An explicitly reflective statement was made: (T10) "Could I just, I haven't thrown in many questions myself and I'm scared to make the stereotypical type statements about father" indicating she was trying to elicit students to express ideas about the artwork. The teacher asked eight (B)
questions where she attempted to include the students, e.g. (T11) "You should have a big mother?" and supportive (E) statements like (T12) "So your point is just as relevant A ..." and (T15) "That's an interesting notion". As a result there were 37 student utterances where they built on other students. However, student contributions were usually only a few words and they were discussing an artwork not concepts. For example:

S 59 You know the guy who's standing there with the pitchfork, I'm picturing that as their father. 9
T23 So that's the Wyett from America. 3 (Accurately Grant Wood)
S60 Who, who, Riff Raff [the media character]? 10
S61 Is that the old guy, the guy who stands there with a pitch fork, you know, in front of the church? 10
S62 Yeah, yeah. 8
S63 Is that Riff Raff? 10
S64 Yes, that's Riff Raff. 8
S65 That's dad, Riff Raff. 8
S66 Yeah, I'm picturing ... he's really suburban and he's thin and he's scrawny and his clothes are just falling off him and so on ... 9

Teacher A Pre-intervention 18.9.95 (Year 10)
Session: Students discussing content and placement of installation.

Teacher questions again invited student response, with eight coded as inclusive statements. One (T10), included an invitation to consider a concept: "Ok, what do people think about the arrangement, are they symbolic enough for you?". When she said (T15) "You like it the other way?", the students responded with (S24) "But isn't it meant to be tolerance, so they can't exactly be fighting" and (S25) "Yeah, but even if they are fighting, we are still saying that they have to tolerate one another" which showed they were thinking about concepts. This issue was not built on by the teacher. She returned the discussion back to the physical object.

The teacher congratulated their effort: T24 "You've had to analyse lots of aesthetic elements in order to make it work". This was accurate in terms of the discussion of the installation. There were 16 instances of student builds (F). Many student responses were, untypically for pre-intervention sessions, categorised as 9. On closer examination they resulted from questions like:

T1 What do you think?4
T10 ... Ok, what do people think about the arrangement, are they symbolic enough for you?4
T15 ... How does that work?4
2. Teacher A Post-intervention session analysis

Teacher A Post-intervention 20.8.96 (Year 9)
The session began with the teacher asking the class to focus on the content of an artwork and the students were asked to discuss the elements. Texting for this part of the session showed that although her questions were inviting student contributions and she was building on what they said, the pattern was a question/answer routine and there were no student contributions coded (F), (G) or (H).

However, a second phase of this session resulted in a different pattern. The topic was coded as an (A) due to the question of whether a photocopy of a work of art should be considered as art. Student responses were used by the teacher, as illustrated in the following talk sequence:

T22  So art is ...
S22  The artistic part of it was how she placed it and how it came out.
T23  Other people at this table. S, you were saying something then too?
S23  Yes, the darker shadows make it look like art. What was G saying about photocopies?
T24  That photocopy was art.
S24  If I say I would have got the picture and actually copied it, it would still be the same thing ...
T25  Could a photocopier be just like a tool, like Mrs R uses it?
S25  It's a tool.
T26  Yes, it's a tool. Well K, then N.
S26  I think that even a piece of paper with noting on it can be called art.
S27  What I'm thinking of is some people are doing really weird things, they do really simple things. Someone could just like put some paper on the ground and call it art.
T27  Uh-huh.
S28  And this goes for other things as well.
S29  It depends on who's doing it.

T22, T24 and T27 illustrate a range of reflective teacher statements. The teacher used reflective statements (C) thirteen times and 12 building approaches (D) during the latter part of the session to encourage students to contribute to the discussion and exploration of abstract concepts. Her questions in T7 and T9, were both demonstrated in the intervention workshop:

T7  Like she's hiding, 3 could somebody follow through in what S was saying? Explain that if they agree with her? 4
S8 Should I go? 10
T8 Yes please. 3
S9 It looks a bit like she's in Boznia, like she's running away trying to find her family or looking for somewhere to hide. 9
T9 So what elements in the picture are suggesting that? 4
S10 (student continues) Um the dark face, the hair just swept around her face. 9
T10 Uh, huh. 3
S11 (student continues) Um, the clothes, 9
T11 Uh huh. Yes.3
S13 (student continues) Um, just the shadows that are around her. 9
T13 Ok. Yes X? (indicates to another student) 4
S14 I was going to say, I think it looks better as black and white. 9
S15 Yes, me too. 8
T14 Really, why do you say that? 4
S16 It's kind of, it's more depressing (elaborates, but inaudible) ...9

There were 20 instances of student building (F). Whereas in the first section of the lesson the teacher had an idea where the topic was headed, later she became a co-inquirer into "uncharted waters" with the students. The following section demonstrates the students being treated as experts whose opinions are important. Responding to a student by saying "Yes", was not dismissive or an indication of correctness, but encouragement for the student to continue:

S7 So, a TV could be represented by a sculpture. 9
T7 That's an interesting perspective yes. A very good way of thinking. Yes. 2
S8 If it's machine made I don't think it could be accurately be called art. 9
T8 So it's within your ... 3
S9 But someone's done the design. 9
S10 Before the finished product there was a designer. 9
T9 Ok, yes X? 4
S11 Some things are like made for a practical purpose, like a rocking chair. A rocking chair is made so you can sit on it and rock but it can be made to look nice so it is art. 9
T10 Yes, so it could be both of those things, you think? Yes. 3 Yes? 4

She encouraged students to build on what they or someone else had said:

S12 With what S said, I reckon, what if you designed like a toaster, like a different kind of thing, like it was just black wool, that could be classed as a design even though you don't make it yourself, a company makes it. 9
T11 Would somebody like to ... 4
S13 Somebody had to design it in the first place. 9
T12 Yes, so ... 3
S14 So their design is the art because they thought of the idea. 9
T13 So the resulting end product is ... 3
S15 It comes from an artist. 9

This pattern continues through the session. Many student responses were categorised 9 as a result of this interaction pattern. Also, the student moves contained statements like: "I think that ...", "What I'm thinking is ...", "If you are saying ...", "With what S said ...", "I think they [other students] are right because ...". They also gave reasons for their opinions.

Teacher A Post-intervention 22.8.96 (Year 9)

(The content of Teacher A's session 22.8.96 was discussed in the body of this study).

Teacher A Post-intervention 28.8.96 (Year 9)
Session: Two slides of artworks by Munch were projected on to the wall for student analysis.

There were 12 instances of teacher builds (E) like T23 "That's an interesting point". In this session many students expressed explicit awareness of the process of the inquiry (only part of their utterance is noted below):

S18 I wasn't going to answer that.
S19 I just wanted to say ...
S28 I want to say ...
S31 Um, with what G was saying...
S33 Um, I don't know if this is good or bad ...
S39 I'd never looked at it that way.

Other kinds of reflective teacher statements used were:

T33 So it can alter the way you look, your understanding of the painting? 3
T29 Uh-huh. 3

T33 above would have been coded under the modified Flanders system as a combination of 3 and 4 (or perhaps 3 or 4 - "accepts" and "asks question"). Using Texting, statements like this were coded B and C (or perhaps B or C) because it was both inclusive and reflective. T29 could in fact be judged to have the same intention. In the case of Teacher A such statements often led to extended student response.

T32 ... S in what way has it changed? 4
S39 I never looked at it that way. It doesn't look like - if you hadn't told us that was like - um I mean when we were looking at a picture of that woman and we were told it used to be rude to be naked as a rule in those days, um (laughs) and um that now that you have told us you can really see that the, how the halo represents how she feels and what she's like. 9

T33 So it can alter the way you look, your understanding of the painting? 3

S40 And um because it doesn't, you can't see blood dripping from her mouth or anything scary, it looks scary because of the shadows around the eyes and everything and it's mouth and that, but if you didn't tell us; like I thought it was like a calm look, like she was sleeping or something, not that she was evil. 9

What distinguished the teacher's verbal approach in this session from pre-intervention sessions was that students were being encouraged to explore ideas and their opinions were being explicitly valued. Given the input of the students and their obvious involvement, the teacher was able to build into the discussion further facts as required or requested, for example:

T32 Uh- huh, yes she's very interesting. 3 Now can I just tell you, because we've got all these wonderful points and all of those are very relevant; now I'm going to tell you a little bit about what the artist's aims were. ...

Teacher A Post-intervention 4.9.96 (Year 10)
Session: Class is exploring how performance works should be classified.

The topic of this session was classified A because of the conceptual challenge it offered. Eight questions or activities were judged to be of this nature. The pattern of talk closely resembled the session of 28.8.96. Students again made explicit reference to the discussion process, for example: S9 "I'd like to expand on what K said". There were long student responses to teacher utterances like:

T13 K?
T14 So art can still ... Yes?
T15 Yes?

There were 17 reflective statements (C), 14 builds (D) and 10 supportive statements (E) like the following:

T6 Ok, so anybody agree with what O was saying, or can somebody...
T9 Does somebody want to expand on that?
T20 No? It's broader than that?
T24 Uh-huh. So, um, it's important that ...?

These teacher builds indicated that the student opinions were important. They led to 35 student builds. Their statements were lengthy and exploratory. For example:
S9 I'd like to expand on what K said, because if people decide they like it, we need works of the present time and we need to see the direction art is going. 9

S10 How can you lose works from the present time because not everyone is going to do performance art? You can have both, like you can have sculptures and things like that, not everyone is going to try to do performances or art like that. 9

...

S62 With that black painting S was talking about, if one of us had have done that the same as the one in the gallery, it wouldn't have got into the art gallery. 9

They were also explicitly agreeing or disagreeing and venturing opinions that might not be correct:

S28 Um, well, I might be wrong with the name I'm going to say, but you remember when we went to the national gallery last term and we saw that guy ... 9

S39 I think this is the opposite to what O said, but I think a lot of artists become famous after they die. 9

S40 Um I was going to say artists probably go to galleries to look at different, other artist's techniques. 9

S42 How do we decide that some things that are done are art? I mean I'm not saying that performance art isn't art, but how do you decide whether doing a trick something like belly dancing or fire eating should go in a gallery? We don't put them in a gallery. 9

3. Teacher B pre-intervention

Teacher B Pre-intervention 12.9.95 (Year 9)

Session: Teacher has a still life arrangement set up and discusses its content and form with class.

Seven instances of inclusive (B) statements embedded in a "quiz" pattern. For example:

T3 ... what we've been looking at so far this term is what? 4

T12 ... What else could you focus on? 4

and builds (D) on student comments such as: S21 "Not see through."

T10 That's right, not see through. More opaque. 3 Now I've used ... [extends into small lecture]. 5

The students responses were merely filling the gap. The pattern of talk for the session was the teacher explaining or telling the class something and the students saying very little. In a subsequent interview (16.11.95) Teacher B noted how little the students had said during her pre-intervention sessions and that she was letting them get away with comments like

S25 Shadow.

S26 Shapes.
S27 White.
S28 One shape or something.
with no elaboration or explanation expected. On one occasion she built on the preceding
comments in a manner which was inclusive:
T14 It's white. One shape, or where could we actually start? 3 All right why did you pick
that? 4
but accepted the following response S29 "I don't know, I just did." with "Right" (meaning "all
right") thus losing an opportunity to extend student thinking. On only two occasions did a
student build on another student's idea.

Teacher B Pre-intervention 18.9.95 (Year 8)
Session: Class discussing still life.

This session revealed an almost identical Texting pattern to 12.9.95. There were 11 invitations
for students to participate. The following demonstrates the pattern of talk that marked this
session.

T4 ... I wonder why I did that? 4
S5 For our imagination. 9
T6. Right. It does help with your imagination. 3 Why else might I have done it? Yes, A? 4
S6 To see different tonal shades. 9
T7 Right, yes, to look at different tonal qualities. I've got these spotlights ... 3

Students were not asked to explain what they said, but were again involved in a fill-the-gap
exercise. There was only one instance of a student building on another.

Teacher B Pre-intervention 10.10.95 (Year 8:1)
Session: Students report on some research they had done on an artist.

Fifteen teacher contributions were allotted a B coding (inclusive), but as part of the same fill-the-
gap pattern noted in the previous two sessions (above). The pattern of talk during discussions in
Teacher B's sessions exemplified the IRE pattern (Perrott, 1988) of teacher initiates, student
responds, teacher extends. She accepted answers with no reasons expected:

T16 You think it looks like dead bodies? 4
S16 Yes. 8
T17 So apart from using his imagination, he's making you use yours, or make you think
about that. 3 Do you think that's something that art should do? 4
S17 Yep. 8
T18 Yes you do C. 3 What about you T? 4

There were four teacher responses coded as E (supportive) and the teacher asked open questions that elicited, and resulted in, thoughtful student responses. For example:

T10 Does anyone um else find out kind of why he does this? Or have you come to some sort of conclusion about why he does this? 4
S10 Um, mainly because he likes taking everyday objects that we take for granted and making them look different. 9

The teacher's response was supportive, but again she changed the direction of inquiry, indicating she wished to establish certain facts:

T11 Well yes, no, that's a pretty logical idea behind it. 3 Do you think his work is permanent? 4

However, as a result of the thinking she encouraged during this session, quite a few student responses were assigned a modified FIAC code 9. For example:

T19 How do you think we usually see art? 4
S19 Oh, it's usually a painting or a drawing on a piece of paper or something, or a sculpture or something, 8 but he's showing us something that no-one else has ever done. 9

One was the result of the teacher's use of reflective statements: T37 "Right. Uh-huh. 3 Yes?" 4. However, there were only 4 students builds overall.

Teacher B Pre-intervention 10.10.95 (Year 8: 2)
Session: Introduction to a graphic communication activity.

This was a long session during which the teacher spoke 65 times. Fifteen teacher responses were builds (D), one was reflective (C) and three were supportive (E). Although the students spoke 69 times, only once did a student build on another's comment. As with the three sessions discussed above, most of the teacher's questions were either leading questions or seeking information, tied in with giving instructions associated with the development of a design brief. During the post-intervention interview (16.11.95) she indicated she had noticed that she did not allow students to develop their ideas, but that she sought specific answers with no elaboration required, thus stultifying the students responses.
T15 Yes. That was an expression of it. 3 But what did we have to make sure, when we were using that model of communication, what type of questions were you asking yourself? 4
S18 Um, its got to stand out so people would want to pick it up, it can't be dull and boring, its got to be bright. 9
T16 Right, they're kind of advertising techniques. 3 But what questions, well, just say I was a company and I said to you I want you to design this poster or brochure for me, what would you have to ask me? Yes? 4
S19 What audience is it for? 8
T17 Right, what audience Are we making this for. 3 What else would you have to ask me? 4

4. Teacher B's post-intervention sessions

Teacher B Post-intervention 11.9.96 (Year 5: I)
Session: Students asked to examine examples of works by Klimpt and look for commonalities.

An examination of this session using Texting revealed a major difference to the patterns found in Teacher B's pre-intervention sessions. There were 47 instances where the students build on other students' comments. As well there were 19 teacher reflective comments (C). These included questions that had been modelled during the intervention program like:

T7 W. do you want to add anything to that? 4
T35 Are you going to try to clarify that for me L? 4

Another noticeable difference was the length of some student contributions which appeared to result from the teacher's open and encouraging approach:

T5 Who agrees with that? What do the rest of you think about her appearance being real? B? 4
S5 Well both of them have different patterns which add to the figures and sort of separate them out from one another and they are real in the sense that um that the colours are real and patterned and that one is different [continues but missed on tape].9

On four occasions either an approach to examining a resource or an activity that was used during the intervention was observed. For example:

T1 ... I'll just give you a couple of minutes just to look at them and then think about it and see if you can come up with some things that you can see that are in common with the [other] picture.

Also noticeable was the students' use of "I think" which appeared to result from a combination:

Examples of student categories 9 (modified FIAC) resulted from questions like:
T11 *How do you think the colour has influenced the way you look at it? Does it have any bearing on what you see?* 4

T14 *Why do you think ...?* 4

T12 *Right [meaning "all right"]; That's a good observation ...* 3

The content of the discussion was quite advanced for Year 5's but the discussion enabled the introduction of information like the example below. The concept of abstraction was explored.

S81 (inaudible) they don't have sort of communication, they have humans in them but especially this one, all these have nature in them and this one is pictures of humans showing nothing about them, they don't have other things about them. 9

T41 *Who agrees with M that they are not showing anything about humans- these other pictures?* 3 P? 4

S82 One thing that I believe that because a symbol- like these ones have got more pictures in them. There's more life in these pictures and I quite like that part. 9

T42 *Who knows a word for that?* 4

S83 *Abstract.* 9

T43 *Yes, good girl, abstract. These are more abstract would you say then?* 3 *Because we've come across that word now in a lot of different ways, like when they are not lifelike. But we are talking more abstract about these pictures.* 5

S84 I think that Klee uses more definite shapes. Like with this you can't really see what that thing really is, but with Klee's works you don't have to keep wondering what it is because you know what it is. 9

**Teacher B Post-intervention 11.9.96 (Year 5: 2)**

Session: Students had been in small groups discussing artworks and were called back to full class to talk about their discussions using Perkins' (1994) model of deep looking.

The pattern for this discussion was similar to the session above. A noticeable feature was that students built on others' ideas for up to 12 sequences (although few were extensive lengthwise) before the teacher spoke. The pattern of talk was more like a teacher/student co-inquiry:

T19 *Can you see the movement in the picture as well?* 4

S45 Oh, right. So there's two interpretations there. 9

T20 *So you can think of different reasons why? Don't you think that they created that?* 4

S46 Even though it's probably like K's I suppose, the design and the way it's been done, it's my favourite. 9

T21 *Why is it your favourite?* 4
S47 Oh because if you look at it you can tell it’s like, you can make out details, like there are so many different things that could have - you can use your imagination of (inaudible) 9

S48 We think that could be a Muse on his way to heaven. 9

T22 Well it has all those things in it because it is a still life. If you could give it a title and the amazing thing that you said that it looked like he was on his way to heaven. 3 This was the very last picture that Klee painted before he died. 5

The teacher did not appear to be using the student responses as a base for the seeking of a particular end point.

Teacher B Post-intervention 13.9.96 (Year 7: 1)

Session: Teacher used the Perkins' (1994) strategy to stimulate a discussion about a painting being examined. For example:

T1 ... something about the picture that struck them the second time that they looked at it that they didn't see the first time. E? 4.

It resulted in longer and more reflective statements by the students, for example:

S8 Yep, um first time I saw this I only really saw one lady up there. And the second time I looked at it I sort of saw lots of ladies dancing and I saw a band and a conductor and all these people. 8

S9 When you look at it far away it’s like more clear and when you look at it up close it’s just solid dots. That’s really interesting to look at this particular pattern and how it changes what you see. 9

Five reflective statements like T4 "Thank you J. Yes Z?" were used. The teacher used the students' inquiry into the issues raised to further the discussion. Saying "Thankyou. Yes?" after a student contribution proved to be effective. As well, the activity resulted in longer student moves than had occurred in the pre-intervention sessions. The knowledge content was high as was the amount of deep thinking about issues raised by examining the art works:

S19 Well I’ve got Home to the Warriors by Mes-o-lite caveman, what is it? 8

T14 Mesolithic cave paintings. 3

S20 Mesolithic Cave paintings, and the first time I looked at it I thought it was just lines and patterns but then when I actually looked at it I noticed they were people and that what I was seeing was changing. It look like this person here is carrying sticks and stuff and it looks like he is going to a camp fire or something like that and as H said, if you really look at this one it’s got like depth in it. 9

T15 Thankyou. 3 Yes F? 4
S21 Ok, well I have this picture and it's got two musicians which are on a funerary banquet. And well the first time I looked at it, the colours ad the texture of the colours on the clothing that they were wearing really kind of flashed to me and but when I looked at it the second time I actually thought about the tomb of the leopards, first of all I thought it was, like the picture was called like that, then the second time you can see the texture of kind of a rocky surface. So then I noticed that it was probably like an aboriginal painting, not aboriginal but on like a painting on a wall or a rock.

T16 Thankyou. 3 Yes S. 4

S22 Well, I chose this picture and I think it's called Pieta.

T17 Yes, Pieta by Michelangelo. 3

S23 This is called Pieta and it's by Michelangelo. And the first time I looked at it I thought it looked fairly rude, and then I looked at it again and I saw (giggles) the thing that caught my eyes were the eyes of the woman, the legs of the man and the background, the thing that they are sitting on and the ribbon around the woman's neck or her chest and the woman's breasts.

Teacher B Post-intervention 13.9.96 (Year 7: 2)

Session: The question whether one can perceive something without paying attention to it, a question modelled in the intervention program (A), was asked.

This topic resulted in both longer sequences of student builds (F). Also the students were engaged in discussion of abstract concepts as the following extract demonstrates:

S9 We thought that when you pay attention to something you actually take part in it, um when you take part in something, to pay attention to something you can't actually do that without knowing you are doing it (inaudible) 9

[teacher and student move omitted here]

S11 I'm not sure whether I perceive or not because I mainly, I don't (inaudible) and try to say oh there might be dancing or there might be blah-blah-blah- 9

S12 But she still recognises it as dancing ... 9

S13 Yeah, I kind of look more at the texture of things and shading and stuff and I guess that's perceiving. 9

T11 So do you think it would be true that the more you pay attention to something, the more you would perceive it? 4

S14 Yes, and the more you sort of search for meaning. 9

S15 I mean, if you look away and look back and see more and you wonder about more. 9

S16 Kate said you've got to have a certain amount of interest in what you are doing. 9

S17 Because if you didn't find it interesting you wouldn't bother looking. 9
Not only were there 31 student builds, but 16 represented conceptual analysis. The teacher used the student's reflective comments to drive the discussion. (Other extracts from this session were presented earlier in this Section.)

5. Teacher C Pre-intervention sessions

Teacher C Pre-intervention 25.5.95 (Year 7)
Session: Discussion about the appearance of dragons and the making that was to follow.

Texting showed one instance of (B), one (D) and one (E). No student utterances were believed appropriate for the codings. The session format was question/answer, with student answers being responded to by the teacher before the next question was asked (i.e. an IRE pattern). For example this sequence:

T2 What did we do first when we did our masks? 4
S2 Sketches. 8
T3 Yes sketches. 3 Did anyone think about dragons and what they could do for their model and that sort of thing? Who did? What did you think about? 4
S3 It's kind of glue and paper scrunched together. 8
T4 Which is called? 4
S4 Papier-mache. 8
T5 Yes, we use papier mache. In fact we'll all be doing that. 3

Teacher C Pre-intervention 13.6.95 (Year 8)
Session: Discussion about what sculpture comprises.

The first section of the lesson was the same question/answer pattern as described above as the materials used to build a sculpture and examples of sculpture were sought:

T20 What is it? 4
S23 It's a mixture of - it's a thing. 8
T21 It's a thing? 4
S24 It's god. 8
T22 Is it a sculpture? 4
S25 Yes, I spose so. 8
T23 All right, I though I had a picture of it (here) but I don't. It's actually called "Angel". I don't know why it's called Angel. 3 What's it made of do you know? 4
S26 Tiles. 8
T24 More specific. 4
S27 Tiles, kind of. 8
S28 There's one in the library. 8
T25 There's one in the library made out of the same thing. Very good. 2
S29 Where? 8
S30 On the wall. 8
T25 Starts with 'm'. 3
S31 Mosaic. 8

Three supportive teacher statements (E) were coded. Some questions were considered open but students were not asked to expand or explain. For example:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T57 Do you think this is art? What's he doing there? 4</td>
<td>S76 Sticking drawing pins in his mouth. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T58 You've heard about him haven't you? Have you or not? 4</td>
<td>S77 (several) No. Ugh. Gross. Disgusting etc. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T59 Now. I wanted to talk about this because it's really interesting.</td>
<td>S's 78 Yes. Yes. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now, I don't necessarily do art like this - I don't.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Do you think that's art? 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps too many conceptual challenges were posed to the students and so they were glossed over. Any one of the issues raised (for example: Duchamp's urinal and Dada principles, realism v's abstraction; appropriation) was potentially a good discussion topic. Although there were no long moves the students were encouraged to show their knowledge and expand on it.

S55 He just put his signature on it. 9
T41 That's really important, what she just said. 2 Would you like to say it again? 4
S56 Um, someone has put their signature on it. 8
T42 There's a signature on a urinal. Somebody has got a urinal and signed it. "There's my sculpture." 3 Do you want to know something about this work? 4
S57 There was a group, and there was this guy - I can't remember his name - it was to be Surreal wasn't it? It was Surreal. 9
T43 Yep. It (his name) starts with D. 3
S58 Dernier? 8
T44 (laughs) What a good knowledge of art. 2
S59 It was meant to show the world how crazy it was. 9
T46 In a way, that's exactly right. 2 It was made by a man called Marcel Duchamp. 3 Ok. So who's heard of him, anyone? 4
(silence) 1
T45 In the art world Duchamp is famous, he's like really famous. 3 He's not like, what's another artist that people know? 4
S60 Van Gogh 8
S61 Michelangelo. 8
S62 Leonardo. 8
Teacher C Pre-intervention 27.6.95 (Year 7)
Session: Discussion where a task was introduced.

Pattern was the same as for 25.5.95 with one (B) one (D) and two (F) categories being assigned. Student contributions were short. The teachers' approach could be described as encouraging. For example:

T15: Good. What do you need to do to reflect that?
S 16 It's very sort of ... [interrupted by student chatter].
T18 What were? Yes, I think you've got the right idea there. What else?
S19 It's peaceful.

The teacher accepted short answers without asking for elaboration:

T18 What were? 4 Yes, I think you've got the right idea there. 2 What else? 4
S19 It's peaceful. 9
T19. It's very peaceful. That's a good one. 2 Who's got another one they'd like me to show?
4 Here's a good one. Called Paradise. I think that's absolutely true, ok. Now how have the actual designs gone. How have people gone? Who has started their final? Has anyone started their final? 4

Teacher C Pre-intervention 28.6.95 (Year 5)
Session: Discussion about Dali.

Same pattern as for 27.6.95. Teacher talk was coded as being inclusive (B) three times, but that was the only coding believed appropriate for this session. Dali's works were discussed using an IRE pattern, but the concepts associated with Dada were not raised, except for Dali's moustache! The teacher said in the subsequent interview that she realised that she was not expecting her younger students to analyse concepts or discuss issues.

It was tempting to say when considering three of Teacher C's four pre-intervention sessions that nothing of any value was happening. There were only two instances where a student built on another's idea in three sessions.

6. Teacher C Post-intervention sessions

Teacher C Post-intervention 21.8.96 (Year 6)
Session: Discussion of a project class was undertaking.
Teacher verbal contributions were coded as follows: Five examples of inclusive (B) statements, one reflective (C) statement; two builds (D) on student ideas. There were ten instances where students built on other student contributions (F) but they were all brief. It was a business-like discussion where the class was preparing for making. Teacher C was, however, less directive and more responsive to the students ideas:

T13 All right, so M said that if it was brown hair you might draw the other side with blond hair. 3
S14 You can glue it on the other side. 9
T14 So do you want to make it a rule, that you have to hide the other side? 4
S's15 No, no, no. 8
S16 Do what we want to. 9
S17 Yeah, do what we want to. 8
T15 All right. You decide. 3 But a lot of these are symmetrical. What's symmetrical? 4
S18 The same on both sides. 8
S19 She's got a mole there. 9
T16 All right. That's a good one actually N, well done. 2

Teacher c Post-intervention 28.8.96 (Year 11)
Session: Teacher preparing class for written work through a discussion of the work of two artists and the meaning of “figuration”. Coded (A).

The teacher was making an effort to get the students to think through a question set for a written task by repeating the question many times. There were a 22 examples of student build (F), but the teacher did not provide a cognitive structure for the students to think through the set problem as the following examples demonstrate:

T18 All right. Do you think that precisely perfect sculpture, that kind of (inaudible), Is precisely perfect sculpture better than that sort of thing? 4
S33 Well I think it depends on what you think that person wanted. 9
S34 I find, I find, I don't know, somehow I think that Peter Collett ...9
T19 Yes, yes?(laughs) 4
S35 I find that his work is just so much better. I don't know, I find it more real as such, so much harder to describe. 9
S36 Yeah it is a lot harder. 8
S37 But yes, I think it is ... (inaudible because several students speak at once) 9

and

T15 I can't hear you. You're being rude. 7 Ok, so well there are pictures, so there are pictures - 3 So does a figurative picture have to be a figure of a person? 4
S21 No. 8
S22 Um, no. 8
S23 It can be any type of thing. 9
S24 Isn't that dog type of thing figurative? 9
T16 I don't know, who saw the dog? 4
S25 Can you tell us what figurative is? 10
S26 Yeah. 10
T17 I don't know. 3 That's one thing about art - that you can't just say this is this or that.

She appeared ready to accept almost any answer and when assistance was required she was unable or unwilling to provide a structure on which the students could build. One student was desperate for the meaning of figurative. She had been trying since S7 to get a grasp of the meaning of figuration. The following excerpt shows why confusion existed:

S42 (same student as S7) If we look up the word figurative in the dictionary what does it say? 10
T24 You want a definition? 4 There won't be a definition for it. 3
S43 How do you write an essay on something if we don't know what it means? 10

and later

T29 That is. Ok. 3 But there's no clear real definitions. But make the definitions within your essay as well. 6
S50 Well if there's no real really right or wrong ... 9

The researcher believed the teacher was trying to remove herself from the discussion and get the students to think for themselves, but her verbal utterances, as facilitator, were "clumsy".

Teacher C Post-intervention 30.8.96 (Year 7)
Session: Discussion about student artwork.

The teacher built on student responses (D) six times and students built on student ideas 13 times. All student responses were short.

T27 All right, how it makes you feel. 3 That's good. 2 How can a car make you feel? What sort of car would make you feel happy? 4
S37 A red convertible. 9
S38 Like in the (inaudible) 9
S39 I was thinking, that maybe the smell of it, or something. 9
T28 Yeah, do you know about car smells? 4
S40 Yeah, brand new ones. 9
T29 Yeah, they can smell new, or they can smell like old - 3
S41 Or if it's second hand it smells like an op shop. 9
The teacher did not ask open questions or use inclusive statements like "Why do you say that?" or "Can you explain?" to increase thoughtful student input.

**Teacher C Post-intervention 17.9.96 (Year 11)**

Session: The topic was "What is art?". (Coded A).

Remarkable changes were noted in this session when compared with the three earlier sessions. There were 46 student builds (F) in response to 20 teacher inclusive statements (B), 18 builds (D) and 8 (F) supportive statements. Student contributions showed analytic thinking and were longer than had been previously noted:

T20 *All right, so you have to actually construct it rather than just go out and get rubbish out of a bin and stick bits of work together, like just you know, you didn't make it*? 4

S24 If that was all it was, it's not a (inaudible) 9

S25 It's not all about putting things together though, if you portray an object in a different way then that's still art, the way that maybe people portray things, like putting them in a different background, putting them in a different area or a different environment than it's used to, then you can call that art and that's, um even if it's just the one object, you know. 9

T21 *Does anybody agree or disagree with anything?* 4

S26 You need to look at what is behind these constructions at least, it depends really on why this art has been made since (inaudible) is it for recording history is it for your own purposes or is it to provide pleasure, or is it just for expression of yourself and it depends on what each person's opinion is about what is art because it might be an expression of himself, he might believe that is very aesthetically pleasing just for himself. 9

Although T21 above is strangely expressed, it shows an effort to use the approach modelled in the intervention program. In the following extract the session is becoming more a co-inquiry with the teacher using strategies to encourage the students to think and participate:

T25 *It's very odd isn't it? And his piece is called- and often the title will give you a little insight into that- his piece is called 'How to Explain Pictures to a Dead Hare'. What was the point?* 4

S30 Yeah! For himself. 8
S31 To do something outrageous. 9
S32 But how could he become so famous? 9
T26 Don't look at me, I don't know all the answers. I mean, let's maybe work this out, because that's a very famous piece. 3
S33 What's the piece, what was the final thing? 10

When she asked the students to elaborate they explored issues well. The following extract shows both this and the effective use of a reflective statement:

T31 The artists which he is one of. 3 How? 4 How, elaborate on this a little bit more. 6
S38 I don't know. - How they explain their art work to people. 9
S39 Is It really that they are not (inaudible) Why can't we have artists explaining their works to hares? It's a question of what is normal and certainly what the artists are trying to do is produce pieces- 9
S40 But, I mean what is normal? Yeah I know things like that are nothing like normal. 9
S41 Kind of average. 9
S42 Yeah average. Like us basically and if someone, like there's certain limits to you know what is normality, like if someone is um you know a serial killer or something that is considered abnormal, but um normal can range through a lot of things, like someone could have a really long finger and the other ones are a lot shorter, that would be abnormal, but they wouldn't be that they are insane, just different types of normal. 9
S43 So you are looking at well, for the purposes of the discussion, social rights and conventions. Something that is considered normal, basically, um that what people will abide by a matter of a moral standing. 9
T32 Mmm. X? 4
S44 Was he famous before he did that? 10
### APPENDIX SIX
Transcripts of post-intervention interviews (reduced)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER SKILLS</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioning and facilitation</td>
<td>&quot;I have to really consciously think about questioning mode...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I'm not necessarily leading the conversation, I put in relevant questions for them to talk about, but they are talking more. The other ones [pre-workshop transcript] I was the star and this time they are.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;With the Year 11's I really value what they think and I encourage them to explore issues. ... with the Year 7's ... Perhaps I don't value their ideas as much, or give them a chance to express them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I get very disappointed when I see the five or six lines that are me speaking ... It means I am not asking leading large amounts of teacher talk, realised it meant she was not asking [open-ended] questions.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I would like to think that I am posing questions that allow kids to respond with more than the one word answer.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I am much more aware of that and try to see what they know and help them that way rather than let them know what I know. In some cases it wasn't very much so it was good to do this because then they brought insight in for me as well in the way they could look at things&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... I want to hear their ideas and why they've got those ideas. So rather than me saying ... &quot;Is this picture happy or sad? Wrong! It's not sad, find out why it's happy,&quot; ... I listen to myself a lot more when I am asking questions because I think I am more aware of myself!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposing the students to artistic language more, e.g. asking: &quot;... what do you think the artist's intentions were and what kind of elements do you think he has used and what kind of mood has been created, so that they are thinking that way all the time rather than trying to just pull it out of the hat now and then&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I still [say]: 'That was a good idea wasn't it? Go to the gallery first blah blah blah, did I mean I find I'm still building [her own opinion] on what the kids have to say um, I'm really aware of the example of the teacher you gave us [during workshop] at the gallery looking at the &quot;Connoisseur 11&quot; and how he'd go 'Ah yes! Fibreglass' [and rave on about his own idea] ... So I think that has probably changed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(From the workshop material.) &quot;For example 'Can you perceive something without attending to it?' I used that as a basis and tried to, from what we were doing, tried to lead into that from what they had said.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I've become more aware - I'm doing a lot more of this sort of thing, ... just responding to something that we do [asking]&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning and facilitation</td>
<td>&quot;I'm just opening their heads and pouring it in, rather than letting them sort of stew it over in their own heads and pour it out.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;And that is where the hardest part I think in my job is because my mind is always thinking; they are speaking about this, can we get them to look at that in a natural sort of flowing way.</td>
<td>&quot;... &quot;Why do you like it?&quot; or &quot;Why don't you like it?&quot; and you know, give reasons or &quot;How could you change it?&quot; Just getting the kids to respond.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... if we are trying to hear what they think, then you would be disappointed if you kept giving them what you think&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;... I think that probably my role is to keep them on track.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 11's &quot;... just don't know how to communicate ... they really need to be taught how to question.</td>
<td>&quot;... you really have to have practice at it because you are spending your time trying to think of what you should be doing next, or how you are going to guide this ...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice: Realisations about and limitations recognised</td>
<td>&quot;... I wanted to tell them about Megan &amp; Munch ... that wasn't necessary in that context ... I would like to go back and say [How] did all that affect your perspectives? because I did sway them ...&quot; Regretted that students were 'motivationally dependent'. &quot;I see now I have to provide the framework to get the students to question.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... to sit and actually talk about something is not done that often, because ... they are expecting ... to produce something that they can take home&quot;. Previously classes spent &quot;... a lot of time making as opposed to this area [dialogue]&quot; and then she was &quot;telling rather than asking because of the shortness of time - or usually leading the conversation more than I did here. So that's why it's nice to hear their own comments&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;... it's funny, like you caught [on transcripts] all of my language: 'Yep, yep.' I do [say] things like &quot;Yes, yes, yes&quot; a lot.  &quot;I have just learned so much just by looking at this [transcript].  &quot;I just find that so much easier when you have eight Year 11's as opposed to 26 Year 7's who just want to get on with their work. Like I would find it difficult to sit down with the kids for half an hour and do that because they want to get up here [to the work benches].&quot;  &quot;I would like to think that I am posing questions that allow kids to respond with more than the one word answer.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice: Realizations about and limitations recognised</td>
<td>Saw the students had previously depended on her to say what they said was a good idea &quot;... but in fact it mightn't be such a good thing&quot;. &quot;I can feel a new part of my brain working ... There really is a difference.&quot; &quot;Previously the class depended a lot on my motivational support. I seemed to be saying, 'Yes', 'That's good' and [giving] reassurance whereas these haven't needed that, so I'm just sort of wondering, in the past have I really mollycoddled them to get the product instead of them being responsible for the product themselves? ... that's a really important difference, that I have to hold back...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Before ... I had concepts in my mind that I would literally say &quot;This is what it's like ... &quot; but now I am more inclined to say &quot;Now you think about this&quot; instead and then bounce back off what they've said to try and extend their own ideas there. Before I used to always have my own agenda.&quot; &quot;... it was really beneficial for me to be able to look in from a new perspective and actually try something out ... everybody says it's so great in theory, but when you get in there you think &quot;Huh, how's that going to work in the classroom?&quot; (laughs) because of mainly time limits. But because it was so good I think you should put time aside more to do it.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I see what can be done, what teachers do that sparks an idea in the student's mind and then they take off.&quot; &quot;I always suggest things and say things like &quot;Do you like this idea, because if you don't why don't we do this, or what else could you do?&quot; And I hope that not only does that happen in their prac but that it comes across in their discussions.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW CLASSROOM APPROACHES</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Puzzles/controversial issues | "Today when I put up two controversial pieces... I didn't try to explain them at all, I didn't need to."
Teacher used the conundrum approach applied to own resources.
When planning lesson the teacher used the workshop conundrums to assist with questioning because it would not come instinctively.
The materials demonstrated at the workshop about Aesthetics and Art criticism were "incredibly useful."
"...it's like learning to teach again" and so lesson planning was lengthy.
New materials for Yr 9's and 10's. Previously taught sequential art history.
Philosophical issues may have arisen previously but were not incorporated as fodder for thinking in the classroom... | "We started talking about all these pictures and I wanted to go from talking about pictures and building their ability to describe and form an opinion about the actual pictures into that more philosophical aspect of perceiving, and you know I was trying to get that kind of flow into it."
"In the materials [demonstrated in the workshop] when they said "What do you think art is?" I mean that was addressing that. They really have no clear ideas at that age [Year 2], really, I mean they think anything you make, basically, is art, which needs to be cleared [up], and then the girl came in with the design thing which was kind of narrowing it down again and trying to get more definite specifics into what is necessary for something to be classified as a piece of art."
"I used it as a vehicle to find out different things about them, like with the younger children, if they could recognise elements ... or whatever."  
"I think it worked when they were talking and they seemed to be able to just naturally talk about that ... which was interesting, their comments on "Can you perceive something without paying attention to it?"
<p>| &quot;... they brought that question [What makes something art?] ... someone said, really it's how you define what art is. I thought &quot;Ah, that's good&quot; because previously we had talked about that sort of question and it was good to know they were thinking about it.&quot; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW CLASSROOM APPROACHES</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open environment</td>
<td>Noting that the students showed respect for each other's opinions in an open classroom environment gave the teacher confidence to continue the new approach.</td>
<td>&quot;... it has opened a door for them [slower contributors]... whereas in most discussion, because it is so short and there are those leaders who always pop through, there's not a chance for them to get their little bit in. Whereas when there is that slowing down a bit they can.&quot; She asked the Year 5's &quot;What did you think about just being able to talk about works of art like this?&quot; and they thought it was a really good idea to be able to just sit down and discuss the pieces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion skills</td>
<td>Previous pattern takes-now there are times when the teacher merely says &quot;uh-huh&quot; and several students respond: &quot;Now that is really different and they are completing sentences and building on top of each other and I think that is much better&quot;.</td>
<td>Some students&quot;... seem to be guiding the conversation and then they can sort of bounce off things that the other students have said...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;When I read it I thought, &quot;Oh, they did contribute&quot; a reasonable amount and like it when I see s/s&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;They just want to burst out ... offering opinions - so you have to go with the flow of it&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;... they look [at artworks] better now ... and can discuss more in terms of artistic terminology, like we talk about an element or composition, and I think that [approach] has developed.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... sometimes they are just talking over without being selected or without allowing somebody else to finish. They are not really being considerate...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The kids will be ... able to argue with me ... and be able to question it and I think that's important.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They are more used to talking and saying what they think and extending ideas and bouncing off each other which is what you see on that tape, that they could do that. So it wasn't hard for me, or it wasn't my job to try and build that ability. I just had give them the opportunity to be able to use that skill that they already had.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;They were saying we could have a cake baking art. They were getting too carried away, but it's nice seeing their ideas get brought up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students are talking much more: &quot;Look at the previous [pre-workshop] transcripts and you would hardly get two words&quot;.</td>
<td>Year 2's &quot;... are not inhibited by things yet, so that's why I think they can be quite free with saying what they say... whereas, when they get much older they are a bit more shy about saying something just in case somebody else disagrees with them.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;This is good. (refers to student talk in transcript): &quot;Haven't you smelt an op shop. It's like old grandmas?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... they really respect each other's opinions. So it's an open environment&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... it would take a regular ongoing thing. Like this is what we do at the beginning of an art class.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Oh, I get it.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... also if you do it from this age too, this becomes what they know art is. Whereas with the older students their perception of art is just doing practical work. But I think because I now speak like this with everybody they get used to it and just come in, they don't expect to have to start ...&quot;</td>
<td>It's like one student explaining it to the other student, which is, yeah that's good.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... younger children ... are quite happy to talk about anything at any time and they all want to have their say.... So that's why you have to bring their attention back ... to what was said and focus them again on somebody else's comment rather than their own opinion.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I was really worried because they didn't do anything, but speak for most of the session. I mean there was time left at the end of the session to do some practical work, but they didn't mind it, to be able to actually talk and ... a lot of them said I really enjoyed it, so there is definitely a place for that.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... there are a couple... that will pick up on what I have said, so they interpret it back ... at the level the others are used to hearing and will understand&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of discussion</td>
<td>Commenting on Year 9: &quot;... they came up with the fundamentals of what makes a successful artist&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;It's surprising to hear back ... how imaginative the girls are and how in depth you can actually look at something - you wouldn't have expected that - and some of the [Year 2] selected material was the same as the Year 5 and 7's&quot;.</td>
<td>&quot;That's a terrific one (referring to child's description of a car's duco as leopard skin). And they are building [on one another] and the very creative things they said about the teachers and the sorts of cars they would drive. They are not normal questions and so it's challenging for them and they come up with unusual responses.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... the 2's came up with ... all those sort of things that are depicted. I thought that was really interesting. ... they went into what they though art was about.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... they are thinking that way [about artists' intentions and elements] all the time rather than trying to just pull it out of the hat now and then&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... another thing that surprised me was how often their [Year 5] perceptions of ... what was happening in the pictures and um was so in line with the artists' ... recorded intentions... and how they could pick up on things that had influenced the artist as well. Their insight was the most surprising thing at that level I think.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... there's also a couple of really bright, very good children in that class who are deep thinkers and once again can put in some of those relevant questions that the others would not have thought about so that they can bounce off them as well.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT SKILLS</td>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Teacher C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Depth of discussion | [Aboriginal art with Year 7] "... they were able to come into this discussion and make up some sort of logical reason why there are differences between what was painted ... It was amazing how the Year 7's responded." | "... the concepts or things you are usually associating with older students having trouble with, but the fact that the younger want to look at the same concepts and attack it in the same way, I think that may be may be the surprise."
<p>| | | | &quot;... there are a couple... that will pick up on what I have said, so they interpret it back, at the level the others are used to hearing and will understand&quot;. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT SKILLS</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual students</td>
<td>&quot;I was pleased with N2 ... she obviously is profoundly interested in this sort of search for meaning behind art ... I have taken another look at her in the class because it was not something that I expected from her.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;... the quieter ones can take the initial direction from them [other students] and more in their terms rather than me.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;One boy and a couple of girls came out with some really interesting long statements, it's like 'wow'. I'm looking forward to reading what they said because they really capture the essence of a lot of things.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One student said after a discussion &quot;I really like this and wish we did more of it &quot; i.e. &quot;... to kind of look more in depth at works of art&quot;.</td>
<td>Two students stayed back after one class: &quot;We talked about art and it was really nice to just talk about art and what they can do. So I think um, and one of them hadn't spoken during the discussion ...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... the girl said &quot;It's like a funeral.&quot; I hadn't told them that was the last painting that he had done before he died. She picked this up just from looking at it.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;... some [individuals] have been surprises in that normally they won't speak, but for some reason [when] everybody was speaking all together like that, [in a community of inquiry approach] ... all of a sudden there is this comment that comes out and you think 'Oh yes she really has got some idea of what is going on and what is happening' and what terminology at her level could be used...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Classroom Communication (Classroom A)

- Pre-Intervention
- Post-Intervention

1. Silence or Confusion
2. Teacher's Praises or Encourages
3. Teacher's Clarifies or Builds
4. Teacher's Asks Questions
5. Teacher's Lecturing
6. Teacher's Gives Directions
7. Teacher's Authority & Discipline
8. Student's Response
9. Student's Initiation
10. Student's Procedural Questions

APPENDIX SEVEN
(i) Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Classroom Communication for Teacher A.
APPENDIX EIGHT
Teacher Awarenesses Following Intervention Seminar Concerning: (1) Teacher Skills, (2) New Classroom Approaches, & (3) Student Skills

A. Teacher Skills: Questioning and facilitation

Teacher A
1. Realised that she was not asking open-ended questions when she saw large tracts of transcript that contained her "talk" during a discussion: "I have to consciously think about the questioning mode".
2. Believed she was still offering her opinion too often during discussions: "I'm just opening up their heads and pouring it in ... if we are trying to hear what they think then you would be disappointed if you kept giving them what you think". She cited examples and said she would like to go back and ask the students: "How did that affect your perspectives?".
3. Realised some students needed to be taught how to question and that she would have to provide the necessary framework because they were "motivationally dependent" on her reassurance that the point they made was good.
4. She used to think she was providing an important emotional prop for the students but decided this might not be desirable: "In the past I have really molly-coddled them to get the product instead of them being responsible for the product themselves". She said it was important for her to hold back.
5. Referred to feeling a new part of her brain working.

Teacher B
1. Noted she was not necessarily dominating the discussions but rather inserting questions: "[previously] I was the star and this time they are".
2. Described her attempts to discover what the students knew rather than pass on her knowledge, "They brought insight in for me...".
3. Described the way she was now thinking before she spoke referring to her previous way of operating as "a telling sort of thing".
4. Conscious that she was exposing her students to artistic language more than previously and pointed to examples like: "What do you think the artist's intentions were?" with her intention being to ensure "that they are thinking all the time...".
5. Described the difficulty of her role as facilitator: "because my mind is always there are speaking about this, can we get their way?" and "In some ways it was somehow..."
6. Noticed that the students enjoyed the disc rather produce art rather than talk about it art is not done that often ...".
7. Referred to the way she previously had her own agenda and felt happy when she had said what she wanted to say: "But now it's not like that at all. ... I had concepts in my mind and I would literally say 'This is what it's like,' ... but now I am more inclined to say 'Now you think about this'."

8. Said that trying out the approaches demonstrated in the intervention seminar between sessions stopped her from cynically saying: "It's so great in theory ... how's that going to work in the classroom?"

9. Realised that she had to work to keep the attention of younger students: "So that's why you have to bring their attention back ... to what was said and focus them again on someone else's rather than their own opinion".

Teacher C

1. "I have learned so much just by looking at this [transcript]."

2. Referred to the way she encouraged the Year 11s, but not the Year 7s, to explore issues: "Perhaps I don't value their ideas much, or give them a chance to express them."

3. Believed that the Year 7s wanted to get on with their work and that she would find it difficult to have a discussion with them because of this. However, she said "I can see what can be done, what teachers do that sparks an idea in the student's mind and then they take off."

4. Hoped that by saying things like: "Do you like this idea, because if you don't why don't we do this, or what else could we do?" as she did in prac. classes might also apply to discussions generally.

5. Attempting to pose questions that elicited fuller responses from the students, more than one word answers, and offered the examples: "Why do/don't you like it?" and you know, "Give reasons" or "How could you change it?".

6. Showed an awareness of her role as questioner: "but I want to hear their ideas and why they've got those ideas. So rather than me saying um, oh you know, 'Is this picture happy or sad? Wrong! It's not sad' you know, find out [from the students] why it's happy."

7. Felt was still building on their expressed opinion too much: "Go to the Gallery first, blah, blah, blah, blah" and referred to the example of the teacher who was a chronic exemplar of this habit referred to during the intervention seminar.

B. New classroom approaches

Teacher A

1. Used the conundrum approach effectively, for example: "Today I put up two contra pieces ... I didn't try to explain them at all, I didn't need to."
2. Used the examples of questions modelled in the seminar during conundrums because she said it did not come instinctively: "It's like learning to teach again". The approaches modelled in the seminar that she had adopted represented a new approach for her.

3. Previously she had taught history sequentially and philosophical issues, if they arose, had not been incorporated as "classroom fodder".

**Teacher B**

1. Described how, using an approach used in the seminar she had wanted her students to "go from talking about pictures and building their ability to describe and form their own opinions about the actual pictures into the more philosophical aspect of perceiving, and you know I was trying to get that kind of flow into it".

2. During discussion a Year 2 had been engaged in a discussion where they were: "narrowing it down again and trying to get more definite specifics into what is necessary for something to be classified as a piece of art."

3. She was using puzzles and Perkins' (1994) model of deeper looking.

4. She was impressed when her young students readily and "naturally" were able to discuss differences between perception and paying attention.

5. Noted how it had "opened a door" for the slower contributors when the discussion was also slowed down.

6. Believed it was a good model to establish in the primary school because: "this becomes what they know art is. Whereas with the older students their perception of art is just doing practical work". She believed they got used to arriving at art and sitting down for a discussion rather than expecting to start practical work immediately.

**Teacher C**

Teacher C referred to her satisfaction with some of the results of engaging in issues modelled in the seminar: "someone said, really it's how you define what art is. I thought 'Ah, that's good' because previously we had talked about that sort of question and it was good to know they were thinking about it".

**C. Student skills: Discussions and depth of inquiry**

**Teacher A**

1. Noted there were times when she only said "Uh-huh" but several students responded building on each others' contributions: "Now that is really different and they are completing sentences and building on top of each other and I think that is much... "They just want to burst out... offering it"."
2. Believed that: "The kids will be able to argue with me and be able to question it and I think that's important".

3. Students were talking more: "Look at the previous transcripts and you wouldn't get more than two words [from the students]".

4. Noted that: "They really respect each other's opinions. So it's an open environment".

5. Gave examples of previous non-verbal contributors now speaking.

6. Was pleased that a Year 9 student "came up with the fundamentals of what makes a successful artist".

9. Noted that some students had the ability to: "pick up on what I have said, so they interpret it back ... at the level others are used to hearing and will understand ... the quieter one's can take the initial direction from them, and more in their terms, rather than me".

10. Previous non-contributors were noted: "Some have been surprises in that they normally won't speak, but for some reason when everybody was speaking together like that ... all of a sudden there is this comment and you think 'Oh yes she really has got some idea of what is happening".

Teacher B

1. Felt students were guiding the discussion: "and then they can sort of bounce off things that the other students have said".

2. Noticed the students' artistic vocabulary had developed: "They look [at art] better now ... and can discuss more in terms of artistic terminology ... like we talk about an element or a composition".

3. Realised students were now used to: "talking and saying what they think and bouncing off each other. ... So it wasn't hard for me ... I just had to give them the opportunity to be able to use that skill they already had".

4. Surprised at the depth of inquiry that the students were capable of: "It's surprising to hear back ... how imaginative the girls are and how in depth you can actually look at something ... they are thinking that way all the time".

6. Surprised at the insight of her students and: "how often their perception of what was happening in the pictures ... was so in line with the artists' ... expressed intention".

7. Noted there were students: "who are deep thinkers and ... can put in some of those relevant questions that the others would not have thought about ...".

8. Surprised that Year 7 students: "were able to come into this discussion and make up some sort of logical reason why there are differences...".

Teacher C

1. Realised: "Oh, they did contribute a reasonable amount and [I] like it [student/student/student]".

2. Felt the ideas expressed were extreme: "but ..."

3. Noticed: "one student explaining it to ano
4. Aware that: "They are building [on one another's contribution] and the very creative things they said ... They are not normal questions and so it's challenging for them and they come up with unusual responses".

5. Students: "came up with some really interesting long statements, it's like 'wow' ... they really capture the essence of a lot of things".
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