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CHAPTER I

The Varying Contexts of Robert Mapplethorpe: Controversial Imagery, Viewing, and Instruction

INTRODUCTION

My interest in examining classroom instruction based on controversial art imagery stems from my own experiences with teaching college students about Robert Mapplethorpe's work, as well as the interactions which I have had with other instructors in similar teaching situations. As a teaching associate during my Master of Fine Arts program six years ago, my initial encounter with Mapplethorpe's work in the art classroom was not necessarily a positive one. In fact, what I observed was a negative use of Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery by another teaching associate who was instructing a large group of art appreciation students.

This particular instance of instruction began with the teaching associate slamming the classroom door shut and then proceeding to show Mapplethorpe's more controversial imagery, seemingly with the blatant intent of shocking the students.
During this presentation, neither was substantive dialogue
developed, nor was the viewing situation treated as a serious
occasion. At best, this shock and show method created an
environment of intimidation and discomfort. Based on what I
would characterize as a misuse of Mapplethorpe’s sexually
explicit imagery, I realized during this initial encounter
that teaching students about controversial art imagery
required a good deal of sensitivity on the teacher’s behalf
in order to make the educational experience a responsible and
meaningful one.

However, more central to the topic of this current study
were the observations I made concerning how students reacted
to the sexually explicit or controversial work. For example,
at times an uncomfortable silence penetrated the room as
students lowered their heads or turned away from the screen.
In contrast to these nonverbal reactions, a number of
students laughed at some of the images while others whispered
comments to fellow classmates nearby as the controversial
images appeared.

Although better examples of teaching exist in the
Mapplethorpe presentations which I observed for the current
study, student reactions like the ones described above still
take place. It is these latter types of student reactions
and responses which this study examines, particularly how
such reactions are immediately handled by the teacher. As a
result, the main focus of this study is on the interactive
structures of talk which are produced during the presentation
of Mapplethorpe’s safe and unsafe imagery.
As it happens, when sexually explicit or unsafe imagery appears on the slide screen, the talk produced is hearably different than the talk which is produced in the presence of Mapplethorpe’s safe images of flowers, still lifes and figure studies. This differentiation of talk can be characterized in the following way: In the presence of Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery, teachers routinely establish learned ways of speaking which can be described as “canonical art educational talk.” Such talk, aimed at the image’s subject matter and formal qualities such as light, shape, color, and texture, is a familiar way of speaking in many art educational contexts. To insure that the students’ experience with Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery is an educational one, this way of speaking is an integral part of the instructional format which drives these presentations of Mapplethorpe’s work.

Conversely, the instances of silence, laughter, and offhanded remarks which occur as Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery is projected reflect how controversial imagery in the art classroom is initially responded to. As will be shown, canonical art educational talk is not found to be the accustomed way of speaking during the projection of controversial images. Instead, the instances of silence, laughter, and offhanded remarks are sequentially weak instructional events, and their occurrence further requires the teacher to reassemble or redirect such events into a better way of speaking. At best, illuminating these differing ways of speaking in the presence of imagery, and demonstrating how such ways of speaking are organized as local phenomena, is what this dissertation seeks.
Mapplethorpe's work was of course not intended to be part of the art classroom experience. Therefore, the following topics related to Mapplethorpe's work, and the controversy surrounding it as an existing part of the public domain will be introduced in chapter one: The fact that many of his photographs potentially challenge our sensibilities toward artistic representation of sexual orientation and sexual behavior; the backlash toward Mapplethorpe's controversial work which has existed and can therefore is an historical component enabling a better understanding of his work; and the acknowledgement that Mapplethorpe's work has undergone and continues to undergo processes of canonization which have allowed his work to be compartmentalized for commercial needs.

In addition, and in terms of Mapplethorpe's work being an included part of a college level art appreciation course, the following phenomena will also be introduced within chapter one: The way in which instruction based on Mapplethorpe's work is carried out by teaching associates can be viewed as an ad hoc occurrence, or stated otherwise, instruction based on the projection of imagery is an immediate event, built off of the local environment which exists at that time; that the sequential order of images, or how they are arranged in the slide carousel, shapes or influences the way in which instruction ensues; that the processes through which the imagery is projected, the darkness of the room, and the seating arrangements each have a direct effect on the way that talk is produced; and finally, that once the controversial imagery arrives on the screen, an
instructional collision takes place - the collision between sexually explicit imagery and classroom talk.

**Purpose and Significance of the Study**

Within the classrooms observed for this study, the presentations of Mapplethorpe's photographic imagery serve to introduce non-art college students to the realm of contemporary art, as well as to promote class discussions centering on topical issues such as sexuality, censorship, and public funding for the arts. When observing these presentations, such stated curricular objectives seem generally fulfilled. Yet to say just how such objectives are fulfilled remains a greater challenge, and essentially make up the direction this research will take.

Educational studies aimed at investigating the processes of teaching are often based on research questions directed at how teachers should teach. Relatedly, research in the field of art education has taken many directions toward suggesting how we should teach art. However, this broad calling assumes our understanding of what art instruction is, as a practice. A more constructive approach may be in asking how teachers do teach or how they teach the way they do (see Cuban, 1987). The sense of collision between viewing safe and unsafe imagery, and the differences between formal and informal interaction and instruction which Mapplethorpe's imagery often provokes, provide us with an opportunity to see the exercise of art education being both stressed and repaired. Thus, a collection of topics can be found in an art curriculum containing controversial imagery; centrally, how
it is that art education is produced, shaped, and repaired on these occasions.

The purposes of my research are threefold. First, I will provide an alternative way of seeing art instruction based on an ethnography of art education classroom talk. Secondly, this study will locate and examine the processes through which students and teachers look at and respond to controversial art in the college art classroom. This involves the collection and analysis of audio and video records of actual occasions of art instruction. Thirdly, the current analyses will describe art instruction as a socially constructed phenomenon, ordered by the interactional organization of the classroom context.

In addition to these purposes, this dissertation will facilitate alternative ways of looking at and analyzing processes of art instruction, with specific emphasis on the actualities of teaching which occur in the art classroom. It will contribute to an interactional understanding of the processes that make up the delivery of art instruction; reinforce the understanding that teaching is the interactional achievement of both teacher and students; illuminate the fact that instruction centering on non-controversial art reflects canonical devices; and demonstrate how controversial art, when introduced within an art education environment, is inherently tamed via instructional processes.
A photograph such as Mapplethorpe’s self-portrait cannot have been made or exhibited for our aesthetic delectation alone but rather to engage us morally and aesthetically. It would be known in advance that such an image would challenge, assault, insult, provoke, dismay - with the hope that in some way consciousness would be transformed (Danto, 1990, p. 216).

The preceding passage is a reminder that Mapplethorpe’s more confronting work has the inherent potential to challenge those who view it in varying ways. Danto’s use of “challenge, assault, insult”, etc., conveys the sense that a part of Mapplethorpe’s work digs at our most private beliefs concerning morality and tolerance. That some of Mapplethorpe’s work is challenging in turn reflects why it is part of the undergraduate art classroom experience which this
study focuses on. Within this setting, startling images of sexuality become the interface between art education and the processes of viewing. Such images, and the rawness which often makes the viewing encounter charged and dramatic, is essentially what shapes my present inquiry. My primary interests lie in examining those actual moments when teachers and students in a general Art Education undergraduate classroom are viewing and discussing Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery. In a broader context, my interests are in the ethnography of the art classroom; specifically, I am drawn to the problematics of teaching with sexually explicit photography and how the interplay of laughter, offhanded remarks, and periods of silence ultimately shape the delivery of instruction. However, before introducing the ethnographic setting, it is important to consider controversial art as a phenomenon.

Controversial Art as a Phenomenon

Historically, we know that controversial art has always been with us. Avant garde art regularly begins as a scandal of innovative conceptions, theories, processes and images considered extremely challenging to some. Then, in time, the scandalous becomes recognized as a valid style or movement. This well documented historical movement, known as the canonization of art works or art movements, continues to take place as artists continue to produce. The process could also be thought of as a taming phenomenon. In this sense, taming is a way of speaking of how controversial and suspect art become familiar art. As an example, consider art produced in
the last twenty years: During the 1970's, Vito Acconci's masturbatory performance art piece entitled Seedbed had an extreme challenging effect on his audience, as did Christo's environmental piece Packaged Cliff involving the wrapping of two miles of Australian coastline in polypropylene. When viewing the contributions of these artists within a historical context, however, we now find such productions housed within the realms of performance art and the earthwork movement. Similarly, Steve Reich's and Pauline Oliveros's musical scores provoked an early period of skepticism, as did the early minimalist movement, yet their compositions have since become grounded in the context of important experimental music.

During the 1980's, the rebirth of narrative painting characterized by the neoexpressionist movement sparked a great deal of criticism, as did the neoconceptual tendencies found in Jenny Holzer's and Barbara Kruger's "billboard" works. These works initially generated controversy centering on issues of quality, aesthetic sensibilities, and critical worth, yet we now see these works as influencing the postmodern style that we currently experience. More importantly, such examples are evidence of the recurrent history of significant art movements or styles which developed in controversy as to their character as art, then becoming historically integrated as part of the expression of western art.
Mapplethorpe and the Notion of Controversial Art

One of the more volatile examples of contemporary art, Mapplethorpe's work has certainly been at the height of controversy. However, since Mapplethorpe's death in March of 1989, the controversy surrounding his work has undergone dramatic changes, which have no doubt influenced our understanding of it. Criticism has played a significant part in this process, as has the interplay of current manifestations of popular art styles, the contexts in which we view these new forms, and how viewers respond to them. Thus, Mapplethorpe's imagery has been processed and reshaped not only through the conventions of art criticism and theory, but also significantly through the public's experience and understanding of contemporary art. What makes Mapplethorpe and his work so historically important is the direct effect that it has had on both the national art community as well as the nation as a whole.

Although Mapplethorpe achieved much of his popular notoriety posthumously, he was one of the most recognized photographers working in the late 1980's. The academic acceptance and use of Mapplethorpe as a pivotal figure in the visual arts is surely grounded as well. As an academic resource, Mapplethorpe and his work have prompted countless dialogues regarding censorship, controversial art as a 1990's phenomena, public viewing of contemporary art, and governmental influence on arts funding. Mapplethorpe's more explicit work provides a visual account of sexual experiences, with some displaying a certain playfulness, while others offer a journey into the realm of sadomasochism.
or ritualistic restraint. Yet the entire corpus has become a resource for academic work aimed at differentiating the many sexual topics in art, especially the analysis of gay oriented art.

Mapplethorpe as Controversy

Looking back four years, one can see that Mapplethorpe has incited a burst of writing with many articles appearing in a wide variety of academic, cultural, and popular publications. The field of art education saw articles and editorials which focused on topics of censorship and controversial art, and its place within both art studio and art educational contexts (Barrett, 1990; Hausman, 1992; Lankford, 1990). Additionally, numerous mentionings of the controversies surrounding Mapplethorpe's work could be found in both mainstream and alternative newspaper publications, whereas articles addressing the aesthetic qualities of Mapplethorpe's work were found primarily in fine art journals, with a large number of these containing reproductions of his controversial imagery. These journals, designed to introduce contemporary artists and their work, were perhaps most affected by the controversy surrounding Mapplethorpe. For example, in the case of Art Journal, specific Mapplethorpe images deemed by the journal's printer to be pornographic, indecent, or immoral, were determined as not suitable for print. Relatedly, Fritscher (1994) states that in November 1992, "When Arthur C. Danto's overwhelming Mapplethorpe, created with the cooperation of Robert's estate, appeared with 280 duotones, London's Harrods, one of
the world’s largest department stores, declared the book pornographic" (p. 83). With respect to the entire Mapplethorpe phenomenon and calls for censorship of indecent art, the offending culprits were, of course, the art works themselves.

As it happens, Mapplethorpe’s work prior to the beginning of 1990 existed within the art world as a relatively quiet artistic force. Controversy was inherently part of his work, however, it had yet to be found out by the public at large. But through the sensational events occurring in 1990, the controversial imagery and Robert Mapplethorpe as an artist were propelled to new heights. Prior to this public awakening, Mapplethorpe knew that both his sadomasochistic and homoerotic work would shock people, and he expressed this quite openly on many occasions. Fritscher (1994) suggested that Mapplethorpe, during the late 1970’s and throughout the 1980’s, “…had to shock the shell shocked. Shock was all that commanded attention” (p. 197). Mapplethorpe even added fuel to the fire by claiming that the more explicit works were not shocking to him, thus providing a more confrontational element for those who were becoming familiar with his work. Perhaps evidence of Mapplethorpe’s intent to shock his audience, yet remain complacent himself, exists in the following passage: “Mapplethorpe said that there is no difference to speak of between photographing a cock and anything else, which is true and at the same time a kind of self-deception” (Danto, 1994, p. 335).
Mapplethorpe’s Art and Societal Backlash

A “challenging air” has typified Mapplethorpe’s oeuvre since it became a national media focus during the early 1990’s. Prior to this time however, Mapplethorpe’s work had been exhibited both nationally and internationally, and for the most part had been received as compelling yet legitimate art. Although Mapplethorpe’s photographic approach for documenting the sexual energy and actions of the underground gay community in New York and San Francisco was evident during the seventies and eighties, Mapplethorpe’s classical studies of flowers, still lifes, and the human figure had become his trademark.

Indeed by the late 1980’s, Mapplethorpe was an artist who was recognized as a technically proficient photographer by those in the art community. However, it was his posthumous move into the public art domain that transformed his standing. It yielded events such as the Corcoran Museum director’s last minute decision to boycott Mapplethorpe’s traveling retrospective, the sensational trial of Dennis Barrie (former director of Cincinnati’s Contemporary Arts Center) based on charges of pandering pornography, and the critical attack on the National Endowment for the Arts by conservative members of the government for its fiscal support of controversial art forms. Each had a subsequent and significant effect on the public’s perception of Mapplethorpe’s work. To this day, the backlash of Mapplethorpe’s work and the controversies surrounding it continue to shape the policies and direction of large arts organizations such as the National Endowment for the Arts,
regional art institutions like Cincinnati’s Center for the Contemporary Arts, and university art centers located throughout the country (Lyons, 1991).

The reception of contemporary art images which display challenging and often evocative subject matter, and in Mapplethorpe’s case in particular, homoerotic and sadomasochistic subject matter, is an important phenomena effecting the support and organization of the art community. Within the wide range of subject matter which Mapplethorpe’s work portrayed, the images of sex acts, nude children, or sadomasochistic encounters were the ones that drew attention. Subsequently, certain public and governmental figures delved into defining what art should be, or at least called for a review of the processes through which artists were being funded. Thus, as evident in the literature, many writings during this period reflected an awareness concerning the development and display of controversial public art, appropriate funding for the arts, pornography and its relationship to the arts, as well as censorship practice.

During and following the much publicized 1990 national traveling retrospective, positions made for or against Mapplethorpe’s sexually explicit imagery centered around the broader issues of governmental censorship, pornography in the arts, and the demise of American cultural values (Sekula, 1990). Within this lively context, Mapplethorpe’s photographic work clearly became the extension of both conservative and liberal agendas which addressed issues of policy in the arts.
Local Elements of Controversy

The controversies surrounding Mapplethorpe’s work are still on-going in the art world. The history of Mapplethorpe’s photographic work has likely influenced the ways in which some individuals in the art community conceptualize and carry out their artistic intentions, especially if their aim is to be controversial. Similarly, Mapplethorpe’s work has affected those who are in a position to exhibit controversial art, as well as those who choose to view it. The following excerpt from Dennis Barrie outlines his role in bringing Mapplethorpe’s work to Cincinnati in 1990:

I personally could not do what the Corcoran Museum had done... withdraw from the exhibition or censor the exhibition... the credit of our board [is that] they agreed to go forward without any censorship but we also agreed to go forward with a great deal of educational effort... the kind to make our community understand what this is all about.

Unquestionably a significant event in the Cincinnati art community, the media focus on Mapplethorpe, as well as other artists characterized as “controversial,” began to filter into the larger public domain. The media exposure had a recognizable impact on persons not commonly associated with the art world. Dennis Barrie spoke about such an increased awareness in this way:

They [the general public] argued about this at bowling alleys, they argued about this in concert halls, any dinner you went to this was the topic of conversation, and people stopped their friendships over these issues, I mean brother against brother, sister against sister... there are people to this day that don’t speak to each other because of this.
This combative environment reflected the larger issues of first amendment rights, social values, and individual morality, and that the arts are not always a safe catalyst for understanding culture. Indeed, the events occurring within the greater Cincinnati area became the "measuring stick" for future controversies in the arts regarding the challenging of normative expectations of art. What Dennis Barrie and other members of the Center for the Contemporary Arts realized was that art education had not been a significant part of most American's lives.

**Controversial Art, Commercialization, and the Canon**

As a result of the intense national and local debates aimed at work deemed pornographic, disturbing, and immoral, the stunning and immediate quality of Mapplethorpe's controversial photographs has gone through a metamorphosis of sorts, particularly the images of enlarged phalluses, sadomasochistic sex acts, as well as graphic depictions of overt penetration. To borrow a phrase from critic Robert Hughes, the *shock of the new* has for some worn off. In effect, the inherent rawness which in essence fueled the engine of debate during the early 1990's has significantly been subdued. As a result of the processes of criticism, academic practice, and especially "commercialization," this subduing or "taming" of Mapplethorpe's work reflects the manner through which his work has begun to become part of the canon of Western art, and certainly its history.
One phenomenon contributing to the lessening of Mapplethorpe as a controversial figure has been the commercial success of his work. What qualities about Mapplethorpe's work make it ideal for commercial use? Mapplethorpe's work has for some time been important imagery in the context of contemporary fine art photography. The images which Mapplethorpe produced have been compared to the rich formal photographs by Edward Weston, Paul Strand, and Imogen Cunningham (Knight, 1990). Mapplethorpe's influences have also been linked in this way: "regardless of his subject, be it a vase of flowers, a portrait, or a nude figure, Mapplethorpe attempted a style that was consistently pared down and mannered, with borrowings from F. Holland Day, George Platt Lynes, and Edward Weston" (Ellenzweig, 1992, p. 135). Mapplethorpe has even been called the most influential portrait photographer of our time.

In addition, Mapplethorpe's work and the controversies surrounding it have generated enough interest by the viewing public to become considered decorative or fashionable art. For some time his work has been considered a bridge between "the avant-garde art world and the realm of fashion, media and uptown chic," with more serious claims that "he elevated advertising images and erotica to art" (McGuigan, 1988, p. 50). As a result of his notoriety and his large body of work, Mapplethorpe's imagery is currently reproduced in an ever increasing variety of art texts as well as utilitarian objects such as appointment books, posters, and calendars. Fritscher (1994) reports that "After his death, magazine mail-order advertisements offered an edition of collectible
'dinner' plates printed with his signature calla lily. T-shirts are sold in museums shops along with posters and greeting cards. His photographs appear on refrigerator magnets manufactured in places where copyright means nothing" (p. 192).

As shrewd a marketer as he was, Mapplethorpe knew the value of his work, and he recognized full well its commercial potential. As it happens, Mapplethorpe’s past and current commercial success has much to do with the artist’s planning prior to his death in 1989. For example, he planned the development of the Robert Mapplethorpe Foundation (with a total worth of well over 200 million dollars) which continues to monitor the collection of his work as well as provide various arts and charity grants. The Foundation itself has played a role in the increased exposure which Mapplethorpe’s work has experienced.

Like many examples of contemporary art, the commercial acceptance of Mapplethorpe’s work reflects a process of canonization - perhaps most evident in the way that his work has been tightly packaged via a thematic approach. There are for example, a large number of available picture books which house specific themes related to Mapplethorpe’s photographic subject matter. Various titles include “Flowers” (1990); “Black Book” (1986); and “Some Women” (1989). With respect to issues of marketability and commercialization, Fritscher (1994) noted that “Mapplethorpe’s classic, materialist, and still-life photographs of flowers and everything in his collection..., could be made more valuable through the canonization in his photography” (p. 101).
Through the processes of commercial exposure, there has been a transformation of the raw and radical sense of Mapplethorpe which we experienced in early 1990. What is portrayed via the marketing of Mapplethorpe is that his work has two sides: One side is the safe subject matter, which we can routinely find commercially. The other side can be described as “unsafe.” Although many of us know it exists, images from this other side are not included in the date books at the checkout stand. This thematic separation is evidence that Mapplethorpe’s work is easily and purposely compartmentalized - that his oeuvre is divisible for specific needs. As a result, his work is widely disseminated, and in the dissemination, transformed or tamed.

The process of commercialization, as a type of historical taming, results in the marketing of Mapplethorpe’s work compartmentally. This taming is not a new phenomenon, it is to be seen as a regular route which controversial art takes towards becoming familiar, and canonized. The work of taming also occurs in the presentations of Mapplethorpe’s work which this study focuses on. But here it involves graduate teaching associates speaking about Mapplethorpe’s work as curricular art. The controversial images generate offhand remarks as well as laughter, and teachers become engaged in trying to maintain the formal atmosphere of art education. In doing so, the controversial subject matter of Mapplethorpe’s photographs calls for its own normalization within the context of the art classroom.
Viewing Contexts

In the undergraduate art classroom, Mapplethorpe’s work is not compartmentalized. Instead, students are exposed to the multifaceted subject areas Mapplethorpe worked with, including his images of sex. This classroom experience can thus be thought of as a specific viewing context. The local events which occur within this viewing context may show parallels to the events occurring in other viewing contexts which inspired the national reaction during the 1990’s. Like the art classroom, situated at the center of these larger events are the images themselves and peoples’ engagement with them. Yet, how they are seen shapes the images that are found. Below are several examples of viewing contexts in which Mapplethorpe’s work was presented during this reactionary period.

During senate debate on the National Endowment for the Arts and its policies in 1989, Senator Jesse Helms passed a printed image entitled “Man in Polyester Suit” around the senate floor, which showed a torso of an African American male, dressed in a polyester suit, with his exposed genitalia positioned at the very center of the image (see page 21). Before doing so, Senator Helms asked all female senators as well as senatorial aids to leave the chambers.

On June 30th, 1989, which was to be the opening night of Mapplethorpe’s retrospective at the Corcoran museum in Washington D.C., members of the art community carried out a reactive performance by projecting slide images of Mapplethorpe’s work on the outside wall of the closed museum.
As an act of criticism towards Corcoran's director Dr. Christina Orr-Cahall's decision to boycott the show, Mapplethorpe's work, for a brief moment, not only became larger than life, but so did the issues surrounding the structure and policies of an established art institution.
A third context was the viewing of select images from the "X-Portfolio" series by jurors in a Cincinnati courtroom. Viewing controversial imagery in this setting provided the basis for constructing broad legal arguments determining the public's right to view controversial art. Specifically, the legalities were aimed at deciding whether or not Dennis Barrie would be found guilty on charges of pandering pornography and an illegal use of minors, based on the planned exhibit of imagery which contained depictions of sexually explicit subject matter as well as nude children.

Each of these viewing contexts demonstrates both the power and openness of Mapplethorpe's explicit imagery. Within these viewing contexts for the explicit imagery, viewers encountered not an exhibit, but a spectacle, and not a viewing, but an argument.

**Contexts as They Relate to the Art Classroom**

The context for viewing and discussing art images is central to undergraduate art education. To begin to see the complexities associated with presenting Mapplethorpe's explicit imagery to college students, consider a parallel between this classroom viewing context and the previous ones mentioned.

Like the jury room, the classroom is a highly "ordered" setting. The viewing is not ad hoc - it is a place for the study of the image. The rebellious act of projecting Mapplethorpe's work onto the outside wall of a closed Corcoran Museum indeed reflected its own dynamic, it stood for something else. Projecting Mapplethorpe's work in the
classroom is done in order to insure that the imagery can be seen by all in the room, clearly and vividly. In this sense, the imagery is the centerpiece, and all discourse is oriented to it. And just as senator Jesse Helms readied his colleagues for their encounter with a sexually charged image, so do the instructors prepare their students for their encounter with Mapplethorpe’s explicit images. However, the preparations are done quite differently. These teachers prepare their students in a manner so as not to only criticize Mapplethorpe. Instead, a formal classroom environment wherein students can view explicit images and discuss them in a responsible and “artful” manner is the intended objective. Thus, the opportunity exists for controversial images to yield educational experiences within the smaller environment of the university classroom. The work of producing those experiences is the focus of this study.

**Mapplethorpe in the Classroom**

As a graduate teaching associate, I was involved in a course which instructed college students about American contemporary art. This course centered on an extensive review of past and current trends in the contemporary visual arts including a significant focus on the relationship between the fine arts and popular culture. The course included a section which addressed controversial artists and their art forms, and part of this instructional unit presented a variety of Mapplethorpe’s photographic work via slide presentations. Photographs used for these class
presentations included compositions of flowers, still lifes, and figure studies. Also projected were images of the human sexual form and explicit sexual interactions.

These latter images, often referred to as homoerotic, included various compositions of male genitalia, displays of homosexual encounters, as well as depictions of alternative sexual acts involving elements of masochism, sadomasochism, and bondage. Because this particular imagery is for many shocking, offensive, or even pornographic, the curriculum required that the teaching associate facilitate a constructive learning environment wherein differing opinions concerning Mapplethorpe’s work could be heard and assimilated into the overall discussion of art forms. How teachers in fact develop and maintain such a “constructive learning environment” essentially constitutes this study.

There were several rationales for teaching Mapplethorpe within this unit. These included seeing photography as a fine art process, presenting students with a substantive and well documented controversy in the art world, exploring the broad concept of what constitutes contemporary art within the portfolio of this single artist, topicalizing examples of censorship in current society, and developing an art learning situation which encouraged the discussion of issues such as alternative lifestyles, differing sexual orientations, and nudity in art. Curricular objectives underlying these presentations of Mapplethorpe’s work aimed at having students view the photographic imagery and then discuss their sense of it and the issues and controversies which it generated, in the context of contemporary art and society.
Each time that I have presented Mapplethorpe’s work in the art classroom, there has been a noticeable atmosphere of hesitancy and anticipation coming from students, particularly those who have not seen his work. And the outcomes are uncertain. In a recent class, I had several students object quite adamantly to my showing Mapplethorpe’s controversial work. They questioned the rationale which I used to incorporate his work into a college level art appreciation class and they did not want to participate in the viewing of images which depicted nudity or homosexual sex acts, or to engage in dialogue which addressed these particular issues. Conversely, other students have appreciated the opportunity to view Mapplethorpe’s work and examine the issues surrounding it. As we might expect, while we may find the flowers and still lifes both striking and beautiful, most of us struggle with Mapplethorpe’s interests in photographing the more carnal experiences of his sexual orientation.

The discussions which accompany these presentations eventually turn to educative rationales or goals, addressing issues of nudity in art, the depiction of children, the existence of alternative lifestyles, and the public’s right to view controversial imagery. However, almost all of these discussions come long after more immediate offhanded remarks and assessments, such as “Jesus Christ” and “that’s disgusting.” These comments also spell the breakdown of formal educative structures, and that is also part of my interest in recovering and analyzing such moments. For the purpose of developing an ethnography of this arts learning situation, these moments offer insight into the classroom
practice of art education. Perhaps seen as bordering on disruption, they are illuminating of the ways in which students react to controversial imagery and how the controversy is managed in art education classrooms.

**Viewing: Looking at Safe and Unsafe Imagery**

As I see it, Mapplethorpe’s work in this classroom context is about pedagogy based on sexually explicit imagery. The imagery challenges the pedagogy too, and central to the pedagogy is the social organization of the room. What is to be seen is that teaching Mapplethorpe in the art classroom entails managing the classroom talk and interaction for the purposes of art education. As a way of visualizing the task, it might be beneficial to focus on two of Mapplethorpe’s images which we can characterize again as “safe” and “unsafe.” The first image, entitled “Calla Lily, 1984” depicts a calla lily flower floating above a dense black background (see page 27). This striking floral form, juxtaposed with a vast and darkened void, creates a strong visual connection to the flower’s overall shape and texture, and certainly this photograph can be considered a study of form in space. It also exemplifies Mapplethorpe’s commitment to demonstrating the “classical” aesthetic, or the consistent interplay of formal elements within very dynamic spaces. With no uncertainty, this image is recognizable as a studied image - thoughtful, accessible, and safe. “Calla Lily, 1984” has no moral position.
Figure 4: X Portfolio, Lou, 1978
The second image, entitled "X Portfolio, Lou, 1978," asks more from the viewer (see page 28). The image is an act of urethral stimulation by way of the subject's own pinkie finger. Accompanying this action is the power of the subject's flexed arms and hands. Although one may want to wander away from the explicitness of this action, the overwhelming compositional power of Lou's hands, arms and legs brings us immediately back. Mapplethorpe has made this an "in your face" experience, and the overt sexual directness which this photograph projects has the potential to challenge the viewer in many ways.

Each photograph presents a strong image. Both are graphic and engaging. However, when compared, clear, striking dissimilarities emerge. "X Portfolio, Lou" is visibly more confronting, as it delivers an extreme sex act for its viewer. The striking depiction of "Calla Lily" is more serene. Conceivably, the floral image is judged to be clean, tasteful art, while the terms dirty and pornographic typify our evaluation of "X Portfolio, Lou." We will likely find "Calla Lily" reproduced as posters or in coffee table books, while "X Portfolio, Lou" will be found on the closed reserve at libraries or excluded from print. These are but some of the examples of the underlying dynamics which accompany our viewing of these two photographs.

To bring these images into an educational context, college students in the current setting are immersed in these types of dynamics for a period of fifty minutes. They are first shown slide images of flowers and still lifes and then shown images of oral sex and leather clad men engaged in
sadomasochistic sex acts. How they react to such extremes is part of the interest. But I share a greater interest in examining what becomes of instruction during these moments.

Finding a Theoretical Place

My interests in these classroom presentations reflect a broader research focus aimed at the organization of classroom instruction. Having used the term instruction, teaching, or art education in very general terms, I want to offer a more specific discussion detailing the theoretical basis of this study.

For this study, instruction is seen as a distinctive and routine organization of interactions between teachers and students. The view that instruction is put together in interaction is grounded in the seminal works and findings of the ethnomethodological tradition (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974); research which views classroom instructional phenomena as interactionally ordered, especially in the production and organization of classroom speaking and listening (McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Payne & Hustler, 1980).

These latter studies are especially relevant because each is a separate study of classroom interaction and instruction. To demonstrate the interactional organization of the instruction of controversial art imagery in the art classroom, it is necessary to work with actual moments of teaching. In other words, the work of instruction based on controversial images is found by closely examining actual occasions, as they take place.
In classrooms it is a familiar finding that teachers talk more than students. Flanders (1970) proposed a two-thirds rule where the teacher is speaking twice as often as students, and indeed the teacher’s role in the classroom is asymmetrical to the students’ (Jackson, 1968). Classroom instruction has been described as a series of interactional sequences between student and teacher (Mehan, 1982). The sequences show a structure of three parts: a teacher’s Initiation, a student’s Reply, and the teacher’s Evaluation (IRE). McHoul (1978) routinely found that during classroom instruction, when students talk, they talk to the teacher, and they seldom talk to one another. Additionally, within teacher-student exchanges McHoul found existing formal turn-taking structures, which through their use, projected order and regularity. Thus, the tangible interactional processes which we call instruction largely find their social organization in structures of speaking.

Up to this point, I have offered general views surrounding the controversial nature of Mapplethorpe’s work, and how such controversies are reflected in the art classroom. I have briefly entertained the notion of art instruction as an interactive phenomenon and I have begun to lay the theoretical foundation which supports this study. In order to begin providing the compositional framework for this study, I would now like to describe in more detail the viewing context which shapes the instruction of Mapplethorpe’s work in the classroom setting.
Spatial Organization, Lights off, Projection, and Classroom Interaction

This section serves as a framework for visualizing the practice of art instruction. Classroom space, the room’s darkness, the projection of imagery, and, lastly, classroom interaction are the familiar features where this kind of art education is done. The first component, spatial organization, essentially accounts for the physical lay out of the classroom and the manner in which instruction relies upon the routine organization of classroom space. The classroom’s overall design and the participant’s involvement within this space has a great deal to do with the interactive phenomena which come alive during Mapplethorpe presentations. In this sense, the space has an influence on the organization of the students’ encounter with the imagery. A good example of this lies in how the students manage the seating arrangement during these presentations. In this setting the students are facing one another at a long table which runs directly down the center of the room. As a result, comments are produced and experienced within very close quarters.

The second component is the darkness of the classroom. In the darkened classroom, there are many instances of students speaking to no one in particular. Though these comments are produced in the dark, they are often aimed at the imagery as opposed to other students or the teacher. Talk like this is readily found as students first encounter Mapplethorpe’s more explicit imagery. Occurrences such as this offer a rich context for seeing the ways in which
unaddressed reactions, produced in the dark, find their way into the on-going talk.

The third component which also shapes the way Mapplethorpe's imagery is encountered by the students in these classrooms is the process of projecting slides onto a classroom screen. As an image appears on the slide screen, the comments produced generally have to do with that particular image. Whether controversial or not, the immediacy of an image being projected onto a slide screen calls for reaction, either by teacher or students. Such reactions can be nonverbal or verbal, the latter usually being the case. These routinely occurring events demonstrate that the manner of projection or the process of looking at slide images, as they appear on the slide screen, has great effect on what is said. What do these comments generally reflect? Perhaps expectedly, comments made during the viewing of more explicit images seem to take on a different feel as compared to comments made during the projection of "non-confronting" imagery. The student talk which is produced while viewing the photographs of flowers and still lifes is noticeably different. The talk is calm, it does not express students' dissatisfaction with the imagery, and for the most part, it is formal. During the viewing of more confronting imagery, the talk dramatically changes; it is unstable, it sounds more reactionary and less formal. Also important to consider is the actual placement of such talk within the continuation of instruction. Given the immediacy of a projected image, there is a great deal going on at this time in terms of when viewer comments are made, and where
these comments are placed.

For both student and teacher, this method of looking at art work reflects the familiarity each one has with slide presentations. As it happens, the talk constructed around Mapplethorpe’s imagery has a great deal to do with the actual moments of projection. In this sense, coordinated elements of precision and timing, in terms of how and when comments are made as an image is projected onto the slide screen, give us an accessibility to the interactive properties of art instruction.

The fourth component, which is undoubtedly influenced by the preceding three, is the developing interaction produced by both teacher and students. By interaction, I am referring to the conversational interaction that organizes the instruction. When observing these presentations, the talk is the main observable and accessible organization which shapes and directs teaching. Of course non-verbal actions, including gestures and body language, have a great influential effect on the instructional direction as well. But for this study, the organization of talk in the art classroom is treated as the primary avenue for viewing art instruction as an interactive phenomenon.

**Instructional Collision**

The components of space, darkness, and projection, can be seen as contributing to the interactional organization of the art classroom. In effect, they shape the following phenomenon: As the curriculum reaches the point of transition from imagery depicting floral and still lifes to those
denoting sexual actions, a collision of sorts occurs - the collision of controversial imagery and classroom organization. These collisions show how instruction based on explicit imagery is dramatically different than instruction based on safe imagery.

These collisions are routinely expressed as "disruptions," where any disruption occurring in the classroom needs to be tended to in order to facilitate the continuation of instruction. During presentations of Mapplethorpe's work, as the images of sex first appear on the screen, there is a sense that the confrontational subject matter has to at least be looked at by the students. These initial encounters produce offhanded remarks, giggles, verbal outbursts of discontent, and have even resulted in some students packing up their books and leaving the room.

Such actions usually result in the break down of formal instruction. Inevitably though, instruction must at some point again become the "order of the day" and how this indeed occurs during these moments of "disruption" is part of the interest of this study. In very brief terms, I am interested in looking at how these moments are built, repaired, and ultimately sustained as an art educational experience. The explicitness of Mapplethorpe's imagery, the showing of them in an educational setting, and the practices of classroom "art education" which govern the direction of such art instruction, each have a contributing effect on the way students learn during these moments. Therefore, the collision between controversial imagery and art instruction becomes a revealing place for study.
Collision as an Interactional Organization

As the challenging images appear on the slide screen, the interactional organization of instruction becomes flexed or stressed, and different organizations emerge. To illustrate, two brief transcripts are presented below, each a sequence of classroom talk when different types of images are shown. Sequence (IA) reflects the talk produced while an image entitled "Irises, 1986" is being projected. Sequence (IB) reflects the talk which occurs when students are looking at the sexually explicit image entitled "Man in Polyester Suit, 1980".
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Figure 5: Image projected in line 1 of the following transcript: (Irises, 1986)

(IA). (48R: 5/18/92)

1. ((Slide Advanced))
2. (2.5)
3. T: kay this is irises (. ) nineteen eighty six.
4. (4.0)
5. Whatz one thing you would want
6. to describe in this work? if you
7. S:  /*lighting* (0.5)
8. T: Lighting? (1.5) yeah (.)
9. very specific lighting here (2.5)
10. *good*

Figure 6: Image projected in line 1 of the following transcript: (Man in Polyester Suit, 1980)

(1B). (19R [audio only] 3/12/92)

1. ((Slide Advanced)) (1.0)
2. ((Ordinary chatter))
3. S1: Lor::dy (2.0)
4. T: eh heh heh heh
5. ///((student laughter))
6. T: what was that down there?
7. S2:  /*o::h* */ba::by*
8. (1.5)
9. S3: *sick* (1.0)
10. T: who said that?
The transcripts are a way of seeing art instruction as it takes place. There is, without any question, a visible difference between sequence (1A) and (1B). What then is this difference and how can we begin to make sense of it? To begin with, in sequence (1A) we see a familiar practice of formal art instruction. We have a clear display of a teacher asking a question, and having it answered in an art-relevant kind of way. The answer is then restated by the teacher as a positive form of assessment. This sequence demonstrates a way of speaking which typifies the practice of art instruction. Anyone walking by this art room and hearing this particular sequence of instruction would likely make it out to be on-going art instruction.

But what our second sequence provides might be termed "interrupted instruction," perhaps to some, a lack of instruction. Here the viewing of an explicit image results in what might be taken as unconstrained type remarks - that is, they are all said softly and to no one. Instead of formal questions and answers, we find phrases or idioms which are characteristic of informal ways of speaking and laughter. Sequence (1B) shows a moment of art instruction that is being flexed or stressed.

Reshaping both the imagery and disruptive comments back into what we know and recognize as an "instructional mode" requires that the classroom talk reflect typical art instruction, not whispers, chuckles, or outbursts of discontent. Required to order and tame the talk of the room, and to facilitate the practice of art education, the teaching associates unavoidably work to make the experience of looking
at Mapplethorpe's imagery an educational one. In this way, taming the interactional order of the viewing serves to render explicit imagery speakable within an educational setting which is shaped by educational processes and standards. Taming occurs as these images become the curriculum; taming occurs as teachers attempt to produce orderly, recognizable ways of speaking in the presence of such visually challenging imagery.
Footnotes

1 Use of the term delivery of instruction refers to the notion that teaching, as an interactional achievement of both teacher and student, is for the most part produced and maintained via the routine practices of conversation. Such practices, in turn, suggest that instruction is a highly visible phenomenon, and, that when studied, reveals teaching as an ordered occasion. See Payne and Hustler (1980) for their research on the managing of a cohort, and McHoul (1978) for his application of conversation analysis directed at formal instances of classroom talk.

2 Dennis Barrie’s account, as well as the one immediately following it, occurred during a presentation for a graduate seminar on public policy and the arts offered at The Ohio State University in the Fall of 1991.


4 Recovery and analysis refers to the processes of collecting actual moments of classroom life through audio and video recordings, and from them, developing transcripts to facilitate a visual account of the interactional phenomena which occurs.

5 In this sense, spatial organization delivers the notion that classroom instruction, as an interactional event occurring within the confines of a particular and recognized space, is influenced by the organization of such space by its members.
CHAPTER II

Robert Mapplethorpe's Photography and Art Education Research

Dome On Instructional Contexts: A review of the Literature

This literature review focuses on two topics. The first section treats a collection of critical analyses of Mapplethorpe’s photographic imagery, and in particular, his more controversial work. This literature itself is part of the controversy of Mapplethorpe that is exhibited in the art classroom. The second section details art education research which has addressed art instruction within art classrooms or other types of arts learning environments. Emphasis will be placed on how the term "interaction" has been treated within these studies. This review will end with a discussion centering on the ways in which researchers interpret the notion of "interaction" and how such interpretations in turn will shape the direction of this study.
Section I: Critical Reviews and Positions Concerning Mapplethorpe's Work

Looking for and finding literature on Mapplethorpe was not always a straightforward task. During my search, there were many instances of articles that had evidently been ripped away from their bindings. Oftentimes, published works on Mapplethorpe's explicit imagery, particularly in publications which were gay-oriented, existed not in the open/public realm of library book stacks, but rather within closed reserve areas. Under these conditions, I could only look at a fixed number of issues at a time. And when returning them, they were critically examined by a staff member for what I assumed to be any damage or vandalism that I might have done.

At a local public library, I was told that certain publications were not part of the library's collection because of their inflammatory nature. I routinely engaged librarians with questions concerning these works asking them what they thought about such publications not being available. Answers ranged from "a library is no place for that kind of magazine," to "there ought to be more inclusion of different viewpoints - I wish I knew who made these decisions." I believe that the existence of controversial publications, the ways in which they are kept, and whether or not they are accepted or ignored by institutions, similarly reflects the dynamics which accompany the inclusion of controversial imagery in the art classroom. In the context of this study, the images that cause so much reaction are the same ones being torn from magazines, the ones kept on closed
reserve, or the ones which administrators or board members have deemed inappropriate for the general public to have access to.

Along with the history of controversy surrounding art work of the 1990’s, there exists a plethora of articles, reviews, and texts centering on Robert Mapplethorpe and his work. Their subjects include: Censorship of the arts by the United States government (Thorson, 1989; Fox, 1989; Kuspit, 1989); NEA drops fiscal support for controversial performance artists (Carr, 1990); Deleting Mapplethorpe photographs from art journals (Cembalest, 1992); Art and politics (Dubin, 1992); Philanthropy, pornography and politics (Brilliant, 1990); Defining pornography (Cembalest, 1989); Depicting nude children in the arts (Ginsberg & Richey, 1990); Racial stereotypes as evident in Mapplethorpe’s work (Hemphill, 1990); and conservative based art criticism (Sekula, 1990). Indeed, these varied topics clearly suggest how controversial art has far reaching consequences for many discourses.

Mapplethorpe’s work did not always invoke powerful issues such as these. This section begins with the critical reviews of his work prior to the 1990’s. In many of these reviews, chronologies of Mapplethorpe’s work and artistic growth are built upon the work’s formal qualities. In these instances, the review details the visual forms, alludes to the classical approach which embodies Mapplethorpe’s work, and suggests that Mapplethorpe was an artist obsessed with perfection and technique (Lemon, 1989; McGuigan, 1988).
Linkages Between Safe and Unsafe Imagery

A different yet recurring theme of the critical literature relates specifically to Mapplethorpe's oeuvre - the interplay between both safe and unsafe images. Reviews of Mapplethorpe's work during the mid eighties consistently remark on the linking of both types of photographs. Reviews at this time addressed Mapplethorpe as a photographer of extremes, and his work clearly demonstrated such divisions from the early 1970's. Reminders or suggestions that Mapplethorpe's work at times could challenge our aesthetic sensibilities provided some of the most interesting passages.

Like all esthetes, Mapplethorpe is devoted to artifice: he brings an exceptionally gifted graphic intelligence to his photographs in order to render what he sees as part of a kind of esthetic utopia, formed from his own tastes and identity (an identity from which he most emphatically does not exclude his nastier side) and construed as a kind of ideal realm. (Koch, 1986, p. 145)

Presumably, the term "nastier" alludes to that part of Mapplethorpe's work which challenges, confronts, or offends people. Another view of this duality of imagery is expressed in Anfam's (1988) review of the Mapplethorpe exhibit at the Hamiltons Gallery and National Portrait Gallery in London:

There is an eye for textural contrasts that would do justice to the glossiest coffee table publication, the magical chiaroscuro that became a hallmark of the California "f.64" group but to which Mapplethorpe somehow gives a sexual frisson as black penetrates white, and a play with the unfolding rhythms of flowers that contrives to marry ikebana to Georgia O'Keeffe. (p. 104)
Flowers and Phalluses

These references help bring into view the inherent sexual gravity which encompasses Mapplethorpe’s work. There were, of course, more direct ways in which critics covered the variety of Mapplethorpe’s work. For example, there were reviews which made specific connections between images of flowers (or other objects) and phalluses; the unsafe image context and the more familiar ones. Consider this portion of a review of Mapplethorpe’s work at the Robert Miller Gallery in 1985:

There are few of the stormier porn images in this show, though one, a white man’s fist clutching his enormous stiff, bent dick, has the same harsh elegance as the numerous, voluptuous studies of flowers (which are, lest we forget, sexual organs). (Indiana, 1985, p. 97)

Sekula (1990) similarly makes a tie between Mapplethorpe’s flowers and images of sex:

Mapplethorpe clearly understood the charged archival relation between these ‘simply descriptive’ pictures and the more cloying, glamorized and openly derivative eroticism of his portraits (the “Y” portfolio) and flower pictures (the “Z” portfolio). (p. 42)

And lastly, Danto (1992) makes a similar connection in this way:

There are plenty of images of elongated objects - an eggplant, a fish spread out on newspaper - that have a formal kinship to the phallus, and there is a beautiful bunch of grapes suspended and hence “hung” the way the man in the polyester suit is. But the real connection is less obvious and more a matter of that primordial feeling experienced when, as a youth, Mapplethorpe encountered pornographic pictures on Forty-second Street. His flowers transmit a feeling like that to us, which is what makes them unique. (pp. 336-337)
Critics Make Mention of the Controversy

By late 1989, the writings about Mapplethorpe's work typically centered on the more sexual images. Mapplethorpe's retrospective at the Corcoran was canceled during this year. Relatedly, the controversial air which had developed during the summer of 1989 was filled with political pressures, some of which were directed at the National Endowment for the Arts for their support of photographer Andres Serrano.1 There were other events in the art community during this time which added to the already turbulent atmosphere. For example, Scott Tyler, an art student at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, displayed a work entitled "What is the proper way to display the American flag?", which consisted of an American flag placed on the floor which was subsequently walked on by viewers. Additionally, artist David Wojnarowicz produced a scathing essay entitled "Attacking Public Figures for Inaction on AIDS" as part of a catalog for an AIDS exhibition entitled "Witnesses Against Our Vanishing" in New York. (Atkins, 1991)

How then did the effects of the controversy specifically surrounding Mapplethorpe find its way into the critical analyses of his work? There were many articles which addressed the issues of sex, public viewing, and censorship via the controversies of Mapplethorpe's work. For example, concerning the image "Jim and Tom, Sausalito," which quite graphically depicts one man urinating into another man's mouth, Ellenzweig (1992) writes:

such images offend those not used to seeing the rites and discourses of private sexual
experience invading the public realm. Yet should more restriction be placed upon the exhibition than upon our access to the written word? One does, after all, choose to go to a gallery or art museum. With Mapplethorpe, we find photography in the midst of a momentous battle over the publicly permissible representation, a battle it was thought the arts had by and large won. (p. 136)

Other reviews, particularly those from the gay community, addressed these issues with strongly held beliefs that Mapplethorpe and the controversy surrounding his work did much to bring attention to marginalized cultures. To this extent, in the December 1990 issue of Advocate, a national gay publication, Robert Mapplethorpe was posthumously awarded “Man of the Year.” Recollecting Mapplethorpe’s work and its effect on the general public, Knight (1990), who outlined the reasons why Mapplethorpe had been selected:

The paroxysm that began last year in our nation’s capital and climaxed in a Cincinnati courtroom a few months ago exposed a vein of repressiveness that forces us to look at his pictures in a way not possible before. And clearly, Mapplethorpe accomplished something no other visual artist has for a very long time: His art has functioned as the fulcrum for broad social discourse about pressing issues of human freedom and dignity. (p. 48)

**Criticism and Our Looking at the Images of Sex**

Within almost every critical review of Mapplethorpe, there are suggestions that a part of his work is challenging and, for some, considered pornographic. Such assessments of course are developed only after the critic has viewed the work. Viewing then, is an essential part of the process which enables a critic to understand and write about controversial art work. Like the art critic, a student
viewing Mapplethorpe’s work for the first time must also access the issues which shape his or her understanding of Mapplethorpe’s work. I see a strong parallel existing between a critic viewing Mapplethorpe’s work for purposes of constructing arguments and a student viewing Mapplethorpe’s work in a developing class discussion. Both are becoming articulate about controversy. In this sense, generating descriptive accounts of the imagery and discussing the social ramifications that these images evoke is a mutual enterprise for both critic and a collective body of students and teachers.

Interestingly, the general public’s viewing of Mapplethorpe’s images of sex, has become for some critics a feature of the exhibitions and, as a result, worthy of remark. In a review of Mapplethorpe’s retrospective at the Whitney in 1988, Lemon (1989) offered the following account of people she observed viewing Mapplethorpe’s work:

No matter how busy the Whitney when I visited the show, no one lingered in front of the black hose snaking forth from Man in Polyester Suit (1980). I couldn’t decide whether this collective reticence was metaphysical - an instance where not only the camera, as Balzac warned, but the image had soul-snatching properties - or behavioral: the prospect of being aroused in public, in a well-lit museum, is too embarrassing. Whatever the reason, people preferred to skip over the polyester and stare at the still lifes, just as Mapplethorpe himself had transferred his attention from the gorged male phallus to protuberant flowers. (p. 73)

Reviewing the same show, Danto’s (1992) account though, is a bit different:

The afternoon I visited the Mapplethorpe exhibition, I was impressed by my fellow visitors. They were subdued and almost, I felt, stunned. There were no giggles, scarcely any whispers. It
was as though everyone felt the moral weight of the issues. And one felt an almost palpable resistance to face the thoughts the show generated, which each visitor had to overcome. It is not an easy experience, but it is a crucial one. (p. 217)

Both passages indirectly suggest the social power of Mapplethorpe’s explicit imagery, and the ways in which we view it. Not only do these two passages reveal that the imagery organizes the viewing, but Danto’s observations begin to reveal organized and embedded procedures for viewing imagery based on the setting in which the imagery is presented in. In this particular museum setting, Danto found the viewers were “subdued” as they found their ways to view it. In the classroom the viewing is, at times, a great deal more vocal, and, students do not have the option of skipping over select imagery. They may even have to endure. But they too become engaged in finding a way to view Mapplethorpe’s images.

**Gay Perspectives**

Because most of the controversy surrounding Mapplethorpe’s photographs centers on images of homoerotic sexual acts, it is important to examine critical writings which represent gay perspectives, wherein the writer acknowledges his or her sexual orientation. The unique perspective of these articles provides a further sense of what Mapplethorpe’s imagery has accomplished in the contemporary art world.

Having previously cited Christopher Knight, a critic for the *Los Angeles Times* and *The Advocate*, I would like to return to some of his thoughts concerning Mapplethorpe’s work
as reflecting a gay perspective. In his review of Mapplethorpe’s more controversial work, Knight (1990) expresses concern over mainstream elements of intolerance and racism in this way:

(I)n using straight photography to picture those whom straight society routinely abuses, Mapplethorpe chose to picture the darkest and most fearful imaginings of mainstream American culture: If blacks are unshackled, their men will act upon their animal sexuality; if women are not kept down, they will shed their submissive femininity; if gay men are liberated, they will aggressively flaunt themselves. Mapplethorpe gave stunning visual form to oppressive stereotypes created not by him but by the dominant culture. (p. 40)

In a more specific fashion, Ischar (1990) leads the reader through an account of what Mapplethorpe’s imagery has provided for gay men. Most of his discussion is contexted by a historical review of Charles Demuth’s work as well as the photographic imagery of Frank Affrunti and Bud Barber, who which have either directly or indirectly projected gay perspectives. Ischar’s approach begins with references to how gay artists and writers, who were often representing a gay perspective, have distanced themselves from an “outing-phenomena.”

Ischar places Mapplethorpe and his work at the opposite extreme. Mapplethorpe succeeded in breaking down such artistic inhibitions, resulting in an immediate challenge to mainstream art discourse. But this challenge is just what troubles Ischar. Underlying most of the article is a concern that Mapplethorpe has been canonized through the process of a “posthumous retrospective.” This canonization has evolved around a gay artist, and has simultaneously resulted in a
large-scale projection of homosexual sex acts, and to some extent, a celebration of them. As unique as this situation is, Ischar remains adamant about how mainstream views have helped to construct such a canonization, and he questions whether or not these views extend to what is rightfully positioned as the gay perspective.

This notion of canonization deserves further attention. For example, Ischar uses the critical stances of Kay Larson, David Joselit, and Janet Fardon, all three of whom appear in the catalog “The Perfect Moment,” to typify mainstream critical approaches. The following passage by Larson (which Ischar uses for constructing his argument) concludes that Mapplethorpe’s images are “more interested in playing havoc with the repressive self than in organizing themselves as images in their own right” (p. 8). Based on this interpretation, Ischar then challenges Larson: “Even here, while disqualifying Mapplethorpe’s grittiest homoerotic images, she [Larson] takes care to neutralize their meanings by positing a universal ‘repressive self’- rather than homophobic constructs of sexual pleasure - as the object of their transgressions” (p. 8).

By Ischar’s account, Larson’s way of speaking about Mapplethorpe’s imagery, combined with the directness of the images themselves, projects a polarization and a weakening of the work. Ischar feels such opposing tendencies are inherent within art imagery which projects a gay lifestyle. Specifically, he feels that the “art records the object of our desire while masking our desiring presence” (p. 9). For Ischar, the duality that exists within this statement is
commonplace within the larger framework of gay life and or experiences. And the point is well taken, in that specific Mapplethorpe imagery certainly presents views of homoeroticism that many in mainstream culture have never encountered. Ischar's underlying premises are tied to the oppressive structures imposed by mainstream culture onto the gay community, and he holds that evidence of such restrictions are clearly visible in the way a significant segment of our population responds to such imagery.

As a final note, when I searched for critical perspectives of Mapplethorpe's work from the gay community, I assumed that the character of the writings would be generally supportive of the work. What I found was not a resounding affirmation of my expectations, but a strong sense that the gay community is not a single community, concerning the issues which Mapplethorpe set out to challenge.

**African-American Perspectives**

In some of Mapplethorpe's exhibits, there are many images of African-American males in sculptural positions. Within these images, Mapplethorpe's lens often focuses specifically on the genital areas (see "Man in Polyester Suit, 1980" [page 21]; "Christopher Holly, 1980" [page 53]; and "Philip, 1980" [page 54]). How these framings affect the gaze of the viewer has become an issue in the critical literature (Hemphill, 1990; Mercer, 1991).
Figure 7: Christopher Holly, 1980
Figure 8: Philip, 1980
As both an African-American and gay male, Hemphill (1990) believes that Mapplethorpe’s work can be clearly seen as a “racist aesthetic” wherein Mapplethorpe depicts black males as truncated figures with the camera focused on the genital area. In many instances, “The penis becomes the identity of the black male that is the classic racist stereotype recreated and presented as Art in the context of a gay vision” (p. 18).

In order to position Hemphill’s argument more effectively, consider Indiana’s (1985) review which also addresses the issue of Mapplethorpe’s photographs of black males as inherently racist. Indiana suggests that any charges of racism in Mapplethorpe’s imagery fall short because the subjects depicted in the photographs voluntarily chose to involve themselves in the artistic process. Still, Hemphill maintains that “it is virtually impossible to view Mapplethorpe’s photos of black males and avoid confronting issues of exploitation and objectification” (1990, p. 18). He adds that “the decision to delete heads and limbs for the sake of showing us black cocks and “antique bronzes” is not simply an artistic decision exempt from political analysis” (p. 18).

Indiana’s response also loses its sharpness when compared to Mercer’s (1987) discussion of African-American males in Mapplethorpe’s figurative images. The essay by Mercer came about as a revision of earlier positions he had taken concerning the same racial issues. By also presenting views from both a gay and African-American perspective, Mercer instills a sense of challenge to the viewer’s
ethnicity when encountering these specific images. For example, he acknowledges that the photographic images of African-American males by Mapplethorpe, “can confirm a racist reading as easily as they can produce an anti-racist one. Or again, they can elicit a homophobic reading as easily as they can confirm a homoerotic one” (1991, p. 192).

For Mercer the underlying ambivalence that he experiences with these images portrays a duality that he struggles with in his writing. This duality is also seen in other reviews of Mapplethorpe and his work. For example, Ken Moody, one of the models used extensively in these particular images, speaks of Mapplethorpe as a caring and trusting artist whose intentions were not to exploit the African-American male. Rather, Moody spoke about Mapplethorpe’s work as “gifts to this particular group [the gay community]”, and that “he [Mapplethorpe] is actually giving” (p. 185). Yet, the context of cultural indifference and oppressive relations which exist between blacks and whites in our society may, in a sense, displace the intimacy and friendships which Mapplethorpe’s images also reproduce.

Art Criticism as a Taming Process

Based on the multiple viewpoints of the literature, we are better able to imagine that when people view Mapplethorpe’s explicit work, there can be multiple experiences and understandings. In many critical passages, the terms shocking and offensive are situated among ample references to the work being beautiful and graceful. This dichotomy of words sheds light on the problematics which
critics encounter when writing about Mapplethorpe’s sexually explicit imagery. On the one hand, Mapplethorpe’s work is beautiful. Most of it is rich with light, texture, and pattern. His classical approach to photography results in strong compositional elements. Mapplethorpe’s sexually explicit imagery, though still strong in composition, rests on the element of shock. Such work documents homoerotic encounters, rough play, and graphic sexual acts. Therefore, meaningful criticism about sexually explicit work cannot solely explore the compositional elements found in an image which depicts a man urinating into another man’s mouth. The social values which images like this evoke are just too compelling to be left unattended, and inevitably require criticism directed toward subject matter as well as technique and style.

As suggested in chapter one, the process of art criticism plays a role in the canonization of art, controversial or not. In the context of Mapplethorpe’s posthumous retrospective, Ischar (1990) pointed out that “canonization is aided by critical readings that smooth out and integrate a life’s production” (p. 8). Barrett (1990) has observed that the critical process “is a means toward the end of understanding and appreciating photographs” (p. 2). Ultimately, the doing of art criticism casts two stones: it helps us to learn about and understand art, and in the process it establishes the art as an object for appreciation.
Criticism, Taming and Teaching

For the undergraduate students viewing Mapplethorpe's sexually explicit photographic imagery in the setting of a university classroom, part of their curriculum entails looking at and discussing the imagery. Though almost all of the students have heard of Mapplethorpe, for most, the imagery is new, and it does shock them. In this situation, teachers have to insure that Mapplethorpe's controversial work continues to be legitimized, and this legitimization happens in the talk. But, as controversial art becomes embedded in communicative events, in this case, art instruction, the art existing as an "unspeakable" domain is transformed into one that becomes "speakable." In the process, something happens to the art works as they become subjected to discursive-like frameworks such as art instruction. My claim will be that art instruction, like art criticism, is a process through which controversial art is tamed, as it becomes topical.

Section II: Research on Classrooms and Teaching Within Art Educational Contexts

Because this study is directed at art education instruction produced as students and teachers view and discuss Mapplethorpe's work, research on art instruction, what art classrooms are like, and how arts learning takes place, serves as the foundation for how this study has been developed. This next section of review considers art education research which specifically addresses the components of art instruction.
In the field of art education, there have been formal calls for research aimed at the instruction found in art classrooms (Day & DiBlasio, 1983). The interest towards classroom phenomena, specifically the nature of dialogue in art classrooms has also been suggested as necessary topics for research (Degge, 1982). And recently, Eisner (1993) has stressed the importance of research that involves extensive "description, interpretation, and evaluation of what actually goes on in art classrooms" (p. 54). For research directed at art instruction in varying art educational contexts, the observation and analysis of instructional interactions, or "art talk," can be considered paramount.

There is a substantial body of research in art education which has engaged in developing a better sense of what art classrooms are like, what art teaching consists of, and how arts learning takes place. Art education research aimed at answering such questions has been developed through both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative studies which dominated the field during the 1960's and early 1970's were often seen directed at, or heavily influenced by coded structures of classroom talk (Clements, 1964; Janes, 1970; Neperud, 1970; Moore, 1973). The emergence of post positivistic, or qualitatively based inquiries have focused on the practice of art instruction, how artistic production takes place, and what happens when students view art (Kakas, 1991; Thompson & Bales, 1991; Taunton, 1983; D'Onofrio & Nodine, 1981; and Sevigny, 1977). Other examples of qualitative research have addressed structures of teaching within mainstream and multicultural settings (Bullock &

Some of this research has been developed using ethnographic methodologies of participant observation, field studies, and case studies (see Anglin, 1985; Johnson, 1981; Stokrocki, 1986, 1989; Pariser, 1981). The methodological approach, termed educational criticism, which attempts to "render and evoke the classroom scene through description, interpretation, and evaluation" (Alexander, 1983, p. 48) has also been applied to instruction (Alexander, 1977, 1983; Catford, 1994).

**Contributions of Research on Art Instruction**

In a central yet often un-remarked on way, these and other studies aimed at art instruction or arts learning have relied on some form of talk or interactional phenomena for data, codings, findings, claims, etc. For example, Johnson (1981) incorporated a phenomenological study directed at the processes of socialization taking place during museum tours. The verbal exchanges between children and docents were viewed as raw data. The exchanges were first recorded by the researcher, who followed the tours. These were then developed into transcripts for subsequent analysis. Analysis relied on the use of five predetermined categories in which the observed and recorded interactional phenomena could be placed. These categories centered around the types of
interpretations or "knowledge" which students generated during tours, specifically, aesthetic, cultural, symbolic, historical, and technical (p. 58). In this sense, interest was placed on how "knowledge was made available to children during the tours" or rather "how are children socialized, and how is knowledge built up and made plausible to them?" (p. 61).

During the course of her study, Johnson remarked that "knowledge was presented through metaphors and analogies made by the participants as they conversed with one another" (p. 61). She further found that "docents fostered the construction of knowledge through three styles of interaction: monologue-lecture, inquiry-question, and imagine-role-play" (p. 62). I share great interest in Johnson's development of these styles of interaction. That there are a variety of interactions which occur during art educational experiences is directly relevant for my study. And to some degree, the presentations of Mapplethorpe's work are somewhat like a guided tour. Thus, Johnson offers us "ways of speaking" about the processes which involve the viewing and discussion of art work.

In research done on interactions within a studio setting, Sevigny (1977) integrated a triangulated method which incorporated ethnomethodological as well as traditional fieldwork techniques to develop an ethnography of communication. Constructing such an ethnography was based on closely examining both student and teacher behavior. This involved specific descriptions of nonverbal behavior; reconstructed histories; summaries of student responses;
introspective analyses; behavioral frequency counts; attendance patterns; social interaction accounts; and methodological notations (Sevigny, 1981, p. 76). Additional data used for the study was gained through interviews and through the researcher's experience as a complete participant observer. For example, Sevigny performed the role of a beginning art studio student within the setting which was he was investigating.

By incorporating a triangulated methodology, a great amount of description concerning the actions which constitute art classroom life was obtained. Some of these descriptions aimed at recovering the nonverbal phenomena occurring in the studio setting. The passage below offers a rich account of the complexities associated with even the most routine of studio activities, in this case, a critique of art work:

The student comes to the table and proceeds to take her work out of the portfolio—the teacher stands back from the work and the student placing [sic] his hands on her hips. The student shrugs her shoulders, the teacher points to part of the picture and begins waving hand across certain area—teacher points, squints. Student points to work, teacher steps in and takes a sip of his coffee—teacher nods but continues focusing on work and then makes a flash eye contact with the student. (1981, p. 84)

We can imagine that the events taking place in this particular sequence occur in a matter of seconds. Sevigny found that observing and detailing small amounts of interactional time offered a great deal of information that could be further addressed analytically. For example, this passage reveals many of the nuances associated with human interaction which often go unnoticed. In the context of my study, what this passage and others like it demonstrate is
that the processes through which students and teachers interact are not only complex, but that they also offer grounds for understanding the social interactions which in essence drive "art speak."

In research focusing on effective methods of art instruction for second and sixth grade students, Stokrocki (1986) developed analyses based on the methods of participant observation, content analysis, time sampling, and instructional verification. An integral part of this process involved intensive examination of three distinct types of behavior found existing in the classroom. Using categories of behavioral actions formulated by Schmid (1979), Stokrocki recorded substantive, managerial, and appraisal behavioral units and their frequency. Stokrocki found that the teacher spent the majority of time acting as a manager, and that the teacher's instruction "could be considered predominately process-oriented" (1986, p. 90).

In another study directed at teacher-student interaction within a multicultural classroom setting, Stokrocki (1989) incorporated similar methods of ethnography in order to access the instructional complexities associated with teaching in a multicultural environment. Descriptive terms used such as "in-process feedback" (p. 90) helped to facilitate a sense for the interaction produced during the production of art work. Other observations, such as "students naturally cooperate to solve problems" (p. 91), or the researcher's recommendations to the teacher such as "appraise students' progress and work while in progress - frequently, individually, and informally" (p. 94), suggest
that the art classroom is an environment in which a teacher’s expectations and positive spirit could combine to form effective multicultural art education.

Research by Alexander (1980) set out to provide an in-depth commentary aimed at one particular high school art history program. By applying the methods of description, interpretation, and evaluation used in aesthetic criticism, the researcher was able to provide the reader with a strong sense of what one teacher was like, and how his method of teaching could be viewed as a process of “modeling.” Through this method of educational criticism, Alexander emphasized that the researcher is completely engaged in “an analytical, metaphoric, and searching exercise” (1980, p. 22). In this way, the “researcher as critic” seeks “to be more artistic in the writing and thus to convey the quality of life in the classroom” (p. 22).

Alexander also demonstrated specific interests in how classroom dialogue develops. At one point she noted the way in which interactions occur within the structure of teacher and student talk:

One pattern of student-teacher interaction often ran: (a) teacher asks a question or a rhetorical question, (b) teacher expands on question or asks a second clarifying question, (c) student responds, (d) another (or other) student(s) respond(s), (e) teacher builds on student response. (p. 24)

Such observations are illuminating for they tell us a great deal about how instruction develops and how it is subsequently maintained. Alexander also focused attention on specific moments of instruction such as “slide-discussion” and “screen-side talk.” Examining these and other moments of
instruction led to the development of "interpretational views" such as the teacher's ability to model his student's "vocabulary, concepts of art history, description, comparison, and humor" (p. 25), or that the teacher engaged in "responsive pedagogy" (p. 26). The processes of observing and analyzing interactions built a description of the overall educative experience.

In Eisner's (1994) text The Educational Imagination, there is a study of a middle school level ceramics class which was also developed through the method of educational criticism (see Catford, pp. 309-329). Detailed accounts of classroom life spanning over a period of days were described. A great deal of emphasis was placed on the multiple roles that the art teacher played during class time with respect to the issues of control and freedom. For example, there were passages which accounted for moments of art instruction, critical evaluation of art work, and a teacher's disciplinary actions in response to clay being thrown around the room by students. Catford expressed that the examination centered equally around the broad domains of "classroom management, curriculum, and teaching" (p. 322).

Like Alexander's (1980) study, Catford developed a rich, "thick description" of what an art classroom was like. In her critique of the component of "teaching," Catford found that the teacher felt the need to "make contact with each child daily," "structure the lessons" so as to have students experience a strong sense of closure, "demand a specific amount or type of work," and "get them to see how to create their own problems to solve" (pp. 325-326). As in
Alexander's study, each of these findings were developed via the researcher's observation of actual moments of teaching as well as through interviews with the instructor. For Catford, the interactive domain clearly provided a springboard from which to remark on the instructional manner or style of a successful art teacher.

Recent research by Kakas (1991) has also addressed classroom interaction and conversations made by fifth graders during art making. Essentially, Kakas' study looked at the different types of responses made by students when exposed to three different styles of teaching. The study relied on coding procedures familiar to discourse analysis and process-product research, both of which will be discussed in the upcoming chapter. Based on three types of teaching styles, including minimal feedback, questioning feedback, and "directive feedback", the content of peer interactions existing during drawing time were entered into sixteen specifically developed categories. Examples of peer interactions included the following: "look at another's picture"; "show picture to others"; "frustration gesture"; "question peer about his/her picture"; and "comment on peer's picture". Due to numerous interactions existing between students and the researcher as teacher, a separate group of nine categories was developed which accounted for specific types of teacher/student interaction, for example, "show picture to researcher"; "ask researcher for advice or guidance"; "watch researcher talk with another subject"; and "ask for researcher's opinion."
Aside from the research generating an incontestable sense of the interactional richness associated with art instruction, it was found that "relationships existed among peer conversations, interaction with the researcher, the feedback method received, and, in some cases, the drawing approach used in a lesson" (pp. 31-32). Kakas further proposed that research needs to examine:

both structured and spontaneous forms of classroom discourse because knowledge of these forms can guide them to reflect on their own talk with students, to weigh the benefits of peer conversations and student interaction with the teacher, and to plan future classroom experiences that will take advantage of forms of classroom talk that might best contribute to cognition and learning. (pp. 33-34)

At this point, I would like to address the issues of interpretation and methodology in terms of how classroom interactions are collected and used, via a re-review of the research previously discussed. What I am interested in presenting is how interactional phenomena are viewed and subsequently managed.

**Interactional Organizations in Art Instruction Research and the Call for Accuracy**

Johnson (1981) described her methods of study of interactions occurring during museum tours as being based on "the sociology of knowledge developed by Berger and Luckmann (1966) which is rooted in phenomenology, phenomenological sociology, and symbolic interactionism" (p. 55). Based on these influences, she saw her study as "not concerned with a traditional focus of research, or with testing hypotheses,
but with illuminating ways in which experience is interpreted in our society" (p. 55). For Johnson, experiences, and our interpretation of them, are directly linked to the interactions which occur in social settings. Johnson endorsed Esland’s (1971) position that “teachers and students share reality and construct zones of knowledge through their interactions” (p. 57).

Sevigny’s (1977) study revealed his interests in the problematics of descriptive research, in particular, the issue(s) of researcher misperception of classroom events.

...until classroom investigators possess more solid and reliable descriptive information related to the orderings of social process in learning settings, the study of achievement will continue to shed but scattered light on the learning and schooling process itself. (1981, p. 80)

Relatedly, the passage below summarizes Sevigny’s understanding of the problematics associated with quantitative approaches to human action:

The observer’s capacity for subjective interpretation of human action is generally ignored in the methods systemic observers use to go about their recognition of specifically coded behaviors in the first place. The result has often been that coded systems use overly generalized categories as “teacher asks question” and “student responds,” which lend themselves primarily to frequency measurement and say nothing of the unique and qualitative dimensions of classroom interaction. (1981, pp. 67-68)

Sevigny sensed that classroom life was too complex a phenomena to quantify, and if tried, the better sense of how interactions are produced and managed would be lost.

Stokrocki’s studies (1986) aimed at effective teaching discussed at length how interactions were treated and analyzed. In the study on second and sixth grade art
teaching, she considered what the teacher did as highly influenced by perceptual organization, that is, how the teacher understands "his/her own teaching, students, and the aim and content of teaching from converging perceptual patterns" (p. 83). Stokrocki maintained that the higher the perceptual organizational skills a teacher possesses, the more effective that teacher ultimately is in the art classroom. For Stokrocki, recognizing moments or acts of "perceptual organization" had a great deal to do with the interactional life of the art classroom, as in the following descriptions:

Ninety-three percent of the second graders liked talking about art, and they were most enthusiastic during occasional discussions in the art room.... On three occasions, the sixth graders presented their work in assembly for the younger students to appreciate performing with their fluorescent masks, giant cardboard puppets, or showing their animated movie. The younger students responded enthusiastically.... Even though second graders felt their work time was adequate, their slowness and complaints in cleanup proved otherwise. This suggests that limited time was an occasional problem for them. (p. 98)

Discussions, performances, and complaints made during cleanup each existed as a separate interactional phenomenon but were found to be a routine part of this art classroom experience. Stokrocki pointed out that "understanding perceptual organization involves describing, analyzing, and interrelating teacher intentions, students' expectations and responses, and other contextual variables" (p. 91). In a broader sense, the observation and analysis of art classroom life inherently relies on the researcher's familiarity with on-going classroom interactions.
Alexander (1980) defined her methods of educational criticism as "a controlled form of inquiry, based on lengthy classroom observation, which takes the form of portrayals of and commentary on classroom life" (p. 21). Borrowing from Eisner, she added that,

The inquiry must be based on the researcher's "educational connoisseurship" - a knowledge of the possibilities and alternatives in education which allows the critic to see, relate, illuminate, and render the classroom scene. (p. 21)

This study was found to be embedded with similar accounts of classroom life, particularly descriptions which characterized how dialogue develops. She proposed that developing an ethnographic account of an art classroom through the method of "educational criticism" in turn "reveals a richer body of conclusions about the classroom experience than many of the more traditional modes of research" (p. 29). For Alexander, describing interactions was part of the broader understanding of what constitutes classroom life. She proposed that seeing the complexities of teaching required that one thoroughly investigate dialogue, and the components which embody it.

Similarly, it was evident that Kakas (1991) regarded classroom interactions as communicative events and suggested that they were complex things. By designing her analysis of "peer conversations" based on three different styles of teaching, she acknowledged that art instruction was not governed by teacher feedback alone. Instead, she provided the notion that art instruction was mutually constructed by those participating in the event.
Because Kakas viewed her research as descriptive in nature, the methodological choice to develop “tentative references” concerning types of interaction as opposed to incorporating predetermined coding systems was considered fundamental. As an example of how observed interactions were grouped according to types, consider a description from the “show picture to others” peer interaction category:

This category consisted of both verbal and nonverbal communication: “Look at how many colors I got.” “Mine looks like slime [holds up picture to show others].” Students showed their pictures to others by holding them up for one or more peers to see, by poking a neighbor to get her/his attention to look at the drawing, or by calling someone by name to look at their work. Minimal feedback subjects engaged in the greatest amount of showing pictures to others. (p. 28)

What Kakas described in this passage were the sounds and the looks of the interactional achievements which the students regularly displayed when making their drawings. In a broader sense, the research begins to recover some of the interactional organization associated with familiar events in an art classroom, such as a student holding up their work and talking about it with their peers. Indeed, research like this begins to address some of the domains of classroom life which have been overlooked in our field.

**Glossing as an Inherent Part of Art Education Research**

Researchers often use classroom interactions as a springboard for further topical inquiries, such as teacher effectiveness or classroom management. For example, Alexander (1980) provides an account of one teacher’s instructional methods:
Mr. Jewel provides a supportive atmosphere for growth as he crawls around an African statue, cracks a corny joke about an artist's name, or holds a screen side talk on maintaining standards. And his tactics seem to work. Kids get excited about and involved in art history. And they learn to look and see. (p. 28)

Although this excerpt does tell us something about effective art history teaching, it essentially presents us with an anecdotal view of what effective teaching consists of. This view has been developed by linking descriptions of various teacher actions with those of an undifferentiated student domain. The way this description is formulated serves as a summary report of effective teaching, rather than its analysis. Alexander senses that the students in Mr. Jewel's classroom are excited and motivated learners of art history, but it remains to be said just how such excitement and motivation actually happens. Thus, we can ask 'just how is it that students learn to look and see'?

Kakas (1991) focused attention on a great deal of verbal and nonverbal interaction. However, it was stressed that "only talk that related to the drawing lesson was analyzed; social conversations (nonart) talk were not examined" (p. 26). This lack of interest in the "nonart talk" claims to know in advance what it could be, and its relevance for art education instruction. In this study, all talk recovered during a selected event is treated as part of the occurrence, or at least none is ruled out in advance.

Studies of classroom management account for a significant part of the research on teaching. Indeed, how teachers handle the classroom space, generate comments, or deal with disruptive students is of great importance when
addressing managing issues. In Catford's study of a ceramics class, she describes two students engaged in a bear hug:

Two students are rough-housing on the other side of the room. One has the other in a bear hold. "Okay. Cool it on the hugs!" Mr. Gebhart raises his voice so they will hear him. With this warning, there are several smiles, and the students get back to work. (p. 317)

Catford provides this account as a way for the reader to visualize a specific classroom experience. Indeed, we have a brief, recognizable account of a classroom event, as well as how it is managed by the teacher. For purposes of constructing descriptive research, this way of recovering a classroom event fulfills its purpose. However, in the context of my study, the manner in which students view and discuss controversial photography is developed through an analysis of the talk in and as it is produced. Descriptions of classroom events, such as a teacher squelching student laughter as a sexually explicit image is projected onto the slide screen, are not developed through anecdotal accounts. Rather, events are examined for their organizational structure as found in the interactions which take place in real time.

A Reconceptualization of Teaching

For this study, the social life and practice of art instruction are to be found embedded within the production of classroom talk. Put another way, art education is rooted in the interactions which exist between teacher and student or student and student within the context of an art classroom. For all intents and purposes, art instruction does not exist
through clearly stated objectives, a well written curriculum, or projected learning outcomes. Instead, art instruction is organized and shaped by the on-going interactions which take place within the classroom. In this sense, the production and placement of the talk in the room constructs what we routinely see as the art teaching and art learning.

To clarify research on instruction, the first section of chapter three focuses on two established paradigms of interaction analysis research - Process-Product and Discourse Analysis. This section will provide a broad survey of interactional analysis research as applied to general education contexts. Considering how the term "interaction" has been conceptualized and used will again be a general focus. In this way, I will develop the theoretical frameworks, methods of implementation, and findings that each of these approaches has generated.
Footnotes

1 Although both Andres Serrano and Robert Mapplethorpe received grants from the NEA to fund exhibitions of their work, it is often believed that Robert Mapplethorpe received funds to produce his work. In actuality, Mapplethorpe never directly received any NEA funding (Fritscher, 1994, p. 66).

2 During the latter stages of my literature review on Mapplethorpe, specific passages found within Fritscher's (1994) text left me seriously questioning Robert Mapplethorpe's racial views towards African-American males. Due to the degree of accuracy and frankness which Fritscher's text displays, I now feel differently about Mapplethorpe's intentions with respect to the use of African-American males in his work. This is due to Mapplethorpe's use of derogatory terms when speaking about African-Americans. In this light, Hemphill's arguments seem very sound.
CHAPTER III

Process-Product, Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis: A Review of the Literature and a Proposed Methodological Rationale

In the general education research literature on classrooms, it is found that the term interaction is routinely used to describe what goes on in instructional settings. Consequently, what we find is the use of this term for the construction of analytic topics, such as procedural display (see Bloome, Puro & Theodorou, 1989), classroom management (Allen, 1986), teacher personality and behavior (Kagan & Grandgenett, 1987), ability grouping (Eder, 1981), and communicative organization of trouble in classrooms (Grahame & Jardine, 1990). Similarly, in art education research, interaction is often part of larger conceptualizations of broader research goals centered on learning outcomes, effective teaching practices, and understanding processes associated with cognition. However, interactions are seldom a topic of study for their own structure and organization.
There is, however, a body of research which has been engaged in developing an understanding of classroom interactions, as they relate to processes of instruction and learning. As a way of characterizing this body of research, I would like to borrow Erickson's (1986) position which states that two distinct research approaches toward classroom interactions exist; namely "mainstream" and "interpretive." Subsequently, this review will both define these types of approaches and center on the ways in which these differentiating conceptual frameworks determine how classroom interactions are to be collected, analyzed, and ultimately interpreted.

**Section I: Mainstream and Interpretive Research: Applications in Educational Research**

In both theory and practice, the analysis of classroom interactions has relied extensively on mainstream and interpretive methodological approaches for its findings and postulations. These two approaches reveal fundamentally opposing conceptualizations of what constitutes classroom interaction and, subsequently, how such interactions can be studied. For example, Erickson (1986) expresses that mainstream research aims at determining interaction as a causal relation among behavioral variables. Such an approach, which routinely reflects a process-product orientation, relies on systematic observation of classroom interactions, usually in the form of coding, in order to maintain high levels of reliability and uniformity across varying contexts. Erickson (1986) also states that process-
product research works within the *positivistic paradigm* with its emphasis on quantifying behavior and variable analysis.

Relatedly, there are strong links between process-product research and behavioral psychology, a discipline which has extensive foundations built upon quantifying human behavior. Process-product research has been described as offering a "taxonomy of teacher behaviors, counting (or experimentally manipulating and counting) these teacher behaviors over one or more lessons, and then correlating cumulative counts with individual student or pooled-class outcome measures" (Carlsen, 1991, pp. 157-158).

Conversely, the interpretive conceptualization approach towards classroom interaction is "concerned with the specifics of meaning and action in social life that takes place in concrete scenes of face-to-face interaction, and that takes place in the wider society surrounding the scene of action" (Erickson, 1986, p. 156). However, based on the review of literature, it will be seen that even within the realm of interpretive research, there exists a variety of approaches, some of which reflect more of an orientation towards language (discourse analysis), while others reflect more of an orientation towards social interaction (conversation analysis).

**Process-Product Research**

Process-product approaches dominated education research during the 1970s, and their effect is certainly still evident within strains of current research. Process-product research initially aimed to "determine which teaching processes are
effective in relation to desired outcomes, such as student achievement" (Koehler, 1978, p. 3). Much of the research on classrooms produced prior to and during the 1970s relied on coding procedures, which are an integral part of process-product research methods.

In simplest terms, the coding method of data collection involves a trained researcher observing a classroom setting, and coding different types of interactions into specific predetermined categories. One of the most noted examples of coded interaction analysis research was Flanders' (1970) Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC). This system relied on ten specific categories of classroom interaction. Seven categories encompassed the teacher's talk, two were used for the students' talk, and one final category was used for instances of silence or confusion.

Essentially, this is how the coding was carried out: Trained coders would observe and note instances of classroom interactions within an allotted time frame (in this case three seconds), and assign each one to a specific category. The first three categories represented several types of teacher responses, including (a) accepts feeling, (b) praises or encourages, and (c) accepts or uses ideas of pupils. The next four categories, representing teacher initiated talk, included (d) asks questions, (e) lecturing, (f) giving directions, and (g) criticizing or justifying authority. Student talk was also entered under distinct categories, including (h) pupil-talk-response and (i) pupil-talk-initiation. Based on the collection of measurable data (coded responses), Flanders' system was used to display the
frequencies of both teacher and student responses and/or initiations. Analytically, this data contributed to observations of broader domains such as teacher effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Within Flander's system, classroom interactions are viewed as "spontaneous verbal communication," which can be arranged as data and subsequently displayed to "study patterns of teaching and learning" (Flanders, 1970, pp. 28-29). Although this treatment seems accurate, it is somewhat misleading. Flanders' system of coding tends to rely on our abilities as observers to quickly understand the nature of classroom interactions. As an example, consider the following passage which outlines Flanders' second category - determining acts of praise in the classroom:

Genuine praise can usually be separated from superficial verbal habits. Pupils probably ignore the latter as a result of excessive use. Genuine praise often takes longer than three seconds to express so that the observer records more than one code symbol. (p. 41)

What this passage delivers are anticipated inferences which clearly shape the observer's expectations for what counts as praise. What is not considered is that acts of praise can be extremely varied events, and it cannot be assumed that they are always identified by the observer. For instance, actions of praise are not always going to be verbal. The non-verbal domain surely exhibits practices of praise through eye contact, hand gestures, and the like. So, although Flanders designed his categories based on the verbal domain, one has to take seriously the interconnection which talk has with such non-verbal phenomena. What is needed is
an in-depth interpretation of what actions of praise (either actual or disingenuous) actually are, and the ways in which the observer could accurately distinguish between the two. Thus, contrary to Flanders’ assumptions, classroom observations may actually be replete with actions which could go overlooked.

How teachers interact in the classroom setting has been a focus of many inquiries again based on the process-product approach. Brophy & Good (1974) suggest that teachers are generally unobservant of their own behavior. Their studies have contributed to a long list of postulations in the areas of teacher expectations, teacher and student behavior, and classroom management (Brophy & Kher, 1986; Brophy, 1982; Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979; Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Good & Grouws, 1975).

I would like to describe, in more detail, process-product research aimed specifically at teacher expectations in order to facilitate another general use of the term interaction. In a study by Brophy and Good (1970), two separate areas of classroom interaction were the focus. The first looked at basic student and teacher actions; for example, hand raising, the number of times a student was called on during an open question, or the total number of incomplete, incorrect, and “don’t know” answers. The second section focused on how teacher preferential treatment affected student behavior, as measured by the percent of wrong answers followed by criticism, or the percent of wrong answers followed by repeating or rephrasing the question, or by giving a clue to students.
Because the study's findings were based on coded data, the second section on "preferential treatment" relied on the observer's interpretation of which teacher acts qualified as praise, criticism, or rephrasing. What was not taken into account were the interactional organizations surrounding teacher questioning, student feedback, and "preferential treatment." In this sense, the research was based on a fragmented view of classroom teaching, as opposed to one which attempts to see teaching as a sequence of interrelated events.

There has also been research done on classrooms which link process-product and discourse analytic approaches. Carlsen (1991) proposes that Bellack's 1966 text _Language of The Classroom_, has benefited both fields. Bellack's main interest focused on the pedagogical significance of what the speaker was saying with a secondary interest directed at specific communicative meaning or structures underlying classroom teaching (Lindsay, 1990). Similar to Flanders' work, Bellack devised a coding procedure aimed at different actions related to the following pedagogical practices: (a) structuring, or focusing attention on subject matter; (b) soliciting, or eliciting a verbal response; (c) responding, or bearing a reciprocal relationship to soliciting moves; and (d) reacting, or accepting, rejecting, modifying or expanding what has been said previously (1990, p. 108). Bellack determined that the teaching process occurred via "teaching cycles," which could possibly result in twenty-one possible combinations based on the four pedagogical moves described above.
Related to his initial interest in teaching patterns, Bellack also devised a coding scheme which categorized four distinct types of meaning that he felt were basic to the content of classroom communication. These were substantive meaning, substantive-logical meaning, instructional meaning, and instructional-logical meaning (1966, p. 20). Essentially these four meanings, as communicated by both teachers and students in the classroom environment, enabled the transition of subject matter. Each meaning was also seen as contributing to the development of regular classroom patterns, procedures, evaluations, and directions.

Carlsen maintains that through Bellack’s approach, process-product research “conceptualized the four moves - structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting - as independent and has striven to describe the effects of each on product variables like student achievement” (p. 160). Furthermore, research based on a sociolinguistic framework “has used the model to begin developing descriptions of how speakers interact in social settings” (p. 160).

**Criticism of Process-Product Research**

There has been a great deal of criticism aimed at the theoretical or conceptual frameworks behind process-product research, and specifically at the procedures of coding as systematic classroom observation. One of the fundamental critiques addresses the use of predetermined categories in order to provide a demonstration of reliability across observational periods (Erickson, 1986). This criticism points to the positivistic undercurrent of designing
observational measures to achieve claims of reliability. Another criticism of coding is aimed at the observer's practice of projecting meanings onto observed behavior. For example, it has been proposed that coding cannot achieve access to a teacher's intentions. Regarding the inadequacies of coding methods, Heap (1982) maintains that:

Such methods necessarily proceed as if they deliver the goods they advertise, i.e., identify cognitive phenomena correctly via behavior. Of course, their delivery cannot guarantee the identity of the goods, because no one can be certain, in principle, as to what goes on in the mind of a fellow being. (p. 392)

What Heap argues is that cognition is an unseen process, and cannot be made visible through the practices of coding. This is a heavily weighted argument, given the amount of education research that has tried to determine cognitive processes.

Criticism of process-product research has also centered on the issue of generalizing teaching behaviors across contexts and subjects (Berliner, 1979); the use of predetermined coding categories (Erickson, 1986); and ignoring content (MacMillan & Garrison, 1984). Additionally, Flanders' and Bellack's research has been challenged for looking only at limited discourse units and for failing to take into consideration other types of response structures occurring between two or more individuals (see Collins, 1987). For example, Coulthard (1977) suggests that the categories of response and initiation used in Flanders' study were too narrow in range. His claim was that the distinction between both types of talk (teacher and student) was inherently more complex, and that the categories failed to discriminate between types of utterances. Similarly,
Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) critiqued Bellack’s categories of teaching cycles, claiming that it was impossible for all teacher utterances to be placed into four distinct categories of pedagogical moves. They similarly challenged the notion that a reacting category could house whatever observable actions did not fit into the other three possible categories.

Erickson (1986) asserts that predetermined coding categories results in the inability to record specific classroom actions. Yet these same coding categories are supposed to enable the researcher to construct claims concerning specific outcomes in the classroom setting. There has also been criticism directed at how process-product inquiries structurally dismiss various components of the classroom setting, such as the level of grade, the subject matter behind the teaching, or even the physical and psychological characteristics of the students.¹

Arguments also have been developed concerning the accuracy of coder’s inferences about the phenomena that is being recorded. For example, Brophy and Good’s (1969) manual for coding classroom behavior has been specifically criticized for their prescribing a two observer system as a way of assuring coder agreement from being invalid. Whereas Brophy and Good believed that this process would eliminate any inaccuracies in coding, the criticism was that cross-checking inferences still would not guarantee the concreteness of any inference, and reliability would therefore not assure validity.
**Discourse Analysis**

Although process-product research claims to rely on the processes of classroom interaction for the development of coding categories and subsequent variable analysis, discourse analysis places attention on interaction as a linguistic phenomenon. Research on educational settings has focused on analyses of lesson structure (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Lemke, 1982), collaborative processes in the formulation of lessons (Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988), relevancy of nonverbal cues (Shultz & Florio, 1979; Bremme & Erickson, 1977; Dore & McDermott, 1982), student responses (Lundgren, 1977; Durkin, 1979); and student interaction (Goodland, 1983).

Based on the foundational sociolinguistic frameworks proposed by Gumperz & Hymes (1972) much of the above research contributed to the early development of an ethnography of communication. Thus discourse analysis, and specifically, sociolinguistics, has contributed to the finding and subsequent study of patterns existing in the production of speech or linguistic interaction. Research on classroom interactions based on a linguistic approach examines the recurring patterns of language use, and seeks to distinguish typical kinds of interaction within and across certain classroom settings. Applications of discourse analysis in classrooms has revealed that classroom talk is produced and maintained via the same established patterns or rules found in informal conversational structures. However, there are important distinctions between sociolinguistic approaches aimed at classroom interaction and other methods of
interactional analysis which need to be recognized.

**Sociolinguistic Applications For Interaction Analysis**

Sociolinguistic research, like other strains of discourse analysis, can generally be described as interpretive as opposed to positivistic. When reading process-product research, the emphasis placed on coded schemes (attempts to quantify social behavior), as opposed to the qualitative frameworks found in sociolinguistic analyses, displays a strong sense of difference in the way interactions are fundamentally viewed. For example, when coded into specific categories, interactions are subsequently presented as one-way causal events, as opposed to a result of reciprocal exchanges of actions (Erickson, 1986).

Concerning the differences in data gathering and analysis, Cazden (1986) states that sociolinguistic researchers “work from transcriptions of audio or video recordings of classroom life or, less often, from detailed observational notes. Their reports may also include frequency counts, but an important place is given to qualitative analysis of excerpts of actual classroom talk” (p. 433).

Perhaps the central difference between process-product and sociolinguistic analysis is that sociolinguistics is “concerned with the interdependency of language and situation” and the “role of social context in the interpretation of spoken language” (Carlsen, 1991, p. 158). In general, sociolinguistic studies of the classroom rely on the following assumptions: Language is understood by affected
parties on both a structural and functional level; the classroom proves to be a unique environment in which language is produced; and there is a great deal of differentiation in each student's competency of language use (Wilkinson, 1982).

An early and important sociolinguistic classroom study was by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). Fundamentally, their methodology can be placed within the systematic operations of applied linguistics, although Cazden (1986) considers their interest as more ethnolinguistic due to the specific settings in which their work developed. Though not originally interested in classroom research, Sinclair and Coulthard decided to investigate discourse in classrooms because,

it would be more productive to begin again with a simple type of spoken discourse, one which has much more overt structure, where one participant has acknowledged responsibility for the direction of the discourse, for deciding who shall speak when, and for introducing and ending topics. (1975, p. 6)

Sinclair and Coulthard developed a “rank scale analysis system” for grouping data gained from classroom observation. This scale was based on the theory that language in the classroom has a type of hierarchal structure that can lend itself to having each component analyzed separately. For example, in linguistics, words are seen as consisting of morphemes, the smallest, meaningful unit of language. Groups are formed from a collection of words, clauses are formed by a series of groups, and sentences are formed from a series of connected clauses. For Sinclair and Coulthard, classroom discourse consisted of “acts,” which when combined created “moves,” which when combined formed exchanges, then transactions, and finally the lesson. By Cazden's (1986)
account, their work led to the development of language relationships being seen as constructed through a "form-function" process. These relationships explain how specific words or utterances have distinctive understandings and meaning within the classroom.

Additionally, Sinclair and Coulthard proposed that they were interested in looking at how successive utterances were related. The linguistic structures of utterances, and the subsequent parties who construct meaning from them, shape the production of future utterances and so on. One specific contribution has been their "identification of feedback as a characteristic teacher response that occurs after the student's response to the teacher's elicitation" (Lindsay, 1990, p. 110). Their work also facilitated the early developments of Mehan's formulation of the three turn instructional sequence (1979).

The conceptualization of the term interaction in Sinclair and Coulthard's work has a much different use than in process-product research. For Sinclair and Coulthard, "interaction" is solely based on language. By examining sentence structure and the meaning of words, their research did not address the interactional properties of classroom talk. Thus, the conceptualization of classroom interaction is based entirely on speech act theory or the belief that meaning is derived via the interpretation of language.

The next section introduces an alternative method of analyzing interactions known as conversation analysis. Although this method is aimed at developing an analysis of discourse, conceptually, discourse is treated as an
interactional occasion comprised of the construction and organization of face-to-face interactions. In other words, conversation analysis aims at discovering the ways in which interaction reveals itself as an organizational feature of talk. Such a conceptualization is to be seen as radically different than the aforementioned sociolinguistic approach.

**Conversation Analysis**

Conversation analysis is essentially derived from the ethnomethodological premise that interactions are mutually constructed by the order and placement of talk produced and heard by the participants of the occasion. For conversation analysts, as for discourse analysts, interactions are indeed language-centered occasions; talk is the fundamental thing which enables interactions. However, their major difference lies in the conversation analytic view that language in use is produced as conversation, and conversation is organized by the interactional competence of those involved in the occasion. In this sense, language as talk is produced, shaped, and placed according to socially established rules of engagement. Levinson (1983) observes that like discourse analysis, conversation analysis aims at "giving an account of how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood" (p. 286). He adds, however, that in conversation analysis research, the task is "to discover the systematic properties of the sequential organization of talk, and the ways in which utterances are designed to manage such sequences" (p. 287).
Discussion of the differences between discourse analysis and conversation analysis for the study of classrooms is an important one. The sense of difference is that discourse or talk between teachers and students, and among students, is viewed in two fundamental ways. The linguist sees the dialogue as structured in a sentential fashion - that we understand each other's talk via our familiarization with words or groups of words (sentences). For the conversation analyst, the sense and meaning of ordinary conversation is viewed as an interactional achievement - that conversational sense and common understanding are produced and maintained by the participants as they manage the sequential organization of their talk. Levinson (1983) also points out that conversation analytic methods are "essentially inductive" and that a "search is made for recurring patterns across many records of naturally occurring conversations, in contrast to the immediate categorization of (usually) restricted data which is the typical first step in discourse analytic work (p. 287).

For Levinson, discourse analysis is significant in that "it promises to integrate linguistic findings about intrasentential organization with discourse structure", while for conversation analysis, "the procedures employed have already proved themselves capable of yielding by far the most substantial insights that have yet been gained into the organization of conversation" (p. 287).
Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis: A Generational Progression

Garfinkel's ethnomethodology developed from his critique of current sociological theories based on normative-distal structures of order. For Garfinkel, social phenomena were produced and organized by local structures of order. For example, Garfinkel's challenge to Parsonian theory aimed "to show how members concert their activities to produce and exhibit the coherence, cogency, analysis, consistency, order, meaning, reason, methods - which are locally, reflexively accountable orderlinesses - in and as of their ordinary lives together, in detail" (Garfinkel, 1988, p. 108). Central to this focus is the view that social actions "do not occur as isolated events but, rather, are linked to each other as one member responds to, and anticipates the actions of, others (Sevigny, 1981, p. 71).

The directions of ethnomethodology subsequently spawned the separate investigative method known as conversation analysis. Initial studies done using conversation analysis took Garfinkel's notion of member constructed or locally produced actions and applied it to the organization of ordinary conversation (see Jefferson, 1973; Sacks, 1972; Sacks, Scheglof & Jefferson, 1974). These inquiries not only found that conversation, or talk, is the most relied upon mode of interaction in the social world, but that within this conversational domain exists the densest matrix of socially organized communicative practices and procedures. As a result, these studies provided the sense that
conversation is quite an orderly accomplishment, detailing sequential organization commonly found in conversational sequences, including, turn construction, turn-taking structures, and adjacent pairs of turns.³

**Acquiring Talk as Data**

All of the data seen in conversation analysis research was obtained via the use of machine recordings, some audio, others, a combination of audio and visual. Recordings of interaction provided detailed, reviewable records of actual happenings occurring in social settings. This practice reflected a broader critique of current methods for sociological research: That sociological research must find a way to treat actual events, as they happen (Sacks, 1984).

Conversation analysts developed transcription formats for detailing the order of utterances and actions found in the recordings. In this sense, the talk in notational form was viewed as the primary analytic source. Concerning the use of talk as an analytic tool, Moerman (1988) observes that:

> it is incumbent upon ethnographers to find out what questioning, telling, arguing, etc., are like; what they do to participants and how they affect what gets said. There is no way in which we can do this without accurate and appropriately detailed records of actual natural occurrences of these activities (p. 9).

This current study relies on video and audio recordings as a way of collecting classroom interactional organizations. Because I am interested in examining face-to-face interactions which occur in the art classroom, recording
technologies not only provide a detailed view of such instances, they also allow me an opportunity to view and review such phenomena indefinitely. It must be stated that my reliance on recorded data is based on the premise that recording devices are especially capable of recovering actual classroom events in and as they occur. However, this is not to say that other research methods associated with on-site observation, such as collecting field notes, conducting interviews, or even becoming part of the scene through participant observation cannot yield insights onto the organizations of instruction. Indeed, I am also a participant to these settings, as an instructor, and researcher.

Erickson (1986) suggests some advantages of recording technologies as compared to other methods commonly found in participant observation. Such advantages are as follows:

1. the capacity for completeness of analysis,
2. the potential to reduce the dependence of the observer on primitive analytic typification,
3. that it reduces the dependence of the observer on frequently occurring events as the best sources of data. (p. 145)

The first advantage essentially means that a researcher can develop a more thorough account of what happens in a setting based on the ability to re-review the data many times. Because recording classrooms results in a great deal of information, the second advantage suggests that the researcher working from recordings is less likely to develop premature analyses of events. Relatedly, Erickson (1986) points out that the limits of “in-person” observation makes analyses based on recordings a “profound qualitative
difference" (p. 145). The third advantage centers on the way in which unexpected or rare events, taking place in an observational setting, can be looked at closely via recordings but are likely lost analytically based on observations compiled through field notes.

Because the processes involved in recording and analyzing instructional sequences have limitations too, it is appropriate that they be discussed before moving onto upcoming analyses of data. To begin with, it could be construed that I am suggesting audio and video recordings of classroom interaction recover all aspects of an event. Of course, no recording could do so. At that same time, whatever information a camera or audio microphone does recover shows an order of real-time detail that is especially rich. Classroom instruction is dense phenomena to work with, and no other methods of record making represent these interactional organizations as well as video and audio technologies.

Analysis

The question "why do people understand one another?", as proposed by Moerman and Sacks ([1971], 1986), is central to the study of natural conversation. Our abilities to understand each other are deeply tied to our familiarity with the structures of social organization. For Moerman and Sacks, talk, as a constitutive element of social organization, could in turn be treated as a point of access to how people understand each other on actual settings.
In the bulk of conversation analysis research, analyses of collections of sequences has generally been the means by which interpretation of data has proceeded. By working from a collection, the aim is to group similar sequences to disclose a same phenomena such as turn organization, sequential organization, pauses, and overlaps. A fundamental conceptualization in conversation analysis is that interaction is sequential. In this sense, analysis can only be formulated based on a consideration of interaction in its course, as opposed to predicting future communicative events or projecting past ones. This can be better demonstrated by reviewing the brief transcript seen below:

(3A). (48R: 5/18/92)

1. ((Slide Advanced))
2. (2.5)
3. T: kay this is irises (.) nineteen eighty six.
4. (4.0)
5. Whatz one thing you would want
6. to describe in this work? if you
7. S: /*lighting* (0.5)
8. T: Lighting? (1.5) yeah (.)
9. very specific lighting here (2.5)
10. *good*

This transcript offers a clean example of an IRE, a term developed by Mehan (1979) used to describe a typical three-turn structure of instructional talk: A teacher provides an initiation or question, a student replies with an answer, the teacher then delivers an evaluation.
By reading the transcript in sequence, we can see how such an IRE is played out. After the slide image has been projected onto the screen, the teacher describes it by reading the title of the work out loud. After a four second pause, the teacher produces a question that it is answered just as she begins to continue what might be seen as an expansion of the question. The student’s quiet way of producing the answer “*Lighting*,” is a mark of uncertainty or timid speaking. However, the overlap reveals the student’s awareness that what the teacher wants answered has essentially been produced. Hearing what else the teacher might have to say has not been seen as necessary for the sense of the question for this student. By treating this event sequentially, we are able to remark that the student has responded to the teacher’s initiation in a rather precise way. As both a reply and a turn, it is produced quite fluidly. Next, the teacher repeats the student’s answer, which is then followed by her assessment “yeah.” This is again followed by a second series of assessments, seen as “very specific lighting here” and “*good*.”

By approaching the scene in a sequential manner, we are able to remark on the turn-taking structures which assemble this instructional event. Thus, analysis of classroom talk is based on the sequential organization of how such talk comes off. What follows is a review of CA contributions to our understanding of conversational structures.
Conventions of Talk

The central findings developed through the study of conversation stemmed from a thorough examination of what can be termed turn-taking.⁴ In the most basic structure of two-person conversations, turn-taking can be described in the following way: one person speaks at a time and turns alternate. Although the continuation of any two-party conversation ultimately requires such a structure, it is not always carried out in this manner. For example, there is not always a clear transition between speakers. Referred to as overlap, this occurs when one person begins speaking prior to another person finishing. Depending on its placement, the overlap may or may not be described as one speaker’s “interruption” of another, and may instead be the next speaker’s familiarity and fluency with when and how utterances do in fact end. As we can see in our previous example, the overlap begins at a place where the teacher’s question is heard as being finished.

If we consider turn-taking structures as a local mechanism for the fluent organization of conversational interaction, then instances of either overlap or gap between speakers can be considered as organized by and oriented to features of the turn-taking system. Concurrently, it has been proposed that during moments of pause and overlap, a great deal of interactive work is indeed at play (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson claimed that turn-taking is routinely maintained by a “set of rules with ordered options which operate on a turn-by-turn basis,” which could be considered further as a “local
management system" (Levinson, 1983, p. 297). In this way, turn-taking can be viewed as negotiated sequences of talk, involving the sustained analyses of the emergent scene by those involved in the conversation. And, it is this sense of interactional competence which routinely directs the continuation of any given conversational sequence.

Within the turn-taking system, the organization of "transition relevance places," or points at which speakers may change becomes a central topic (Levinson, p. 297). As a result, conversation analysis studies have incorporated different distinctions for describing such places. For example, variations like gaps, lapses, silence, and pauses have been suggested, each having its own unique characteristics (Levinson, p. 299). It is not necessary to go into great detail concerning the types of gaps; however, it should be stressed that moments of silence between utterances are themselves features of the conversation's organization.

Adjacency pairs refer to the array of sequentially paired utterances such as question-answer, offer-acceptance, greeting-greeting, and, these organizations are also deeply embedded within the structure(s) of turn-taking. Schegloff and Sacks (1973) characterized adjacency pairs as:

sequences of two utterances that are adjacent; produced by different speakers; ordered as a first part and a second part; typed, so that a particular first part requires a particular second....offers require acceptances or rejections, greetings require greetings, and so on. (Levinson, 1983, pp. 303-304)
Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) found that embedded within a speaker’s utterance of the first part of an adjacency pair are the heard rights for a next speaker to begin talking. This rule simultaneously demonstrates that the second speaker routinely finds the first speaker’s turn as a first part calling for its completion (p. 728). Within educational settings, adjacency pairs in the form of questions-answers are routinely a part of instructional talk, and it is within this organization that students fit their comments to the teacher’s questions.

These conventions, as well as many others, provide for how it is that individuals interact fluidly and coherently. These same conventions, particularly turn-taking structures, have also provided a relevant place at which to start analyzing the order of affairs within the classroom (Mehoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Payne & Hustler, 1980). Mehan’s (1979) research on instructional sequences has been considered as an extension of Gumperz & Hymes’ (1964, 1974) call for studies centering on communicative and linguistic aspects of culture (Mehan, 1982, p. 63). His work has also been viewed as a direct expansion of earlier work done on instruction by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). In a broad sense, Mehan’s research took shape as an ethnography of communication, sharing company with other studies reflecting interests in how discourse comes off in social settings.

The research Mehan produced focused on the sequential and organizational structures of lessons. In his study it was found that instruction was routinely organized as a three part sequence of initiation, reply, and evaluation, or IRE.
The IRE sequence consists of two coupled adjacency pairs, the initiation and reply being the first pair, and the second constituted by the reply and evaluation (1982, p. 69). Essentially, the IRE sequence revealed how instructional talk was organized as it shifted back and forth from the teacher’s domain to that of the students. Mehan (1979) made the case that a large portion of classroom talk followed this particular structure; specifically, that the teacher’s initiation, routinely a question, is followed by a student’s reply which is then assessed by the teacher.

Mehan also addressed instances where the IRE sequence did not come off as three succinct stages. Such instructional moments, called “extended sequences,” occurred when the student’s reply did not fulfill the teacher’s expectations, specifically when students gave partial and/or wrong answers, or, when students did not answer at all (p. 71). In order for the extended sequence to resolve itself, these moments required the teacher to elicit or further prompt students in order to produce the right answer, thus reproducing the sequence structure. Mehan maintained that when an acceptable answer is produced, the final evaluative sequence was fulfilled, thus completing the IRE scheme.

In a section outlining the interactional work of students, Mehan makes reference to an existing “floor” from which student talk gets produced and is managed. In this case, the term floor is not used in the literal sense; instead, the floor refers to the ownership or rights for parties speaking in classrooms. Mehan expresses that “when the teacher initiates action, she allocates the floor, the
students reply, and the teacher takes the floor back again as she evaluates the reply” (1982, p. 75). What is reinforced here is that students have rights to the floor at specific times due to an established or secured rule that, when in classrooms, “students cannot just talk any time” (p. 75). In this way, students only have rights to speak within certain “places” of the teacher’s talk. Thus, “locating an appropriate floor-control juncture is a component skill in students’ contributions to classroom lessons” (p. 75).

McHoul (1978) took the findings of earlier conversation analysis and applied them toward instances of classroom talk. Specific interest was aimed at determining the ways in which rules of turn-taking seen in instances of natural conversation compared to the organization of turns existing in classrooms. McHoul proposed that classroom talk differed from informal instances of talk in the following ways: That the potential for gaps and pauses increased; the potential for overlaps was reduced due in part to the familiar or established rights of the teacher to select who speaks; and, that frequent turn-taking does not, for all accounts, exist that often (p. 189).

McHoul also characterized classroom talk as “a heavily pre-allocated system in which the locally managed component is largely the domain of the teachers”, with “student participation rights being limited to the choice between continuing or selecting the teacher as next speaker” (p. 211). However, he also provided examples of a number of students simultaneously selecting themselves to speak when given the option. At times, this occurred when instruction
revealed open-ended questions, which for all accounts are questions asked by the teacher to no one in particular. McHoul suggested that this did not occur often; however, this is an important phenomenon in the context of my study. For example, it is often found that when discussing Mapplethorpe's imagery, the graduate associates frequently ask very open-ended questions. Such questioning takes place when images first appear on the slide screen and the teacher asks for a general response to the work ("what do you all think?", or, "what do you think Mapplethorpe was trying to say with this photograph?"). What is of more importance, in terms of extended sequences and interactional structures, is how instances of simultaneous speaking almost always revert back to a single speaker. This is due to the overwhelming "one party speaks at a time" rule found in classrooms.

One final study conducted by Payne & Hustler (1980) addressed the relationship between structures of talk and the organization of classroom cohorts. In broad terms, their study provided detailed accounts of the interactional workings which comprised the two-party structure familiar to all classrooms - the teacher and cohort. To find evidence of this two-party structure, they looked to where the structure had not yet been established - beginning moments of classes. As a result, the ways in which a group of twenty to thirty students were assembled into an organized cohort by the teacher was presented as a topic.

Working from transcription of a beginning class, Payne and Hustler found that:

the teacher does not announce that the lesson is
beginning, nor does he explicitly describe the pupils as a collectivity; rather it is through the organization of his talk that these actions are being made available to the parties in the occasion.... (p. 53)

It is this organization of the talk, this required "work and action from the parties to it," which is of primary interest. Thus, what a teacher says during these beginning moments and how it is heard has a great effect on the organization of the cohort. For example, in their materials, beginning teacher talk is described as mimicked cadences like those found in "drilling" procedures, and that the students were reacting to a type of "regimenting" (p. 55). It was also observed that the instructional topic was frequently a part of the initial announcements made by the teacher. In this sense, the students, during the teacher's collection of them, were being reminded as to why such a collection needed to occur. A teacher's assembling of the cohort, then, "is a feature of the occasion of the lesson which is made available to us in part through the organization of the talk" (p. 50).

Using Conversation Analysis to Develop an Ethnography of Art Classroom Talk

From my perspective, the application of a conversation analytic approach directed at sequences of art instruction can provided a better understanding of the composition and subsequent order of art classroom talk. In the context of applying conversation analysis methods toward this study, I find relevance in the following considerations: (1) The conversation analytic approach fundamentally considers talk, in and as it is produced, as data. In an educational
setting, such a consideration requires that the researcher
treat teaching and learning primarily as a talking
enterprise. (2) Analysis is not solely based on utterances,
but on the interactional components which drive such
utterances such as turns, overlaps, and pauses. In this
sense, classroom talk is viewed as an interactional
achievement negotiated, produced, and maintained by the
participants situated in the classroom. Thus, applying
conversation analysis towards the talk which emerge during
presentations of Robert Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery
in the college art classroom can contribute to our
understanding of what such talk looks like, how it is
organized, and in what way it directs the practices of art
education. This methodology lends itself towards introducing
a new way of speaking about what goes on in the art
classroom.

In summary, the talk which is produced in the presence
of Mapplethorpe’s imagery ultimately shapes the viewing
experience. In this way, both the talk and the imagery are
to be seen as a mutually constituted relationship. Thus, the
presentation of Mapplethorpe’s photographs is to be seen not
only as an occasion of talk, but also as an occasion which is
driven by the imagery shown. By applying the methodological
frameworks of conversation analysis to this particular
classroom situation, it can be demonstrated that there are
organizations of the talk which in turn shape Mapplethorpe’s
imagery into a speakable domain.
In order to present the art classroom as a social setting, and the talk which occurs within its boundaries as an organized and managed phenomenon, the next chapter will provide a detailed description of the research setting, present a first analysis of talk during the beginning moments of presentations on Mapplethorpe’s imagery, and begin an analysis of the canonical sounds of art instruction.
Footnotes

1 See (Gage & Needles, 1989) for their thorough and insightful review of criticism directed at the theoretical and methodological foundations of process-product research.

2 Parsonian theory represents the work done by Talcott Parsons, particularly The Structure of Social Action (1937) and Toward a General Theory of Action (1951). Central to this work was the integration of analyses typifying individual action with that of large-scale social systems. Garfinkel's critique was that Parson's system, as representing the established science of sociological study, imposed a set of sociological categories on the ordinary person.

3 It should be stated that initial CA research examined turn-taking structures produced during moments of informal conversation. In an up-coming discussion, it will be shown that classroom conversations prove to be formal in nature. Differences between these two types of talk is always an issue of concern. However, the findings which early CA research produced more often than not can be applied to the talk produced in formal settings.

4 Solely investigating turns revealed the following findings or systematics underlying how conversations get produced: (1) Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs; (2) Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time; (3) Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief; (4) Transitions (from one turn to another) with no gap and no overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions; (5) Turn order is not fixed, but varies; (6) Turn size is not fixed, but varies; (7) Length of conversation is not specified in advance; (8) What parties say is not specified in advance; (9) Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance; (10) Number of parties can vary; (11) Talk can be continuous or discontinuous; (12) Turn-allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party), or parties may self-select in starting to talk; (13) Various 'turn-constructional units' are employed; e.g., turns can be projected 'one word long', or they can be sentential in length; (14) Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson; 1974).
CHAPTER IV

The Setting, Data Collection, Organizing the Cohort, and the Canonical Sounds of Art Instruction

Most of this chapter will focus on the analysis of classroom talk. The initial analysis will address the phenomenon of instructional beginnings, or, the period of time wherein a graduate teaching associate prepares the class for their presentation on Robert Mapplethorpe. The second set of analyses, based on a collection or series of transcripts, will speak of the canonical sounds of art instruction which exist as these presentations are underway. However, I would first like to introduce the scene of the research, including descriptions of the art course, the participants involved, and the classroom space. Following this, I will briefly discuss the processes of data collection used for this study.

Section I: An Art Course and its Participants

The students involved in these presentations were enrolled in a 10 week contemporary art survey course. The course was offered through the department of art education
located at a large, midwestern university. The course itself was essentially designed for students' exposure to and appreciation of American contemporary art and musical styles since the 1950's. The students enrolled in the course met three times a week, for the duration of the quarter. Each student was required to attend two lectures a week, and to also participate in a recitation period which met weekly. The lecture format delivered substantive curricular materials to around 350 students, while the recitation period, led by a graduate teaching associate, provided an opportunity for students to further discuss the ideas and material that they received during the larger lecture format. The recitation period was also an opportunity for the teaching associate to present other topics of interest which were not covered during lecture.

The presentations on Robert Mapplethorpe's photographic imagery took place solely during recitation periods. It was decided by the teaching associates that the smaller student size in these recitations was more suitable for the presentation and discussion of Mapplethorpe's controversial imagery. Because the presentations occurred late in the quarter, each student in the setting was well aware of their teacher's style, the character of their fellow classmates, and the culture of the art education classroom.

Concerning the format of these presentations, each teaching associate was able to present and discuss Mapplethorpe's imagery in their own way. For this study, the eight graduate teaching associates opted to first show the imagery and to then develop class discussions. However,
there were variations concerning how the imagery was shown and how discussions were developed. For example, although most of the teaching associates showed Mapplethorpe’s work first as a quick run through, some opted to make the entire presentation of imagery last for the duration of the recitation.

In each presentation, the same carousel of slides was used and the images were shown in roughly the same order. The order of images resulted in Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery being shown first, which included self-portraits, still lifes, floral studies, figure studies, portraits of celebrities, and depictions of objects. The more controversial imagery was projected last. The decision to order the images in this way was agreed upon by both the lecturer of the course and the teaching associates. Interestingly, the controversial images were also arranged in a type of order, with images of nude children appearing prior to images of explicit sexual acts. This way of sequencing the controversial imagery was based on the belief that the images of nude children were not as severe as other images.

Some teaching associates occasionally jumped around the carousel in order to reinforce their ideas or thoughts with an image. There was even one instance where the carousel was accidentally dropped onto the floor spreading slides everywhere. Due to time constraints, this particular teaching associate decided to randomly place the slides back into the carousel and project them accordingly. Although a refreshing change of pace for me after seeing numerous presentations based on the same order of slides, the random
order of slides shown in this case did not seem to have a
great effect on the students' viewing experience.

Perhaps expectedly, most of these discussions were
energetic and involved the participation of many students.
Some discussions even developed into heated debates centering
on the issues of censorship, nudity, and child pornography.
In many of these instances, the class would divide into two
distinct groups either in support or opposition of the work.
From my perspective, the presentations of Mapplethorpe's
imagery were the most dynamic week of teaching for the entire
ten week period. Other teaching associates expressed similar
feelings.

It is important to stress that each recitation had its
own character or dynamic. Because of the course being open
to all undergraduates, it was not uncommon to find the
resulting population of each recitation consisting of an
enormous mix of students. Besides reflecting strong cultural
diversity, many other existing differentiations such as age,
academic level, academic interests, and exposure to the
contemporary arts combined to create quite an interesting
student composition. In some of my classes, age seemed to be
a significant factor in how successful these presentations
turned out. It seemed that having older students in the
class made it more possible to develop lengthy discussions
concerning the imagery. I think for many of the younger
students, the presentations were viewed as a show and shock
event, and students subsequently reacted in accordance. I
also found that having students in the class who possessed a
strong background in the arts enhanced the discussions.
Description of the Setting: The Classroom Space

Throughout the duration of data collection, the same classroom was used. This particular classroom, located in an art building on campus, was quite small. Upon walking through the door, one immediately experienced the floor as an incline or ramp that led up into the main classroom space. In the approximate middle of the rectangular dimensioned room were two long, gray tables connected at either end, providing an overall table length of twenty feet. A variety of chairs were situated at the table, allowing just enough walking space between the back of chairs and the classroom walls.

Centrally located on one of the room’s longer walls was a chalkboard with two bulletin boards mounted on either side. Situated on the opposing wall were three vertically long windows, one large metal storage cabinet, and a three-tiered bookshelf mounted on the wall. Each window had two types of adjustable vertical blinds, allowing for variations of light in the room. Located on the room’s smaller back wall was a rather large slide screen, running vertically from just above the floor to about the ceiling’s height.

One unique aspect of the classroom space during presentations involved the student’s seating arrangements. Because the chairs were arranged around the table, most students generally found themselves seated across from one another. In most of the recorded presentations, there were about fourteen to sixteen students sitting at the table, while another three or four usually sat behind them along the walls. In some cases, one or two students occupied the space at the end of the table nearest the slide screen, although
they usually had to move so as not to block the screen when
the imagery was being projected. Overall, the larger
recitations limited the amount of walking room there was for
the teacher, and as a result, the classroom space at times
appeared to be more noticeably managed by the teacher.

Because slides were used for the presentation of
imagery, each teacher was at some point concerned with the
lighting conditions of the room. During the beginning
moments of the presentations, teachers frequently asked the
students if the lighting was adequate or if all of the
students could easily see the images. If adjustments were
needed, there were a few options. Some teachers lowered the
three black vinyl blinds, while others lowered another set of
metal blinds. In general, most teachers tried to get some of
the blinds down, while others simply went with the quality of
lighting once the overhead lights were turned off.

**Slide Projection**

Showing slides was just one of many familiar
instructional steps which comprised these presentations of
Robert Mapplethorpe's imagery. Where the slide projector was
situated, how large of an image appeared on the screen, and
how long the image was projected were each determined by the
teacher. The placement or positioning of the slide projector
varied, but not by much. For example, at times the projector
was positioned close to the slide screen at the end of the
table (I would estimate the distance from the end of the
table to the slide screen was around ten feet). This of
course resulted in a smaller projected image. But at other
times, the slide projector was situated farther away from the screen, which resulted in a larger image being projected. The operation of the slide projector when in these locations occurred in a variety of ways. I found that teachers would either manually engage the forward button while seated next to the projector, use a wire-remote button which enabled them more mobility during the presentation, or would ask a student situated close to the projector to advance the carousel. In other instances, when the projector was positioned much farther away from the slide screen, a projector cart was commonly used. From this location, the teacher could either stand next to the projector to advance the carousel, or again, use a wire-remote.

Another variable related to the viewing of slides concerned the rate of projection, or how long the slides remained visible on the screen. It was found that the pace of projection seemed to pick up when the more controversial images were shown as compared to rate of projecting the safe images. In one instance, when a student was advancing through the controversial slides, the teacher asked the student to "slow down" so as the images would remain on the screen longer.

For all intents and purposes, both the slide projector and the slide screen proved to be the unspoken yet totally relied upon objects which delivered the images central to these presentations. Yet, as familiar as both objects are, it became necessary for the current study to consider the routine process of projecting slide imagery as a distinct visual and aural experience. For example, the momentary
changes in the room's lighting as images came and went on the screen, the mechanical sounds of both the advancing carousel and the lens's automatic focus mechanism, the duration of time in which an image remained on the screen, and the places at which a teacher's first utterance was made, were all part of the projection technology and experience.

In a later up-coming section, I will spend some time demonstrating and discussing the use of the slide projector, specifically the advancement of the slide carousel as a way for the teacher to distinguish the end of one topic and the beginning of the next. However, the manner in which the data used for this study was collected needs to first be considered.

**Data Collection**

Because I was a graduate teaching associate for the course during the time in which I collected data, gaining access to the setting was never an issue. Because I opted not to study my own classes, solicitation of students occurred in recitations taught by other graduate associates one week before the presentations on Mapplethorpe. A short script (see appendix A) was read aloud and time was made available for any questions that students might have had regarding the data collection. On the day of taping, I was reintroduced by the graduate teaching associate overseeing the class, I again explained my intentions, and a sheet asking the students' permission to be taped was passed around the class and signed. Though it never happened, students who did not wish to be on tape were given the option to move out
of range of the recording equipment.

A total of seven presentations on Mapplethorpe were recorded. Initially, recordings were made solely through audio means, but as time went by, I began to develop an interest in collecting data via visual recordings as well. Visual recordings were made with a standard VHS video recorder mounted on a tripod and situated at the front of the room. This location provided a view of the slide screen as well as about two-thirds of the students who were seated at the table. The camera angle was the same each time, though slight adjustments were sometimes made to insure the least obstructed views of both the students and the slide screen. The overall quality of the video images could be considered average, as the lighting during most of the recorded presentations was low.

Two microphones were used to record the audio portions of these presentations. One of the microphones, which was built into the video recorder, picked up a large portion of the classroom talk. However, to ensure that sounds produced nearer to the slide screen were heard, a second microphone and recorder was used. A PZM or “pressure zone microphone” and micro-cassette recorder were placed directly on the students’ table. Although the recording equipment was obviously present, it did not seem to interfere with the students’ space. In addition, I often relied on both sets of audio recordings in order to obtain an accurate account of what was said.
During taping, I usually sat near the camera in order to make any necessary adjustments. Because the camera was recording essentially the same phenomena which I too was observing, I did not feel compelled to take extensive notes. However, some notes were made concerning the presentational format, and included brief descriptions of occurrences which I found interesting. For example, I was particularly interested in the moments wherein students made the transition from viewing Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery to viewing his more controversial imagery. During these moments, I paid particular attention to body movements, whispers and quiet conversations existing between students, as well as what the teacher was doing during this time. In general, I tried to maintain the lowest profile possible, although the equipment in the room certainly served as a reminder that I was there. On occasion, I did leave the room for extended periods of time, perhaps to find out later if my presence in the room was at all influential. I cannot say whether it was or was not.

Section II: Organizing the Cohort

We are all familiar with what beginning classes look like. For example, teacher activities such as calling roll, asking for a quiet room, writing information on the chalkboard, or introducing the day’s topic are each events commonly associated with classroom startups. The actions produced by students during this time also provide us with a sense of how classes begin. These actions occur in a variety of ways such as students complying to the teacher’s request,
lowering their voices, adjusting themselves in their seats, or getting out materials. In this way, through a collaborative organization of these familiar routines by both teachers and students, classes begin.¹

Payne & Hustler’s (1980) study on the organization of a two-party structure in classrooms (the teacher as one party and the collection of students, or cohort, as the other) provides a better sense for the organizational features found in the talk associated with a beginning class. Based on the analysis of transcripts developed from recordings of classroom events in real-time, their study provided that classes do not just begin, rather, a system of orderliness embedded in the teacher’s talk provides for an assembly of the cohort. The work of Payne & Hustler is important in terms of the up-coming transcript, for we too find the construction of a two-party structure occurring in the classes which this study examines.

Finding Our Way

We might better be able to recognize the way in which instruction formally gets underway by examining a class which has not yet been formally called together. The following transcript offers such an opportunity to recover and examine the beginning moments of art instruction. We begin with this transcript because it offers an account of how a class begins. The transcript is presented in such a way that it reads like a tutorial, in order to orient the reader to finding the embedded interactional structures within
sequences of classroom talk.

First, some background information concerning the transcript. The instructor has just finished showing the students their current grades by going around the room and allowing each one to look in her grade book. The instructor has also removed a tape that was playing on a portable cassette player located in the room and given it back to one of the students. The transcript begins with the instructor’s saying “thank you” as the tape is handed back to the student.

(4A). (310.5R: 5/28/92)

1. T: Thank you: (...) itz wun ah my favorit songs:.. (0.5)

2. Oh kay: (2.5) ((teacher begins walking))

3. *lemme just see:* (1.5)

4. ooh dangerous (1.0)

5. ( ) ahh= ((teacher stumbles at the back of room))

6. =You wanna have your notebooks out

7. cause we’re taking notes to: day:

8. (21.0) ((mixed chatter & sound of notebooks opened))

9. Alright (.) Everybody sign this sheet?

10. is there

11. S: // n:o

12. T: // anybody here that

13. *didn’t sign this (..) Jef:f?*

14. (3.0) ((Chatter continues))

15. ((ringing sound)) (2.0)


17. (2.5)

18. and I really need everybody’s atten: shun=

19. =cause its hot and there’s alot of

20. people in here (. ) and I’m gonna talk really fast

21. and I’m only gonna walk on this side so I don’t

22. like knock over those people (.)
23. trip on the wires (.) break something. (1.0)
24. T: I have ah lot to say
25. S: [(( whistle ))]
26. //as usual so I’m going to talk
27. really fast (.) so just (.) write ‘fast.’ (0.5)
28. Today were doing Robert Mapple thorpe: (.)
29. and his names spelled up on tha board:::
30. (2.5) ((chatter ceases))
31. and robert mapple thorpe
32. is ah pha’tah’gra’fer (0.5)
33. please do not mix that up with photo’real:’list:s=
34. =is something that you jus did recently in class=
35. =who can tell me: (.) Definition of photoreal’ist=
36. =that was in class (.) ye- yesterda:y? (1.5)
37. Hillary? (0.5)
38. H: *like artists that use
39. photography for their references* (.)
40. T: and then they do what with it?
41. H: *paint* they (.) paint=
42. T: =Right (.) then they paint it (.)

As the above transcript shows, to suggest that instruction merely begins misses the interactional workings which enable classes to begin. The transcript recovers the interactional transformation wherein the classroom goes from ordinary conversational organizations to one that is organized well enough for instruction to begin.

This sequence has been divided up into five sections signified by the brackets seen in the left margin. The analyses in the following sections will discuss the events in each of these brackets, and their subsequent effect on the development of the two-party structure. Essentially, the
first four brackets highlight the work of the teacher assembling the cohort. In the final bracket, we find evidence that the cohort has been assembled and that the two-party structure has been established.

**Line 2: Oh kay:**

In line 2, the teacher’s “Oh kay:” is seen as a change of address from what went before; it comes after the teacher’s finalization of her interaction with a single student and also after a half second pause. The “Oh kay:” is this teacher’s first delivery of a beginning or opening call to the students. Upon doing so, the teacher then moves toward the slide projector located at the other end of the room. Upon arriving at the projector, the teacher makes a first preannouncement “You wanna have your notebooks out cause we’re taking notes to: day:.” Within the teacher’s utterance are found the collective addresses “you” and “we’re,” both of which are familiar references routinely used by teachers to recognize and address the existing cohort. However, in this instance the cohort has not yet been organized. What we find here is that “you” and “we’re” are being used as an embedded part of the on-going work which the teacher produces as she is in the process of assembling the cohort (cf., Payne and Hustler, 1980).

**Line 9: Alright (.) Everybody sign this sheet?**

Though out of the camera’s view, during the rather long twenty-one second pause, the teacher is found organizing her notes and preparing her “space” for lecture. The teacher’s
"Alright," produced after the pause in line 9, is her first re-beginning. This re-beginning is produced at an opportune time; the twenty-one second pause has been a long period of undirected teacher talk and, as a result, the student chatter has reached a very high level. Although it is not unremarkable to find this teacher producing such a re-beginning, its production is revealing in terms of the existence of multiple conversations during the pause.

Like preannouncements, re-beginnings are also part of this teacher's work of assembling the cohort, and can often be short-lived events. As we see here, the re-beginning does not lead the teacher into instruction; rather, we find her involved in a managerial event - making sure that a sign-up sheet, which has previously been passed around the class, is signed by all the students. Thus, in lines 10-13, we have an exchange existing between the teacher and a student, while simultaneously, classroom chatter develops again.

Line 16: Alright.

The teacher's "Alright" in line 16, is seen as her second re-beginning. The construction of this re-beginning, as compared to the "Alright" in line 9, is different in two ways. First, it is produced in a more forceful manner, signified by the underlined portion "Al." As a result, the "Alright" this time is notably louder. Second, there is a stretch after the first part of the "Alright," signified by the colon. In this sense, the teacher has placed more stress on the utterance, thus elongating it and giving it a longer duration in which to be heard. Soon after this re-beginning
comes a series of more preannouncements in lines 18 through 27. Here, the teacher is giving grounds for why everyone should attend, and although a student begins a whistle in line 25 as the teacher preannounces "I have ah lot to say" in line 24, this series can be viewed as a sustained turn held by the teacher which ultimately ends with an announcement of the day's topic seen in line 28.

**Line 28: Today were doing Robert Mapplethorpe:**

Up through line 28, verbal chatter has been maintained by the students. However, in and as the topic is being announced in line 28, the chatter begins to drop off, and the room becomes noticeably quieter. By line 30, the chatter ceases altogether. It is possible to remark that up to this point the teacher has managed to cobble together a substantial structure of talk which has enabled certain pre-instructional events to take place, most especially the first formulation of the day's topic, and the students evidently hear it that way. In lines 31 through 33, we find the teacher's first development of the topic at hand, which constitutes a further move into the lecture.

At this point, there is both an aural and visual difference in the way that this teacher now talks. Part of this difference is found in the way the teacher stresses descriptive words such as "pha'tah'gra'fer" and "photo'real:'list:s." The teacher's stress placed on these descriptions, in a room which is now free from on-going chatter, provides the sense that the teacher has collected or assembled the students, or has perhaps facilitated the
environment necessary for a two party structure to exist. However, the evidence of a working two-party structure has not yet been demonstrated.

**Line 37: Hillary?**

The teacher's question "=who can tell me: (.) Definition of photoreal`ist=," beginning in line 35 and ending in line 36, is her first call for a rejoinder. In line 38, we find Hillary to be the first found member. As it happens, this teacher, who routinely selects students to answer questions, calls on Hillary to answer, thus making her responsible for providing the rejoinder. With Hillary producing her answer, we now have evidence of not only formalized turn-taking, but also a working two party-structure. And, it is no accident that as the first found member of the cohort comes into view, we see the formulation and completion of an IRE sequence; the teacher poses a question, a student provides an answer, and the teacher evaluates the answer.

The IRE sequence found in lines 35 to 42 represents what we can describe as canonical talk produced within an art educational setting. Canonical talk is the routine way in which art instruction based on the viewing of art imagery is delivered. In order to further demonstrate this type of talk, and the organizational structures which enable it to occur, the next section of analysis specifically focuses on classroom talk which exists as teachers and students view Mapplethorpe's safe imagery such as flowers, still lifes, and portraits.
Section III: Canonical Art Educational Talk and its Established Place Within the Art Classroom

The term canonical talk refers to the established or routine ways of speaking about art imagery in the classroom, wherein the emphasis is placed on an image’s formal elements. For example, when Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery is presented to students, the talk is driven by teacher directed questions such as “what do you see here?,” “what is the light like in this one?,” or, “how is the image of this flower different that the last one?” In essence, these types of questions facilitate the development of descriptive-type talk which is understood to be an accepted way to speak about such imagery. In a much broader sense, questions like these and the students’ answers which stem from them are to be seen as the canonical sounds of art instruction - questions with known answers via learned ways of seeing and speaking. In the context of talking about Mapplethorpe’s work, this is the sought after language of art education.

The following collection of transcripts recover such canonical talk produced in this setting. In each of the sequences, teachers and students are looking at imagery projected onto the slide screen, and teachers are asking students to produce comments on the images. In the first sequence, an image of flowers has been projected onto the slide screen. After the teacher reads the title of the work out loud, a question is then posed to the students.
In terms of the organization of the talk, this sequence recovers the way in which a teacher’s question is posed, how it is answered, and how the answer is evaluated. In lines 5 and 6, the teacher produces the question “Whatz one thing you would want to describe in this work?” As the teacher begins to clarify the question, the student produces the answer “*lighting*” which overlaps the teacher’s talk in line 7. This overlap demonstrates not only that the student selected herself to speak, but, that the student did not need to hear the additional phrasing of the teacher’s question. The answer, though low in volume, has been offered close on the completion of the teacher’s first complete utterance. The organizational relevance of this is that embedded within the teacher’s talk are recognized places wherein students have the right to speak.

In lines 8 through 10, the teacher’s assessment involves a repeating of the student’s answer in combination with evaluative type remarks such as “yeah”, and “*good*.” With
the teacher's final utterance in line 10, we have evidence of a cleanly produced IRE sequence. IRE sequences, like this one, are routinely a part of the instruction wherein students are looking at Mapplethorpe's non-controversial imagery.

Similarly, the next transcript provides four IRE sequences, which, like the previous one, display routine instances of art instruction as students look at one of Mapplethorpe's non-controversial figure studies. They are each noted by the brackets in the left hand margin. The image projected depicts two figures, one male and one female, clinging to each other while engaged in a dance.

(4C). (29R: 5/20/92)

1. \((\text{slide advanced})\)
2. T: \(*(\quad \wedge \quad \wedge \quad \text{this one})*\)
3. alright (.). let's start with this one (2.0)
4. S: \((\text{Cough})\)
5. T: [What kind of themes do you see in this:: (4.0)
6. photograph: (2.5)
7. S: *light and dark* (3.0)
8. T: *I couldn't hear it* (0.2)
9. Could you guys speak up I can't hear ya.
10. S: Light:: and Dark::
11. T: //Okay thanks sharla (.)
12. Great light and dark (.). what else:: (1.5)
13. C: Decency and decadence
14. \[\((\text{tapping noise}))\) (0.2)
15. T: Good (.). good chris: okay decency a:n
decadence (.). what else::
16. S3: Masculine and feminine
17. T: //Good (2.0)
19. S4: Raw and refined
20. T: //Go:od: (.) what else? (3.0)
   -> 21. Nature artifice? (.) anybody see that (1.0) at all?
   -> 22. ((slide advanced)) (3.5)

After the image is projected onto the screen and the teacher directs the students' attention to it, we see that the teacher again poses a question. However, unlike the overlap of a student's answer with on-going teacher talk as seen in the previous transcript, the teacher's question here is completed and subsequently followed by a (2.5) second pause. Pauses like this one are places for members of the cohort to consider the question and produce an answer. But, note how this first student’s answer gets produced: In line 7, a student (Sharla) does provide a rejoinder however, it is offered quietly. After Sharla’s rejoinder, we hear a (3.0) second pause before the teacher says "*I couldn’t hear it*" in line 8.

With respect to line 8, the teacher has indeed heard or sensed some type of reply coming from a student, and although the teacher has not heard the student’s answer, the teacher does reveal her hearing of a response produced in a place where answers are routinely to be found. This then is why her reply "*I couldn’t hear it*" is similarly produced in a soft manner. If there is a problem in the teacher’s hearing the reply, then perhaps the teacher is still waiting for an answer. The micro-pause (0.2) following the teacher’s "*I couldn’t hear it*" reflects such a wait. The teacher at this point is calling for the original rejoinder to either be made
again or for a new one to be produced. The teacher’s next
call “Could you guys speak up I can’t hear ya”, seen in line
9, confirms this. As a result, we see Sharla’s repeat
“Light:: and Dark::” in line 10 followed immediately by the
teacher’s overlapping third-turn evaluation in line 11. Thus
we have an IRE sequence which begins roughly but is soon
brought to completion. With this in mind, consider the way
in which the next three IRE’s in this sequence materialize.

Line 12 of the second bracket contains the teacher’s
extended evaluation, a micro-pause, and then a call for
another rejoinder. After the (1.5) second pause, a second
student’s rejoinder is produced. In line 15 we have the
teacher’s second third turn evaluation followed by a third
call for a rejoinder in line 16. This call leads us into the
third IRE sequence which is produced at a much quicker pace
than the previous ones. With the student’s rejoinder in line
17 overlapped by the teacher’s third turn evaluation in line
18, we then a (2.0) pause, following the teacher’s rejoinder
“Go:od.” This pause, like the ones seen after the teacher’s
rejoinders in lines 6 and 12, produces the familiar places
where answers are expected to be produced.

As we see, a fourth student provides an answer in line
19, and by line 20, a total of four IRE’s have been produced.
There is an interesting difference between the way in which
the first IRE sequence comes off and the three which follow
it. My suggestion is this: once the teacher acknowledges the
first student’s answer as a right answer by uttering “Great
light and dark,” the subsequent answers “decency and
decadence,” “masculine and feminine,” and “raw and refined,”
because they were written up on the board, were easily found. In this way, the teacher's positive assessment "light and dark" shows the format of the answer being looked for; with the first one in place, students then know how to answer. Therefore, the quickening of the pace seen in the last three IRE's reflects the student's recognition of how answers are to be produced.

As we near the end of this sequence, the teacher, in line 21, provides her own thematic polarity, "nature artifice?," and asks if anyone sees that reflected in the image. Sensing that she does not have any takers as she nears the end of her question, she then moves on by advancing the slide carousel. It is worth remarking that the advancement of the slide carousel, as seen in line 22, often serves to punctuate the instructional sequence. In order to visualize this, consider the way in which the teacher's final utterance found in line 21 is heard. The teacher's question "(. ) anybody see that (1.0) at all?," ends with a rise in intonation. Given that there are two pauses within this final question wherein rejoinders are not provided, this likely reflects that this series of descriptions has been exhausted. And, perhaps as a sign of this instructional sequence being exhausted, the advancement of the carousel happens right after her ending.

In this instance, the physical characteristics associated with an advancing carousel - the familiar click- click of the advancing mechanism or the immediate change in the room's lighting as an image leaves the screen - could be considered an extension of the teacher's acknowledgement that
the previous topic is now closed and that the class needs to move on. In this sequence, the teacher advancing the carousel can be viewed as an organizational feature of the talk; a teacher’s non-verbal way of demonstrating clearly the class that the instructional sequence has been completed and that the class now needs to move on. Discussion concerning the use of the projector and its relationship to both ongoing and ending talk will occur more extensively in chapter five.

In the following sequence, students are in the midst of viewing one of Mapplethorpe’s self-portraits, which could easily be categorized as non-controversial in nature. The teacher is again asking students to respond to the work being viewed.


1. T: Any other ideas: (2.0)
2. (whispers) (1.0)
3. anything else about this: (.)
4. yes (San )
5. S: //maybe thats what he thinks
6. our expression would be as we look at* (.)
7. T: scuse me I cant hear you=
8. S: =Maybe he thinks that thats what
9. our expression will be as we are looking
10. at his: (. photos like he’s imitating us: thats
11. S2: //(hh)
12. S: how were all gonna look *when we see the photos
13. or somethin*
14. T: //oka::y (1.0) very intrasteen::
In line 1, the teacher asks the collected body of students if there are any other ideas regarding the image at hand. Although there are whispers produced in line 2, they are not heard as an answer. Subsequently, the teacher asks the students again in line 3 if they have anything else to say. In the wake of line 3 or possibly in the wake of line 1, one student has done something, perhaps a hand being raised or a look of readiness to speak, etc., which has been noticed by the teacher. As shown by the first set of arrows, as the teacher asks for "(San )" to speak in line 4, the student begins her turn in overlap of her name. Like the overlap seen in the first transcript, the overlap here demonstrates the student’s strong display of an orientation to the turn-taking in the room; the student, knowing that it is her turn, does not need to hear the teacher’s completion of her name in order to begin producing her rejoinder.

Similar to the second transcript in this collection, in line 7 we hear another instance wherein the teacher asks for a clarification of an answer. As it happens, the student’s answer in lines 5 through 6 is not only uttered very softly, but the answer trails off before it is completed. The micro-pause existing at the trailing end of the student’s answer could suggest that the student sensed that the answer, in and as it was being produced in a soft and uncertain manner, would at some point need to be said again. However, it is not possible to determine why this student produced this answer in this way. Instead, we can remark on the way in which the answer is handled by the teacher, based on the way that it is heard.
Further analysis of line 7 offers that the teacher's comment "scuse me I cant hear you=" calls for the student to repeat the answer. Line 8, then, is the student's reiteration of her initial comment. This time the rejoinder is much louder, more forceful, and most of all, completed. In fact, the answer is itself reiterated within the same turn. By line 14 we get another instance of precision timing wherein the teacher starts up her evaluation during the final utterance offered by the student. In this way, the teacher, by displaying an awareness of when a student's turn of talk is nearing a completion, likewise demonstrates her orientation to the turn-taking in the room. Thus, the instantiation of an IRE sequence is to be seen as a collaborative event existing between teacher and student.

Up to this point, we have seen three sequences of classroom talk wherein we find IREs organizing the practice of art instruction. In the upcoming and final two sequences of this collection, we have questions which are either not answered or answered in a way which reflects a negative evaluation. In the first of these two sequences, an image of a non-controversial still life has just been projected onto the slide screen.

(4E). (48R: 5/18/92)

1. T: Okay Urn with fruit (.)
2. nineteen eighty seven (1.0)
3. ((teacher coughs))
4. Artists for centuries have been (.)
5. painting still lifes (0.5)
6. baskets of fruit et cetera. (1.0)
After the teacher provides an introductory account of the image, the first call to the cohort is then made. The first set of arrows directs our attention to how this teacher’s call to the cohort is produced. What is to be seen is that the teacher’s question is being built as a turn. To get a sense of how this is done, we can begin by considering the placement of the pauses which exist within it. Both the micro pause seen in line 7 and the (1.0) second pause seen in line 8 are significant in the following ways. Such “intra-turn” pauses (McHoul, 1978), reveal the teacher’s assessment of whether this question has been adequately heard and understood. In this way, the measure of a question’s adequacy is linked to the common understanding of those to whom the question is being directed. In terms of the order
of turn-taking, these pauses demonstrate how the teacher is assessing the readiness of the cohort to answer. As we see, the student's rejoinder comes cleanly after the (1.0) second pause in line 9, not the one in line 8, although the low speaking could be a measure of uncertainty.

Conversely, the second part of this sequence reflects questions asked but not answered at all. Following both the teacher's third turn evaluation in line 11, and the (2.5) second pause in line 12, the teacher then offers another call to the cohort. This call is directed at the cohort instead of the same student who provided the rejoinder in line 10. This redirected effort is interesting in that the answer provided by the student in line 10 shapes the teacher question in line 13. Thus the teacher now tries to generate other rejoinders by going elsewhere. As it happens, the (1.5) second pause in line 15 reveals that there are not any takers to the teacher's offer. We then see that the teacher offers a second, leading question which also goes unanswered. As a result, the teacher begins to bring the sequence to closure in line 18 by generating an extended turn with no possible openings for students. In effect, as an extended turn, the teacher provides the answer to the question raised in line 16.

The teacher's turn here could be seen as a type of instructional recovery from the rejoinders which were never produced after line 14. This type of teacher dialogue routinely occurs during the viewing of Mapplethorpe's safe imagery. It is as if each image deserves some type of an account, whether provided for by both teacher and student or
by just the teacher. Still, it is significant to note that the teacher's talk here, although it does offer a place for a rejoinder (see line 20), hearably remains a monologue. In this sense, the teacher's turn, though filled with breaks or micro pauses, is hearably teacher talk and not a time for student talk.

In the next and final sequence, another still life has been projected onto the screen. Again, we find the teacher trying to solicit comments from students.

(4F). (48R: 5/18/92)

1. ((Slide Advanced))
2. T: Okay now some still lifes (2.5)
3. how many of you did ah your first critical
4. paper on visual (.) art (1.0) ((Hands raised))
5. other than the aids photographs anybody? (.)
6. for a moment? (.)
7. //((a student keeps his hands raised))
8. I'm not sure why I'm excluding the aids
9. photographs but (1.0) ((teacher turns to student))
10. Did you talk about color
11. in your paper? ((student nods)) (0.5)
→12. okay (0.5) talk about color here.
13. (1.0)
15. (0.5)
→16. T: warm?
→17. Sl: [(  )] yeah.
18. (1.5)
19. T: Anybody talk about shape?
20. (1.0)
21. What do you see here (.) shape (..) shape wise?
22. (1.0)
23. S2: *in the flowers (.) and that shaped vase*. (0.5)
24. they’re almost oval (.) close.
25. (1.0)
26. T: say that again (.)
27. S2: an oval.
28. (1.0)
29. T: tha (.) you mean the vase (.)
30. S2: yeah sort of (0.5)
31. T: okay (1.5) I guess I’m also thinking of spa::ce:.

In the first portion of this transcript, we find evidence of hand-raising as a teacher’s resource for finding members. McHoul (1978) speaks of hand-raising in the following ways: When a new topic or question is introduced, it poses a problem for the turn-taking if the topic is potentially answerable by every member of the cohort. In this way, a teacher’s asking for a show of hands provides a selection procedure. In the above instructional sequence that the teacher asks for a show of hands occurs for two possible reasons: to introduce the topic of color, and to find a select number of students who wrote their papers on colorful art works as opposed to black and white photographic images (the aids photographs).² In this sense, the teacher is organizing familiar procedures of classroom display to better organize the direction of instructional talk.

In lines 3 through 11, a great deal of non-verbal organization contributes to this teacher finding a single student. The student’s close proximity to that of the teacher may have a great deal to do with the student’s participation. Actually, the student selected is seated
directly across from the teacher. As the student raises his hand, the teacher acknowledges it non-verbally; perhaps by a nod of the head or by an extended gaze. In line 8, the teacher then turns away from the student and looks toward the screen, but soon returns a look back to the student during the latter portion of his utterance in line 9. Here we have a selected student whose turn to talk has been established, yet he has waited until the teacher’s next move. In line 10, the teacher, now looking directly at the student, asks him a question wherein the student nods. Without hesitation, the teacher then produces the request “talk about color here.”

At this point, we have the beginning of the initial IRE sequence. However, an analysis of this particular IRE sequence presents some ambiguity concerning how the sequence ends. As has been shown, IRE sequences routinely come off without a hitch - there are usually clean transitions between a teacher’s first turn, the student’s second turn, and the teacher’s final turn. What is of interest in this particular sequence is that there is not a clear third turn evaluation. Instead, what we find is that after the teacher asks a selected student to talk about color in the projected image, the student answers with “warm colors.” Following a (0.5) second pause, the teacher then (in line 16) makes the reply “warm?,” which is a reiterated portion of the student’s initial rejoinder. Now, note that as the teacher reiterates the utterance “warm?” in line 16, the student, at the same time, produces an unrecognizable utterance which is followed by a “yeah.”
The main focus here is on the student’s simultaneous start-up and what happens to the course of instruction after it occurs. Recall that a teacher’s third turn evaluation is generally found as a discrete turn. In this instance however, both the teacher and student produce utterances at the same time. What this simultaneous start-up demonstrates is that the student timely anticipates that what the teacher will say at this point will likely be an evaluation. In other words, the student has anticipated the teacher’s assessment in advance.

That this simultaneous start-up occurred is interesting enough. However, what the start-up suggests in terms of interactional organization is more impressive. My claim is that the student hears the (0.5) second pause as a pending negative evaluation, and subsequently, the student starts to say more. However, it proves to be problem of hearing, and once heard “correctly,” the sequence moves on without explicit evaluation. What we find here is that the student’s simultaneous start-up demonstrates that IRE sequences are not always distinct turn-taking events. In this way, the adequacy of the student’s answer is never provided for by the teacher. We see this because the sequence ends without the teacher asking for a clarification of his answer. Thus, the student’s anticipation of the teacher’s utterance “warm?” reveals that providing correct answers in classrooms is a familiar exercise.

In terms of the course of instruction following this simultaneous start-up, we find that the sequence is left to pass, and notably so as demonstrated by the (1.5) second
pause seen in line 18. After the (1.5) second pause, the teacher asks if anyone can talk about the shapes found in the image. Here we have a distinct change of topic. As evidenced by the (1.0) second pause in line 20, no student has self-selected to speak. Line 21 then is a re-address of the question proffered in line 19; the teacher is working at reformulating the question in line 19. After a (1.0) second pause in line 22, a student provides a rejoinder. Upon the completion of it, we again have an existing (1.0) second pause.

At similar places between responses and evaluations in the first three transcripts, a pause does not exist. Instead, a teacher’s evaluation is routinely found. In this case, the (1.0) second pause in line 25 is to be seen as a delay of the teacher’s third turn evaluation. Because it is heard as a delay, the pause is measurable as a negative evaluation. In this way, the teacher’s “Say that again” hangs nicely as a demonstration of the sequential environment at this time. As it happens, the student, having been asked to provide a re-do, utters “an oval” again and then we find another (1.0) second pause.

Structurally, the (1.0) second pause seen in line 28 is a re-do of the pause seen in line 25. As the teacher produces “tha (. ) you mean the vase (. )” in line 29, the student does not get an evaluation; instead he gets a further call for clarification. After his reply “yeah sort of”, the teacher’s “oh kay (1.5 ) I guess I’m also thinking of space” displays a type of two meaning affair. In one way the student has been evaluated; he has performed and completed
his role as a participating student. However, there is also a sense that the teacher has not found the answer initially sought in line 21. For example, the student’s ending remark “yeah sort of,” speaks of how this sequence has really been about this teacher’s search for clarity, and perhaps, a better answer. We are not able to clearly say whether or not the teacher was impressed with the student’s answer(s), but it’s accepted. However, we do get a sense that the teacher’s “oh kay (1.5) I guess I’m also thinking of space” as said after hearing the student’s reply “yeah sort of,” reveals that the teacher was looking for some other type of answer or description. What this really demonstrates is that the production of IRE instructional sequences is not always based on achieving “correct” answers. Instead, a teacher’s familiar way of determining unacceptable answers and subsequently building off of the notion of unacceptability in order to establish new ways of speaking or seeing, is a crucial part of canonical talk as well.

What I have sought to establish in the latter portion of this chapter is the familiar sounds of art instruction, and the ways in which art educational discourse is crafted or shaped. What has also been stressed is that the production of canonical talk in the art classroom is less a matter of topics of talk, than its organization; there are specific yet familiar places wherein both teachers and students talk. In this way, canonical talk, or the practice of art instruction, is a highly organized affair. Working from transcripts of actual classroom talk provides access to such order, and provides a sequential analysis of how teachers and students
find their way through the viewing of Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery. The next chapter reveals what interactional structures of instructional talk exist within the presence of Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery.
Footnotes

1 Although the term "beginning" is used here to describe the early moments of class time, there are also beginnings or re-beginnings found occurring during the entire presentation; i.e., a teacher's change of topic, the reconvening of the class after an exchange between the teacher and a single student, the point of transition between the projection of safe and controversial imagery, etc.

2 The teacher's reference to the "aids photographs" refers to a collection of work shown at the Wexner Center for the Arts which addressed the issue(s) of aids. As the transcript suggests, many students enrolled in the course at this time chose to write their critical papers on this particular exhibit.
CHAPTER V

Controversial Art in the Classroom: The Intertwining of the
Talk and the Display

"I will admit to butterflies and moist palms between slides;
not having any idea of what was coming next."

"I have seen pornography and I have seen Mapplethorpe's work
and I don't see much difference."

The above passages were found as part of two students' answers on a final exam question regarding Mapplethorpe's work. Both demonstrate a sense for the underlying dynamics associated with viewing his controversial work, and subsequently constructing opinions about it. In chapter one, I suggested that when teachers and students encounter Mapplethorpe's controversial imagery, a collision of sorts occurs; the collision of viewing sexually explicit imagery with the practice of instruction. Because the explicitness of imagery is central to the teaching of Mapplethorpe's work, the explicitness has to be handled in an educational way. Thus, in this chapter, the curricular use of controversial imagery in the classroom will be demonstrated as a distinct educational situation; specifically, the varying ways in
which teachers and students speak in the presence of sexually explicit material.

As it happens, art instruction based on sexually explicit images is woven with lengthy pauses, whispers, laughter, and offhanded remarks, all of which frequent the talk during the viewing of such imagery. It is my intention to point out the salient features of this type of talk and then to remark on them analytically.

The collection of transcripts found in this chapter will be approached analytically by way of the talk produced by both teachers and students. However, a considerable part of this focus will again center on other components embedded in classroom interaction, such as instances of silence, laughter, as well as the dynamics associated with the display of controversial imagery. I will begin by examining the initial projection of controversial images and how such an event is reflected in the teacher’s talk.

**Announcing the Arrival of Controversial Imagery**

When teachers arrive at the point wherein Mapplethorpe’s controversial work is first shown, often times the “arrival” is announced. Because the teachers know that the controversial images have in fact arrived, such announcements are naturally found to be the teacher’s domain. I have long felt that these announcements serve the following purposes: to indicate to those students who are not comfortable in viewing Mapplethorpe’s controversial work that the up-coming slides contain sexually explicit material; and, to establish a clear distinction between the safe imagery and the unsafe
imagery.

Such announcements also reflect the teachers' ad hoc ways of speaking as these images first appear on the screen. For example, the following three transcripts will reveal the influence that the immediacy of projection has on the teacher's talk, as well as how such talk directs students toward viewing the work. In this way, the ad hoc curriculum is the reflexive creation of on-going instructional talk as images appear and disappear from the screen.

Keep in mind that the collection of slides used for these presentations have been sequentially ordered, including the controversial images which are ordered in such a way that the first set of these images projected are not as graphic as the last series of images. In terms of the transcriptional layout on the page, I have chosen to include a collection of figures which reflect the imagery projected during these specific instructional sequences. The captions under each figure will signify which line(s) the images appeared in.

Figure 9. Image projected in line 1 of the following transcript: (Embrace, 1982)
(5A). (210.5R: 5/27/93)

1. ((slide advanced)) (1.0)
2. T: ahh this is moving towards
3. the images that have been considered
4. //((slide advanced))
5. a little more controversial (1.0)
6. ((slide advanced))

As seen above, three slides are projected in the course of this scene. After the first image is projected, there is a (1.0) second pause after which the teacher begins to offer that the first image of two men hugging projected in line 1 exhibits an element of controversy. As the teacher does this, a second image is projected. In this way, the projection of imagery reflects a type of graded sequence; the first image displayed provides a visual reference for what constitutes controversy, and, the display of a next image provides the "continuum" of controversy. Thus, in and as the teacher is speaking on behalf of one controversial image, another image is projected, which is found to also be controversial.

What we find in this sequence is the way in which the display and on-going teacher's talk are interconnected. At best, this instance of the teacher's continuation of speaking as one image disappears and another reappears demonstrates the fluid and timely manner in which the teacher's talk is accentuated by the display. As a result, the students are seeing as the teacher is speaking beyond the overlap.
Prior to the second teacher's talk found in this next transcript, the notion of controversial art has already been suggested. However, there has not been the use of an image to reinforce the element of controversy.

Figure 10: Images projected in lines 1 and 7 of the following transcript: (Embrace, 1982; Melia Marden, 1983).

(5B). (310.5R: 5/28/93)

1. ((slide advanced)) (3.5)
2. T: Again maybe moving into
3. a little controver: sy:: (.)
→ 4. Sexu:ality: as well as inter: racial:: (.)
→ 5. or you can jus think its ah hug (1.0)
6. its up to you
7. //( ((slide advanced)) (1.0)
8. Another controversial issue is that he has
9. photo: grafs of chil: dren::
In the above transcript, it is found that as the image of two men hugging is projected onto the slide screen in line 1, the (3.5) second pause serves as ample time to gaze. As we see, the teacher, by uttering “Again maybe moving into a little controversy,” frames this image as the first one that is controversial. Unlike the previous transcript wherein the teacher’s interpretation is only that the image is “moving towards controversy,” in this sequence, specifically in line 4, the teacher provides a descriptive account of what elements may constitute controversy (“sexuality” as well as “interracial”). Additionally, in line 5, an opposing viewpoint is provided which suggests that the image can be viewed as non-controversial “or you can just think its a hug.” And finally, as the teacher is uttering “its up to you,” the next slide comes into view. Again, this offers us another display of changing imagery in the midst of on-going talk. This time the teacher remarks on another element of controversy associated with Mapplethorpe’s work; that being the images of nude children.

What this transcript offers in terms of the organization of talk is this: As teachers present Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery, there is a need to find ways of speaking, and those ways of speaking will unavoidably organize this field. As a result, the teacher’s talk not only provides the newly projected imagery with context, the talk also shapes and directs the ways in which students could potentially speak about such imagery.
In the third transcript of this collection, a teacher has been showing images of nude children, and these same images, as seen in the previous transcript, have been characterized as controversial. However, the teacher in this case chooses another photographic image with which to announce the arrival of controversial art.

Figure 11: Images projected in lines 1 and 9 of the following transcript: (Larry and Bob, 1979; Bryan Ridley and Lyle Heeter, 1979 )

(5C). (48R: 5/18/92)

1. ((slide advanced))
2. T: //everybody's got pictures like that
3. in your scrapbook (1.5)
→ 4. maybe not this: (0.5)
5. Larry and Bob (.) nineteen seventy nine (.)
→ 6. *(h)unh* (1.5)
7. So here we Get more into his::(.)
8. the environment from (. ) which he::
9. existed::(.)((slide advanced))
As the slide of two men kissing is projected in line 1, the teacher’s utterance produced in lines 2 and 3 is actually a continuation of talk related to a previous image of a nude child. In line 4, the teacher, in a very fluid way, constructs a comparative link between “safe” imagery and “unsafe;” images which you find in scrapbooks, and images which you do not.

After the title of the work is read aloud in line 5, in line 6, we see that the teacher produces a quiet laugh, which for all accounts sounds like it is made to himself. I believe the teacher’s laugh reflects the way in which the transition from an image of a nude child to one depicting two men kissing occurs in the commentary. In this way, the laugh underscores that the image now on the screen is indeed more controversial than the previous ones shown. And after a brief introduction of the work, we see that the teacher’s next step is the further announcement that the class is now looking at controversial imagery. For example, in line 7 we find the teacher making distinct references or connections to the image at hand. And, it is done so in a careful way, with a repair existing at the end of line 7 and beginning in line 8, as well as stretched endings of words such a “he::” and “existed::.”

Each of the above transcripts demonstrate that as the controversial photographs first arrive, they arrive in the company of ways of speaking which introduces, articulates, and intercalates them as controversial. And, within these ways of speaking, a gradient is provided - the gradient of controversy. The fact that these announcements are even
made, suggests that the viewing of controversial imagery is an expected challenge for both teacher and student. Organizationally speaking, it is in these three sequences that we find teachers doing the preparatory work necessary for instilling an instructional sense for the projection of Mapplethorpe's controversial imagery.

In the Presence of Sexually Explicit Imagery

Recall from chapter four that when images of flowers, still lifes, and figure studies are projected onto the slide screen, there is not a particular problem in the way teaching associates articulate turns; the instructional or canonical art educational talk produced by teachers is done so in a very fluent way. However, when controversial images arrive on the slide screen, the work of building instructional sequences or turns, becomes quite problematic.

The next collection of transcripts recovers the events which take place in and as controversial images are now being projected onto the slide screen. At this time, the students are likely aware that the images are not anything like the floral and still life photographs shown earlier. It should be stated that in the first transcript the teacher has opted not to discuss any of the images until the entire carousel has been shown. This way of presenting was announced to the class prior to their looking at the images.
Figure 12: Images projected in lines 1 and 2 of the following transcript: (Self Portrait, 1978; Untitled, 1981)

(59R: 5/19/92)

1. ((slide advanced)) (3.5)
2. ((slide advanced)) (1.0)
3. S1: *wha was tha:t?*
4. (1.0)
5. T: tha last one?
6. S1:  
   //m: : yeh heh (h)
7.  //((teacher backs up slide carousel))
8. T: this is ahh::
9. S1:  
   //
10. S2:  //yee:sh:
11. S3:  //heh:(hh)(h) (0.5)
12. T: Wh:: there is no title to this (.)
13. self portrait (.I'm not sure of the year.

After the projection of the first image and a (3.5)
second pause, a second image is projected. As this image
remains on the screen, a student produces the rhetorical
question "*whas was tha:t?*," directed at the previously
projected image in line 1. The quiet manner which the asking
of this question displays gives us the sense that the utterance has been made to no one in particular. At the same time, the utterance has been produced to be heard. And, as seen in line 5, it is heard and responded to by the teacher.

Embedded within the teacher’s reply “tha last one?,” is the teacher’s understanding of what image the student is referring to. In the presence of an image, the student could only be speaking of some prior image. The student’s utterance then is organized to the local history found in the projection of the imagery. Organizationally speaking, the teacher’s question “tha last one?” is not asked because the answer is not known. Instead, the teacher asks the question solely as a topical exercise; a means toward demonstrating to the class that the student’s question “*wha was that?**” is a justifiable one to ask. Retrospectively, the teacher is retrieving the student’s question as a resource for bridging the sequential organization of instructional talk back together.

In instructional terms, the teacher, through this exchange with the student, is able to redirect attention back to an image previously shown. And in lines 6 and 7 we see how this is done: the teacher spins the carousel back one space in and as the student provides a rejoinder to the teacher’s question. As the image is projected this time, we see the teacher begin to announce something overlapped with an indecipherable utterance made by the student. This utterance is also overlapped by a second student’s “yee:sh:,” which is further overlapped with a series of breathy laughs by a third student. Thus, in lines 8 through 11, we see that
projection of the image this time around evokes a variety of responses from three students, and we now find the element of controversy clearly displayed as a part of the on-going talk. However, the talk is not a sequential organization of turn-taking. Instead, this type of talk consists of singular remarks which typify how students respond to Mapplethorpe’s controversial work.

**Laughter and its Place**

Up to this point, we have seen instances of both teacher and student laughter which occur during the presentation of controversial imagery. In this next transcript, instances of laughter, particularly that of the teacher, are found to be fundamental in terms of the viewing of imagery. This sequence involves the same class seen in the previous transcript, which is now further along in the presentation of Mapplethorpe’s controversial work. The pace of projecting the imagery has quickened, and the transcript begins at the point where about half of the controversial images have already been shown. The teacher is sitting next to the projector which is located near the slide screen.
Figure 13: Images projected in lines 8, 11, and 13 of the following transcript: (Mark Stevens, 1976; Jim, Sausalito, 1977; Jim and Tom, Sausalito, 1977).

(5E). (59R: 5/19/92)

1. ((slide advanced)) (3.0)
2. T: *untitled:* (1.0)
3. ((slide advanced)) (5.0)
4. ((slide advanced)) (4.0)
5. ((slide advanced)) (4.0)
6. ((slide advanced)) (3.0)
7. ((slide advanced)) (4.0)
8. ((slide advanced)) (4.0)
9. *ehh:: hhh*:
10. Sl: //ehh::
I would like to begin first with a discussion concerning the bracketed area of lines 2 through 8. After the teacher reads the image’s title aloud in line 2, we see a considerable period of silence extending until line 9. The only notable sound during this time of viewing is the advancing carousel as a series of images are being projected without any interjection or commentary by either the teacher or students. It is not unusual to find this kind of presentation, although this absence of talk may be occurring for a variety of reasons. As seen in transcript (5D), this same teacher has opted not to discuss the images, although talk during the viewing of these images has occurred. In lines 2 through 8, the rules of engagement that have already been established remain true again—the images are just to be looked at as opposed to responded to verbally.

However, the silence of their viewing is broken, and the element of laughter plays a large part in bringing talk back into the viewing process. For example, in lines 9 and 10, there are two instances of laughter, with the teacher producing the longest stretch, while a student generates the rest. We can only imagine what causes the teacher to laugh; perhaps the quietness of the room, a look on a student’s
face, or even the content found in one of the images. However, we can remark on the laughter in terms of the organizational structure which it reflects. For example, as the teacher produces the initial laugh in line 9, a student overlaps the teacher’s laugh with his own. Similarly, the same structure occurs in lines 15 and 16. This ordering of the laughter reveals that teacher laughter, as the first laughter produced, opens up the possibility for laughter or other rejoinders produced by students.

After the next slide is projected in line 11, a longer laugh is again produced by the teacher in line 12. However, this time it is not followed by student laughter. The projector advances and we then see the image of one man urinating into another man’s mouth. Now we see that after a (4.0) second pause, a student poses the question “how did he get people to pose for these?” while the image is still being projected. In both cases of teacher laughter, the laughter itself has opened the floor to any next remark. Therefore, the student’s asking of this question can certainly be seen as stemming from an environment in which such a question can rightly be asked. The question itself is interesting in terms of the student self-selecting to produce it. However, what I find more interesting is the way in which the question is handled by the teacher. Recall that this same teacher in the previous transcript made use of a student’s question which was not produced necessarily for an answer. Here, though, the inverse takes place; a student’s question is earnestly asked but it goes unanswered.
In the next transcript, we find an image projected with a long pause before any talk is produced. Unfortunately, I am unable to recover exactly what image is being projected at this time.

(5F). (69R: [Audio Only] 3/13/92)

1. ((Slide Advances)) (7.0)
2. T: Come on you guys gotta have somethin tah say:=
3. S1: =*eh heh heh*
4. S2: //*(hh)*
5. S3: //*(hh) huh muh god:* (1.0)
6. T: Well whatayah think about this? (.)
7. It’s not
8. S3: [It’s Gross:: man
9. T: //it’s not easy to look at

To begin with, we get a sense that during the (7.0) second pause after the image is projected, the teacher is waiting for some type of response. The teacher’s request seen in line 2, therefore, is a formal call for talk. In an interactional sense, the call for talk requires that a rejoinder be produced. What we in fact see produced are three instances of laughter, the last of which ends with the utterance “huh muh god.” Again, the central organizational structure of this laughter is found in the overlaps - once one student produces laughter, subsequent laughter is found to be produced more easily. Furthermore, that these responses are really said to no one in particular seems to have subsequent implications for the teacher’s next move. In this sense, laughter provides open grounds for more
verbalized responses.

As we see, the teacher’s next utterance in line 6 reflects that the laughter produced in lines 3, 4, and 5 does not suffice as answers. So, the teacher’s utterance “Well whatayah think about this?” is to be remarked upon as an upgrade of line 2. Ultimately, after the teacher makes the second call and begins an additional utterance, “It’s not,” we see that a student simultaneously starts up with “It’s Gross:: man.” This simultaneous start up, in that it is produced as the teacher is still speaking, seems to reflect that this student is not holding anything back. Here the comment is also notably louder as well as stretched. Furthermore, we find evidence that the teacher has in fact recognized this comment as a rejoinder in the way that the teacher cuts-off the beginning part of the utterance “It’s not” and begins with “it’s not easy to look at” only after the student has nearly completed the rejoinder.

The next transcript again recovers multiple student responses made toward Mapplethorpe’s image of two men engaged in an oral sex act. Prior to line 1, the teacher has been speaking with students concerning varying themes found in another controversial photograph.
(5G) (19R [audio tape only] 3/12/92)

1. ((slide advances)) (1.0)
2. S1: *ohh*
3. S2: /*ahh
4. S3: //Ahh:
5. S4: //Augh::h:::
6. S5: //Jesus Chr:ist::(0.5)
7. S??: ((Multiple outbursts of laughter))
8. T: //Jo:hn::?
9. (1.0)
10. S??: ah hah (hh) (hh) (hh) (hh)
11. S3: /*That's dis 'gusting::*

Following the image being projected and a (1.0) second pause, we hear a wave of cacophony of expressions that overlap each other in lines 2 through 6. In terms of organization, it should not be said that such responses are merely uttered. Instead, what occurs is an ordering of responses; each 'next' is produced as the preceding one is
heard. And, as each utterance is produced, the 'next' is again that much easier to produce.

After the fifth student in this sequence utters "Jesus Christ:,", a (0.5) second pause exists before a loud outburst of laughter is produced by several students. At the tail end of this laughter, the teacher, in line 8, is found calling for the speaker who provides the "articulated" comment in line 6. Interpretively speaking, the crest of this grading of utterances is the teacher's directive call to "Jo:hn." The fact that "Jo:hn" is even looked for is this teacher's way of finding a member in hopes of establishing a next instructional move. In retrospect, the four initial responses in lines 2 through 5 are not actually found to be accountable by the teacher; in terms of sequential implications, they are "weak." However, the student who produces the comment "Jesus Christ:,", remarkably, is sought after by the teacher, and the calling out of his name serves as a potential place for any future talk. However, as it happens, "John" is never found. Instead, what we do find is a (1.0) second pause, which for all accounts, is the designated place wherein "John" could have replied. What fills the place is more laughter as well as an additional comment quietly directed towards the image is produced. In this way, the teacher's call for "John" is a place wherein an organization of the talk was attempted but never fully achieved.

Finally, it can be stated that out of these sequentially weak utterances, the teacher is trying to remount recognizable structures of sequential implication. Thus, the
teacher's call to "Jo:hn" is significant not only as a member addressment, but that the addressment itself is an attempt by the teacher to generate any type of talk.

**Changes in the Display and in the Talk**

In this setting, the order of images projected has been a significant factor in how the talk produced during such projection ultimately comes off. In the next sequence, focus will center on how changes in imagery is subsequently reflected in the student's talk. First though, the events in the next transcript requires some background information. This teacher has opted to show all of Mapplethorpe's images first before developing a class discussion. Up to this point, ten images have been shown with nominal instances of teacher talk. Only one instance of students making whispering comments has occurred.

---

**Figure 15:** Images projected in lines 1, 2, of the following transcript: (X portfolio, Joe, 1978; X portfolio, Helmut, 1978)
Figure 16: Images projected in lines 5, 8, and 10 of the following transcript: (Man in Polyester Suit, 1980; Marty and Hank, 1979; Self Portrait, 1978)

(5H). (210.5R: 5/27/93)

1. ((Slide Advanced)) (2.0)
2. T: These ((Slide Advanced))
3. //have sometimes been called
4. the leather images:: (0.5)
5. ((Slide Advanced))
6. S1: /*masachism* (1.0)
7. S2: *oh::* (0.5)
8. ((Slide Advanced)) (0.7)
9. S3: Oh:h heavenly joy::
10. S4: //(^ )//((Slide Advanced)) (.)
11. S?: (student [S3] pushes himself back from the table)
12. S?: ehh ehh (hh)(hh)(hh)(hh)(hh)(hh) (0.5)
13. (student [S3] bends down to collect his things))
14. ((Slide Advanced))

The first part of this sequence is the teacher’s announcement of Mapplethorpe’s leather images. As we see, two images are used to construct such an announcement. Through the practical accomplishment of both the display and the talk, the teacher is providing a gradient for seeing levels of offensiveness associated with Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery. The teacher is also providing a respectable way of speaking in the presence of these images. This is done for the practical sense of assembling the curriculum. In this respect, the teacher’s talk frames the images on the screen, as well as to those which will be further projected. We find this occurring as the teacher uses the image projected in line 1 as a springboard for announcing the arrival of Mapplethorpe’s leather images. At the conclusion of the teacher’s utterance and a (0.5) second pause in line 4, a third image is projected which is not a leather image. It is this change of imagery and the differing responses produced by students that I would like to address here.

The student who produces the utterance "*masachism*" in line 6 does so in response to the leather images projected in lines 1 and 2. The utterance itself is produced in the dark, before the image projected in line 5 comes up on the screen. It is clear that during the room’s momentary darkness,
comments which are made at this time prove to be a regular place to produce talk about images just seen. Given that this comment is uttered quietly and in the darkness of the room perhaps suggests that this student may not intend for the comment to be found by the teacher.

As the the image of "Man in Polyester Suit" is projected, a (1.0) second pause exists before we hear the second utterance "*oh:::*" produced in line 7, based on both the change of visual theme as well as an increase in the graphic content of the third image. And as we see, the comment is said to on one in particular thus it does not receive any attention. As the next slide is projected (which depicts two men engaged in an oral sex act), the ensuing responses made by students this time are produced much louder. This image, entitled "Marty and Hank, 1982", depicts a graphic act of sexual behavior. As one of four images shown during the Mapplethorpe presentation which portrays an on-going sexual act, such an image routinely evokes the most dynamic reactions. As we see in line 9, one student boisterously produces the utterance "Oh:: heavenly joy:::," while another student overlaps with an additional yet indecipherable comment during its production.

With the projection of different images in lines 5 and 8, the "Oh:: heavenly joy:::" in line 9 is to be seen as an upgrade from the "*oh:::*" produced in line 7. Furthermore, I would suggest that embedded within the student talk, we find the organization of controversy, both as a visible and aural experience. In other words, the students here are displaying an assessment toward varying levels of controversy associated
with differing images.

**Remarks Which are Permissible and Those Which are Not**

The following transcript offers are two further features associated with viewer responses. The first is a series of student remarks which are not taken up by the teacher. The second is a single comment which is.

![Image](image.jpg)

Figure 17: Image projected in line 2 of the following transcript: (Man in Polyester Suit, 1980).

```
(51) (19R [audio tape only] 3/12/92)

1. ((Mixed chatter))
2. ((Slide Advanced)) (1.0)
→ 3. S1: Lor:by (2.0)
4. T: eh heh heh heh
→ 5. S: //((multiple instances of student laughter)) ()
6. T: What was that down there?
7. S2: //o:h //ba:by (1.5)
→ 8. S3: *sick* (1.0)
→ 9. T: who said that?
10. S3: I did (2.0)
```
11. T: Frank is that you?=
12. S3: =yeah=
13. T: =oh:kay? (.)

To begin with, mixed chatter is occurring as the image "Man in Polyester Suit" is projected. After a (1.0) second pause, we see the student comment "Lor::dy" being made, which, after a (2.0) second pause, is accompanied by a wave of teacher and student laughter in lines 4 and 5. After a brief pause at the end of the student laughter, the teacher in line 6 then begins to address the comment "Lor::dy." Note that just after the teacher begins uttering "what was that down there?", we find a second student overlapping the teacher's talk with the comment "*o::h ... ba:by*.

Following this comment, and a (1.5) second pause, a third student delivers the comment "*sick*," which ultimately leads to a specific call made by the teacher towards that particular student.

Again, we have a situation wherein a variety of comments or responses are made, yet none of which really have a usefulness in terms of possible sequential or dialogic interaction. However, based on the teacher's "who said that?," the comment "*sick*" is to be seen as the first response which is made accountable by the teacher. Prior to this comment, responses such as "Lor::dy" and "*o::h ba::by*," as well as the multiple instances of laughter, have essentially been permissible. The student's comment "*sick*" is evidently heard differently than the others. The comment is more judgmental in its tone and therefore stands out as a negative evaluation. What this act of accountability
demonstrates is that in the presence of controversial imagery, certain remarks, particularly ones which have an embedded sense of negativity, provide a more workable foundation for the teacher to facilitate more constructive ways of speaking. Thus, in this setting, direct challenges to imagery as opposed to less substantive viewing remarks are to be seen as accountable talk which provides a potential for established practices of art instruction.

**Talking Over the Imagery**

Up to this point, each featured transcript has reflected the events which have occurred during the initial projection of Mapplethorpe's controversial work. This final transcript, however, is a bit different in that the teacher, having already shown all of the imagery in the carousel including the controversial images, is now beginning to elaborate further on the material.

---

**Figure 18:** Image projected prior to line 1 as well as images projected in lines 8 and 27: (Self-Portrait, 1980; Self Portrait, 1978).
1. T: There is a concept of tha self that extends
2. far beyond self: por treh tur:e
3. an you see this in images such as this:
4. ((carousel spun))
5. as well as: ((carousel is spun again))
6. for example
7. [ // ((carousel spun))]
8. ((carousel spun)) (1.5) ((image projected))
9. in this type of an image (0.5)
10. S1:     // ( ow:w )
11. T: What type of ah view of himself is he
12. S?:     // ( ^ )
13. revealing to us:
14. what does he want us to see:: (. ) yes: and maybe
15. we don’t need to take these things literah: lly:
16. maybe thats his suh:ggestion: (. )
17. either way itz an exploration of the self:: (. )
18. and thats what(. ) one of the interesting aspects
19. of his work I think: (0.5)
20. But lets return to the front
21. of the carahsel: ah:gain
22. // ((Slide carousel is spun))
23. S?:     // ( ^ ) (1.0)
24. S2: *the guy was so gro::ss* (2.0) ((image projected))
25. (2.0)
26. T: He said of this picture(..) umm

The discussion of this transcript centers mainly on the
synchrony of slide projection, and the teacher's talk in
lines 11 through 21 as an extended turn. To begin with,
lines 1 through 3 recover the teacher’s talk concerning the
first image which is already projected on the slide screen.
At the end of the teacher’s utterance in line 3, we see that the carousel is then spun in search of another image. Actually, the teacher is doing an instructional move which most of the teachers in this setting do not do— an immediate shift from projecting a “safe” image to one which is “unsafe.”

What is notable here is that the teacher’s talk, the shifting of the carousel, and the projection of imagery are each precisely timed events. As an example, consider the following two occasions. First, the teacher’s “as well as:” in line 5 is produced after the carousel shifts in line 4 but before the carousel is shifted again at the end of line 5. In this sense, the teacher speaks only when the talk can optimally be heard.

Second, the teacher spins the carousel as the utterance “for example” is produced in line 6. At this point, the carousel itself is spun twice, once as the teacher utters “for,” and again as the teacher utters “example.” This time, instead of speaking in between the sounds of the carousel being spun, there are two distinct shifts of the carousel which fluidly coincide with the teacher’s talk. Such fluidity, as demonstrated in the talk and in the movement of the carousel, is certainly not a planned act. Rather, in the darkness of the room the teacher’s way of speaking is influenced or directed by the familiar procedures associated with the process of projecting slide imagery. These two events display the routine yet synchronous ways in which a teacher uses both the organization of the carousel and the practical management of it for developing talk during the
time of finding and projecting a new image. In this way, the
teacher is providing the directive grounds necessary for
instruction while in the midst of the room’s darkness.

The teacher’s very next utterance, produced in line 9,
 begins just as the second self-portrait is projected. As it
happens, the announcement of the image in line 9 is not
singularly the domain of the teacher. As we see in line 10,
the first utterance produced by a student overlaps the
teacher’s talk. The student, by placing the comment “ow:ow”
here, again demonstrates the familiar, found place within the
teacher’s talk wherein comments like this can safely be
uttered. I find the student’s comment “ow:ow” interesting for
a number of reasons; however, that it is said in the presence
of an image which depicts an act of self-inflicted violation
is the most intriguing.

At best, the comment “ow:ow” reveals a certain
playfulness with respect to what the image portrays. And,
although the comment may not be the best initiator for
further instructional points, there is a strong sense of
immediacy associated with it. This comment also is
interesting as a juxtaposition with the upcoming teacher’s
talk found in lines 11 through 21. I say this for the reason
that in terms of its content, the student’s comment “ow:ow” is
directly aimed at the image as a way to express its raw and
graphic content; inversely, the teacher’s talk in lines 11
through 21 clearly avoids the intense graphic nature of the
image’s display - a sort of “talking over” the image.
Before discussing the manner in which the graphic content of this image is "talked over," consider first the organizational structure of the teacher's talk at this time. After announcing the arrival of the image on the slide screen in line 9, we see that the teacher begins to make an address to the class in line 11. In line 12, a student overlaps the teacher's talk with an indecipherable comment; however, whether the comment has been heard or not, the teacher continues on. For all intents and purposes, lines 11 through 21 can be seen as an extended turn. And, as an extended turn, the teacher's talk contains multiple places wherein completion of the turn can take place. Such places are to be seen as micro pauses and sound stretches on words, each of which reoccurs throughout lines 13 through 19. But as we see, although the teacher's talk is completed by line 21, it is neither overlapped nor found to be a place for student talk to occur. In this way, the turn is singularly the domain of the teacher.

In terms of instruction, as the teacher talks at length about this controversial image, the teacher is also providing constant companionship to the image; the teacher is accompanying the image with talk so as not to leave it subjected to instances of silence. And although questions are raised by the teacher concerning the description of the image, they are questions which are heard to be left unanswered by students. For example, in lines 12 through 15, the teacher rhetorically asks "what type of a view of himself is he revealing to us::?" In line 16, the teacher asks "what does he want us to see::." Structurally, the two
questions are heard as highly open-ended. However, the content of these questions is even more intriguing given the fact that they are asked in the presence of this image.

For example, Mapplethorpe’s self portrait involving the whip is clearly an intentionally confronting image, yet the teacher is found posing questions which create a distance between the image’s content, and which in turn rather nicely avoid the rawness which is being projected. In a way, the teacher’s talk here is filled with parody. For example, the graphic fact that Mapplethorpe is penetrating himself with the handle of a bullwhip, is, in turn, the “view of himself” which he is “revealing to us.” And, it is Mapplethorpe’s backside which he wants us all to see. Furthermore, the teacher’s account of self-portraiture as an “exploration of the self” is both a succinct and formal explanation as to why artists take pictures of themselves; however, given that Mapplethorpe is physically exploring himself here with a whip handle is another matter altogether.

The flow of talk here does not end with rhetorical type questions; it is also found existing in the teacher’s announcements concerning where the class is going to next. For example, the teacher utters “but lets return to the front of the carousel.” In the presence of Mapplethorpe’s backside, the description of the carousel’s front is equally illuminating. That the teacher speaks in this way is revealing in terms of how instructional talk is shaped and presented. But, what happens when the teacher stops talking brings us back to the organizational sense of the room.
In line 22 the slide carousel is spun back to the image that was originally projected on the slide screen in line 1. In the room's current darkness we hear two comments being produced by students. The first, seen in line 23, is indecipherable; however, the second comment "*the guy was so gro:::ss*" has been recovered. Because both comments are produced prior to the image being projected further demonstrates that whispered comments in a dark room are a safe place for students to make such comments, especially after the teacher has had such an extended amount of time holding the floor. And as we see, the teacher, after a (2.0) second pause for viewing the image, calls the students' attention to the image in line 26.

What I have sought to establish in this chapter are the ways in which art instruction based on controversial imagery is produced and maintained. What has been evident is that the routine production of canonical talk in the art classroom during the projection of controversial imagery does not take place. Instead, informal ways of speaking tend to be the typical feature of the talk. However, there are still specific yet familiar places wherein both teachers and students talk. In this way, the practice of art instruction during the showing of controversial imagery is still considered a highly organized affair. In the next and final chapter, the notion of taming, as a process which accompanies instruction based on Mapplethorpe's controversial imagery, will be reinforced. In addition, chapter six will serve as a recapitulation and final introspection of those issues outlined in the previous five chapters, in an attempt to
illuminate the various organizational features of classroom talk within the context of viewing controversial imagery.
CHAPTER VI

General Findings: A Sense of the Taming

This chapter reviews the different ways of speaking in the classroom in the presence of controversial and noncontroversial imagery. It also provides an opportunity to reflect further on the nature of the taming phenomenon. Based on the analytical sections developed in chapters four and five, the central elements surrounding the presentation of Mapplethorpe’s work, such as the order of the slide presentation, the production of canonical talk, the production of an ad hoc curriculum, and the sequentially weak ways of speaking in the presence of controversial imagery, will be collected and reviewed. Finally, the place of instructional talk as a taming action inherent to the classroom presentation of Mapplethorpe’s controversial work will be reviewed and assessed.

The Order of the Presentation

Mapplethorpe himself spoke about wanting viewers to experience his work as a duality - when looking at his images of flowers, the viewer should, at the same time, encounter
the more sexually explicit work, thus resulting in an emotional oscillation between safe and unsafe imagery. In the exhibition of the traveling retrospective "The Perfect Moment" in Cincinnati, this format of viewing did exist; however, it was controlled. Although some controversial images did appear alongside images typified as safe, a decision was made by the curator of the show to display the more graphic images in a separate section of the gallery. In this respect, the organization of the exhibition regulated or guided the viewing experience.

Similarly, in the classroom, the images that are shown are ordered in such a way as to shape and organize the experience of viewing them. The images shown in these presentations are prearranged into a regular sequence, with the controversial images being the last images projected. Such an ordering suggests that there is an anticipated instructional rationale. I have indicated that this arrangement exists so as to lead students to see a variety of themes before the controversial work arrives. Another reason for ordering the imagery is to afford the teacher opportunities to demonstrate that Mapplethorpe's work can be viewed and discussed in a formal, educational way. In general, the ordering builds an immediate context for viewing the more controversial imagery.

Once the controversial images arrive on the screen, they do not arrive in a brazen manner. For example, images of nude children, two males hugging, and two males kissing are shown first, then comes the imagery of leather sex, sadomasochistic experiences, and other graphic sexual acts."
Based on the notion that controversial imagery can reflect varying degrees or levels of controversy, the sequencing of the slides used for these presentations reflects a moral order carried out in the form of a gradient of controversy. In this way, the ordering of the slides reflects not only a collaborative interpretation of what constitutes controversy, but that the ordering itself presupposes how students are expected to react or respond in the presence of controversial imagery. Ultimately, the order of the presentation is to be seen as an attempt to initiate some type of control over the imagery. And for the purposes of this study, such control reflects a taming action.

**Canonical Talk**

In chapter four, the term "canonical talk" is used to characterize art instruction which occurs during the projection of Mapplethorpe's safe imagery. And, as the transcripts show, the students in this setting are being asked to speak in recognizable, familiar ways concerning the subject matter and formal elements found in the non-controversial imagery. As a result, canonical ways of speaking in this setting have been suggested as the familiar discourse of art education. The development and practice of canonical art instruction during the projection of safe images is found to show regular sequential structures of exchanges between teacher and students; namely teacher questions, student responses, and teacher assessments. The exchanges between teachers and students also demonstrate a working two-party structure, wherein instructional sequences
routinely and fluidly unfold between the teacher and cohort. Thus, in the presence of safe imagery, canonical ways of speaking result in teachers being able to develop fluid exchanges with students, which in turn reveals that Mapplethorpe's safe imagery is conducive for orderly, manageable sequences of art instruction.

**Development of an Ad Hoc Curriculum in the Presence of Controversial Imagery**

In the projection of any Mapplethorpe image, the immediacy of the image appearing on the slide screen and how both teachers and students respond to it makes for a lively occasion. However, as the controversial images begin to appear, the interactional organization of the room is transformed. As we have seen through an investigation of the on-going talk in these classes, the presentation of Mapplethorpe's controversial work in the classroom becomes a spontaneous and often delicate instructional situation as the curriculum develops in an ad hoc fashion. For example, we have seen teachers announce the arrival of controversial imagery. However, the arrival of the controversial imagery as compared to the initial projection of flowers, portraits, and still lifes is to be seen as a clear, discernible transition - the transition between viewing safe and unsafe imagery. We have also seen that once a class has begun viewing the sexually explicit images, the viewing involves periods of silence, instances of laughter, or the development of offhanded remarks. The fact that these types of responses do not exist during the projection of Mapplethorpe's safe
imagery reveals the nature of an ad hoc curriculum - teachers shape and direct unrestrained interactions back to a familiar, instructional practice.

Teachers in this setting rely on a number of resources for shaping and directing the on-going talk. The first involves expected actions of students; specifically, their familiarity with the classroom setting as a place of normal structures of classroom participation. In this sense, although the imagery can be confronting or challenging for some students who view it, these students understand ways they are expected to behave. The second involves the role of the teacher; that when sexually explicit images are being shown, the event should be guided or directed by the teacher. For example, students may whisper, talk, and laugh, but their expressions are always understood to be potentially accountable to the teacher. In other words, any remark can become part of the emerging curriculum.

Furthermore, there is a larger, more influential component at work in the development of the ad hoc curriculum. Because Mapplethorpe’s controversial images have already been deemed controversial in other contexts such as courts, the United States Senate, and critical literature, when showing these images, the teacher is reading into the curriculum these other contexts of controversy. Thus, presenting Mapplethorpe in the classroom is always accompanied by the historical discourse which has shaped the controversy surrounding Mapplethorpe’s work. Teachers who present the controversial material are already deeply influenced by the varying agendas, political issues, and
controversies which have shaped reception of Mapplethorpe's work in the public context. The larger point to be made is that the controversy is already known by everyone - the images are already given a context.

Through the organizational structures of classroom talk, the anticipated behavior of students, the understood role of the teacher, as well as varying influential contexts relating to the Mapplethorpe phenomena, these presentations on Robert Mapplethorpe result in the production of an ad hoc curriculum. In the presence of Mapplethorpe's controversial imagery, the ad hoc quality reveals itself in the following way: the spontaneity of the talk first displaces familiar instructional practice and then becomes the resource for the teacher's work of directing the class back to canonical ways of speaking. At this point, consider the element of spontaneous talk or "ways of speaking" as an existing part of the viewing of Mapplethorpe's controversial work.

**Sequentially Weak Remarks Made in the Presence of Controversial Imagery**

In chapter five, instruction based on controversial imagery is, conversely, found not to consist of canonical structures of talk. Instead, the transcripts show teachers managing students' informal or sequentially weak ways of speaking which exist in the form of unarticulated responses, laughter, and offhanded remarks and assessments. It is found that these types of student responses are either produced during the immediate viewing of Mapplethorpe's controversial work as it initially appears on the slide screen or when
teachers question students about it at some later point. Consider first the differences in how teachers question students about Mapplethorpe’s safe and unsafe imagery. As opposed to a teacher initiating dialogue by asking “what’s one thing you would want to describe in this work?,” or “what kind of themes do you see in this photograph?,” in the presence of controversial imagery, we find offerings like “Come on you guys gotta have somethin tah say,” or “well whatayah think about this?”. This difference reveals that in the presence of controversial imagery, teachers are not looking for formal descriptions centered on line, shape or color. Rather, the teachers are in search of any form of articulated responses, and upon hearing them, the teacher will then begin the work of shaping them into familiar structures of classroom talk.

Relatedly, unlike finding students speaking a familiar type of discourse in the presence of flowers and still lifes, in the presence of sexually explicit imagery, we often find students producing quiet comments which are seemingly made to no one in particular, or, following a series of laughter, we discover outbursts of discontent or dissatisfaction. In chapter five, and as stated above, a commonly found reaction to Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery, and one seen to be a significant part of how students initially address the work, is laughter. For all intents and purposes, laughter is a way of speaking. For example, laughter provides for the initiation of talk; it constructs a familiar place for other remarks to be said. Laughter may also exist as a response to a particular image, or it may serve to break the air of
uncomfortableness within the classroom. Furthermore, laughter can serve as a teacher’s resource for leveraging conversation.

Laughter in the context of viewing and discussing controversial images, however, is not really sufficient for art educational purposes. Therein lies the teacher’s capacity to either go along with laughter, make an attempt to squelch it, or redirect it into the type of talk necessary for instruction and learning. Because teachers in most cases are found trying to redirect it, laughter can be seen as a permissible response in the context of viewing controversial imagery, yet one that cannot continue for long, nor be ignored and left unarticulated. In other words, at some point instruction must again be the on-going, regular feature of the talk.

The other ways in which students produce talk in the presence of controversial imagery is a significant matter to consider. Again, many of the students’ comments are produced quietly and such comments are often heard as being made to no one in particular. This type of talk typifies the first wave of comments made about an image. Other times, students make comments precisely as one image leaves the screen and before the next image appears. In this way, the darkness of the room reveals itself to be a safe place in which to speak. I believe these characteristics of student responses made to controversial imagery reveal that students are aware of their comments as potentially accountable. Therefore, these ways of speaking are seen as steps taken to lessen the chance of students being selected by the teacher to participate more
directly.

In order for the teacher to begin to reestablish instruction, informal or sequentially weak ways of speaking need to be transformed. And, we have seen that such a transformation occurs in a variety of ways. For example, some remarks made by students are not conducive for instructional purposes and therefore are not dealt with by teachers. However, this avoidance can result in the production of other comments, perhaps ones which are more conducive for developing discourse. In other instances, students producing judgmental or interpretive remarks have subsequently been called on by the teacher. These comments, being viewed as more accountable than others, provide a more suitable springboard for classroom dialogue.

The final transcript in chapter five provides us with an example of a teacher talking over a controversial image as it appears on the slide screen. I see this as part of the teacher’s intent on curtailing the production of any sequentially weak remarks in the classroom. Teachers have the option of managing the floor by holding it for longer periods of time, thus preventing students from attaining it. However, this does not have to be done solely to prevent disruptive talk from occurring. Holding the floor can also be done as a way to instill an educative sense for the controversial work; if a teacher speaks at length about an image, then that image in turn becomes an educational focal point.
In summary, the talk produced during the viewing of Mapplethorpe’s safe imagery is dramatically different from the talk produced during the projection of sexually explicit imagery. Although canonical structures of art educational talk do not exist when controversial imagery appears on the slide screen, the talk that is produced is highly managed by the teacher as a way of reestablishing that canonical ways of speaking are an accepted way of speaking when in the presence of both controversial and non-controversial art imagery.

**Taming**

Taming is found to be an organizational feature of classroom talk which develops during the presentation of Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery, and examining such talk provides access to understanding the taming phenomena. It is important to make the distinction that talk, or the interactional phenomena produced during the viewing of imagery, is tamed, as opposed to the taming of the imagery itself. In chapter two, recall that the practice of art criticism enables an image to be transformed from an unspoken domain to a speakable one. In the classroom, this same transformation takes place, yet here, it is guided by the rules of instruction and instructional discourse. Thus, taming is to be seen as an unavoidable feature of the ongoing instructional discourse which is managed by teachers.

As I see it, taming is a result of several factors which shape the viewing experience. First, the act of presenting Mapplethorpe’s imagery orders or guides the seeing. As it happens, the sequential or gradient ordering of imagery is
designed to make the viewing experience an educational one, and is a significant part of the presentational format. As a result, the ordering greatly influences the way in which talk is produced. However, the ordered arrangement of imagery is based on a predetermined notion of what constitutes controversial art. Therefore, when students encounter the controversial work, the ways in which they are expected to respond or react to it are already provided for.

Secondly, both Mapplethorpe’s controversial and non-controversial imagery are an included part of these presentations. This results in both types of imagery being presented as important, contemporary photographic work. However, the talk which is produced during the projection of sexually explicit imagery certainly does not reveal that the students find the imagery important or significant. Instead, the production of whispers, laughter, and offhanded remarks reflect how students are adjusting to their encounter with the images. Thus, the taming exists as teachers are put in a position where they have to manage the talk in order to direct it back to a more recognizable practice of instruction.

Finally, steps which teachers take to ensure that the students’ encounter with Mapplethorpe’s controversial imagery is a responsible one are further reflective of taming actions. Such steps include: announcing the arrival of controversial imagery as a way of preparing the students for a different type of viewing; attempting to assemble instructional ways of speaking in the midst of sequentially weak remarks; allowing initial remarks to take place but not
necessarily allowing their continuance; and talking over imagery in order to prevent unarticulated responses from happening. Certainly, such steps are inherently found upon examination of actual instructional sequences, and, in conclusion, confirm the taming phenomenon as one which allows controversial imagery to become suitable for art educational purposes.
Footnotes

1 Ironically, the images of nude children actually caused much of the furor surrounding the public’s engagement with Mapplethorpe. However, recall that it was felt by both the lecturer of the course and the teaching associates that the images of nude children were not as controversial as other images.
APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION SCRIPT FOR RECORDING MAPPLETHORPE PRESENTATIONS

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak to you today regarding my research as well as acknowledging your contributions to it. I am a graduate student here in the department of art education and I am interested in investigating classroom interactions, specifically those occurring when college students are presented with the imagery of Robert Mapplethorpe. I want to focus on your responses to his work as well as how you interact or engage with your teacher while viewing and talking about Mapplethorpe's work. Next week as part of my research method, I will be recording what goes on in this recitation.

The recordings made will be used extensively for my dissertation which I hope to complete by Spring of 1994. I will be making transcripts from the recordings of your recitation and will then begin the process of analyzing them. For this research project, the purpose of such transcription is to recover and present actual classroom interaction in and as it occurred. Therefore, because you are part of this class, either directly and indirectly, each one of you are contributing to my research. I would like to add that your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect
your class standing. Also, I would like you to know that at anytime during the taping you can discontinue participating.

Maintaining confidentiality is extremely important to me. First names will be used if they exist as part of the talk. I would like to assure you though that last names, if mentioned during instruction will not be used either in the transcript or final write-ups. In the case of any future write-ups, I will include pseudonyms wherever names are mentioned. Subsequently, all recordings of classroom interactions will be used strictly for research analyses and will remain in my possession following the completion of this dissertation. If you have any questions concerning my research, specifically the recording session, please feel free to ask. I will be glad to answer any that you might have. Once again thank you for your time.
APPENDIX B

NOTATIONAL SCHEME

The notations found in the transcripts used for this study are derived from the conventions developed by Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, et al., (1974). Punctuations note intonations and associated pauses. Pauses are also noted in seconds, e.g., (2.5); micro pauses are noted by (.), (..). Other notational devices are as follows:

// notes the point at which one speaker overlaps another

[ notes the start up of two or more speakers speaking simultaneously

(.h) indicates an in-breath; (.hh) indicates a larger one

(h) indicates out breath

- indicates the point where a word is cut off in its production

= notes the ending of one utterance and the beginning of a next with neither a gap nor overlap

* * notes a softly spoken utterance or word

: indicates a sound stretch on a word or word portion, e.g., "no::"

— placed under words to suggest an emphasis on the projection
(‘) indicates an unheard utterance. Parentheses that are filled indicate an uncertain hearing. Accent notes within parentheses approximate beginning of unrecognized utterance.

Speaker Designations

The teacher is shown as T:. student speakers are shown by S:, and successive student speakers are numbered, S1, S2, and so on. In some cases, students that speak are not found, and thus will be designated as S2. In the event of a name being called, the first initial of a student’s name will be used to designate them.


