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ABSTRACT

Art teachers have inherited unreconciled attitudes toward the teaching of drawing, which stem from an unresolved conflict between interventionists and non-interventionists. The resulting fragmentation of teaching practises is further confounded by consideration of the "crisis in confidence" period of drawing development that surfaces in grade four. In an effort to provide a clearer definition of the teacher's role in the drawing class, this study examined the practises of four exemplary art specialists. Descriptive research techniques were employed in the observation of 27 drawing lessons, nine each at the grade two, four and six levels. Recorded dialogue was analyzed using Kakas' Peer Interaction Typology and Clements' Questioning Typology, and it was found that peers at all grades spoke most often about their own drawing experiences or artwork, and that teachers used mostly indirect questioning strategies when interacting with students. Data collected regarding initiators of interactions revealed that with increasing age came decreasing amounts of student initiated interaction, together with increasing amounts of teacher initiated interaction. It was also found that there was a paucity of peer interaction at the grade four level, and that in-process viewing of peers' artwork was an important component of the drawing lesson. Within a supportive environment, interaction generally ranged from neutral to positive.
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

A. Introduction

Picture-making activities, specifically drawing and painting, are perceived by some art educators to be one of the most important aspects of the elementary art program (Gaitskell, Hurwitz, & Day, 1982; McFee & Degge, 1977). Advocates emphasize that the inclusion of drawing contributes to the development of cognitive processes, as well as to "skill and competence in the usage of a valuable symbol system" (Wilson & Wilson, 1979; Chapman, 1982). Educationalists outside the field of the visual arts refer to its important role in providing an early insight into the writing process (Jackson & Michael, 1989), in providing practice with line-making tools, in encouraging children to report on their experiences and in instilling an attitude toward communication by means of line-making tools that brings about an understanding that it is possible to add, alter or improve an initial statement.

However, today's art educators have inherited what on the surface appear to be unreconciled attitudes toward the teaching of drawing. Early literature referring to children's drawing development promoted the view that artistic development is a naturally occurring process and that intervention may be harmful (Kellogg, 1979; Lowenfeld, 1947; Viola, 1944). The role of the teacher was to keep out damaging influences that might impair or dampen the child's artistic creativity. More recently, researchers (Chapman, 1982; Smith, 1982; Wilson & Wilson, 1979) have stressed their opposition to the non-intervention theory. Chapman is adamant in her condemnation of what she concludes is a widespread belief that the teaching of art is "unnecessary and
damaging" (p. 55). It is the belief of these educators that adult assistance is necessary to achieve artistic growth.

Upon closer scrutiny, it is apparent that promoters of these pedagogical positions are not entirely in opposition. There is agreement with respect to the existence of a period of drawing development in middle childhood that is characterised by diminishing self-confidence in one's drawing ability, as well as a marked qualitative decline in drawings when compared to those of earlier years of development (Lowenfeld, 1947; Chapman, 1978; Gardner, 1980). Robertson (1987) refers to a consistency of opinion among debating theorists as to the existence of what she terms "a latency period of artistic decline" (p 37).

The documented emergence of this "crisis in confidence" period (Chapman, 1978), which begins in preadolescence and is made evident by reticence concerning, or even cessation of drawing, has provoked an even stronger stand among some interventionists. Writers in the field (Chapman, 1978; Gaitskell, Hurwitz, & Day, 1982; Winner, 1982) are of the view that effective guidance by the teacher at the preadolescent stage of artistic development is not only advisable but essential if continued progress in drawing is to be made in the later years of elementary art instruction.

Even those advocating a hands-off stance in the early years of development recognize a need for some teacher input in order to mitigate the negative outcomes of this difficult period of drawing development. Richardson (1948) writes of the necessity for some kind of intervention during this "stage of disillusionment" (p. 62) because although "...it is impossible for any adult to teach a technique that matches childlike vision, children nevertheless need teaching if they are to feel their powers of expression keeping pace with the growth of their ideas" (p. 60).
Agreement also seems evident with respect to the severity and the difficulty of overcoming this critical period. When asked if many children in Cizek’s drawing classes survived the onslaught of intense self-criticism and ensuing creative paralysis, Viola (1944) lamented "very few" (p. 69). He pronounced it "an extremely difficult task to bridge over the crisis and to help the production of the child to another level" (p. 69).

Reasons given for the difficulty in helping children through this developmental period are many and varied. Cizek considered the problems involved almost impossible to solve due to the insufficient training and lack of understanding on the part of teachers, while Chapman stated that the cause was meagre instruction in the early grades and a heightened sensitivity to criticism by both peer and teacher groups.

If one were to generalize about the differences between the attitudes of art educators prior to 1960 and those held today, it would seem that contemporary art educators are more confident that intervention makes a difference in student knowledge acquisition and in student attitudes to art. It has been suggested that, taking into account the growing available working memory of preadolescent children, training methods could be established to provide a greater capacity to develop compositional strategies (Morra, Moizo, & Scopesi, 1988). According to Churchill (1970), this would then "lift their work out of the realm of what they feel is babyish expression," by providing them with the necessary challenge, knowledge and experience of techniques. One of the most important concerns of the art teacher at the pre-adolescent period should be this transition from the unconscious imaginative activity of the child to the conscious and controlled activity of the adult (Michael, 1964).
B. Statement of the Problem

Fragmentation of teaching practices has resulted from the unresolved conflict between interventionists and non-interventionists (Smith, 1985). If in fact some guidance is necessary at the time of the onset of inhibitions with respect to drawing, confusion nevertheless arises with respect to the recommended amount and form that such guidance should take. A clearer definition of the teacher's role and actions in the drawing class must be provided to the elementary teacher.

C. Purpose of the Study

The aim of the study will be to examine existing classroom practice with respect to the drawing component of the art curriculum, to assess this practice as it relates to theory in the field, and to recommend appropriate methodology, for the drawing class in general and in particular for the preadolescent drawer, that should result in increased technical ability, and increased confidence on the part of the pre-adolescent student.

D. Proposed Study

The study will examine the interaction between teacher and student and, where possible, between students during drawing instruction in three elementary grades. Data will be collected regarding the amount and kind of assistance students are requesting during drawing classes, the quantity and content of assistance they are receiving, and the appropriateness of this assistance with respect to their ability to implement suggestions or their desire to incorporate them into their drawings.
E. Research Questions and Related Subsidiary Questions

The decision to focus on interaction as a means of unveiling existing classroom practice was based on Simpson and Galbo’s notions (1986) that interaction is more than an enhancing agent but is "central to the learning process," and that significant aspects of teaching and learning are most effectively explained in terms of interaction. "Learning is individually constructed from one's relationships with others, including teachers; it is not just what others attempt to teach" (p. 37). Bruner and Bornstein's (1989) insistence that "development is intrinsically bound up with interaction" (p. 11) has echoed the need to use interaction as a window to the complexities of the teaching/learning situation.

The research sought to determine what interactions were occurring during drawing classes that might influence the process of learning, and/or the product. The following research questions were formulated for this purpose:

1. What is the nature of the interaction that occurs during drawing classes in the elementary grades?

2. How does the nature of the interaction that occurs during drawing classes affect the artwork produced by elementary children?

Subsidiary questions to be investigated were as follows:

a. When is interaction taking place?

b. What strategies or intervention techniques are being used by the teacher?

c. To what extent are the teacher/student interactions

   i. teacher initiated?

   ii. student initiated?

d. What is the nature of students' questions or assistance needs?

   i. students' questions?
ii. students' assistance needs?

e. Are teacher suggestions implemented by students?

f. How does the nature of the interaction differ between grades two, four, and six?

F. Propositions Underlying the Study

Three propositions guided the research:

a. Given an understanding and consideration of child development from both an artistic and sociological perspective, a teacher is capable of fostering development in the drawing abilities of children through appropriate actions and talk.

b. Learning is contextually dependent. It is a complex process which can be influenced by changing variables such as the nature of the task, the classroom atmosphere, peer interaction, and the organization of the work space.

c. Using an approach and teaching strategies that reflect a knowledge and consideration of developmental changes in children's drawing abilities and in their sociological make-up, a positive outlook toward drawing can be maintained.

G. Significance of Proposed Research

Issues relating to drawing and graphic ability have received more research attention than all other areas in the field of visual arts education during the past century (Davis, 1977). However, children's drawing has most often been contemplated within the confines of the experimental paradigm (Wilson & Wilson, 1979) with emphasis placed on evaluation of the end product of a well-defined drawing task. A qualitative approach with its provision of "thick"
description (Geertz, 1973) answers a call in the field of art education for a
glimpse of the spontaneous realities of the classroom art teaching/learning
process (Chapman, 1982).

Further, quantitative emphasis has meant a restriction of possible
intervening variables in the interests of focusing on drawing performance,
preventing any notion of influences that occur in a classroom setting rich with
social interaction. Hubbard (1982) draws our attention to the necessity of
studying drawing in the context in which it occurs. This contextually based
study is significant in its treatment of drawing as a classroom activity influenced
by both peers and teachers. Descriptive methods afford the researcher a multi-
faceted view of the activity from the perspectives of both teacher and student.

Consideration of the student's perspective or intention has been rare,
although some researchers (Hubbard, 1982) have alluded to the need for a
research account of children's intentions with respect to drawing experiences.
Reliance on the teacher's interpretation of the behaviours and motives of
children may result in what Hubbard fears would be a condescendingly adult
centric viewpoint that already "pervades the educational system" (p. 11) by
distorting the world of the child through omission of the child's perspective. The
inclusion of this perspective has meant that there would more likely be a
documentation of the whole phenomenon rather than select parts.

The "conventional wisdom" (Duncum, 1986) that the drawings of middle
childhood represent a marked qualitative decline from those of younger
children has been well-documented. This study is an attempt to capture the
period directly preceding and following this decline in the hope of providing
additional information upon which the teacher may base instructional decisions.
The NEA Report of 1988, as well as Davis (1977) and Chapman (1982),
emphasize the importance of research that will guide and improve classroom
instruction. Few efforts have been made to understand the dynamics of the classroom during drawing classes or to examine what art teachers actually do when they teach aspects of art programs such as drawing (Gray, 1984). By providing commentary on the interactions that are occurring during the process of teaching/learning about drawing within the confines of the classroom, it is intended that a clearer picture will emerge, adding to knowledge of present teaching practices. Only with such knowledge can educators begin to focus attention on the instructional improvement that is an imperative research priority (NEA, 1988).

H. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Choosing to focus on "exemplary models" of art teaching as a means of highlighting effective teaching techniques and practices limited the generalizability of this study. The teachers selected were art specialists who had received educational training in the making and teaching of art that would not be common to non-specialist classroom teachers, who are duty bound to teach art as well as most other subjects.

Grade four was chosen as the focus of observation because it is recognized as the pivotal point at which changes in the attitude and intentions of the preadolescent drawer begin to occur (Chapman, 1978). It is likely that grades three and five may contain the overflow from this "crisis in confidence" group. For this reason, grades two and six were chosen, to provide a foundation upon which to view and compare the observational data collected at the grade four level.

Accuracy of data collection was enhanced through the use of two audio recording devices worn by the teacher and researcher. Interaction occurring between two parties, i.e., the teacher and students, the researcher and students,
and the researcher and teacher, was recorded clearly. In contrast, spontaneous peer talk during art-making was often multi-layered. To provide a control for the quantity and complexity of verbal interchanges, written anecdotal comments were notated on site. However, not all audio recorded peer talk was decipherable, and in spite of efforts to strengthen data collection through written recording methods, it cannot be assumed that all peer talk was captured.

The intention underlying the design of the study was to capture the realities of the classroom drawing experience. The researcher had no control over the type of drawing experience planned. Although lessons using drawing from observation, imagination and memory were observed, there was a disproportionate number of lessons concentrating on observational techniques.

I. Definition of Terms

Interaction: refers to all manner of behavior in which individuals act upon each other (Simpson & Galbo, 1986)

Intervention: refers to teacher initiated actions or statements that temporarily interrupt the flow of events during the lesson.

Non-directed interactions: statements or actions that may not have an intended audience, but reflect the values or thoughts of the subject.

Pre-adolescence: refers to the period from age nine to thirteen years.

J. Outline of the Thesis

Chapter 2 will provide a review of literature pertaining to teacher/student interaction and recommended teaching practices, the timing of intervention both in terms of students' development and the progress of the lesson, peer interaction and its influence on learning in the art lesson, and the appropriate environment for maximum student social and artistic growth. Chapter 3 will deal
with the conduct of the study, including information about the participants and the procedures followed. An analysis of the material collected and comparisons with models contributed by other art educators will comprise Chapter 4. Further analysis will be contained in Chapter 5 involving holistic descriptions of observations of the life world of the drawing class. Chapter 6 will include a summary of the study, and a discussion of implications for teachers and for the field.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Introduction

The actual process involved in teaching art effectively to children has been given relatively little attention in art education research. Instead, the primary focus has been on identifying stages of children's artistic development (Chapman, 1982). This study is intended to address the apparent need for what has been described by Chapman as "instructional studies" and to examine aspects of communication occurring in the art class, an area considered by Kakas (1986) to have been largely neglected. It is concerned specifically with the nature of interaction occurring during drawing classes in the elementary grades, both between teachers and students and between the students themselves.

A review of the literature will cover areas related to questions raised in this study beginning with an examination of both teacher/student interaction during drawing classes, and recommendations by art educators regarding how such interaction should occur. This will be followed by a discussion of educators' views on the point in instruction at which such interaction should take place, as well as the age of the group to which it may most profitably be directed. Interaction among peers and its influence on drawing tasks will be covered, as well as art educators' views on the classroom environment for appropriate interaction.

B. Teacher/Student Interaction

Is the teacher's presence necessary or are the students better left to their own devices? With regard to the general need for teacher interaction in art
education, in a study of thirty-five children aged five to seven enrolled in a children's art programme, Kindler (1993) found that the children adopted three distinct approaches to the construction of graphic representations. One group readily engaged in drawing without demonstrating any need for external support. A second group waited for a few minutes until certain peers had begun to draw, borrowed certain pictorial elements from them, and then continued to draw independently. A third group spent time observing the work of others as well as visuals displayed in the classroom. Some children in this group then began to draw by copying what they had seen, while others did not draw at all throughout the observed session. It was noted that the first group represented the "classical Lowenfeld ideal", but that the others needed to rely on "culturally mediated models" rather than innate biases in order to create graphic representations. Kindler concluded that it should be recognized and accepted that young children's graphic solutions are determined by cultural influences as well as certain intrinsic factors. It would appear then that the teacher's role with younger students, at least, should be the facilitation of the drawing experience through the structuring of a learning environment sensitive to the varied learning approaches of the children. For those who are unable to engage in the task, the challenge lies perhaps with the teacher. Viola (1944) suggests "telling them an exciting story" (p. 83) as a motivational tactic. There is little doubt that a teacher's words do affect students' performance on a drawing task.

Kratochwill, Rush and Kratochwill (1979) studied the effect of teachers' words in the form of descriptive reinforcement on four five year old children who demonstrated an absence of diverse forms in their paintings. The children were each invited to paint two paintings at a number of sessions in an empty classroom. At the sessions no teacher instructions were given on what to produce. During the first eight to sixteen sessions, the art teacher watched the
child closely without making negative or positive comments about a particular form, although expressing appreciation of the child's total effort at the end of the sessions. In subsequent sessions, the art teacher remarked positively every time the child created a form that had not appeared previously in that session's paintings. Kratochwill, Rush and Kratochwill suggested that diversity of response was readily increased by descriptive reinforcement procedures. From this they concluded that:

> [t]he practice of expecting children to produce certain art forms at certain ages perhaps must be modified on the basis of such findings to include an appreciation of the degree to which experience or training affects the forms produced. Early exposure to non-restrictive art education practices may have more significant visible effect than had previously been supposed. (p.37)

They also concluded that to encourage creative responses in children, a combination of praise without description and description without praise was likely to be the best way to encourage certain creative responses in most children. Their findings supported the results of Goetz and Baer (1973), whose study indicated that children receiving descriptive reinforcement merely for art form diversity within a specific session display a diversity of forms across sessions.

It appears that teacher intervention involving indirect means impacts on students' drawing performance. However, a study by Lansing (1984) was concerned with a more direct approach to instruction to determine its effect on the development of mental representations by kindergarten children. The study involved five groups of kindergarten children (145 altogether) in five different drawing experiences and measured the change in their mental images through the use of drawings and specially constructed distractors. The children
observed and drew a two-dimensional abstract object. The results indicated that the most accurate and fully developed mental images of the object were produced when children received instruction. It was recommended that instruction should be offered that calls attention to the visual relationships within the viewed object, and that repetition of the same exercise is important to the development of mental representations of a figure.

Other art educators (Barrett, 1983; Heard, 1988; Lowenfeld, 1957) advocate that focus should be placed on broadening students' concepts of objects rather than on using direct instruction to teach specific drawing strategies. These researchers support the view that individual graphic styles will be more strongly developed as a result of this type of instruction.

According to Packard (1984), the value of many studies on teacher initiated interaction regarding art production is called into question because of inadequate research designs and methods, resulting in questionable conclusions. Moreover, topics examined rarely replicated or extended the research of others (Packard, 1984). In addition, Kakas (1986) found that, although children's developmental stages have been studied extensively to assist the planning of suitable curricula, media and instruction for children, art educators have not attended to the developmental aspect of communication in the classroom, teacher to student or student to student.

An example of an early study of teacher/student interaction where the research design may have been inadequate was based on role playing by twenty subjects assigned to ten teams, each subject alternating as art teacher and as art student (Jones, 1965). The conclusions of the study appear to be significant. For example, it was found that "the frequency of student task and judging statements correlates negatively with total strategy gains in art" and "the length of student statements and the percent of student talk correlate positively
with aesthetic gains in art" (p.14). However, the value of the study is lessened by the artificiality of the setting. No actual art teachers were involved in the study, as students played the role of teacher.

In contrast, a more recent study by Kakas (1986) on the effects of teacher feedback and peer interaction on fifth grade students' drawing performance was conducted with a multiple research perspective. An experimental component investigated whether three different forms of teacher feedback administered to fifth grade students during the art-making phase of six drawing tasks would result in significant differences in their drawing performance. An observational component involved the observation and interpretation of both peer interaction and subjects' communication during the art-making segment of drawing lessons, through analysis of audio and videotape recordings of the sessions, and questionnaires and post-treatment interviews conducted with each subject and their classroom teachers. By investigating teacher feedback, drawing performance and communication during the art-making process, relationships were revealed among several factors in the art teaching/learning process which did not surface when teaching any one variable. Administration of feedback methods was influenced by responses to contextual factors, and other contextual factors affected student behaviour as well. It was concluded that students are influenced not only by the feedback they receive from their art teacher, but also by the task, their peers, their classroom teachers, and school events. Art teachers are influenced not only by their feedback strategies, but also by the demands of the task, and by behaviour of individual students and of the group. The study indicated that although educational research showed that teacher feedback contributes to student achievement, it was difficult to apprehend the extent to which it was a determining factor in children's drawing performance because of the interrelationship of all the factors referred to above.
Schirrmacher (1986) divided frequently employed approaches to children's art by art teachers into six categories, and assessed their relative effectiveness. It was concluded that the judgmental approach, stating one's opinion in terms of "good" or "great", is liable to become overworked and meaningless and its credibility lost. The valuing approach, ("I like it") is limited in that it values the product over the approach, although the child often considers the process itself to be more important. The questioning approach ("What is this?") suffers from the inability of many children to verbalize what they are creating, and from their tendency to find primary value in the physical act of creating rather than in the product itself. The probing approach ("Please tell me all about it.") becomes stale with use. The correcting approach, used to bring the children's art closer to adult reality, discourages children and impedes their artistic growth. Rather than using these approaches, Schirrmacher recommends allowing the children "to go about their art without comparing, correcting, or projecting yourself into their art" (p. 6). This can be achieved by beginning the interaction by smiling, pausing and saying nothing, to give time to study the art, to think of a good response, and to allow the child to speak first; by then commenting on colour, line, mass, pattern, space and texture; and by concluding with simple remarks expressing gratitude for having shared the work, and a positive statement regarding the amount of effort expended by the child in his art-making. Although written in 1986, Schirrmacher's recommended approach is reminiscent of the non-interventionist philosophy promoted by art educators such as Lowenfeld.

C. Teacher/Student Interaction Through Questioning

Questioning by art teachers is described by Lowenfeld (1950) as the foundation of art motivation. In view of its importance, an empirical study on art
teacher questioning was carried out by Clements (1964), who was inspired to initiate his research by the variety and kinds of questions asked by student-teachers in art classes that he observed as a student-teacher supervisor. From instances involving questioning of one hundred pupils from grades four to nine, he found that questions could be categorized into eleven different subsets. Clements found that suggestion-order questions were most frequently asked (Why don't you do x?), followed in frequency by three more non-directive types: process recall (Why did you do x?), judgement (How do you like x?) and intent (How will you do x?). Other types of questions less frequently posed were those asking for a rule (How do we do this?); for identification (What's this?); for an experience (How did it look?); for acceptance (O.K.?), and those used as an opening (What are you doing?).

Clements (1964) states that skilful questioning can be used as "an aid in drawing forth a student's inherent creative potential" (p. 14). Included in his list of benefits of good questioning practices are the stimulation of aesthetic judgements, the intensification of past and present experiences thus enhancing graphic representation of them, the planning of sequential steps in picture-making, and the direction of the student toward solutions to problems encountered during drawing experiences. In short, he sees the role of questioning as stimulation of the student to "think and act" (p. 14).

This study by Clements was weakened in its generalizability because the teachers observed were inexperienced and it is likely that their questioning techniques were probably not sufficiently developed to serve as models for effective art teaching. Although Clements planned to extend his research to public schools and colleges to determine whether and how questioning changes at different levels of institutions, there is no record of these studies in the literature. The present study, which includes an analysis in terms of
frequency of questions, as categorized by Clements but in the context of exemplary art teaching, can act in this regard as a useful extension of Clements' research.

Several art education researchers have set out questions that art teachers should ask in order to teach effectively. Sparling and Sparling (1973) recommend that comments and questions be open-ended to heighten the sensitivity of each child to what the child is doing or has done. They emphasise the importance of a positive initial statement to let the child know that the adult accepts what the child is doing and finds meaning in some part of the child's creation. The follow-up question can then be one of genuine interest and can be worded in such a way that the child can choose freely whether or not to respond.

Taunton (1984) recommends that there should be reflective dialogue between teacher and student, constituted by discussions among teachers and children specifically focused on children's introspections during their own art-making, and children's reflections about their experiences in relation to those of other artists. She recommends the following questioning goals: 1. invite the child's consideration of the visual qualities of media; 2. encourage the child's choices; 3. explore sources for the child's art ideas; 4. develop and enrich the child's art ideas; 5. relate choices to a child's art ideas; 6. stimulate the child's consideration of other artists' intentions and efforts; 7. encourage the child's curiosity and flexibility while working; 8. provoke the child's evaluation of art-making experiences and art works.

Following a review of research in the area of the teaching of representational painting and drawing, Langford (1987) concludes that "at most periods in their development children draw using both skills centred on the paper and skills centered on the relation between the paper and the world" (p.
It is now evident that it "probably hinders the child's development if teachers refuse requests for help with the technical aspects of drawing" (p. 50). And yet, with regard to students' questions directed towards the teacher, studies indicate that children ask few such questions in school. In particular, Comber (1988) requested that a classroom teacher considered highly successful by her colleagues conduct research on this topic in her classroom. A journal was kept of questions asked by the eight, nine and ten year old students in the class during the first month of the school year. Although the children were invited to ask questions, they were reluctant to do so and limited any questions to what was needed to begin a task or to complete its surface features. Rather than admit uncertainty or confusion before the teacher and the entire class, the children often preferred to ask each other. As pointed out by Dillon (1982), the social rules of the classroom may make children's questions inappropriate, as the teacher's role is usually to ask the questions and the children's role is to answer them. In the Comber (1988) study, children explained that it was embarrassing for them to ask questions and by doing so, interrupt the class. To change the social rules of the classroom, Comber and the teacher asked the children to keep notes during language arts of questions they asked or wanted to ask, and to write their names on the blackboard indicating their need to ask a question. It was suggested that, in an hourly session each week, teachers review questions that children had listed in their notes; establish pre-task discussion times concerning questions and problems; and model useful questions by acknowledging and applauding such efforts before the class. Comber found that "[w]hen the children believed that it was safe to ask questions and admit problems, [they] were invited back into their world and shown how to help. Their questions indicated how they understood literacy tasks and how they operated as learners" (p. 152). As noted by the teacher in
the study, "the best thing about listening to their questions is that the children who might go on being ignored and at risk don't escape you" (p. 152).

The Comber study is limited in value because it involved one teacher, one classroom and one grade, and was not specifically concerned with art education. Reluctance to question may have been attributable to the age group of the children, their socio-economic class, or the particular teaching style of the teacher participating in the study. Questions raised are whether the findings are generalizable to art education, to children of all ages, and to a broad range of classroom environments.

D. Non-verbal Interaction

Interactions between teacher and student may be non-verbal in nature. When behaviour to be learned is acted out by the teacher and imitated by the student, it is termed "modelling" (Bandura, 1977). Researchers have found that modelling is more effective than verbal instruction, but most efficient when verbal instruction is added to the modelling (Rush, Weckesser, & Sabers, 1980).

E. Appropriate Extent of Intervention

In a study of the effects of "dictatorial" and "laissez-faire" forms of interaction by teachers with students in art instruction, Gaitskell and Hurwitz (1975) first divided 250 students between the ages of six and eight into two groups of equal number. Up to the time of the experiment they had all been involved in a creative programme of art. One of these groups continued in the same programme, while the other was given activities of a dictatorial or restrictive nature during ten days of teaching. As late as two years after this instruction, when asked to draw pictures from their own experiences, children in the second group resorted to the same stereotypical work they had produced
during the ten days of dictatorial instruction. On the other hand, when asked to draw pictures from personal experience, the first group was successful in this work, in that their drawings and paintings illustrated personal reactions to their observations and were produced in a variety of media and with different techniques. In the same study, 100 children between the ages of five and six were subjected to "laissez-faire" teaching, in that they were given no aid in motivation and no teaching assistance but were simply provided with a variety of materials already familiar to them, including tempera paint, clay, plasticine, and construction paper and glue. After the first day of such activities, interest declined rapidly so that by the fourth and fifth day nearly every child indicated a lack of interest in the activities, and all the work lacked vitality. The same procedures were followed with a second group of 100 children ranging from seven to nine years; in this instance there was already a noticeable lack of interest on the first day and almost universal lack of interest on the second and subsequent days. The results of this study suggest that neither a dictatorial nor a laissez-faire teaching approach is appropriate for art instruction, and that while children between the ages of five to nine all need teacher intervention to sustain their interest in art activities, the older children of this group may be more dependent on teacher intervention than the younger ones.

F. Timing of Instruction

Gaitskall, Hurwitz and Day (1982) emphasize the importance of timing in the art teaching process. They state that decisions regarding timing are largely dictated by common sense and intuition. However, considerations of age-related capabilities must also be weighed in such decision-making. As children become older, the range of art ability for each age increases (Eisner, 1963). A useful theoretical perspective on teacher initiated interaction with students is
offered by Wertsch (1978), who concludes that such interaction depends upon the child's level of mental development. At a low level of development, the teacher gives a series of commands, as one would to a computer programme. At a higher level, the child is led through the task orally but without commands, using a series of questions and statements aimed at revealing to the child an overall strategy.

Kensler (1965) found that effects of perceptual training on students' drawing of perspective were not significant at the grade seven level when training and drawing were integrated. In contrast, Salome (1965) established that perceptual training given prior to the task was the most significant factor contributing to high levels of drawing performance in grade five. Results at the grade four level were less decisive. One may therefore infer that the students' readiness must also be considered before methodology and content are chosen.

In the same vein, Korzenik (1979) stressed the importance of being aware of how children change and develop, because by unconsciously favouring one type of product characteristic of one certain stage of development, we may unintentionally aim to inhibit the shift in development that inevitably will take place. Likewise, Kratochwill, Rush and Kratochwill (1979) concluded that as their study found that descriptive reinforcement procedures increase diversity of responses, the practice of expecting children to produce certain art forms at certain ages might be modified to include an appreciation of the degree to which experience or training affects the kinds of forms produced.

Timing by the teacher of interaction during the lesson is also important. According to Sparling and Sparling (1973), comments and questions need not be given every time a child does something, as children need to gain satisfaction from their work without constant adult approval. It is particularly
important not to interrupt when a child is fully involved in an activity. In their view, the ideal moment for communication with the child is when attention is not on the work, at which time the teacher "can show interest with a thoughtful, sincere comment" (p. 340). On the other hand, Schirrmacher (1986) found that the best time to talk to children about their work is after they have completed their task, because their ideas are then still fresh and their interest in sharing their art is high. With regard to the subject matter of interactions with the art student, Szekely (1982) notes the changes in content at different stages of the lesson. Discussions before work generate ideas, possibilities and personal directions. During the work, skills, techniques, materials, difficulties, and the artistic process are dealt with. After the work is completed, teacher and student are liable to discuss what went wrong or right, what was learned, how an approach changed, or how another way of carrying out the task might have been preferable.

The art teacher may be concerned that too much interaction during the lesson may result in disruption of the learning process. However, Brophy and Good (1986) found a positive correlation between the amount of teacher/student interaction and the amount of learning that took place.

Stockrocki's (1990) descriptions of preadolescent classrooms, the product of eight participant observation studies and cross-site analysis, focus on the social aspects of the classroom and the relationship between teacher and student. In view of the problems in preadolescent classrooms stemming from conflicts among students, subversive tactics by students, debates over student-teacher expectations and other challenges to authority, Stockrocki recommended management and motivation by means of interactive role-playing and art appreciation, teamwork, and co-operative planning with students. To deal with instructional problems, it was recommended that
teachers be firm, organized and compassionate. Appraisal of the art-work of adolescents should be individual and in-process in order to avoid public embarrassment. With regard to the study as a whole, Stockrocki drew attention to "the large number of qualitative variables which affect practice in art education programs for preadolescents" (p. 116).

G. Peer Interaction

Piaget (1959) contends that peer interaction reduces egocentrism and enhances intellectual growth, and that discussion between children plays a role in cognitive development. He proposes that the question of social interaction increases as children become more logical. Moreover, Bruner and Bornstein (1989) are of the view that although adults may be better able than peers to help children learn skills and knowledge in the course of interaction, the type of verbal interchange that seems influential in changing perspectives is more likely to occur through peer interaction.

The results of a study of interaction among children in four pre-school kindergarten art classes conducted by Thompson and Bales (1991) contradicted the Piagetian view that children under the age of seven derive little benefit from the presence of peers. The study involved the observation of weekly meetings of four pre-kindergarten classes, a total of 56 children, over the course of an academic year. Conversation was rare among the children, as verbal exchanges usually took the form of a comment, followed by a question and response. Thompson and Bales found that the language of the children could be divided into four categories: representational language, used to give information about events and situations; directive language, used to direct the actions of the self and others; heuristic language, used to seek information; and interactional language, used to initiate, maintain or terminate social
relationships. Among themselves, the children favoured representational and interactional language, interspersed with a few directive comments. Personal and heuristic language was used solely for talking with adults. Egocentric speech "appeared to provide impetus and direction to social interaction", and when resulting from "problems and possibilities in a particular work, tended to elicit relevant responses" (p. 46) from other children. It was noted that the children commented freely on each other's work, expressing their admiration without restraint. While exchanging ideas and discovering shared interests, the children built communities within the class. It was also found that they participated in modest forms of collaborative learning and peer tutoring. The results of this study are in contradiction to the Piaget's (1974) view that children under the age of seven derive little benefit from the presence of peers, a view that had provided support for concentrating on individualized and exploratory learning for children of this age group.

Another study of peer interaction extending to 230 children of ages five, seven and ten involved the observation of children's glances at peers' work. It was found that in grade one, children tend to compare ability, even in a non-competitive setting (Butler, 1989). Other studies of peer influence on children's artistic development have found that children learn to draw forms from each other (Wilson & Wilson, 1982), and that pre-school children working with clay and styrofoam pieces imitate each other's actions and adapt them for their own purposes (Sherman, 1984).

One art educator concluded from an extensive analysis of research in the area of peer communication and/or interaction in the classroom that where a teacher's structure for lessons allows extensive peer interaction, learning in such lessons develops primarily through peer conversations (Taunton, 1987). A more recent study (Kakas, 1986) examined how three different feedback
mechanisms and three different drawing approaches influenced peer interaction among fifth-grade students and their communications with the researcher-teacher during drawing lessons. Analysis of video and audio tapes of the drawing time during each session resulted in a compilation of categories of talk that took place among them and the researcher/teacher. It was suggested from the findings that frequency of different types of talk is influenced by the form of teacher feedback, the drawing approaches used in the lesson and other contextual factors. It was recommended that teachers consider the potential educational benefits of spontaneous peer interaction, because "knowledge of these forms can guide them to reflect on their own talk with students and to weigh the benefits of peer conversations and student interaction with the teacher" (p. 239). As the Kakas study recorded the peer interaction of students at only the grade five level, data compiled in the present study may extend this research by providing a means of comparison with peer interaction of other age groups.

Not all researchers have found that peer interaction is a positive force in the learning process. A study of grade seven classes using data from drawing test scores, teacher observations, student evaluations and drawing surveys indicates that talking among peers in the classroom may inhibit the process of visual thinking and retard the acquisition of specific concepts and drawing skills (Bevis, 1982). On the other hand, Johnson (1981) found that peer interaction has a constructive impact on learning if it is characterized by acceptance, support, and liking. Teachers can directly affect the quality of peer interaction by the manner in which they structure learning goals and the way they encourage and manage controversies. A co-operative goal structure is most effective in promoting supportive peer relationships. Moreover, McLaughlin (1987) concluded from a study of fifth and sixth graders who completed
questionnaires administered by their teachers, that peers provide significant aid to one another in helping to cope with the stresses and problems typical of the preadolescent period. Children also vie for friendships, peer recognition and acceptance in their classroom performances, and set their educational and achievement goals according to what their peer culture values.

H. Environment to be Established for Appropriate Interaction

Kindler's (1993) recommendations that a classroom environment must be structured in a manner that is sensitive to the learning styles of all students have been discussed in section B of this Chapter. Other art educators have also concerned themselves with aspects of classroom conduct that are instrumental to the establishment of an environment conducive to learning.

Dixon and Chalmers (1990) state that one of the most effective ways to develop perception and aesthetic awareness is to promote significant discussion, and to facilitate discussion by providing an adequate vocabulary that children can use to talk about the arts. Emphasis should not be placed on the end result and opportunities should be provided for other types of involvement, such as time for individual observation and reflection. However, Dixon and Chalmers recommend that when talking with children about the arts, teachers should avoid having a fixed point of view and "trying to elicit a predetermined response, practices that inhibit children's spontaneous and personal reactions" (p. 16). Sparling and Sparling (1983) emphasize that, in fulfilling their instrumental role in establishing the appropriate learning, teachers should leave their opinions and observations entirely open for challenge or rebuttal. They refer to this opportunity as the fair play necessary for classroom environmental safety.
I. Amount of Art-related Conversation During Art Lessons

In spite of much talk on the desirability of art-focused interaction, it should be noted that, in a study by Szekely (1982) of 27 grades five, six and seven art classes held by nine different teachers, 68 percent of classroom conversation was non art-related. There was very little conversation on the creative process, discussion of students' work, or on ideas or reactions to art experiences. Moreover, there were seldom adequate explanations or reasons given for the purpose of the lessons, such as how they related to the students or how the students might contribute to them. As the present study involves exemplary art teachers, rather than non-specialist teachers chosen at random, it might be useful to compare findings to those of the Szekely study with regard to the content of classroom discussion and the kind of environment created to facilitate the art-making process.

J. Summary

The literature presented in this Chapter has been compiled in an attempt to reveal the complexities of classroom life. From the teacher's perspective, decision-making must encompass aspects of teaching approaches (whether directive or non-directive), questioning practices, and feedback techniques, including positive reinforcement. Beyond the form and content of these verbal strategies, teachers are compelled to consider matters of timing and amount of interaction. Although it is essential for a teacher to be able to dissect instruction into its various components, and to make decisions on appropriate strategies for them, the ability to focus on the creation of a classroom environment in which maximum learning can take place is also extremely important. Enveloped in this concern is consideration of and planning for student questioning, which may be unknowingly inhibited in many circumstances, and peer interaction,
considered by some researchers to be more influential in the learning process than teacher/student interaction. The recommendations and findings of the researchers and art educators presented in this Chapter, reveal the intricacies and multi-faceted nature of the art teaching/learning experience.
CHAPTER III
CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

A. Introduction

This Chapter provides a description of the methods used to collect information, the classroom settings and the participants in the study. Three major categories that emerge from the data collected are identified, and means by which the data from this study may be compared with existing material are presented. Two comparison instruments, developed by Clements (1964) and Kakas (1986) respectively, are delineated. Issues of validity and reliability are discussed.

B. Appropriateness of Research Methodology

A study focusing on the interactions occurring during the process of instruction and the process of drawing warrants the selection of a method best suited to the study of process. Guba (1978) asserts that the study of process is most effective when observed directly "rather than to infer its nature from the known input and the observed output" (p. 25), as would be the case when incorporating an experimental design. Wilson (1979) reiterates the appropriateness of this choice of qualitative research by insisting that the methodologies associated with participant observation offer a suitable match with the complexity of phenomena associated with the art classroom. Numerous art educators are in agreement with the choice of descriptive techniques for use in the study of the school art teaching/learning setting (Alexander, 1981; Chalmers, 1981; Degge, 1983; Eisner, 1981; Ettinger, 1987; MacGregor & Hawke, 1982; Sevigny, 1981).
C. Research Methodology

Naturalistic research was employed using descriptive research techniques.

Observations were made of regularly scheduled art classes, nine each at the second, fourth, and sixth grade levels, amounting to a total of 27 lessons observed. Observational focus was on the interaction that occurred during drawing lessons between the teacher and student, and as far as possible, among the students themselves. Field notes collected by the researcher included descriptions of both verbal and non-verbal interactions. Small tape recorders were worn by both teacher and researcher to record all dialogue between teacher and students and between researcher and students to provide an accurate and detailed account of verbal interactions. Dialogue between students that occurred within close proximity to the teacher or researcher during the lesson was also recorded.

Although the study was primarily qualitative, the inclusion of some quantitative measures was intended to strengthen the design. An instrument was designed (see Appendix A) to tabulate frequencies of interaction between teacher and student. The instrument was also used to record the parties responsible for initiating interactions. It was field tested by the researcher prior to the study. The quantitative information served to bolster the in-depth descriptions that made up the bulk of the research. A more comprehensive view of the teaching/learning situation was permitted since the frequency count, that could not be obtained in any other way, provided a valuable insight into the intentions of all parties involved in interaction.

Each teacher was interviewed formally prior to the observations. Informal post-observation interviews and discussions with teachers and students were recorded through field notes and audio recordings.
D. Subjects and Subject Selection

The study chose to look at exemplary models of teaching to learn not only what takes place in a drawing class, but how an experienced art teacher approaches and responds to interactions with students and between students that may occur during the progress of the class. The selection of the four teachers for the study was based on the

a. recommendations of a District Art Supervisor
b. willingness of the teachers to become involved in the study
c. regular inclusion of drawing in the curriculum of each teacher

All four teachers were art specialists with between three and seven years of teaching experience in the classroom. All had undergraduate degrees in Fine Arts prior to becoming teachers.

As a result of the decision to observe these four teachers, a student population consisting of nine intact classes was provided.

E. Description of Teaching Settings

The study took place in two school districts in the greater metropolitan area of Boston. Both were culturally diverse and encompassed lower middle to upper income groups. Teachers A, B, and D taught in three different elementary schools located in a large suburban school district. Each teacher was permanently located in a classroom intended solely for the teaching of art. Although the arrangement of furniture varied in the three classrooms, all had large work tables which were shared by a number of students. The walls of the artrooms were covered in displays of children's artwork.

Teacher C was located in an elementary school in a nearby suburban district. She was employed as the art specialist and moved from classroom to classroom with materials in order to teach art. Students sat at individual desks,
although Teacher D did rearrange the desks on one occasion to create large work areas for groups of students. A small amount of artwork was on display on the walls of the classroom among displays of work from other subject areas.

F. Procedures

i. Preparation for the Study

The proposal for the study was described in detail to a prominent art educator and supervisor in a Boston suburban school district. Formal written application was made to a supervisory panel responsible for research within the district, and permission to conduct the study was granted. Recommendations were made by the district art supervisor for three possible teacher/informants within the district. A fourth teacher was recruited after an oral presentation of the research proposal to a group of art educators called "The Drawing Group." Formal written application was made to the director of personnel for approval to carry out the study in the suburban district that employed this teacher. Permission was granted.

A meeting was conducted with each teacher prior to observations to discuss procedural requirements of the study and a possible time frame for observations which would coincide with the regularly scheduled teaching of drawing. Each teacher was provided with a teacher consent form (see Appendix B), the interview schedule (see Appendix C), and a date within a week of the first meeting was set for the interview.

At the time of the interview, parental consent forms (see Appendix D) were provided for distribution to the students involved in the study. The teachers handing out the consent forms described the study briefly as "an opportunity for another teacher to observe what is occurring in the classroom during drawing lessons". Immediately prior to the first observation session,
students were introduced to the researcher and the purpose of the study was reviewed.

ii. Data Collection

Both teacher and researcher wore small tape recorders. This enabled the researcher to obtain an accurate record of discourse occurring during the lesson while remaining free to complete the interaction inventory of tallies and cryptic notes that would later be translated into more detailed field notes. Teachers explained to their students that the purpose of the tape recorder was to obtain an accurate record of what was said during the progress of the lesson and during informal discussions between students and researcher preceding or following the observed lesson.

While trying to remain as unobtrusive a presence as possible, the researcher was positioned in close proximity to students and, whenever possible, with an unobstructed view of the entire class. Occasionally the researcher changed position to accommodate better observation in response to changes in student positioning.

Although this occurred infrequently, students at times sought interaction with the researcher during the lesson. They periodically volunteered or were occasionally asked by the researcher to take part in an informal discussion following the lesson. Informal discussions with teachers regarding their perceptions of the progression of the lesson followed the lesson when time permitted.

Photographs were taken during the last lesson to provide a visual record of the setting and participants in the study. Following each lesson, examples of student artwork were copied or photographed to provide the researcher with additional information as to the extent of implementation of teacher suggestions that was taking place. Teachers received transcripts of their interview
responses and were asked to provide further clarification or correction where necessary.

G. Instrumentation

Topics examined in the field of art education have rarely replicated or extended the research of others (Packard, 1984). In an attempt to rectify what Packard considers to be a shortcoming of the field, two instruments were used that had been constructed to measure the questioning practices of teachers and the contents of peer interaction during drawing lessons. The data collected enabled a comparative analysis of the results of the present study with the results of the studies for which the instruments were originally designed.

Researcher developed tools were also used in data collection. These included an observation instrument designed to enable efficient recording of initiators of interactions and two interview schedules constructed to guide teacher and student interviews.

i. Interaction Initiators: An Observation Instrument

An instrument was devised to enhance the efficiency of information accumulation during observations (see Appendix A). It was field tested in a school district in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and then revised to improve its efficacy. This pilot run also afforded the researcher an opportunity to become more comfortable with the use of the instrument prior to the actual study. The instrument was designed to record the frequency of interactions that took place during each lesson as well as the initiator of the interaction, whether student or teacher. Space was allotted for written recording of key words used by subjects to enable a linkage with audio recordings. As well, a limited space was provided for observational notes that might include relevant non-verbal
communication, or queries that arose within the lesson that might later be directed to the teacher or become the focus of future observations.

ii. **Interview Schedules**

Two interview schedules were created. The teacher interview schedule (see Appendix C) was used during a formal interview session preceding the lesson observations. It consisted of two parts. The first was intended to reveal background information about each teacher pertaining to training, personal drawing experiences and the extent of teaching experience. The second section dealt with the actual teaching of art and focused on planning, performance expectations of the teacher and thought processes behind aspects of the drawing lesson such as dialogue and student interaction during the learning process. The student interview schedule (see Appendix E) contained possible questions to be used during informal interviews or discussions following each lesson observed. The questions were designed to reveal student ideas and beliefs about the nature of teacher designed drawing tasks, the kind of help they desire from teachers and peers, and insights into aspects of peer talk, reasons for it and meaning behind commonly used students' statements.

iii. **Clements' Questioning Typology**

Clements (1964) used student-teacher protocols to generate categories of questions asked in the teaching of art. The ten categories formulated provided a framework for classification of all teacher-posed questions found on transcripts of verbal interaction occurring during drawing lessons.

*Type 1 Past experience questions.* This question type, considered by Lowenfeld (1947) to be a key instrument of motivation, is used widely.
Examples of this kind of question included "How did it feel? What did you see?".

**Type 2 Present experience questions.** Present experience questions are characterised by immediate visual or emotional experiencing followed by representation of the experience. They are concerned with how something seems, looks or feels. Clements refers to the questions of Nicolaides during gesture drawing as examples of present experience questions. "Do they spread like bursts of flame from a skyrocket, or do they fall down, dropping like water?" (Nicolaides cited in Clements, 1964, p. 16).

**Type 3 Rule questions.** Rule questions are used as reminders of previously discussed techniques, rules or principles. Examples may include such questions as "How do we do this?" or "What is our rule for this?".

**Type 4 Planning questions.** The purpose of planning questions is to urge the student to clarify ideas and techniques in advance. Allusion on the part of the teacher to both process and product helps to structure the prior experience for the student in readiness for problems that may occur or steps that might otherwise be overlooked. Examples include questions such as "Where will you go from here?" or "If this happens, what will you do?".

**Type 5 Opening questions.** Opening questions inform the teacher about the student's progress and allow the teacher to become familiar with the student's artwork and problems a student may be encountering. They are the first questions asked upon approaching a student and include questions such as "Can you tell me about your drawing?" or "What are you working toward?".

**Type 6 Identification questions.** Identification questions are used for the teacher to determine what represented images are or where they should be. Clements sees an additional purpose in their use. He suggests that teachers use such questions to point out weaknesses, ambiguities or omissions.
Examples include questions such as "What is this supposed to be?" or "Where are its ears?".

**Type 7 Suggestion-order questions.** Clements described this question type as a "pseudo-question" because of its actual intent to give a suggestion or order to the student. Although admitting that its purpose may be valid, Clements finds fault with its deceitful form and suggests to readers that a more direct approach would be more effective. Examples include "Why don't you put some red over here?" or "Why don't you use freer lines?".

**Type 8 Acceptance questions.** Acceptance questions are usually asked following a set of directions or an explanation given by the teacher. They are intended to be a way of affirming that the student has understood what the teacher has said or of determining the intent of the student to carry out the teacher's suggestion. Examples include questions such as "Do you know what I mean?" or "Okay?".

**Type 9 Process recall questions.** These questions encourage the student to recall the creative process that led to the final product. The teacher is searching for a verbalization of the student's intuitive feelings and the decisions made during the creative experience. Clements refers to Beittel's (1979) confirmation of the value of process recall training to the art-making process. Questions of this type include "Did you have a clear idea of how to cope with this difficulty when you encountered it?".

**Type 10 Product judgement questions.** Product judgement questions call for the evaluation of the final product or aspects of the final product by the student. This type of question assumes that self-criticism will enable the student to determine problems to be faced and future direction to be taken with respect to personal artistic growth. An example of a product judgement question might be "How do you feel about the composition?".
iv. **Kakas’ Peer Interaction Typology**

Kakas developed a seventeen category inventory as a means of coding peer interaction, both verbal and non-verbal, that occurred during drawing lessons. The categories are discussed in order of overall frequency of occurrence beginning with the most prevalent.

**Type 1 Talk about self’s picture.** The statements that fell into this category were non evaluative and referred to aspects of a subject's picture such as a detailed account of planning strategies for content or descriptions of what had been completed in the subject's drawing to that point.

**Type 2 Comment on subject.** Students often commented on the subject matter during peer conversations. Comments included reference to visual details of an object, inquiries about the possible history of an object or background information that might help a student in the planning of a drawing from imagination.

**Type 3 Teacher bid.** Students frequently placed themselves in an advisory role, giving suggestions or information to peers.

**Type 4 Evaluation of others.** Evaluative statements, usually affirmative in nature, were a means of demonstrating support for peers. They were often made to contradict self-effacing comments about artwork.

**Type 5 Show picture to others.** Both verbal and non-verbal signals initiated this action. Students found some means of attracting the attention of peers so that another's picture could be viewed or the student's picture could be shared with others. Signals included calling a peer's name, placing the drawing in convenient viewing position of an intended audience or directly asking a peer to look at the drawing.

**Type 6 Comment on peer’s picture.** Included in this category were non evaluative statements about a peer's picture.
Type 7 Question peer about his/her picture. Students at times inquired about aspects of another's drawing.

Type 8 Evaluation of self. Comments, usually negative in orientation, were made by subjects in assessing their own drawings. These ranged from statements describing disappointing or frustrating details of a drawing to more general complaints about their lack of ability.

Type 9 Talk related to materials. Remarks about drawing instruments and paper were made between peers.

Type 10 Ask peer for opinion. Students turned to peers for opinions about content details of pictures or asked for a general assessment of the drawing.

Type 11 Frustration gesture. Behaviours in this category were both verbal and non-verbal and demonstrated students' frustration with aspects of the task, their dissatisfaction with what they had drawn or impatience with unfamiliar drawing instruments. Disparaging comments, negative facial expression, crumpling of paper or scribbling over a drawing in anger were examples of the intense frustration felt by students.

Type 12 Look at another's picture. Behaviours in this category were non-verbal and were both solicited and unsolicited. Students viewed the picture of a peer when asked to do so but also when experiencing a creative block at the onset of a task. Insecurity prompted regular viewing of peers' drawings by some. Products by those considered gifted by their peers were the focus of much of the unsolicited viewing, although proximity was also an important factor in the choice of products viewed by students.

Type 13 Management. Students monitored each other's behaviour on occasion. Statements in this category were often commanding in form and tone. Some students were more comfortable in this role than others.
Comments referred to talking behaviours during work time, proper treatment of materials, time management and following directions properly.

**Type 14. Supportive comments.** Supportive comments were made in reaction to a peer's self-effacing remarks or frustration gestures associated with the drawing task. Students reassured peers that others were experiencing the same difficulties.

**Type 15. Learner bid.** Students sometimes made statements indicating a need for assistance. These were formulated indirectly using statements that alerted those around them that they were struggling with one aspect of the task. Direct requests for assistance were also made to students in close proximity.

**Type 16. Comment on difficulty of task.** Students made comments with reference to task difficulty or they compared the difficulty of the task with that of a previous one.

**Type 17. Procedural statements.** Statements between students referring to components of the task or the degree of completion of the task were categorized as procedural statements.

**H. Validity and Reliability**

Validity was enhanced through triangulation (Denzin, 1978) of data sources and collection procedures. Interviews of both teachers and students, tabulation of frequencies and initiators of interactions, field notes and audio tapes of verbal interaction were combined to enable a detailed descriptive account of the nature of the elementary drawing class at three levels. Multiple instruments used in data analysis also strengthened the internal validity of the study. Audio recordings of both interviews and lesson dialogue improved accuracy of data collection and thus increased reliability of data.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

The primary focus of this study was on interaction, defined in this context as "all manner of behaviour in which individuals and groups act upon each other" (Simpson & Galbo, 1986, p. 46). "Non-verbal" aspects of communication such as facial expressions, non-verbal signalling, seating arrangements and positioning of subjects relative to others as well as classroom organization and decoration were documented. These helped to form conceptions of the workings of the classroom environment. Through observations (cryptic notes made on the observation instrument) and reflections (field notes written immediately after lesson observations), a foundation for understanding of the "taken-for granted" realities of the drawing class was constructed.

Talk in interaction is considered by Schlegoff (1987) to be the focus of much of our communicative activity. Dialogue captured on audio tapes was therefore seen to be the resource "gem" of information. Reminiscent of an uncut stone offering a new view with each cut, each reflecting the light in a slightly different manner, episodes of dialogue provided the material for most of the analysis done in this study.

The analysis will be reported in three main sections. The first will deal strictly with an account of the initiators of the interactions, whether teacher or student. The second will focus on teacher discourse analysis. In this section teacher questioning methods will be investigated using an instrument developed by Clements to analyze student-teacher questioning practices, followed by a discussion of the findings of an analysis of teacher dialoguing strategies according to an eleven category typology devised by the researcher.
The final section will be concerned with peer interaction. It will focus on the quantity of interaction occurring between peers and will describe the results of a content analysis of peer interaction through the use of Kakas' Peer Interaction Typology.

Analysis was concurrent with data collection, although formalized, expanded and refined upon completion of the study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Tape recorded interviews and lesson dialogues were transcribed in full by the researcher so that subtleties of meaning such as tone of voice, pauses, and hesitation were captured. Bogdan and Biklen stress that "capturing the punctuation that gets at the meaning of what is heard is especially difficult" (p. 96) while Wilkinson (1983) suggests that a transcription is not sufficient for analysis without the tape recorded details of talk. Familiarity with the tape itself, the most accurate rendition of what has occurred, is recommended by both researchers. The transcription exercise had the additional advantage of thoroughly familiarizing the researcher with its discourse content.

B. Initiators of Interactions: Teacher or Student?

Tabulations of initiators of teacher/student interactions were made during observation sessions using an instrument designed by the researcher for this study (see Appendix A). Interaction was solicited by the student through a number of techniques that ranged from overt verbal requests for assistance and hand raising, to more covert means such as facial expressions signalling distress, with the teacher as the intended receiver of the unspoken communication. Teacher initiations were most often verbal cues, although positioning in close proximity to the student often preceded verbal interaction.
Findings. The number of teacher initiated interactions exceeded student initiated interactions overall although the discrepancy was not substantial (see Figure 1). When patterns of initiation across teachers were considered, it was found that in all but one case, teacher initiations exceeded student initiations.

Percentage Distribution of Initiators of Interactions by Teacher

Teacher B was the exception, as in her case student initiations exceeded teacher initiations by a slight margin of two percentage points. The ratio of teacher to student initiated interactions was similar across Teachers A and C but the difference between teacher and student initiated interactions with respect to Teacher D was more pronounced, with the teacher initiating sixty-nine percent of all interactions that occurred between teacher and student. However, the fact that Teacher D taught only grade six may have had a bearing on the large differential between student and teacher initiations. When considering patterns of initiators across grades, it is apparent that with increasing age there emerged a distinct pattern of increasing teacher initiated interactions coupled with declining student initiated interactions (see Figure 2).
In spite of a general trend across the grades, lesson by lesson analysis pointed to the unpredictable nature of interaction initiation between teacher and student in both amount and ratio.

![Percentage Distribution of Initiators of Interactions by Grade](image)

**Figure 2**

C. Teacher Discourse Analysis

i. Teacher Questioning

Analysis of teacher questions was completed using an instrument developed by Clements to categorize student-teacher questions. In this section the overall findings are reported, followed by an analysis of the data across grades and teachers. General findings are compared with those of the Clements' study. The results of a comparative analysis of three question types across two different grades are reported.

**Findings.** Present experience and planning questions were the most frequently occurring questions in this study (see Figure 3). These were followed by process recall, acceptance, and past experience questions. Rule and product judgement questions were seldom used, while suggestion order and
opening questions occurred infrequently. Figure 4 clearly shows that there does exist a general consistency of questioning practices across the grades.

![Teacher Questioning Across Grades](image)

Figure 3

However, with the isolation of class four questioning practices, it becomes apparent that inconsistencies exist with respect to the use of three question types. Teachers used planning and process recall questions more often with grade four students and the proportion of identification questions used is relatively large considering the frequency of its use in the other two grades.

Calculations of the percentage of occurrence of each question type by teacher revealed that there were similar questioning styles across the four teachers (See Figure 5). Past experience and planning questions comprised the majority of all questions asked while rule, suggestion/order and product judgement were the least preferred. However, there were teachers who turned to particular question types more often than their colleagues in the study.
Teacher C used significantly more past experience questions. Teacher D relied most heavily on planning questions and Teacher B used more identification and acceptance questions than her counterparts.

**Teacher Questioning Across Grades**

![Figure 4](image)

The results of Clements' study of the questioning practices of student-teachers were compared with the findings of this study. Figure 6 attests to a wide discrepancy between the most commonly used question types of student-teachers and those of the experienced teachers in this study. The most striking difference appears in the category of experience questions, in which Clements grouped both past and present experience type questions. The teachers in this study used these far more often than Clements' subjects did. Planning questions were also more frequently a part of the experienced teachers' questioning strategies. In contrast, student-teachers chose suggestion order and product judgement questions types much more often.
**Teacher Questioning Across Teachers**
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**Figure 5**

**Comparison of Teacher Questioning with Clements Study**

![Comparison of Teacher Questioning with Clements Study](image)

**Figure 6**
Clements' comparative analysis of the student-teacher questioning practices used with younger and older students across three question types provided the quantitative data necessary for comparison with similar age groups in this study.

**Comparison of Teacher Questioning at Grade 4 with Clements 4/5**
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*Figure 7*

Figure 7 shows the relationship between the percentage of experience, identification, and judgement questions used in grades four and five by the student-teachers in Clements' study (referred to as the 4/5 level) with that of teachers of grade four students involved in this study. Comparisons of questioning practices used with students between grades six and nine in the Clements' study (referred to as the 6/9 level) are made with students of grade six in the present study (see Figure 8). Similar to the overall findings, with respect to both age groups, the employment of experience questions by teachers in this study far exceeded their employment by the student-teachers of Clements' study. Teachers in this study did not use judgement questions in either grades 4 or 6. However, these were the first choice of student-teachers at both the 4/5 and 6/9 levels. Identification questions played a larger role in the
teaching practices of both student-teachers and teachers when dealing with students at the 4/5 level.

**Comparison of Teacher Questioning at Grade 6 with Clements Grades 6/9**
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**Figure 8**

ii. **Directive vs. Non-directive Questioning**

Clements classified the ten question types in two major categories. Suggestion order, rule, and acceptance questions were considered directive in format while process recall, judgement, planning, experience, and opening questions fell into the non-directive category. Clements found that non-directive questions outnumbered directive by two to one. Similar trends characterized the questioning practices of the teachers in this study although the discrepancy between the two categories is more pronounced, with the non-directive exceeding the directive by a large margin. Although student-teachers chose to use non-directive questions twice as often as directive, they did rely on question types in the directive category much more often than the teachers did. The contrasting findings of the two studies may be attributable to the differing levels of teaching experience between the two sets of subjects.
iii. **Teacher Dialoguing Strategies**

Isolation of teacher questions from teacher/student dialogue enabled categorization according to Clements' ten distinct question types. However, teacher talk consisted of more than questions and isolation of them does not give a complete understanding of the intentions behind them or what student talk or behaviour instigated them. Further, Clements' suggestion that a valuable follow-up to this research might be the investigation of how students respond to teacher questioning assumes that influence flows mainly in one direction, from teacher to student. However, Woolfolk (1985) is of the view that the reciprocal influence is more likely to characterize classroom exchanges between teacher and student. For this reason, how teachers responded to student requests for help seems also to be a necessary focus of analysis.

Analysis of all teacher dialogue was made with the intended purpose of deciphering the motivation of the teacher while placing it in the context of student/teacher interaction. It was evident that all four teachers had developed spontaneous and fluid dialoguing techniques to accommodate student needs incorporating their own style, while remaining true to a well-developed philosophy of art teaching. Teacher dialoguing strategies fell into eleven different categories:

**Type 1 Encouraging.** Remarks made with the intention of encouraging the student were the third most frequently occurring strategies used overall (see Figure 9). Examples include statements such as "Oh, that's an interesting way of looking at it!" or "I love how Matt is working. He is working so hard, looking so carefully." Grade two students received more encouragement than students in the other two grades.
Teacher Dialoguing Strategies Across Grades

Figure 9

Type 2. Reinforcing. Teachers used the strategy of reinforcement regularly. It is ranked fourth in frequency of occurrence. Reinforcing remarks served to promote continued use of a technique or behaviour that the student was demonstrating. Questions or comments in this category were most often preceded by an encouraging comment. Examples include "You've figured out how to make three different kinds of colours with the charcoal, huh? and "I can see that he is really inspecting that dinosaur and concentrating!". Reinforcing remarks appear to be used less often with increasing age.

Type 3. Redirecting. All four teachers practised a strategy of redirecting the question or problem back to the student. This was done only under circumstances where it was apparent that the student's confidence was not noticeably shaken by the problem being faced. Its use was subtle and, as with
the strategy of reinforcement, it appeared to be negatively related to the increasing age of the students. However, the number of occurrences attest to its importance as a dialoguing strategy for the teachers involved in the study.

Examples of student/teacher dialogue using redirecting strategies include:

S Should I add something here?
T What do you think?
S Yeah.
T Then that is the answer.

and Teacher A's comment and question, "So, that didn't work. What's a better way to solve that problem?".

**Type 4 Promoting/Extending.** Teachers used this tactic as a means of extending the child's skills. Through questions and statements made by the teacher, students were prompted to include more detail in drawings or to extend imaginative aspects of the product. This strategy was used with students during moments when they were not experiencing frustration with the drawing task. Teacher C used this strategy to urge a child to add more detail to a drawing depicting life on an imaginary planet.

S Look at my craters!
T Good! And where would the people be?
S (reflects for a moment) They'll be coming out of the craters.

Teacher talk using this strategy was often directive in nature. It was the second most commonly used dialoguing strategy at the grade two and six levels. Although utilized less frequently in grade four, it still ranked third among the eleven strategies used by teachers during teacher/student interaction.

**Type 5 Providing Choices.** The most frequently occurring dialoguing strategy used at all grade levels was to provide a choice. Teachers used this type of dialogue to ease students through times of frustration when technical
problems arose that were beyond the skill level of the student or had not yet been encountered by the student, and on those occasions when the student was searching for an imaginative idea to begin a drawing. When combined in a list of possible alternatives, directive statements such as "You might try a different view" became less directive. Although guidance had been provided, the ultimate decision as to the next step to be taken remained in the hands of the child. One might infer that the child's decision could be loosely based on one or more of the ideas presented by the teacher, but the decision not to incorporate any of the suggestions was also an acceptable alternative. The teacher presented ideas for consideration and then moved away, allowing the child the time and freedom to make choices based on individual needs, abilities and interests. This strategy also took the form of a list of questions. Teacher C used this technique to initiate ideas to help a child begin a drawing of an imaginary place. "Would it be dark or light? Would you be able to see other life forms? What modes of transportation might they use? What kind of vegetation might there be?"

**Type 6 Troubleshooting.** Through questioning techniques and comments aimed at breaking down the task, the teacher sought to subtly orient the students toward the location and understanding of problematic aspects of the drawing task. Teacher A chose to help define the child's problem.

T | This is hard.
---|---
S | Why is it hard?
T | I just can't get the handlebars right.
S | What do you mean?
T | They won't twist back again.

This troubleshooting strategy occurred three times more often in grade six (see Figure 9). However, because Teacher D, who taught only grade six in this study
used this strategy extensively (see Figure 10), Figure 9, which indicates that this strategy was used more frequently with all grade six classes, is misleading. Teachers A and B used the strategy infrequently.

Teacher Dialoguing Strategies Across Teachers
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Figure 10

**Type 7 Monitoring.** To maintain contact with students who were less forthcoming, teachers sometimes made efforts to initiate dialogue to determine if help was needed that had not been sought by the student. Teachers A and D approached students directly with questions like, "Matthew, how's your drawing coming?" and "Okay, what are we doing here?". Teacher B chose an indirect means, signalling the student that she was interested in his progress with the statement, "Let's see how Brian is doing."
Type 8 Verifying. Statements of verification were used by the teacher to bolster the confidence of the students. The teacher's comments emphasized what had already been accomplished in the drawing. Teachers A and B used this strategy effectively. "You've used a jagged line to show the ruffled feathers and now you're concentrating on the rough texture of feet by making bumpy lines." "Good, I can tell that his shirt is wrinkly by the way you used folding lines to show its bumpy edges." Statements of verification were made most frequently in grade two and were used to a lesser extent with grade four children, although their use was often frequent enough to be classified as an addition to the art teacher's dialoguing repertoire. The verifying strategy was seldom employed by teachers of grade six art classes.

Type 9 Explaining. Teachers found it necessary to provide explanations of difficulties the students were experiencing when students were too distraught to independently move further. This was most often seen at the grade four level in the classes of Teachers B and C. Statements of explanation included "This is a hard viewpoint to do because you can only see parts", "Okay, it probably looks like an arm there because you haven't made his shoulder come in front of it", or "That round shape? It's hard because it's not really a circle." This strategy only appeared when other strategies had failed to bring the student to an understanding of the reason for the difficulty or a solution to the problem being faced.

Type 10 Legislating. Teachers found themselves in a situation where it was necessary to confirm or alter the expectations of the task. Comments ranged from positive approval to denial of the request to alter procedures or expectations. Teacher A exclaimed, "Sure, you could make a background!" on one occasion but stood firm in her commitment to the choice of drawing implements during a grade four drawing lesson.
S I wish I could use a pencil to make a drawing.

T Well, we're using charcoal today, Eric. Sorry. Another time.

**Type 11 Alerting.** Ranked sixth among the eleven dialoguing strategies used by teachers when working with grade two students, alerting comments made the students aware of possible ensuing challenges to be faced in their drawings. Teacher B used this strategy more often than the other three teachers. Alerting remarks focused the student's attention on technical aspects of the drawing.

T Careful, it's kind of a wavy line.

S There, like that?

T That's it!

In the planning stage of an imaginary drawing, Teacher B alerted the student by saying, "You probably won't see their legs if you decide to do it that way." The student replied, "Yeah, all you would see is their heads and shoulders."

**General Findings.** The dialoguing strategies outlined above were well developed in all four teachers although personal styles tailored the appearance of them through varied vocabulary and manner of presentation. The teachers were adept at reading the cues that signalled the choice of an appropriate strategy. Decisions were based on the teachers' sensitivity to the developmental level of the student, the student's emotional state at the time of the interaction and the requirements of the task. Teachers moved with ease from one dialoguing strategy to another, quickly assessing and reassessing the student's needs, sometimes altering strategies in mid-sentence.

Figure 9 attests to general usage trends. The first six categories, which included encouraging, reinforcing, redirecting, prompting/extend, providing choices and troubleshooting were the most utilized of the eleven strategies overall. However, Figure 10 reflects the tendency for individual teachers to rely
on particular strategies. For example, Teacher D used the troubleshooting strategy predominantly, although her counterparts seldom did. In contrast, Teacher D was less likely to turn to reinforcement, a strategy used most frequently by Teacher A. Teacher C led the others in her use of encouraging remarks but relied most often on the strategy of providing choices, the most frequently used strategy overall. Teacher B's dialoguing techniques were dominated by providing choices but it is noteworthy that remarks categorized as alerting comprised ten percent of Teacher B's dialoguing with students. Its use by Teacher B exceeded that of each of the other teachers by more than two times.

By grouping the eleven strategies according to underlying intentions and placing them on a continuum spanning the least to most directive dialoguing strategies used by the teachers, practice patterns emerge across the grades. The majority of teacher dialogue fell into categories representing a non-directive stance. Prompting/ extending and providing choices were the leading strategies employed overall and can be considered strategies that would be found midway between directive and non-directive in nature. The intention behind these strategies was to prod the students to make choices, to require more of themselves.

These strategies were used least often in the grade four context. The explaining strategy, which falls closer to the directive end of the scale, was a working strategy for grade four but was rarely observed in grades two and six.

Six of the eleven categories were used most often with grade two students. The motivation behind the encouraging, reinforcing and verifying strategies was positive reinforcement and confidence building. These strategies were used more often with grade two students and with increasing age there existed a marked pattern of decline in their use.
Encouraging remarks were the third most frequently used form of dialoguing by the teachers. These remarks were almost always combined with other dialoguing strategies. The practices of the teachers in this study were contrary to the recommendations of Kratochwill, Rush and Kratochwill (1979) that praise should not be accompanied by description, nor should description be followed by praise. Encouraging remarks were used in tandem with descriptive comments from the reinforcing and verifying strategies. Interviews with teachers revealed that this practice was intentional. Like researchers (Austen, 1984; Sparling & Sparling, 1983) who warn that the teacher must "praise specifically" thus avoiding "pat phrases" (Sparling & Sparling, p. 341) that lack sincerity or purpose, three of the four teachers in this study referred directly to the importance of honest praise used in conjunction with descriptive reinforcing statements.

D. Peer Interaction

Peer interaction was analyzed for both quantity and content.

i. Quantity of Peer Interaction

Tabulations of the number of student interactions during each lesson were totalled from data recorded on the Interaction Tabulation Instrument (see Appendix A). Calculations were then made of the total number of peer interactions across teachers and grade levels (see Figure 11). The most striking pattern emerging from this analysis is the substantial drop in amount of peer interaction at the grade four level in relation to peer interaction at both the grade two level and grade six level. These findings are remarkably consistent across teachers at the grade two and four levels. Grade six was an exception, with distinct differences in the total number of peer interactions across teachers. The amount of peer interaction at the grade two and four levels appears to be
dependent to a greater degree on the grade level of the student than on teaching styles.

**Amount of Peer Talk Across Teachers and Grades**

![Bar chart showing the amount of peer talk across different teachers and grades.]

Figure 11

ii. **Content of Peer Interaction Using Kakas' Peer Interaction Typology**

Kakas' fourteen category typology was created in a 1986 study of peer interaction during grade five drawing classes. On the present occasion, peer interaction documented in transcripts of audio recordings of lesson dialogue and field notes of both verbal and non-verbal interactions was studied and categorized according to the fourteen peer interaction behaviours outlined by Kakas. Comparison of results, as shown between Figures 12 and 13, revealed few similarities. The only resemblance between the results of the two studies was that the two most frequently used forms of peer interaction were Comment on Subject and Talk about Self's Picture. Comment on Subject led all categories in frequency of use in Kakas' study followed by Talk About Self's Picture. The reverse was true in this study. No other marked similarities were
apparent between the results of the two studies.

**Kakas' Peer Interaction Typology: Grade 5**
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Reasons for conflicting results could be attributed to grade level differences. The Kakas study focused on grade five students while this study's focus was on the students of grades two, four, and six. Differences in teacher training may have also been a contributing factor. The teachers chosen for this study were trained at universities in the Boston area and all subsequent professional development occurred in Boston area school districts. Similarities in teaching philosophy as revealed in teacher interviews of teachers in this study were marked. Kakas' results were based on a substantially larger number of peer interchanges. The sufficiency of the total number of peer interchanges in this study may be questionable in providing an adequate base
of comparison with the results of the Kakas study, especially in light of the numerous categories used in Kakas' measurement instrument.

Overall Peer Interaction by Kakas' Typology
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iii. Peer Interaction by Three Major Orientations

In an attempt to compensate for the limited number of recorded peer interactions in this study, peer interaction was redefined in terms of three major orientations. These were derived by dividing Kakas' categories into three groups.

The first consisted of those categories dealing with the self or the self's artwork and included comment about self's picture, frustration gestures (when engaged in self's artwork), asking a peer's opinion (about self's artwork), evaluation of self, showing (self's) picture to peers, and learner bid (asking for help with self's picture).
The second group was concerned with the peer or peer's artwork. It included the categories of looking at peer's picture, evaluation of others, teacher bid (tutoring peers), comment on peer's picture, questioning peer about peer's picture, and supportive comments (directed toward peer or peer's picture).

The third group incorporated all categories that were neutral in orientation and were concerned with procedural steps or comments on the task. These included comments on subject, comments on difficulty of task, talk related to materials, management comments, and procedural statements (see Figure 14).

**Peer Interaction by Grade and Orientation**
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**Figure 14**

The results of Kakas' study were analyzed using the same three group orientations and, after conversion of data to percentages, the findings of the
Kakas study were compared with those of the present study (see Figure 15).

**Peer Interaction by Grade and Orientation**
Including Kakas Grade 5

![Bar chart](Figure 15)

The results were much more comparable in this form. The consistency with respect to the percentage of total peer interaction at each grade level was noteworthy. Peer interaction concerned with the self and/or the self's artwork accounted for approximately forty percent of all peer interaction at each grade level. In grades four, five, and six, a pattern of frequency of occurrence of the three orientations was evident. The self orientation was followed by the peer orientation and finally, the neutral orientation. Grade two was the exception, with the neutral and peer orientation equal in percentage of use. Of the four grades, grade two students were the least concerned with peers, although concern with self was not greater than that of the other three grades. More of grade two interactions dealt with procedural talk, talk about materials and other
categories under the neutral orientation grouping. It is noteworthy that grade four students used the peer orientation more frequently than students in the other three grades.

iv. Off-task Peer Talk

Of the 1111 recorded peer interactions, only 8 were considered "off task." However, in the Szekely study (1982), it was determined that a large percentage of peer talk was not associated with the art task. This is a profound contradiction. A reason for this may be the difference between teaching styles and practices of the exemplary teachers of this study, in contrast to those in Szekely's study, where teaching subjects were chosen because of availability or willingness to participate in the study. It is also possible that, as not all student dialogue was captured, the comments recorded in either study may not be representative of overall peer talk.
CHAPTER V
THE LIFE-WORLD OF THE CLASSROOM

A. Introduction

While for the purposes of analysis it has been important to break what occurs in the classroom into its constituent parts, there is an organic unity within the classroom that can only be appreciated when viewed holistically: as experience, rather than analysis. In this Chapter descriptions are presented of the varied and changing roles played by both teachers and students during the drawing lesson. General descriptions of lesson dialogue are provided, with reference to both teacher and student dialogue, as well as a discussion of themes that emerged from recorded peer dialogue. The lesson formats used by teachers in the study are described. The sharing of artwork through formal and informal means is discussed, as well as its importance in relation to student learning. Teacher influences on process and product and student recognition of such are covered. Finally, characteristics of the preadolescent as observed in individual students are noted.

B. The Shifting of Roles

i. Student Role-playing

Interactional dialogue that occurred between students during the art-making portions of the lessons allowed one a privileged view into the changing roles of the players in the lesson drama. Students assumed multiple roles depending on their assessment of their own needs and/or the needs of others: a desire to become agents providing support and direction, or a desire to maintain a high social profile within their peer group. Role changes were preceded by peer dialogue, sometimes directed toward each other, sometimes
with another intended audience. Students changed roles frequently, moving freely between artist, critic, tutor, supporter, and learner.

However, just as teachers demonstrated individual preferences in their choice of dialogue strategies, so did students appear to prefer one role over another. Those struggling with confidence in their drawing abilities often found themselves in the role of learner, seeking advice from peers or teacher each step of the way, while students considered "talented" moved more freely between the various roles, most often fluctuating between those of tutor and supporter of peers.

Preoccupation with a particular role was also a question of personality type. Matthew, a grade two student, dominated peer talk at his table. As a critic, he readily volunteered critical analyses of peers' artwork, confidently offered unsolicited advice and abruptly accused peers of copying his ideas. His manner was intense and his teacher's recognition of this was apparent in the concern she showed for protecting another student who was the latest target of his attention.

S-S Hey, that looks like my idea. Is that the skill saw? It doesn't look like the skill saw. You messed up!

T Matthew, whose drawing is this?

S It's his.

T Whose drawing should you be concerning yourself with?

S Mine.

T Right, thank you.

Teachers could influence students' movement from role to role. This was sometimes unintentional, but as in the example above, where Teacher A saw a need to move Matthew from the role of critic to that of artist, teachers often
manipulated student role-playing in an effort to provide a healthy learning experience for all.

ii. Role Requirements of Teachers

Teachers' behaviours could also be found to fall into various roles. Ideas for analysis of teacher behaviour in terms of roles came from Gray and MacGregor's (1990) cross-cultural study entitled "Personally Relevant Observations About Art Concepts and Teaching Activities," which revealed that the 74 teachers observed functioned in three major roles or modes: that of a conductor, team captain or consultant. As a conductor, the art teacher orchestrated in depth behind the scenes organization within a multi-staged and multi-faceted lesson, while as a team captain, the art teacher moved from group to group rallying the teams towards artistic ends. In the role of consultant, the teacher responded to the individual needs and concerns of class members.

In this study, it was found that student demands, both explicit and implicit, demonstrated that students also envisaged teachers as functioning in particular roles. Analysis of student/teacher dialogue revealed that students' intentions with respect to the kind of assistance or guidance sought fell into four categories. Students were seeking the direction of a consultant, the opinion of an adjudicator, the clarification of a clarifier and the permission of a legislator. Teachers were called upon to shift roles frequently although certain roles were more characteristic of particular stages in the lesson.

The consultant. Although not always willing to openly entertain suggestions of teachers, students deferred to the knowledge and expertise of the "art consultant" in times of intense frustration. As a consultant, the teacher's role was to provide directives to instantly remedy problems of content and technique. It was apparent that the children respected the skills of the teacher-consultant when encumbered by indecision about what to draw, or when
perplexed by technical difficulties that confounded further progress in the picture-making process.

Although not always explicitly stated, intensity of need was often made evident through frustration gestures and self-effacing or negatively-oriented comments. This need for the teacher to act as consultant was more prevalent in grades four and six, although grade four students were less likely to explicitly state difficulties they were experiencing and to make requests for help in resolving them. Grade two students seldom called upon the teacher.

The adjudicator. When placed in the role of "adjudicator", the teacher was called upon for appraisal. Both in-process and final product evaluation were expected. Linked with the authority granted to pass judgement on the product of a personal endeavour was an unspoken trust that this authority would be exercised in a sensitive and constructive manner. Admiration for the teacher-adjudicator as the ultimate authority in matters of art was evident as students sought the acceptance and approval of the teacher in the form of evaluative statements. Teachers did not comfortably assume this role or the responsibilities associated with it. They instead chose to redirect the responsibility for product judgement back to the student who requested it.

The legislator. The teacher was seen as the authority responsible for formulating the rules and procedures that governed the classroom. Adherence to these class ordinances was strict, and when students sought permission to alter procedures, materials or to redefine the task, they turned to the legislator. Permission to terminate the task was also seen as a responsibility of the legislator.

The clarifier. The role of the teacher-clarifier was to make clear the expectations and parameters of the task as well as to outline procedural steps to be followed during the process of art-making. The student also looked to the
teacher for clarification of perplexing technical problems that arose, which to the child appeared insoluble and seemed to stifle forward movement in the art-making process.

The four metaphoric labels were chosen to exemplify the roles forced upon the teacher by the requirements of the students (see Figure 16).

**Student Requirements of Teacher**

- **Consultant**
  - i. Ideas & content-oriented information
  - ii. Technical (skill-oriented) information

- **Adjudicator**
  - i. Evaluation
  - ii. Approval & Acceptance

- **Legislator**
  - i. To redefine task
  - ii. To alter procedures or materials
  - iii. To terminate or move to next stage

- **Clarifier**
  - i. Parameters / expectations of task
  - ii. Procedures
  - iii. Technical Problems (What's wrong with this?)

Figure 16

The consultant, the adjudicator, the legislator and the clarifier provide four distinct services and yet all fall within the rubric of "facilitators." All are held in
high esteem because of their depth of knowledge. The manner in which their knowledge is imparted is intended to be constructive and enabling, rather than definitive.

C. Dialogue

Teacher dialogue has been analysed in terms of questioning techniques and other dialoguing strategies used to facilitate student learning during the course of the drawing lesson. The contents of this section will be a discussion, more general in nature, of the content and form of both teacher and student dialogue and an outline of various themes that surfaced at all grade levels during the course of the study.

i. Teacher Dialogue

From interview discussions and informal talks following lessons it was evident that the fluidity and spontaneity characteristic of the dialogue of all four teachers was the result of practise and constant reflection. All emphasized the importance of choosing appropriate dialogue sensitive to the developmental levels and emotional states of students. Feedback given to students remained within the realm of the positive, ranging from acceptance to encouragement. There was a conscious focus on providing specific feedback. Teacher A's preoccupation with the appropriate wording of questions and responses to students was evident in her immediate and intense clarification for a student-teacher of the correct approach to talking about a child's artwork. The willingness of the student-teacher to supply a solicited opinion with respect to the relative size of objects in a student's drawing disturbed Teacher A, who warned the student-teacher to refrain from "imposing adult ideas on children's drawings." Her fear was that such impositions would devalue the child's ideas, thus diminishing the incentive of the child. Her recommendation to the student-
teacher was to redirect the question back to the child, so that in doing so, the teacher would be "echoing or validating what the child has done." Like Wertsch (1978) who sees adult guidance as a crucial aspect of the adult-child interaction in the problem-solving inherent to art activities, Teacher A requested that the student-teacher "keep asking questions until the child figured out a solution."

ii. Student Dialogue

Although teachers recognized that some learning did occur as a result of peer dialogue during the drawing lesson, all seemed torn between allowing and restricting student conversation during the art-making process. When questioned about the kinds of things students learn from each other, teachers were hesitant in their responses, admitting that they had not given it a great deal of thought. Teachers did monitor the content and tone of some student talk, usually coming to the defence of another student to soften the blow of blunt criticism or to protect the less confident student from unrelenting and insensitive tutoring of those who were more confident. Teacher A's remarks to Matthew are an example of a protective stance when it was feared that the strength of one student was inhibiting another's opportunity to experiment.

T Matthew, where are you sitting?
S Over there... but I'm helping Kiara.
T (repeats) You're helping Kiara? How are you helping her?
S I'm telling her how to draw...
T (repeats) How to draw? I think Kiara needs to figure that out on her own. You sit down.

Although Teacher A acknowledged the existence and importance of peer talk during the lesson, her message to Matthew was that he was not to interfere with the drawings of his peers. Her resistance to his tutoring stemmed from a concern that his critical comments might have a negative impact on the
confidence or progress of the student whose work was the object of his critiques.

iii. Peer Talk Themes

Field notes and lesson transcripts revealed that a number of peer talk themes were constantly reappearing. These themes straddled all three grade levels, although the frequency of their appearance did fluctuate from level to level.

Theme 1 I'm done!. Some students, particularly at the grade four level, appeared to find it necessary to announce the completion of their work. In a loud voice, with no particular intended audience, the student firmly reported the completion of the artwork. It appeared that there was some status in finishing quickly. Peers did not verbally acknowledge receipt of this information, but frequently glanced at the purveyor of the information while returning to their work with a sense of urgency, only to follow the same practice when their picture was complete.

Theme 2 I messed up!. Students also made it a practice to announce that they had "messed up" in some way. Once again, the responses to such announcements were infrequent or noncommittal grunts of acknowledgement, but this did not seem to alter the regularity of the practice. It continued through all grade levels. However, in saying that they had "messed up," students infused varying degrees of frustration into their voices. A very concerned variation would sometimes instigate supportive, consoling remarks from peers nearby or would alert the teacher in an indirect way that guidance was being sought.

Theme 3 That doesn't look right!. Students at all levels discussed the degree of "realism" they were able to create. However, this escalated
noticeably in the grade six level as repeated comments demonstrated a
constant concern with making images "look right."

Theme 4 You copied me!. Students in grade two were often
preoccupied with guarding their work so that peers would not copy it. Ideas and
images were considered personal property and discussions concerning them
focused on the degree to which an idea or image had been copied. An
argument broke out in one grade two lesson that required mediation by the
teacher because a student had angrily accused a classmate of copying an idea.

S-S Can I see your picture for a sec? You copied mine!
S-S No, I didn’t.
S-S Your hammer is exactly like mine! Your coping saw looks exactly
like mine!
S-S No way. No, they don’t! (angrily)
(After a long silence...)
S-S Well, I didn’t copy your wrench!!

In spite of the fact that all children were drawing the same tools from
observation, aspects of manner of representation of the objects nevertheless
became the personal property of the artist. It was considered cheating to
bypass the difficult step of translating the three-dimensional image onto a two-
dimensional surface by copying the already transferred image of another.
Rather than concede that he had indeed copied, the accused chose a defence
that included reference to the amount he had copied. It appeared that while
copying was unacceptable, the degree to which one copied was also a
concern.

Students sometimes asked for permission to use the ideas of others.
One grade four girl had drawn an imaginary planet with trees emerging from a
spherical form. This appealed to a boy nearby who requested the use of the
idea. "You can use it all but not the trees coming out," she said. She had decided to guard what she considered to be the most original aspect of her drawing.

**Theme 5. How many have you done?.** Quantity of drawings produced was also a concern of grade two students. A lesson in which a number of small sculptures were placed on tables throughout the room prompted a competition between grade two peers to see who had finished the most drawings. Quality seemed irrelevant as students announced their latest score to classmates or inquired about the quantity others had finished. This had not been a teacher set goal but students became so intent on completing observation drawings of all statues that the teacher's recommendation to work slowly and carefully went by unheeded. Quantity ceased to be an important concern in grades four and six.

**Theme 6. Can I erase?.** Students at all levels discussed the whereabouts of the eraser, an important tool in the drawing class. Some teachers played down its importance and tried to encourage experimentation with mark making as opposed to creating the "right strokes." Students asked for permission to erase their work, or suggested to classmates that they erase lines or portions of their drawings. The use of charcoal confounded the habits of some because erasing was no longer an option. Frustration mounted as students complained that they had just ruined a drawing with one wrong stroke that couldn't be erased.

**Theme 7. What can you see from there?.** Students often discussed points of view. Drawings from observation were an obvious source of many comments on the difficulty of certain views or the lack of interest in others. The terminology was not yet a part of grade two repertoire and so they referred to the view indirectly with comments like "From here it's hard," or "This way looks funny," or "I think I could draw it better from that table." With increasing age
came increasing reference to view. Older students referred to their use of view in drawing from imagination as well as observation. An object looked the way it did because the student had intended that the viewer see it from a different angle. "I drew it as if you were looking from above," one student pointed out.

Theme 8. I can't. Students at all grade levels openly discussed their frustrations with either the task or their performance. The phrase "I can't" was frequently a part of dialogue. Used alone, it represented a student's apprehension about beginning a task or the general state of a student's confidence level with respect to drawing. It was also accompanied by phrases outlining exactly what the student saw as the difficulty being faced. Students explained, "I can't get the chin to go up like it's supposed to," or "I can't draw the way that line comes out behind the other one," or "I can't figure out how to make his shirt look squiggly." Although this kind of comment was present at all levels, it did escalate with increasing age.

D. Lesson Format

There was consistency with respect to lesson organization on the part of all four teachers. Lessons consisted of three main sections. The first ten minutes were spent in full class dialogue with the teacher. This section prepared the students for the task. Discussion focused around student ideas for the task, planning strategies with respect to page layout and content, and review of techniques that students had used on previous tasks. New techniques were also introduced at this time, and infrequently demonstrated by the teacher. Students appeared comfortable with the idea of discussing their ideas and sharing planning strategies. In the art rooms, students assembled in a circle around the teacher, creating an atmosphere conducive to participation. In the regular classroom setting of Teacher C, students remained at their desks
for this portion of the lesson. The atmosphere was slightly more constrained but students readily contributed to the discussion.

After a brief description of the procedures to be followed in obtaining the appropriate drawing materials, students moved freely about the room, gathering materials and setting up a working space. The second section of the lesson, the art-making phase, had begun. It was in this section that most of the one on one discussions took place between the teacher and individual students and between peers. The atmosphere in this phase was generally relaxed with the teacher moving about the room constantly in contact with individuals. Some students approached the teachers or signalled with hand raising that they were in need of contact with the teacher; others only responded if approached by the teacher. Proximity usually prompted some form of dialogue between teacher and student, even when unsolicited by the student.

The final section of the lesson followed clean-up of materials. It was usually about ten minutes in duration and consisted of display of student artwork and discussion of the contents of final products and experiences in the use of various techniques. Students in the artrooms moved stools so that a circle could once again be formed. In two artrooms, teachers had the students hold their products in front of them while discussion took place. In the third artroom setting, the teacher displayed students' artwork on a moveable bulletin board. Students in the classroom placed their own artwork temporarily on the chalkboard at the front of the room. Discussion in all settings took the same form. Teachers asked questions regarding the images and techniques used in the art-making process. Questions posed were intended to elicit responses that were non-critical in nature, showing no sign of valuing one particular end product over another.
E. The Sharing of Artwork

i. Formal Teacher-initiated Display of Artwork

The surge of conversation that accompanied display of peer artwork was indicative of students' interest in viewing work of their peers. Initial comments usually took the form of remarks and questions to verify the identity of the artists. "Wow, who did this?" or "Is this your's?" were common. Some students stood beside their drawings, proudly inviting classmates to ask which was their creation. The slightest interest in their drawings prompted a detailed account of its contents. Other students stood near the display board but feigned discontent with their drawing through mildly self-effacing comments that appeared to be bait for reassuring comments from peers. However, a few students were sincerely reluctant to share their work. One grade four student spoke openly about her apprehension explaining that "the others might think it's sort of childish". When asked if she thought that it was childish she said "No, but they might." Another grade four student was intimidated by the display process and cited peer disapproval as the reason. "This is too much like something I did last year. Everyone will know," she said. On the other hand, one student was so concerned that his drawing be displayed that he became aggravated when the teacher placed another drawing partially covering his. "Don't cover mine up!" he called out excitedly. Another student became distraught that his drawing had not been mounted on the display board. He pointed this out to the teacher on a number of occasions during the discussion. The teacher resisted acknowledgement of his problem. Finally in a question directed to the entire class, she asked, "Which drawings show us an interesting way to represent texture?". The student answered in an agitated tone, "Mine does, but it's not up!". 
It appeared that students used the drawings of peers as a point of comparison to determine not only where they stood in relation to others in the class but whether or not they had met the expectations set for the task. The following account is from the field notes describing the atmosphere in a grade four class during the initial viewing of newly displayed drawings, and one student's reaction to seeing a drawing that differed from her own.

When the teacher calls for the students to bring their drawings to the front of the room where she tapes them temporarily to the chalkboard, the chatting begins instantaneously. They discuss their own work and survey the work of classmates, asking who did this one, or uttering exclamations about ones that appeal to them. Comparisons are frequent occurrences. One girl saw that a classmate had done two perspectives of her shoe. She quickly related this to her drawing that had only one, uttering that she didn't know they were supposed to do more than one shoe. She seemed rather worried that she had not met with the expectations of the teacher. This chatter lasts while the teacher places all drawings on the board. Students return to their desks upon the request of the art teacher to do so. The discussion is once again more controlled as students are called upon to point out drawings with particular characteristics.

ii. Observing the Artwork of Peers: A Crucial Aspect of the Lesson

The informal viewing of the work of peers was an essential component of the learning experience. It was evident across the three grade levels, although there were more verbal invitations and requests to share work at upper levels. Comments like "Hey, let's see yours!" or "Look at this!" initiated the interaction. Responses to the observation fluctuated between non-committal phrases like "Was that hard to do?" or "Is it nearly finished?", to exuberant praise statements such as "My god, that nose is good!" or "This is so good!". Aside from positive evaluative comments, non-specific supportive comments which were intended simply to bolster the confidence of a peer were infrequent, and in fact almost non-existent in grade four lessons. Instead, students seemed to favour specific comments dealing with aspects of another's picture rather than skill. These
comments seemed to be modelling the comments given by teachers in the study. Negative evaluative comments were few, although grade two children were at times abrupt and brutally honest in their assessment of a peer's work. "You sure messed that up!" is an example of the kinds of comments heard in the grade two setting.

The compelling need to view the work of others and to present one's own work to be viewed is particularly evident in this account of a grade four lesson that took place in a regular classroom. The furniture arrangement of separated desks and the presence of the class teacher dictated a noticeably constrained atmosphere which stifled peer talk. The students subverted classroom behavioural expectations imposed by the class teacher while at the same time conforming to them. Although remaining quiet and seated at their desks, the students developed a method of enabling the necessary picture sharing experience to continue. This excerpt from field notes written following an observation in a grade four classroom describes the situation.

The students nevertheless manage to share their work with students near them and even on the opposite side of the room. There is a silent code that has been developed. It is a system of hand and facial signals that signify approval or neutrality toward the picture of a classmate. The interaction usually begins with eye contact and then matures to picture showing. The student who begins the interaction in turn requests a look at the other's work. Reactions range from mouthed words like "awesome" and excited facial expressions to no change in facial expression. The latter seems to be the most negative reaction in the spectrum. When a student receives this, she/he returns to the work by seemingly reassessing the drawing, staring at it for a short period before beginning work again. Sometimes an excited reaction from a neighbour will cause a chain reaction among that section of the classroom, as others request a peek at the favoured drawing through hand signals or motions or, more infrequently, through whispers.

Another interaction at the grade four level demonstrated the consideration by some students that viewing a peer's work was as an integral
part of the drawing class and learning experience. One student even equated its importance with that of viewing the model. Referring to the view, a student in the midst of drawing from observation, called across the room to another, "What do you see from over there, Betty?". A nearby student interjected, "She sees mine!".

iii. Student Impressions of the Value of Sharing Drawings

Formal and informal methods of viewing peers' drawings were an integral part of the lesson, and students recognized the necessity of doing so. When asked why it was important to see the work of peers, students responded with comments like "To see how you're doing compared with them," "To make sure you're doing the right thing," or "Just to see how someone else is doing it." Students obviously used the work of peers as a means of measuring their progress or judging their own work.

When asked why they voluntarily showed their drawings to peers, most students questioned at all levels said it was to "get compliments" or "to have someone say how good it is." However, some said that they chose peers to critique their work because "let's face it...the teacher can't really, like...tell you how bad it is." In these instances peers were seen to be in a position to give a more honest appraisal.

F. Students' Opinions on Tutor Preference

Students' propensity to call on the teacher for help during the drawing lesson seemed to vary with both the age of the student and the severity of the problem being encountered. With increasing age came a diminishing desire to initiate involvement with the teacher, although students readily became involved in conversations initiated by the teacher. Direct questioning of students regarding tutor preference confirmed conclusions based on
observations. Grade two students thought it natural to rely on the teacher for help with drawings. However, older students stated that they would more likely turn to a peer in the vicinity than call on the teacher for help although a number of students admitted that the teacher would be consulted if bad advice "could wreck a good drawing."

G. Student Recognition of Teacher Preferences

Although not always explicit, it may nevertheless be inferred that teacher preferences influenced the children's actions and products at all levels. A grade two child, obviously distressed with his final product, slammed his pencil down on his desk. "I hate my picture!" he said. He then gave his classmate a detailed critique of his work. Although it had not met his expectations, he realized, however, that it would please his teacher. "I bet she'll like it," he said, begrudgingly. And then, as if to prove his point, he approached the teacher holding his picture out in front of him without any indication of his discontent. She accepted his efforts with warm approval. He returned to his desk, slamming his picture down. "See, I told you she'd like it!" he said, unchanged in his condemnation of his own work.

Two grade four children sat contemplating remedies for one of their pictures that had been "messed up." The student who posed as a temporary mentor began to suggest specific possibilities for revival of the picture. After a number of such suggestions, the student whose picture it was, still looking uncertain about the remedy to choose, was warned by his peer not to approach the teacher with it. "She'll only tell you to add more detail. That's what she always says."
One grade six student was acutely aware of a teacher's important role in evaluation of his work and referred to this humorously while drawing his class teacher from observation.

S-S I can't figure this out.
S-S That's a bald spot?
S-S Where his hair recedes?
S-S Oh, yeah. It's that thing. I can't see that.
S-S I gave him more hair than he has. The reason I did that was cause my grade matters.
S-S You always get A plus.
S-S No, but I mean in these...like art things.

Although this comment was made with humorous intent, it nevertheless showed the student's awareness that even in the subject of art, the appeal of the work to the teacher was a component worthy of consideration during the art-making process.

A grade four student who was heralded as a "talented" artist by her peers, distributed her artwork among them rather than assembling it in a portfolio to take home at the end of term. She explained that although her teacher liked the artwork she had produced in school, her parents, who were professional artists, would not. Her remedy was to produce the kind of artwork appreciated by the adults in each setting. Her attempts to adapt her style according to adult expectations were indicative of many students' desire to meet the expectations of the guiding adults in the art-making setting.

H. Crisis in Confidence Characteristics at Three Levels
Low self-esteem, uncooperative behaviour, preoccupation with producing realistic results, lack of confidence with respect to one's drawing ability and a desire to learn the tricks that enable one to produce drawings that closely resemble reality are all characteristics attributed to the preadolescent crisis in confidence period of artistic development (Barnes, 1987, Churchill, 1971, Gardner, 1980) that is believed to begin at the onset of grade four (Chapman, 1978). The following examples of three students at three different levels of development bring into question any notion that these characteristics are limited to children of the grade four level and even the grades adjacent to it.

The objective of a grade two art lesson was bypassed when Joey became preoccupied with a technical aspect of his drawing. The task involved drawing a classmate who had been asked to pose as if he were fishing. Having chosen to begin with an imaginary dock, Joey became engrossed in the three-dimensional representation of each plank. Word of his technical ability quickly reached others in the class who showed their admiration through complimentary remarks, and requests that Joey share the secrets of his "trick" with them. Although Joey's diligence throughout the lesson resulted in only a few planks, he proudly displayed his drawing at the end of the lesson.

Typical of a grade four student, Michael, was vocal in the condemnation of his artistic "talent." "I can't draw", he said frequently. "No talent here. No talented mother. No talented father. No talented people in my family." Prior to each drawing experience, Michael required coaxing to begin the task. However, once underway, the process of drawing became an obvious pleasure for him. His progress was described in detail to anyone who would listen. He appeared proud of the ideas his drawing represented but was not confident that his drawings expressed them adequately. He positioned himself strategically
beside his drawings on display to intercept any interested observers so that the purpose behind each stroke could be explained.

Norman's lack of co-operation and apprehension about drawing were pronounced. He approached every aspect of the task with negativity. Attempts to help him were outwardly rebuffed, although advice from his teacher was sometimes heeded, but never openly. Norman, a grade six student, suffered over every detail of his self-portrait, constantly uttering disparaging remarks about his drawing and his drawing ability. He erased constantly and insisted that he wanted his portrait to look "more like a real face."

To varying degrees, all three children demonstrated characteristics that would normally be associated with a child of the "crisis in confidence" stage of artistic development. Although these were isolated instances and the behaviours described here of a grade two and six child would not necessarily be typical of children of these ages, their occurrence alludes to the fact that the appearance of the problems associated with the preadolescent artist are not confined to this age group and that the teacher must be prepared to deal with these problems as they arise.

1. Summary

While Chapter IV described aspects of the art class through analysis of the number and kinds of interactions of teachers and students, the questions of content and interpretation are of equal importance. An holistic approach to analysis in this Chapter revealed that the teachers and students together created one kind of classroom culture, while the students themselves created another, with rules that are just as important to consider as those formally constituted by the curriculum.
A. General Review of Study

Vygotsky's (1978) year theory stresses that "a child's cognitive skills develop through social interaction embedded in a cultural backdrop" (p. 292). Based on the premise that artistic development takes place in the sociocultural setting of the art class, this study endeavoured to gain access to the real world of the art teaching/learning environment. In doing so, it focused on interaction that took place within the drawing class between teacher and student and between students themselves. The intention was to capture the complexities of interrelationships without impairing the naturally occurring patterns of activity that influence learning. Naturalistic research methods were employed. Twenty-seven lessons, nine each at grades 2, 4 and 6, were observed. Whenever it was convenient to do so, teachers were interviewed both formally prior to the study and informally following lessons. Informal interviews of students also took place following lesson observations.

As a key to understanding more fully the interrelationships between all parties involved, dialogue became an important focus of interpretation. All teacher/student dialogue, and where possible, student-student dialogue, was recorded by means of audio recording devices worn by teacher and researcher. Interviews with both teachers and students were also recorded.

B. Summary of Findings

i. Research Questions

This study was designed to answer two questions:
1. What is the nature of the interaction that occurs during drawing classes in the elementary grades?

The nature and quality of peer interaction. Contrary to Szekely's study (1982), it was found that the majority of peer interaction was directly related to the drawing task. Comments among peers were seldom derogatory, but usually spanned a range from neutral to positive. However, occasionally abrasive and harsh appraisals were present in grade two peer interchanges. Teachers who witnessed such treatment stood ready to avert the negative impact of such statements through bolstering remarks and stern reminders to critics regarding appropriate classroom conduct. When solicited, students actively and willingly ventured to give opinions on and to make supportive remarks about peers' artwork. Unsolicited intervention in the form of recommendations and critiques were also common at all levels, although with age came improved discretion in the delivery of critical remarks due in part to the modelling and vigilance of the teachers. Johnson (1981) recommends that in order to promote constructive peer influences, "teachers must ensure that interaction takes place within a supportive and accepting context" (p. 6). It was evident that this was the priority of teachers in this study.

Apart from verbal interchanges, students found other means through which to communicate. The interactive process of viewing peers' artwork was found to be a necessary component of the lesson for students. When prevented from sharing drawings, students invented means through which to carry on the viewing practise. All teachers in this study allotted time at the end of each lesson for the viewing of artwork. However, in spite of this, it was apparent that in-process viewing remained integral to the lesson, and imperative in the students' view as a means of idea formation and self-evaluation. Berndt and Ladd (cited in Yussen, 1985) suggest that children evaluate what they do in
terms of whether it is better than, as good as, or worse than what other children do. The words and actions of students in this study confirmed this view.

The nature and quality of teacher/student interaction. Based on repeated references by numerous art educators, intervention, defined as "actions or statements that temporarily interrupt the flow of events during the lesson", was originally an object of concern in the formulation of this study. As the study progressed, it became apparent that for these teachers, the intervention/non-intervention question was not an issue, and that concern with it had been somewhat of a red herring. Teacher implemented strategies were an integral part of the flow of the lesson rather than a disruptive force, and never abruptly punctuated lesson events. None of the teachers in the study was particularly concerned about the question of intervention or non-intervention. Instead, teachers focused on the form and content of intervention, and were particularly sensitive to the wording of each question or response given to students. They concerned themselves with details of timing, aspects of developmental levels of the children involved, and appropriateness of intervention tactics in view of the child's fragility or strength with respect to drawing at the point of interaction. It followed then that teacher/student interaction was characterized by neutral to positive comments on the part of the teacher.

2. How does the nature of the interaction that occurs during drawing classes affect the artwork produced by elementary children?

The atmosphere of acceptance developed by the teachers, through dialogue sensitive to the individual needs of students, enabled those who were struggling with both technical and content aspects of drawing tasks to overcome difficulties that may have stifled productivity under less supportive circumstances. However, in view of the data collected, aspects of quality of drawings could not be assessed.
ii. Subsidiary Questions

The subsidiary questions to be investigated were as follows:

a. When is interaction taking place?

Teacher/student interaction occurred in all three stages of the lesson, although its content and the teacher's method of initiation differed from stage to stage. The first and last stages of the lesson were characterized by full class discussions led and usually initiated by the teacher. The central portion of the lesson was comprised of dialogue with individual students or small groups of students.

The majority of peer interaction took place during the process of drawing in the middle stage of the lesson. A flurry of peer dialogue always accompanied the initial moments of the display of drawings at the lesson's end.

b. What strategies or intervention techniques are being used by the teacher?

This study chose to focus on exemplary models of art teaching. In doing so, it was hoped that such teachers would provide insight into effective teaching methods in the drawing class. In all cases it was apparent that teachers had developed refined and sophisticated dialoguing techniques that served as tools for achievement of their goals. The use of these techniques was tempered with acute sensitivity to the individual concerns and immediate developmental needs of each child. Eleven different dialoguing techniques were isolated. Although teachers displayed personal preferences, there was a general sense that strategies involving indirect methods were most often utilized. In all grades, the strategy most often chosen by the teachers was to provide choices. This was followed by the prompting/extending strategy, a more directive attempt to challenge the student with respect to content or technique. Encouraging remarks ranked third in frequency of use by teachers, but were invariably
accompanied by detailed descriptions of what the child had accomplished. Teachers were also found to use the strategies of reinforcing, redirecting, troubleshooting, verifying, explaining, legislating, alerting, and monitoring. The importance of honesty and sincerity with regard to teacher/student dialogue was emphasized.

Fundamental to the dialoguing techniques of all teachers was an ability to use questioning with facility. An analysis of teacher questioning using Clements' typology of eleven categories found that the teachers of this study used predominantly non-directive questioning strategies. This confirmed Clements' findings, although choice of of non-directive strategies was considerably more pronounced among the teachers in the present study. Directive questioning strategies were seldom employed. Questioning practices across teachers were similar, although each teacher had developed a particular style, favouring certain non-directive questioning strategies over others. A comparison of three questioning strategies (experience, identification and judgement) at the grade four level with Clements' 4/5 results and grade six results with that of Clements' 6/9 level, led to the conclusion that the employment of experiences (non-directive) questions by teachers in this study far exceeded their use by the student-teachers in Clements' study. The reverse was true of judgement (directive) questions, the first choice of Clements' student-teachers but never employed at either level by teachers in this study.

c. To what extent are the teacher/student interactions
   i. teacher initiated?

The difference between overall initiators of interaction was marginal, with teachers initiating teacher/student interactions only slightly more often than students did. However, accumulated data did reveal a noteworthy pattern of
interaction initiators across grades. With increasing age came an increase in
the number of interactions initiated by teachers.

ii. student initiated?

The increase in teacher initiated interaction was coupled with a decline in
student initiated interaction. However, a reluctance to initiate teacher/student
interactions on the part of the student was not accompanied by a reluctance to
engage in teacher/student talk once it had been initiated.

d. What is the nature of:
   i. students' questions?

   Students made requests through questions for permission to alter the
task or its procedures or materials, to terminate the task or to move to the next
stage. They asked for direction with respect to content and technical aspects of
the drawing task and called on the teacher when clarification of task
parameters, procedures to be followed or the source of technical problems was
necessary. At times, students also requested an evaluation of their drawings or
components of them.

   ii. students' assistance needs?

   In a more general sense, students sought the direction of a consultant,
the opinion of an adjudicator, the clarification of a clarifier and the permission of
a legislator. Through analysis of student demands upon the teachers, both
explicit and implicit, it was apparent that students were in need of guidance that
was facilitative and enabling rather than definitive.

e. Are teacher suggestions implemented by students?

   As stated, teacher's guidance took many forms although seldom that of a
direct suggestion. At best, the teachers offered a list of possible alternative to
students who were on the verge of frustration. On these occasions students
often chose one of the alternatives that had been offered, adapting it according
to personal preferences. In the older two grades, it sometimes occurred that the students were reticent to accept any of the alternatives offered, but then quietly choose to follow one of them.

f. How does the nature of the interaction differ between grades two, four, and six?

Differences in dialoguing strategy choices were apparent among teachers across the grades. Teachers chose the explaining strategy (directive) most often when working with grade four students. Strategies favoured in dialogue with grade two students were based on positive reinforcement. With the progression of grade level came a decline in the use of strategies based on positive reinforcement.

Peer interaction varied to some extent across grades. As previously stated, grade two conversations sometimes consisted of unsolicited and brutally honest appraisals of peers' work or accusations of copying, while peer interactions in grades four and six were characterized by more sensitive remarks and more refined approaches to criticism. Peer talk at all levels was remarkably on-task and appeared to be an enhancing agent rather than a distractive force. Content of student talk varied among the grades. With increasing age there tended to be an increase in self-effacing comments by students about aspects of their drawing or drawing ability. Such comments were often followed by encouraging remarks by other students in response to what had been an indirect plea for positive reinforcement or advice. The difference in quantity of peer verbal interactions was striking. Grade four was characterized by diminished peer conversation when compared with peer interaction at the grade two level. However, in grade six, the quantity of peer conversation rebounded to levels equal to or greater than those found in grade two.
C. Assessment of Propositions Underlying the Study

Three propositions guided the research. This section includes an assessment of their validity with respect to the findings of this study.

a. Given an understanding and consideration of child development from both an artistic and sociological perspective, a teacher is capable of fostering development in the drawing abilities of children through appropriate actions and talk.

Assessment. In light of the data collected, the validity of this proposition cannot be determined. It was apparent that all teachers in the study concerned themselves with both the artistic and sociological aspects of development, and that their approaches were determined by this knowledge. However, this proposition can only be tested by means of a study designed to measure developmental changes over the long term involving an analysis of completed drawings.

b. Learning is contextually dependent. It is a complex process which can be influenced by changing variables such as the nature of the task, the classroom atmosphere, peer interaction, and the organization of work space.

Assessment. The task, classroom atmosphere, peer interaction and organization of work space were all variables that influenced learning in the lessons observed. All were interconnected. Variations in one resulted in changes in another. However, teachers and students were steadfast in their desire to meet formulated objectives and learning needs, and both adjusted their behaviours so that this could be accomplished.

c. Using an approach and teaching strategies that reflect a knowledge and consideration of developmental changes in children's drawing abilities and in their sociological make-up, a positive outlook toward drawing can be maintained.
Assessment. The approach to drawing was generally positive, fostered by a carefully developed and constantly preened classroom environment where a supportive atmosphere was the norm. Reticence toward drawing tasks was expressed at both the grade four and six levels, but this was not indicative of the general attitude toward drawing, and was most often short-lived once those concerned were engaged in the process of drawing.

D. Implications for Teachers

The nature of instructional research is that results obtained are directly applicable to the classroom situation. Teachers in this study were chosen based on recommendations of their teaching expertise. Close attention to aspects of the teaching observed in this study will provide teachers a basis for comparison with their own practices. Analysis of questioning, dialoguing techniques, student needs and the suitable environment created for maximum learning are outlined. Awareness of the quality of these components is essential to a successful teaching/learning situation. Findings related to aspects of peer interaction such as the necessary viewing of peer's artwork, the content of peer dialogue and its quantity or lack thereof, bring to light aspects of the drawing lesson that have been neglected. For purposes of more effective planning and profitable application, knowledge of these many facets is essential to the teacher of drawing.

E. Implications for the Field of Art Education

In an effort to build upon past research in the field of visual arts education, two instruments were used in the analysis of data that had been constructed by researchers in the field. Kakas' seventeen category "Peer Interaction Typology" offered a well-defined instrument of analysis to unravel
the contents of peer conversation. Clements' ten category "Questioning Typology" enabled dissection of teacher questioning. A comparative analysis of the findings of both studies with interaction data collected in the present study, resulted in verification and supplementation of a body of dialogue derived from interactions among peers and between teachers and students. In one or two instances, aspects of this body of dialogue were also called into question.

F. Suggestions for Future Research

Although all four teachers in the study agreed that peer interaction was an integral component of the lesson that facilitated the learning process and had some influence on the products of the school art-making experience, all admitted that they were unaware of the degree to which it was productive and on-task. Teachers were indecisive therefore with regard to the extent to which it should be enhanced or inhibited, and during the lesson planning process their consideration of peer interaction was limited. Observations and interviews of students highlighted the importance of peer communication during the art-making process from the perspective of the students themselves, and in one circumstance efforts to inhibit such communication were unsuccessful. There is a need for research that more clearly defines how peer interaction influences learning in art, how its positive aspects may be facilitated through careful planning, and in view of the findings of this study that there was a notable decline in peer interaction at the grade four level, whether or not it should be promoted to a greater extent in grade four.

In the endeavour of this study to reveal the richness and complexity of interaction during the drawing lesson by tapping the perspectives of both teacher and student, other phenomenon were uncovered that may warrant further study. Students were candid about their awareness of and adaptation to
the preferences of their teachers. They openly discussed the meaning and importance of in-process sharing of artwork with peers. Research is needed that probes further to determine the extent to which these factors influence the learning process and the products of drawing lessons.

G. Conclusion

The life-world of the art classroom is created through a web of interaction, each strand of dialogue intertwined with the connecting framework of the lesson. However, unlike the predetermined precision that characterizes nature's web, classroom interaction cannot entirely be forecast, but occurs as a series of actions and reactions, with each new strand of dialogue influencing which turn the next will take. Using dialogue as a window to the intentions and needs of both teachers and students, it was revealed that all participants took on multiple roles, moving between them, sometimes voluntarily, sometimes through subtle coercion by other participants. Teachers endeavoured to create a supportive environment through careful monitoring of peer comments and modeling of appropriate dialoguing strategies. Refined questioning strategies were also a part of the teachers' repertoire, built soundly around a philosophy influenced by knowledge of childrens' levels of artistic and sociological development. What eluded the teachers was an awareness of the quantity and content of peer talk occurring during drawing lessons. Through peer talk analysis, it was apparent that there existed a peer culture that functioned simultaneously with the culture created through teacher/student interaction. As underlying strands tugging at the lesson framework, peer culture should be considered a structural feature of the interactive web of the drawing lesson.
LIST OF REFERENCES


Brophy, J. & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In Wittrock (Eds.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.


APPENDIX A

OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

Teacher Code

Lesson Code  Date

<table>
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APPENDIX B

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

Research Study: A Study of Interactions Occurring During Drawing Classes in Three Elementary Grades.

Researcher: Judy L. Allingham, Masters Student
University of British Columbia
Telephone: (617) 864-7313 (Cambridge, Ma.)

Advisor: Dr. Ronald N. MacGregor
Chair, Department of Visual and Performing Arts in Education
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this study is to examine existing classroom practice with respect to drawing. The study will focus on verbal and non-verbal interactions that occur naturally in the classroom setting while drawing classes are taking place. My intent is to compare interaction at the second, fourth, and sixth grade levels so that implications may be drawn for the teaching of drawing in the elementary art class.

Nine drawing classes will be observed. An audio recording of each lesson will be made to provide a detailed, temporary record of dialogue that occurs between the teacher and students. The students may be asked questions informally regarding their drawing experiences and the content of their artwork. Photographs will be taken of the classroom environment during the progress of the study. One formal interview of approximately one hour in length, will be requested of you.

All data collected will be confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Only the researcher and members of her committee will have access to the research data. At no time during the data analysis and presentation of the thesis will the data be identified with individual participants. Participation in the study is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. Any questions regarding the study may be directed to me at (617) 864-7313.

Thank you for considering participation in this study.

Sincerely yours,

Judy L. Allingham

I _____________ have received a copy of the letter documenting the study, its purpose, procedures, and requirements for participation. I consent to participate in the study described above to be conducted by Judy L. Allingham entitled "A Study of Interactions Occurring During Drawing Classes in Three Elementary Grades".

_____________________________ ________________________
(signature) (date)
APPENDIX C

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A. Background

1. How long have you been teaching art?
   To which grades do you presently teach art?
   How many years experience do you have teaching art to grades 2, 4 and/or 6?
2. Why did you decide to become an art teacher?
3. What kinds of courses have you taken that have influenced your art teaching?
   How many of these courses were concerned in part, or entirely with drawing?
4. Did you develop your ideas for teaching drawing in other ways? What were these?
5. What other experiences affect what you now do when you teach drawing?
6. Can you recall experiences from your elementary years regarding drawing?
   Do they affect the way you now teach drawing?

B. Teaching Art

1. What do you consider to be the value of art, as you teach it?
2. How often do you teach art lessons to each class?
3. What percentage of the total amount is devoted to drawing?
4. Why do you include drawing in your art program?
5. What kinds of performance do you look for?
6. Where do you get your ideas for drawing lessons?
7. Do you integrate drawing with other subject areas? Which subject areas? How?
8. What role does dialogue play in your art lessons? Teacher/student? Peer?
9. What kinds of feedback do you give students?
10. Do you comment on skills, content, subject matter?
11. Does this vary from student to student? How?
12. Do your students learn from each other in drawing class? What kinds of things do they learn from each other?
Dear Parent,

The purpose of this letter is to request consent for your child's participation in a study that will take place during regularly scheduled art classes. I have received permission from the Brooklyn School District and your child's art teacher, to conduct a study entitled "A Study of the Interactions Occurring During Drawing Classes in Three Elementary Grades". It will focus on verbal and non-verbal interactions that occur naturally in the classroom setting while drawing activities are taking place. My intent is to compare interaction at the second, fourth, and sixth grade levels so that implications may be drawn for the teaching of drawing in the elementary art class.

I am a masters student currently enrolled in art education at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. My advisor is Dr. Ronald N. MacGregor, Department Head of Visual and Performing Arts in the Faculty of Education. Data collected from the study will become part of my M. A. thesis.

Three drawing classes will be observed. An audio recording of each lesson will also be made to provide a detailed, temporary record of dialogue that occurs between the teacher and students. The students may be asked questions informally regarding their drawing experiences and the content of their artwork. Photographs will be taken of the classroom environment during the progress of the study.

All data collected will be confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Only the researcher and members of her committee will have access to the research data. At no time during the data analysis and presentations of the thesis will the data be identified with individual participants. Participation in the study is voluntary. Your child may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. Any questions regarding the study may be directed to me at (617) 864-7313.

Please complete the attached form and return it to the school. Thank you for considering your child's participation in this study.

Yours sincerely,

Judy L. Allingham

I have received a copy of the letter documenting the study, its purpose, procedures and requirements for participation.

( ) I consent to my child's participation in the study.

( ) I do not consent to my child's participation in the study.

------------------------------------------  ------------------------------------------  ----
(parent/ guardian signature)  (child's name)  (date)
APPENDIX E

STUDENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Formal interviews were not conducted with students. Informal discussions of their drawing experiences and the contents of their drawings included some of the following questions listed below. The interview schedule was conceived in part prior to the study's commencement but was altered and expanded to address questions that arose from observations of drawing lessons.

1. Do you like to draw? Why or why not?
2. Tell me about your drawing.
3. What do you like about it?
4. What was the most difficult part to do? Why?
5. What was the easiest part to do? Why?
6. What did you think when your teacher told you what you were going to draw today?
7. Did you need help while you were drawing?
8. Did you ask for help? Did anyone offer to help or give you suggestions?
9. Did these suggestions make your drawing better? Did these suggestions make it easier to finish your drawing?
10. What kind of help would you prefer from the teacher?
11. Do the comments made by friends during drawing lessons help you to learn about drawing? What do you learn?
12. Why do students say "I'm the world's worst drawer!" or "Mine stinks!"?
13. Why do you talk about your drawing progress to friends as you draw?
14. What kind of drawing do you prefer? observation...imagination...memory?
15. Do you draw at home?
16. Do you ask for help from anyone at home? Why or why not?