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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE INVESTIGATION FOCUS

We are not lumps of clay, and what is important is not what people make of us but what we ourselves make of what they have made of us.

Jean Paul Sartre

What I make of what others have made of me is part of my perception of "self". Laign (1966) referred to this interpretation of "self" as one's "metaperspective". He claimed that though a person may not actually be able to "see" himself as another "sees" him, he is constantly acting in light of the actual or supposed attitudes, opinions, needs and so on, that others have in respect to him.

Translated for an instructional situation, what this says is that what is important is not just the judgments a teacher makes, but how those judgments are interpreted by the students to whom they are made. A studio art instructor devotes much instructional effort to the appraisal of student production performance. Since the student's subsequent production response could be affected by the interpretation he gives to those judgments, Laign's assertion has significant implications for research.
related to studio classroom learning.

One implication is that a potentially significant variable for the study of studio classroom achievement may be the student's comprehension and interpretation of what is "appropriate", "aesthetic" or "skillful" in the particular setting in which he performs. Accordingly, this investigation explores and describes studio appraisal as it pertains to the interpretive perspectives of the studio classroom participants.

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to present the general characteristics of the researchable problem which generated this investigation. The position asserted in the chapter is that in the quest for a greater understanding of the learning dynamic that operates in a university studio classroom setting, educators should take into account the participants' methods for evaluating artistic achievement, as well as the participant's methods for interpreting value statements and judgmental acts.

The chapter begins with an explication of the notion of a "perspective". It then examines the major assumptions which underlie the investigation focus. The chapter concludes with the related research questions which serve to delimit the boundaries for this study.

The reader should note that this dissertation is written in the first-person singular narrative to remain
consistent with the ethnographic reporting style.

The Participant Perspective

The word "perspective" is used to refer to the set of beliefs, attitudes and actions that a person uses to make sense of what is problematic. That is, a perspective is the conceptual frame of reference from which the individual can make adaptations to situational problems. The term is employed to refer to the concepts and values which provide a basis for responding.

A perspective may be seen as the set of ideas which guides an individual's action choices. One's perspective, in other words, can provide justification for acting the way one does. This is not to assert that such ideas or beliefs are in a casual relation to action, though, in some cases a person does act so as to implement his belief. However, in other cases, he may take some action and develop the ideas as an after-the-fact justification. Then too, the ideas and actions may develop together as the person experiments with a variety of adaptive approaches to unfamiliar and perplexing situations.

We develop a perspective when we face a situation that calls for actions for which there may be options. In other words, perspectives arise when individuals face choice points. Becker (1961:35) addressed this notion when he wrote:
In many crucial situations, the individual's prior perspectives allow him no choice, dictating that he can in these circumstances do only one thing. In many other situations, the range of possible and feasible alternatives is so limited by the physical and social environment that the individual has no choice about the action he must perform. But where the individual is called upon to act, and his choices are not constrained, he will begin to develop a perspective. If a particular kind of situation recurs frequently, the perspective will become an established part of a person's way of dealing with the world.

In relation to the perception of options, the studio classroom setting will not be viewed equally. Some members will perceive the situations as having few options and will act in a way that will not call for the interpretation of choice; while others come to the setting with a perspective that influences a way of acting which searches for the means to digress from what some have perceived to be restrictive conditions.

Each participant in the studio classroom setting must evaluate studio products from some perspective - out of some aesthetic viewpoint. Raleigh (1972:23) said it this way:

The value assumptions made by the artist and the teacher are the source of the reasons for what they do. If nothing else, the value system represents a visual standard, a perfection of appearance against which an artist's personal decisions are made, the means by which he judges the rightness and the wrongness of his artistic actions.

"Evaluation" is defined as the determination of the worth of something and the judgment of the presence or absence of some quality or criterion. In a holistic
sense, instructional evaluation includes obtaining qualitative information through observation, the interpretation of perceptions and the making of a value judgment. In this study, these interrelated activities are referred to as "instructional appraisal behaviors".

**Underlying Assumptions**

The perspective that the art student brings to the studio classroom, or that which he develops as a part of his participation in the setting, can affect both his interpretation of the setting as well as his methods for performing in that setting. The studio instructor's perspective, however, is central to the definition of the goals for the setting. His leadership in determining the goals, the aesthetic criteria and performance activities, together with the student's interpretive responses, construct and maintain the "aesthetic reality" of that setting.

An "aesthetic reality" is the constructed sequence of studio interaction which qualifies the conditions and defines the criteria for "good art". That is, the participants of a studio classroom setting structure their aesthetic reality and give a value meaning to the individual acts that are performed and the words or dialogues that are spoken. Meanings unfold within an unending sequence of practical actions. An aesthetic reality, then, is situationally determined and meaning is contextually bound.
Perspectives however, can and do differ, therefore, every aesthetic reality is a fragile reality; and, any aesthetic reality can be dissolved as quickly as it was constructed.

The student's evaluation of his classroom performance is structured from a perspective, imposed, in part, by his own biographical history and his own expectations, and, in part, by his cultural background and his studio training. The grading of his artistic achievement, however, is dependent upon the instructor's aesthetic perspective. Therefore, much of the student's classroom behavior is directed toward the acquisition of a new aesthetic perspective and to the altering of his initial "aesthetic reality". If the student perspective is in agreement with the teacher perspective, and if his work reflects that agreement, he is likely to be graded high for his classroom production. On the other hand, when his perspective is in conflict, and when his work reflects that conflict, he is likely to receive lower grades for his classroom performance.

When the student's perspective has not been accepted, in effect, his aesthetic reality has been "breached". His taken-for-granted standards have been contradicted and he is faced with a perplexity that calls for him to re-examine his initial values and beliefs. The value change which results is what we have come to accept as "aesthetic learning".
In relation to education and the acquisition of a perspective, a particularly elegant statement is offered by Peters (1967:8):

> We do not call a man educated who has mastered a skill, even though the skill may be very highly prized, such as pottery. For a man to be educated it is insufficient that he should possess the mere know-how or knack. He must also have some body of knowledge and some kind of conceptual scheme to raise this above the level of a collection of disjointed facts. This implies some understanding of principles for the organization of facts.

> What Peters writes of closely resembles the conception of studio education, where learning is assumed to be much more than the mastery of technical skills. That is, the acquisition of an aesthetic perspective is perceived to be at the heart of transmitting conceptual substance to the training of artists.

> Art schooling, in this sense, is an ongoing process of adapting one's perspective and performance to these conditions that structure and maintain a particular classroom situation. The student is faced with the ongoing task of discovering the aesthetic criteria and the performance implications upon which the assessment of his achievement will depend.

> Paradoxically, as the art student gains experience and self-confidence in the university setting, it becomes increasingly difficult for the studio instructor to define and maintain control over the aesthetic standards that structure an "aesthetic reality". Adler (1975:367) wrote:
To be a teacher in a field in which the only reliable tradition appears to be a tradition of breaking with tradition is, in a sense, to be a teacher without a field, without a body of theory, without any guiding standards of practice which do not erode as fast as they can be established.

The aesthetic tradition is a fragile tradition. Without a stable tradition, studio teachers are forced to play a kind of game that provides them with a traditional basis for "authority" and offers them at least a temporal and contextual stability for their aesthetic perspectives. Nevertheless, their position is weakened by the student's growing awareness of the fragility of any aesthetic perspective. And so much of the task performance that is accomplished in the studio classroom becomes "token" production. According to Goldin (1973:44) "tokens are crucial as evidence that the department is doing its job of producing art. The student work has purely local significance that will not win points anywhere else."

From Goldin's insightful speculation, art teaching is interpreted as a game. One university student shared the same analogy for learning when he said:

Art schooling is learning to play a game where you already know that the teacher will be the winner, and so, you play this game hoping to come in as close to second and as far from last.

(Student Respondent 1977)

This perspective is one that perceives few performance options. It is illustrative of a compliance to "token performance" and the willingness to follow the teacher's
perspective. All students do not share this interpretation. And, the divergent nature of some creative students often places the studio instructor in a precarious situation where he must defend the aesthetic "reality" he has defined; and, he must control the boundaries of how that "reality" can be interpreted. Adler (1975:373) said it this way:

For the teacher of art, though, the problem is more acute. Often feeling like mere watchmen or maintenance men of expensive equipment, they must maintain their morale and some form of performance in the face of the shrinking legitimacy of their teaching role.

**Classroom Dialogue and Aesthetic Appraisal**

Dialogue related to the appraisal of art products is a principle means for constructing the aesthetic reality. Participants discuss their descriptive, interpretive and evaluative claims; in effect, to explicate, justify or test their perceptions against the mind and eye of one another.

Because the aesthetic perspective is fragile, justification is essential. The justification of aesthetic judgments involves the logic of language far more than most studio instructors tend to recognize, or are prepared to admit (Ecker, 1967). Practically speaking, identifying aesthetic concepts and regulating the language used to focus to them, involves the selection of linguistic terms and the formulation of descriptive definitions. Talk about
art is an inescapable task, but yet, studio teachers sometime shy aware from definitions and verbal criticism because they associate them with establishing rigid criteria that stifle the student's creativity (Eisner, 1973).

Perkins (1976) took the position that the role of art talk concerns itself with identifying perceptions and offers the teacher a valuable instructional guide in sharing those perceptions with others. He noted however that talk about art can make mischief as well as magic in guiding perception, and asserted that the ways in which both can happen are in need of charting.

**Statement of the Problem**

The major assumption underlying this research is that instructional appraisal is a fundamental studio classroom behavior and a prime acculturative force in the development of an aesthetic perspective. If instructional appraisal serves this purpose well, it would be well to know the ways in which it accomplishes the task. Furthermore, it would be useful to understand the relationship of instructional appraisal to the interpretive procedures which give it meaning.

**Significance of the Problem**

Increased understanding of the qualitative dimensions of studio classroom appraisal has significance for the field of Art Education in that it could serve to
build instructional theory. Such theory could lead to more responsive appraisal strategies for studio teaching.

Perkins (1976) reviewed the few investigations that have focused upon the art critic and how aesthetic criticism is accomplished. He concluded that:

The possibilities of worthwhile talk about art are good; but that the practice of talk is often bad; and that education does not do nearly as much as it could to help.

The implication that he drew stated that: "studies examining real contexts of criticism would be valuable," and "the whole dynamic of facing criticism deserves more understanding than has occurred to date."

After a thorough review of the literature, I have found that how the student arrives at a solution to the assigned task and the in-process relation of his output to instructional feedback have not been adequately attended to, nor sufficiently researched.

B. Wilson (1974:273) made a similar observation. He reached the conclusion that more research was needed in this area. He calls for direct observation of what art schooling is actually like. He wrote:

There is a need to understand more fully what art schooling is actually like, that is, just what art games are played by students and their teachers. The art class is truly the 'black box' of art education. There is actually little knowledge of what art classrooms are like and how art schooling is actually conducted.

Wilson also made the point that what is particularly important is, "a fuller understanding of how the outcomes
of art schooling are affected by students' predispositions, purposes, assumptions, values expectations and attitudes" - what has been introduced in this paper as, "the participant perspective."

This study is based on the premise that aesthetic learning, art criticism, and participant perspectives are interrelated components of the art schooling process and that we have insufficient knowledge of this interrelation­ship. This poses a perplexity which merits special study.

**The Investigation Focus**

To reduce the perplexity, this study investigates instructional appraisal in its natural setting - the studio classroom. Specifically, it examines the appraisal dialogues and the evaluative behaviors which structure the student's aesthetic reality. It observes the multiple perspectives, perceptions and metaperceptions that operate in a typical university studio art classroom. The research incorporates a series of case study investigations which explore instruc­tional appraisal from the different vantage points of (a) the teacher, (b) the students and (c) the trained observer.

**Related Goals**

Since this research relates to the subjective interpretations of an "aesthetic reality", the data in question is derived from subjective sources, and not easily
obtained through the methods and procedures that have been characteristic of the traditional models for classroom investigation. Therefore, a second major goal for this study is the development and implementation of what is referred to as the "triangulated" approach for case-study investigation.

Simply stated, the "triangulated approach" perceives the classroom event through the following: a variety of descriptive operations, a variety of observation perspectives and a variety of analysis procedures. That is, it employs more than one observation stance, more than one interpretation and more than one methodology. To accommodate the multiple participant perspective the study develops as a sequence of related case study investigations. The series evolves from general exploration toward more fine-grained description and analysis. This notion of gradual evolution is referred to as the "temporally developing design".

The objective of the "triangulated" approach and the "temporally developing design" is to gain a wider awareness of the multiplex nature of classroom appraisal as evaluative events are constructed and perceived by the classroom participants.

The study of methods of participation is the special research interest of the branch of social science known as "ethnomethodology". The research stance of
ethnomethodologists provided a major source of influence for the development of the "triangulated" approach, and is the focus of extended explication in the proceeding chapter.

**Delimitations**

This triangulated research design incorporates several case study observations in a variety of art-related studio contexts. The study focuses upon multivariant description of the complexity of classroom participation. However, for purposes of this dissertation, the report delimits its topic focus to the analysis of data gathered from the last two case studies.

In the presentation of the results of the study, a second factor was considered in the delimitation of this report. Since the "triangulated" observation stance and the "temporally developing design" represent novel approaches for classroom investigation, the dissertation has been organized to serve as an illustration of the funneling dynamic of the "triangulated" design. Two exploratory questions were chosen for the focus of event description, and two related subquestions were selected for refined data processing and analyses.

**The Research Questions**

The preliminary explorations, the data collection, the data processing and the analysis phases of this study were structured in relation to the following questions, subquestions and major propositions:
Exploratory Question One: What are the characteristics of the appraisal events and the instructional methods that accomplish the evaluation of student artistic performance in the context of a university studio art classroom?

Subquestion One: Are there any observable and describable differences in the characteristics and pattern of the teacher's instructional appraisal dialogues with students he judges to be high in achievement as opposed to the characteristics and pattern of his summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged as low in achievement?

Descriptive Proposition One: There are observable and describable differences in the characteristics and pattern of the teacher's summative appraisal dialogues with students he judges to be high in achievement as opposed to the characteristics and pattern of his summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged low in achievement.

Exploratory Question Two: What are the characteristics of the student participant perspectives which allow students to assign meaning to, and to act upon, the evaluative events that occur in the context of a university studio art classroom?

Subquestion Two: Are there any observable and describable differences in the way that students who have earned higher achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior as opposed to the way students earning lower achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior?

Descriptive Proposition Two: There are observable and describable differences in the ways that students who have earned high achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior as opposed to the ways students earning lower achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior.
Limitations

This investigation represents a study of the multiple perceptions that operate within a beginning level studio classroom of one midwestern university. Although it encompasses several comparative cases, I do not claim that the findings would also be the same for other age levels, geographic locals, non-collegiate studio classroom settings or beginning level studio classroom contexts.

Definition of Terms

Adaptive Aesthetic Learning: is the ongoing modification of one's aesthetic attitudes, ideas and beliefs for the purpose of adjusting to a specific setting.

Adaptive Criticism: is the process of adjusting one's preference bias or aesthetic standards to the contextual setting or the aptitude level of the individual that is being judged.

Adaptive Teaching: is the ongoing process of explicating technical information or aesthetic concepts and criteria in response to the student's production and development.

Aesthetic Breaching: is a challenge to one's aesthetic perspective which is brought about as a result of a conflict in interaction expectation or as a result of confrontation with an authority figure.

Aesthetic Perspective: is the individual's set of attitudes, beliefs and ideas which relate to his definition of "art".

Aesthetic Reality: is the socially constructed perspective of what constitutes "goodness", "appropriateness" and "art".

Appraisal Behavior: is any manifest behavior that reacts or responds to a person, the antecedent behavior of a person or the product or the behavior of a person by judging or acknowledging the person, the behavior or the product of the behavior.
Evaluation: is the determination of the worth of something and the judgment or the presence or the absence of some quality or criterion.

Ethnomethodology: is the organized study of a member's knowledge of his ordinary affairs, of his own enterprises where that knowledge is treated as part of the same setting that makes it orderable. It is the study of the methods which accomplish the doings of the social order.

Instructional Manding: is teacher behavior which is directed toward control or which attempts to change the behavior, values, or attitudes of another by direct influence or authoritative pressure.

Metaperspective: is what we make of what others have made of us - our perception of the judgments, opinions and observations that others have made in reference to us.

Paradigm: is a coherent model for scientific research practice, which includes law, theory, application and instrumentation together.

Participant Observation: is a research practice characterized by a period of intense social interaction between a researcher and his subjects in the milieu of the later. During this period the data are unobtrusively and systematically collected.

Participant Perspective: is the frame of interpretive reference which allows the participant to make sense of, and to act upon, that which is problematic. It is the behavioral stance which structures adaption to the setting.

Perception: is the transactional phenomena between an object and a stimulus and the mind which is dependent upon the frame of reference. It is the mental recreation of the moment as influenced by the experience and paradigms we bring to bear.

Qualitative Methods: are research procedures which produce descriptive data related to the verbal accounts of observed interaction and the written or spoken isolates of observable behavior.

Quantitative methods: are research procedures which produce descriptive data related to the measurement and statistical analysis of the variables of observable behavior.

Social Reality: is the constructed sequence of social interaction which creates social phenomenon.
Studio Instruction: is the process of arranging human, material, special and temporal resources with the intent of facilitating artistic and aesthetic learning for the improvement of art production.

Summative Appraisal: is evaluation aimed at the completed product or the completion of a unit of production behavior.

Temporally Developing Design: is a research plan which is flexible and exploratory in its initial stage and which develops a refined focus and methodology over time, as a result of observation in the setting and ongoing analysis.

Triangulation: is a research approach which incorporates more than one observation perspective, more than one data collection procedure, more than one data processing procedure and more than one analytic operation.

Tutorial Appraisal: is judgmental behavior that is dyadic and which serves an instructional appraisal function related to learning behavior or the product of the behavior.

Dissertation Overview

This report is divided into six chapters. In the next chapter the position is developed which asserts that the traditional models for classroom research are limited in their singular application to problems. A rationale for a multiple methodology and "triangulated" observation perspective is presented and, the basic premises and methods of an ethnomethodological stance are reviewed. Chapter III discusses the general nature of the temporally developing and "triangulated" design and outlines the specific methods and procedures that were used for the collection of data. It also reviews the major scientific issues and potential methodological problems that were confronted in the development and implementation of the design. Chapter IV provides an outline of the data
processing and analytic operations that were employed to achieve a "triangulated" interpretation of the data. Chapter V is a descriptive presentation of the data, as it relates to the exploratory research questions, subquestions and descriptive propositions, while Chapter VI provides a summary of the study and explores the implication for both the research findings and the research methodology.

Summary

This chapter began with Sartre's notion that judgments by others were not as important as how they are interpreted by those receiving them. The participant perspective was then discussed in relation to the structuring and the interpretation of studio instructional appraisal. The position asserted was that instructional appraisal functions as a prime acculturative force in the studio classroom. Yet, our understanding of its dynamic is limited. This condition suggests that it would be well for art educators to know the ways in which instructional appraisal operates and functions in a studio classroom. Finally, the chapter concluded with a statement of the research problem, definitions of key terms, an overview of the investigation focus and a presentation of the questions and subquestions which served to delimit the analysis and presentation of the data.
The history of science is replete with examples of conflicting systems of knowledge which emerge within particular disciplines. During such conflicts, basic theoretic assumptions and presuppositions of the taken-for-granted research models, or paradigms are questioned. Kuhn (1970:6) has labeled such conflicts, "scientific revolutions", and stated that they occur when scientists take a different attitude toward the existing paradigms. The standards by which the profession determines what should count as an admissable problem or as a legitimate solution also change. As a consequence, there is often a shift in the problems available for scientific scrutiny.

Kuhn builds on the notion that scientific revolutions are a natural factor for scientific advancement. He demonstrates that science possesses built-in mechanisms that insure the relaxation of the restrictions that bind research, whenever the paradigm from which they derive ceases to function effectively.
Kuhn (1970:6) said it this way:

Normal science repeatedly goes astray. And when it does, that is when the profession can no longer evade anomalies that subvert the existing tradition of scientific practice - then begin the extraordinary episodes in which lead the profession at last to a new set of commitments, a new basis for the practice of science. The extraordinary episodes in which that shift to professional commitment occurs are the ones known in this essay as, scientific revolutions. They are the tradition-shattering complements to the tradition-bound activity of normal science.

Led by paradigm change, scientists often adopt new instruments, and look in new places; but, more importantly, during scientific revolutions, scientists often see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before.

Paradigm change is rarely accomplished by single individuals. If a paradigm is destined to win support in the scientific community, the number and strength of the persuasive arguments in its favor will and must increase. As more scientists are converted to the new paradigm stance, methodological refinement will go on.

Kuhn (1970:168) stated that when a new paradigm is evoked, scientists will be reluctant to embrace it unless convinced that two all-important conditions are being met. First, the new candidate must seem to resolve some of the outstanding and generally recognized limitations of the existing paradigm. Second, the new
paradigm must promise to preserve a relatively large part of the concrete problem-solving ability that has occurred to science through its predecessors. Novelty for its own sake is not a desideratum in the sciences as it is in so many other creative fields. As a result, new paradigms often preserve, modify or build upon the concrete parts of past methods, while permitting additional concrete problem-solutions besides.

We find evidence for scientific revolution, in the proliferation of competing articulations and the recourse to philosophical debate over fundamental issues. Within the area of educational research is found a growing surge of discontent with the experimental methods adopted from psychology and the taken-for-granted paradigms derived from physical science. This critical state is conducive to scientific revolution and provides the climate for paradigm change.

The trend of educational research has been to adopt the alternatives to be found in the field methodologies of the social sciences. The alternatives proposed in this investigation are in keeping with that trend.

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to present a background rationale for methodological innovation and
paradigm change for research in the studio classroom setting. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part reviews a sample of the literature which points to the limitations of the traditional approaches to educational research. The second part explores alternatives to be found in some of the qualitative methodologies adopted from the social sciences, specifically focusing upon the theoretic assumptions made by the practitioners of "ethnomethodology". Part three explores the support and the potential of this approach for research in the studio classroom setting.

The primary assumption underlying the objectives of this chapter is that it is both feasible and necessary to develop a new orientation toward other data collecting strategies for researching those questions which are not amenable to experimentation or pure statistical treatment.

Part One

Research and Student Achievement

A unique feature of our educational process is that, although students may enter school together, they may and do select different learning paths and they terminate their schooling at different points in time and having achieved different schooling outcomes. The
factors which influence those differences have become a major focal point of educational research.

Traditionally, three main theoretical explanations have emerged from the investigations of student achievement differences. One set of explanations focuses on the student attribute variables, and the biographical history he brings to the learning experiences, (e.g., Jensen, 1969). School success or failure is said to be the result of the limitations and potentials of hereditary factors.

The Coleman Report (1966) and its offshoots, Jenks, (1972) and Mostellar and Moynihan (1972) have offered a second position, which has minimized the effects of attribute variables and maximized the effects and influence of socio-economic background, ethnicity and cultural attitudes, and situational home environments.

The third major interpretation comes from the environmentalists who contend that success or failure is directly linked to the nature of the classroom or school environment, (i.e. Holt, 1969, Silberman, 1970). The typical school environment has been described as sterile and stifling because of the over-domination of teachers and the compartmentalization of instruction practices. Environmental factors are used to blame failure and to explain success. An extension of the
environmentalists camp is found in the research of the interaction analysts who employ systematic classroom observations. These researchers generally interpret achievement in relation to the social and psychological "climate" created by the teacher's instructional interaction style. Observation systems supply the researcher with a tool which is designed to collect descriptive information about the frequency and pattern distribution of behavioral classes of activity. The general procedure is for the trained classroom observer to encode interactional behavior. The coded data is usually quantified, summarized then subjected to statistical analysis procedures for correlation with the researcher's hypotheses.

Classroom climate variables, as the focus of systematic observation study, can be traced back to the categorization scheme developed by Anderson (1939), who identified types of teacher classroom behavior consistent with his "dominant" and "intergrated" constructs. Withall (1949) built upon the work of Anderson and developed the constructs related to the influence of the teacher on the social and emotional climate of the classroom. Systematic observation received recognition in the scientific community through the procedures developed by Flanders (1960). He proposed that student achievement was related to the "directness" or
"indirectness" of the interaction style and developed instrumentation and analysis techniques to test that hypothesis.

Instrument development throughout the sixties were, for the most part, outgrowths or modification of the Flanders Basic Ten Category System (see Flanders 1970); and the majority of them maintain an emphasis upon the indirect/direct influence.

Simon and Boyer (1970) presented descriptions of ninety-two systems in their anthology, Mirrors of Behavior, a series of volumes which comprehensively encompasses the research efforts done in the analysis of teacher/student interaction. In a comprehensive review of direct observation in the study of teaching, Rosenshine and Furst (1973) claimed that more than 400 observation systems were then in existence.

The Limitations of Traditional Models

In their review of the research on teaching, Dunkin and Biddle (1975) conclude that most of the findings on achievement variables have little significance and in most cases there has been contradictory or "muddy" evidence. At best, those few positive findings can only be classified as "tentative". In commenting on the findings of over fifty studies conducted in the classroom setting, Rosenshine and Furst (1973) were able to identify only nine variables that
yielded significant and/or consistent correlation between teacher behavior and student achievement.

We know much more about the nature of instruction than we knew in 1960, largely because of researchers use of classroom observational instruments. Yet, we know far less than many would have hoped about the relationship between student achievement and teacher/student interaction. Perhaps Rosenshine and Furst have a point when they suggest that we have spent too much effort in instrument development when our efforts would have been better directed toward testing the utility of those instruments for studying the social events which accompany instruction.

Lutz and Ramsey (1974) have attempted to explain the limitations around the fact that observation studies and educational experiments have been limited to teaching acts and learning outcomes that can be subjected to measurement by paper-and-pencil tests and/or operationalized into simplified coding systems. Other researchers have reflected upon this same shortcoming (Berliner, 1976, Cronback, 1975, and Glass, 1972).

There has even been some concern within the discipline of psychology itself. Lang (1966) demonstrated that quantification has been limited to insignificant and artificially isolated aspects of phenomena. He proposed that researchers blend qualitative and quantitative techniques to compensate for the limitations which have been
In a similar vein, Cicourel (1964) argued that numerical and mathematical properties, proposed by what is conveniently understood as "hard data" in sociology, do not meet the requirements for literal measurements of social actions. He said that numerical data are typically employed in a metaphorical fashion. According to his analysis, this is "measurement by fiat", and how observed social actions are interpreted to achieve these numerical presentations remains an open question.

Researchers of student achievement have generally employed what has been called "a black box approach"; that is, operationally defining and crudely measuring an assumed linear relation between "input" and "output" variables. Their efforts have been "quantitative"; that is, rooted primarily in statistical theory and analysis. This may be because the kinds of questions they have been trained to ask are those which lend themselves to experimental testing and variable measurement. Research training, at the graduate level, has been grounded in statistical theory. Rosenshine (1970:296) observed that it may be the emphasis on statistical description that has limited the significance of findings using systematic observation. He wrote:
A major need is the improvement of observation instruments that attend to the context of the interactions that describe classroom interaction in more appropriate units than frequency counts.

Social scientists have been critical of systematic observation instruments because they do not record data which is unique to the context. A further distinction is often drawn between the context and the "text". A perceived weakness in observation systems is their lack of concern for data related to the uniqueness of the "test", which are the verbal expressions themselves. They also do not attend to the uniqueness of the context - the setting structure which grounds the meaning of the "texts".

Speier (1973:23) was critical of observational systems for their failure to provide qualitative data related to how the members of the classroom society methodologically construct interaction into mutually organized social activity. He concluded that because systematic observers generally ignore such data, they have designed narrow classification schemes, adopted from informed learning theories. These theories in turn become the rationale for studying the classroom environment and provide the researcher with theoretical purpose and the means for generating hypotheses out of these purposes. He said of the Flanders System, for example:
What is treated as a relevant problem of study are the types of teacher influence used in the classroom - is solved by quantitative inspection of the amount a teacher talks, a student talks, or the amount of silence of both. But what is amount of talk? The number of words per minute? The number of sentences? Is the teacher's silence equivalent to the student's silence? What is silence? Is it merely the measured interval of time between two uttered sounds? Or might it be something far more subtle, such as unwillingness to speak when called upon to do so, or a pause in the middle of one's remark that clearly belongs to that person and to that remark?

Speier focuses to questions of a qualitative rather than quantitative nature - questions which should be answered if a complete (or "holistic") understanding of social interaction is to be attained. The issue which is raised questions the value of statistical description, used alone. Neither approach, used alone, can be as effective as an approach that combines the two. This same position is reflected by M. Mead (1976:905) when she wrote:

We must come to realize that the extension into the human world of the methods of the physical sciences can be stultifying and dangerous. It is only when we realize that there are two distinct and complementary - rather than antagonistic - sources of knowledge that we can fully develop methods appropriate to each and consider how such methods can serve to support and reinforce each other.

As a consequence of the tentative state of the art, more and more educators have expressed a feeling of uneasiness with the traditional research paradigms.
Limitations are now perceived in a purely statistical orientation. For example, Heath and Neilson (1974) concluded that:

1. There is no established empirical evidence for relating teacher behavior solidly to student achievement.

2. The flaws in educational research are due to nonsensical statistical analysis, sterile operations and definitions of teacher behavior and student outcome.

3. Because of the strong omnibus measures of student achievement and socio-economic status, the effects of teachers and techniques on achievement are bound to be trivial.

Social scientists point to another limitation in an overemphasis for designing "low-inference" category systems. Such systems limit coding to easily recognized overt and highly simplified classifications. Anthropologists take the position that human understanding is arrived at through the researcher's capacity for intersubjective inference and therefore acknowledge inference and empathy. M. Mead (1976:905) wrote:

"Disciplined introspection and empathy are essential to the study of unique characteristics of mankind...Human beings also have a capacity to understand their fellows because they are sufficiently like themselves so that attention to their own internal states provides information about the internal states of others. Obviously, such understanding is enhanced by language and the development of appropriate and accurate vocabularies through which people can communicate to one another what they feel, how they feel, how they perceive others and themselves and how they conceptualize internal and external events."
Recognizing the importance of the subjective view is long overdue in educational research. In the social sciences, it was the "Chicago School" of Cooley (1902), G. A. Mead (1934) and particularly Thomas (1927) who began to stress the importance of the subjective realm. Perhaps the closest status to scientific "law" comes in Thomas's dictum, "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences", (Thomas and Thomas 1928:572).

The observer's capacity for subjective interpretation of human action is ignored in the methods systematic observers use to go about their recognition of specifically coded behaviors in the first place. The result has often been that coding systems use such 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.

Of this limitation, Berliner (1976:6) has said:

All of these events have led us to reassess our strong behavioristic stance in the study of teaching. We still regard frequency counts as useful information. But we feel quite strongly about the qualitative dimension, that dealing with value judgments about appropriate use of skills, must enter into our observations of teaching.
The qualitative dimensions which have been ignored with the systematic approach to observation include: the unique character of isolated events, meaning and interpretations given to events by the participants of those events, the linguistic dimensions and content focus of verbal interaction, and the degree of rated significance from the participant's perspective. The shortcoming of traditional observation systems, is that they quantify through the screen of the observer and they do not qualify, through the screens of the participants. The reason for this limitation is that systematic observers have chosen to ignore the internal states of the participants of the classroom setting. Educational research is in need of a change in research methodology which would enable classroom investigators to collect "qualitative" and "subjective" data.

Brofenbrenner (1976) has proposed a major reorientation to experimental design. Critical of the traditional experimental method, he charged:

Contemporary researchers are characterized by experimental designs that are primarily statistical rather than scientific; that is, these designs enable us to predict the concomitants of certain combinations of conditions, but do not understand the causal connections that produce these observed effects.... I submit that the reasons for our ignorance lie not in our personal limitations as researchers, but in the shortcomings of the designs we employ.
A similar position has been taken by Eisner, (1975) who wrote of the inappropriateness of the physical science paradigm saying:

The researcher in art education is placed in particularly difficult circumstances, especially when he attempts to employ a research paradigm originally designed to assess the effects of fertilizer on corn yield per acre.

The issue being raised is that the investigation of singular variables is ineffective for the multiplicity of the schooling dynamic. We cannot allow confidence in "explanations" offered by "microscopic" isolation of "macroscopic" phenomena. Eisner found fault with the traditional paradigms because they tend to limit and reduce the research questions we can ask. More specifically he listed the following deficiencies:

1. The quest for objectivity and reliability has led to experiments that are educationally trivial.

2. In our efforts to control variables, in experimental designs, the treatments employed are extremely brief in duration.

3. We have tended to skip over the amount of descriptive material provided on the characteristics of the experimental treatment. Researchers apparently believe that what is done to achieve results is not as important as the results themselves; and therefore, replication of those results is made difficult.

4. We have failed to examine our changing values in education. What was once considered an important variable may be regarded as trivial today. This affects the validity of our findings.
5. The conclusions from populations twenty years ago may not hold true for students today. Students change in their attitudes and dispositions. What has been found in one situation has only temporal and contextual representative validity.

Until more is known about the influences of behavior fluctuation over time, over settings, over populations and over curricula: the studies attempting to find causal explanation, relating process behavior or teaching practice to schooling outcomes will remain primitive.

Hough (1973) summarized the limitations of past educational research efforts. He perceived the following weaknesses:

1. The search for single variables to explain instructional effects may be less fruitful than a search for conceptually related variables.

2. We have failed to carefully map out the complex phenomena from within the social group being studied.

3. We have proceeded too quickly to searching questions before having proper regard for context against which variables or questions may be considered.

4. We have often used available and popular instruments because they were convenient, not because they were most appropriate to our questions.

5. We have largely failed to consider the qualitative dimensions of classroom interaction and furthermore, we have not attempted to find ways in which they can be made amenable to analysis procedures.

6. We have failed to interface quantitative data with qualitative data without regard to the contribution each can make to the other and the new strength found in their combined descriptive capacity.
The position taken in this investigation is that past methods have not necessarily been wrong, but used alone they have been inadequate. Since proposed changes appear to be moving toward the qualitative realm it would be unique to examine the premises and techniques which are inherent in those qualitative methods. Given any research problem, the methods and techniques employed should be selected for their appropriateness to the research task. Mydral (1969) made this point clear when he said: "In reality there are not economic, sociological, or psychological problems, but simply problems, and as a rule they are complex."

Part Two

Qualitative Research

The task of the qualitative methodologist is to capture what people say and do as a product of how they interpret the complexity of their world. In order to grasp the meaning of a person's behavior, the qualitative researcher attempts to understand social events from the person's point of view - to gain understanding through the participant's perspective.

Anthropologists often make use of the drama metaphor: the researcher, rather than appearing in the
audience watching the drama unfold on stage, is himself on the stage, acting a role in the production, and interacting with the other actors. Bluer (1966:542) expressed it this way:

Since action is forged by the actor out of what he perceives, interprets and judges, one would have to see the operating situation as the actor sees it, perceive objects as the actor perceives them, ascertain meaning in terms of the meaning they have for the actor, and follow the actor's line of conduct as the actor organizes it— in short, one would have to take the role of the actor, and see the world from his standpoint.

Research which examines phenomena from the actor's perspective is commonly referred to as "participant observation".

**Participant Observation**

It is misleading to regard participant observation as a single method. Rather, in common parlance, it refers to a characteristic blend or combination of data collection techniques that are employed to study social phenomena. That is, participant observation combines several methods toward a particular research end. That end is **analytic description** in the form of written accounts called "ethnographies" An ethnographic description employs concepts, constructs, propositions and empirical evidence, through thorough and systematic data collection, classification and reporting. What is reported are the unique variations of social phenomena as they have been observed
or experienced in the actions and the language of the participating members.

Although the term "participant observer" is widely used in the social science literature, little attempt has been made to separate differences in the participant observation research stances available to scientific observers. The kinds of data they gather will depend in part upon how they participate as observers. Schwartz and Schwartz (1955) make the distinction in terms of a continuum that ranges from "active" to "passive" participatory roles.

Junker (1952) has suggested four theoretically possible roles for participant observers. These range from the complete participant at one extreme to the complete observer on the other. Between these, but nearer the former, is the participant-as-observer; nearer the latter is the observer as participant.

The researcher selects the perspective that will provide him with access to the type of data which is most pertinent to his study. No matter which stance he assumes, his collection of data takes place in the natural setting. The prime method of data collection is direct observation which is recorded through field notation.

Although direct observation is essential, it alone is not sufficient to enable the participant observer to obtain thorough description. McCall and Simmons (1969:4) offered three reasons for supplementing direct
observation with indirect observation report:

1. The organization is typically being manifested in several locals simultaneously.

2. The organization has typically been in existence for some time before the scientist undertook his study.

3. Many of its features or determinants (i.e. motives, intentions, interests and perceptions of its members) are only imperfectly inferable by direct observation.

From the first two reasons we can see a need to supplement the researcher's own observation with indirect observation reports, which can only be obtained from perceptive persons who were on the scene in the scientist's absence. These persons are called "informants" and they must be carefully questioned for the researcher to piece together the facts and the validity of the informant's account.

This particular field strategy is known as "informant interviewing". It is a regular feature of the participant observation methodology.

The need for subjective data emphasizes yet another reason for interviewing the members or participants concerning their motives, their intentions, and their interpretation of the events in question. This provides the investigator with a critical check on the validity of some of the inferences he makes about the subjective side of events. To focus on the subjective aspects of thought, the participant observer often assumes an active part in the relevant activities of the group. By so doing he is
receiving the same socialization as ordinary members, and acquires similar perspectives which allow for his participation and consequently encounters similar events and experiences. In this way, the researcher acquires some sense of the subjective side of the events which he could less readily infer if he observed without taking part. Having become a participant in the phenomena, the researcher has attained personal knowledge and the question of validity is not tested against the corpus of scientific knowledge but against the everyday experience of a community of people.

Although the active participant observer can acquire some sense of the subjective side of experience, this sense still remains his own and cannot be assumed to correspond to that of others. Informal interviewing of the feeling states of other participant members of the same setting is necessary to supplement, or to validate the generalizations which the members hold. The research function of the empirical observer's participation is to bring to an awareness the subjective issues which can be probed through informal interview of the other responders in the setting. This particular research technique is known as "respondent interviewing". Both "informant" and "respondent" interview data are central to cross-validation.
The qualitative observer may also collect a variety of other data for use in his final analysis. This data may include: personal documents, diaries, photographs, video or audio recordings, intitutional records, sample products or anything which may be potentially useful to holistic assessment, (see Webb, et al, 1966). Each of these may prove to be particularly important in obtaining a particular type of information in gaining a richer understanding of complex social events, as they are part of a multiplex social organization.

**Toward a Concept of Holism**

Participant observation, like other qualitative research, does not begin by hypothetical constructions of the world, nor does it assume singular variable casuality. A singular phenomenon is viewed in terms of its relation to a greater whole - the principle of "holism". Qualitative investigations emphasize the multiplex structure of phenomena. Qualitative analysis requires that the data touch on virtually every issue of conceivable interest. Only then can the investigator have some assurance that the data will have within them evidence of the underlying patterns and multi-dimensional interrelationships.

The demand for holism leads to field observation and the case study, as the preferred research design.
This means simply that a social phenomenon is best studied in the natural setting, as it is experienced in everyday life. Those committed to preserving the integrity of the situation maintain that any face-to-face situation is of importance in of itself in determining the meaning of what goes on in that situation. Concrete human events are always to some degree dependent upon the situational context in which they occur and can be explained only through the perceptions shared in the situational context in which they have taken place.

A holistic account of instruction would focus on the totality of the classroom context as the participants take part in and act upon social phenomena. In the classroom that might include:

1. The awareness of the instructional events in terms of the meanings these are given in a particular setting.

2. The content of instructional events in terms of the information they present.

3. The sources, methods, and styles of instructional events.

4. The motives which give rise to social events.

5. The motives which give rise to attending to events.

6. The interaction patterns.

7. The historical continuity of events.

8. The external influences upon events.

9. The social "rules" which allow for the construction of events.
10. The unique characteristics of the instructor.
11. The unique characteristics of the instructed.

A holistic account would not only examine the individual aspects of the events, but the several ways in which they interact and interrelate.

Holistic analysis has not been the concern of traditional classroom research. A holistic account suggests a multiple methodology, which can produce a variety of interrelated data as well as provide for multiple points of view. The holistic approach is aligned with the methodologies found within the social sciences. A particularly strong holistic orientation is found in the approach taken by the branch of social research known as ethnomethodology.

**Ethnomethodology**

The term, "ethnomethodology" can be translated to mean, the study of the methods of a people. It was first coined by Garfinkle (1967) to refer to the shift in attention toward investigations of the production practices - the "doings" - which constitute the "social order" of particular social encounters. Garfinkel (in Turner, 1974) has defined it as:

An organized study of a member's knowledge of his ordinary affairs, of his own enterprises, where that knowledge is treated as part of the same setting that makes it orderable.

Its general focus then, is on the everyday "doings" of social interaction - the members' ways of
looking at the social context - their particular way of searching, scanning, sensing, or becoming aware, to the degree that they are able to operate on such awareness.

At the most elementary level, the research interests of ethnomethodologists are the regularities and changes in selected features of behavior that are meaningful to the individual members of a social setting. In social settings, 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. This is so even when the action is performed in solitude, (e.g. the student's working at home on an assignment). Any particular action, then, is embedded in a process of interaction involving several participants responding to each other's actions.

As a model for interaction research ethnomethodology offers educators an alternative paradigm for investigating the classroom setting. Its strengths lie in a flexible approach to design and its commitment to holism. Its data collection incorporates a variety of qualitative methodologies, including those of participant observation. A difference, however, is found in its underlying assumptions and the basic theoretic stance it takes toward social interaction.
Since its stance is a relatively recent outgrowth of sociological research, and generally unfamiliar as an alternative model for instructional research, its basic goals, methods and assumptions are in need of further clarification.

The scattered range of problems which have been pursued by ethnomethodologists, as well as the lack of common procedures have led to some confusion and ambivalence regarding its specific nature as a science. Adequate description of basic procedures do not exist in the general literature nor have ethnomethodologists, as a group, sought to make their position clear. It could be argued that ethnomethodologists in general, and Garfinkel in particular, have made little effort to clearly communicate their position to the larger sociological community. Indeed, confusion regarding the methodology is fostered from the lack of theoretical clarity which is characteristic of their written reports. Criticism of this particular failure has come from Coleman (1968), Hill and Crittendon (1968) and Denzin (1970).

The closest attempt to descriptively clarify the aims and practices of ethnomethodology, is found in the work of Mehan and Wood (1975). Their book, The Reality of Ethnomethodology, describes the variety of
methodological interpretations which have been assumed under the heading of "ethnomethodology", making a singular generalization difficult. In their attempt to define the discipline they spoke to the difficulty when they said:

I cannot reproduce ethnomethodology here for your inspection, as no form of life can be captured by symbols. My strategy therefore is to treat ethnomethodology in several ways. These treatments should be viewed not as pictures of ethnomethodology, but rather as fingers pointing toward ethnomethodology. (1975:3)

Ethnomethodology is sometimes described as a methodological style, sometimes as a body of findings, sometimes as a theoretic stance, and sometimes as a world view. None of these alone capture its reality and in my own interpretation of the term. I perceive it as a methodology for researching which results in "fine-grained" description that can lead to theory and thus clarify a world view. It's unique features enable its practitioners to enter other "realities" (e.g. Castaneda 1968), there to experience the assembly of world views, or what I refer to as a "Triangulated Perspective of Social Reality". In order to explicate this conceptualization it will be necessary to examine first the basic theoretical premises of the ethnomethodological position.

The Basic Premise of an Ethnomethodological Stance

In delineating the meaning of an ethnomethodological stance, we might do well to begin with the
influence of Edmund Husserl, the founder and most influential thinker of phenomenological theory. Husserl's influence comes by way of the work of Schutz, (1966) who translated Husserlian Phenomenology from its epistemological concerns to sociological ones. The central features of Schutz's writing form the basis of the theoretical structure of all phenomenological sociology, and of ethnomethodology in particular. The focus of Schutz's concern is "common sense knowledge", or the "sociology of everyday life", as it is sometimes called. Schutz focuses on the "actor's" deviseing of conduct through what is called "intentionality". Intentionality takes on meaning according to the actor's system of relevance and the purpose at hand. Therefore it is a subjective and unique to the individual's biographical situation.

In order to understand social interaction, the actor must be able to "typify" the actions of those with whom he interacts. Schutz (1953:18) labeled this phenomenon the "reciprocity of motives". The assumption made is that motives of another are typically the same as one's own would be in similar circumstances; all in accordance with the genuine, or socially derived knowledge at hand. This human capacity for typification allows us to anticipate the actions of others and to give meaning to everyday encounters.
Schutz's conception of the typification process asserts that all knowledge of the world involves interpretive constructs sets of abstractions, generalizations, formalizations, idealizations - each specific to a retrospective level of thought. All thoughts originate from schemes of reference and are interpreted as "facts". According to Schutz (1953:2) there is no such thing as facts, pure and simple. Furthermore, the ethnomethodologist is not concerned with the discovery of facts but rather with the question of how people do account for facts within particular settings. Their basic assumption is that individuals have meaning structures which allow them to operate on a social level. Furthermore, those meanings are believed to be contextually related to the events in which action occurs. A research question which investigates the interpretation and meaning that participants give to social acts is clearly an ethnomethodological problem.

Returning to Garfinkel's development of the ethnomethodological stance, we find a second major premise extensively expressed throughout his writing - the "documentary method of interpretation". Interestingly enough, Garfinkel borrowed the concept from Mannheim (1952:57) who, in turn, borrowed it from the area of art criticism. The documentary method is "the search for an identical, homologous pattern underlying a vast variety of totally different realizations of meanings." Documentary methods of interpretations are the member's way of giving
structure and order to social reality. Ethnomethodologists seek to describe the documentary method by participating in the daily life and focusing their attention on what is normally taken for granted by the participants. They refrain from judging the adequacy or predicting the consequences of a member's account. Ethnomethodologists seek to describe social situations to gain understanding of how the members of a setting go about constructing and maintaining social reality. They examine, then, a multiple interpretation of the social event. They hold that the world, in essence, is the same for everyone (intersubjectivity) but that individual perceptions can make its interpretation different for each participant in the setting.

Unique biographically determined situations lead to differences in the perceptions of objects and events in the social world. Interpretation and meaning, then, are bound to the contexts which give rise to social interaction. Thus the definitions of situations or the perception of social events may vary according to individual systems of relevance. That assumption is fundamental to an ethnomethodological stance. It is in contrast, however, with the traditional "building block" conception of social theory construction which assumes that there is only one "reality" and that bits and pieces of that reality will eventually lead to its construction into theory - the stance of the natural and physical sciences. Taking such a stance
for the study of man tends to treat man as an "object". A prime difference between man and objects is that man can perceive options and make choices among them. The shortcoming of the natural science paradigm is that it ignores the determinants of choice and intentionality, and therefore ignores a primary human variable.

Of fundamental concern here is the question of how order and meaning can be produced. The answer to these questions has been said to be found within "rules", "norms", and "definitions". While ethnomethodologists are concerned with these topics, they make a distinction between the "basic rules of everyday life" and the "normative rules of conduct", (i.e. social norms and role perceptions). According to Cicourel (1970:24) the basic rules are similar to deep, structural, grammatical rules:

The actor must be endowed with mechanisms or basic rules that permit him to identify settings that would lead to appropriate invocations of norms, where the norms would be the surface rules and not basic to how an actor makes inference about taking or breaking rules.

In the studio classroom, the "normative rules" would be the sanctioned standards of the teacher or the group, while the "basic rules" would be the underlying and informal structure which allows individual members to make action choices toward or against the normative structures. Garfinkel (1963:190) labeled these, "constructive expectancies"; that is, the underlying expectancies which allow for
the construction of social interaction.

Social order in the classroom exists as an emergent phenomenon, having no existence apart from the member's accounting and describing practices. According to Dreitzel (1970) it is upon this point that ethnomethodology departs from traditional sociology.

There is another sense in which ethnomethodology views rule-governed activity differently. Traditional sociology is heavily weighted with assumptions which relate to the role of normative elements in social action and the process whereby individual motives are "normally" structured (Wrong 1961). According to that view, the moral order is governed by norms and social rules. Ethnomethodology on the other hand, views moral order as a set of background expectancies - as a general scheme of interpretations. Rules are not altogether normative, but, are quite problematic for the participant. Hantover (1972:4) noted:

To believe in a way that is responsive to rules requires the prospective actor to employ practical wisdom to determine whether the rule is appropriate to the situation.

This, then, is the dynamic process by which "norms" become constructed and situationally interpreted, evaluated, and applied to social events. Although it may be said that persons are "normally" motivated toward compliance with rules and other background expectancies, such rules and
assumptions are open to situational interpretation, negotiation and re-evaluation.

Schutz (1966) labeled this theoretic assumption the "pragmatic motive". He asserted that "meaning is situationally defined according to the purposes at hand". Such a position would assume that the student must determine the translation of normative structures as a negotiation between the elements of the setting and his own purposes at hand.

Blum and McHugh (1961:104) have introduced the term "rule-guided" in contrast to "rule-governed". The former implies the element of choice and interpretation, while the latter implies the notion of cause and compliance. Like other cultural determinants, "rules" are always subject to interpretation and choice, (Scheff, 1973). From this stance, man is perceived as "rational" with the capacity to perceive options. Man is perceived as having an active participant role in creating his ongoing world.

Ethnomethodologists also make a distinction related to the linguistic context of meaning - the many ways in which the occasion and particular usage of words determines their meanings. Pierce (1960) has proposed the term "indexical" to refer to the practical determination of language use. The study of language indexicality has since become a major focus in many ethnomethodological studies,
A close examination of Garfinkel's writings about ethnomethodology makes it apparent, however, that his more general concern is not for indexicality, but rather, for the ways members go about presenting each other their rational accounts of their actions. Ethnomethodologists make an assumption that social knowledge has a "tacit" dimension (Polanyi, 1958, 1967). Tacit knowing is knowledge that is intuitive but which has not reached an "articulate", or linguistic level of knowing. That is, it is the internal knowing that is used by people to build social action, but it may not be a part of their immediate awareness, nor may they be able to verbally account for it. Therefore, ethnomethodologists do not employ survey research or questionnaires, nor do they use interviews alone. They examine the "doings" through direct participation or repeated observation analysis of video, or audio recorded events and seek to uncover the underlying and taken-for-granted tacit dimensions of social interaction.

It should be emphasized that ethnomethodology is not an alternative sociology aimed at a more efficient solution to traditionally formulated social problems. Its very existence was stimulated by a new set of research questions and a new set of theoretical assumptions. As such, ethnomethodology must be viewed as a scientific enterprise which is separate from, yet a part of, the
larger discipline of sociology.

In summary of the ethnomethodological stance, it can be said that:

1. Reality is interpreted rather than discovered; that is, reality is socially constructed and maintained.

2. Human behavior is rule-guided and rational.

3. Human behavior is typified according to its biographical and contextual level.

4. Basic rules, or background expectancies, form the structural property of social acts.

5. Background expectancies are the basis of valuation and moral order, and although interpretation of this moral order is problematic, individuals are motivated toward compliance with their definitions of legitimating that order.

6. Social settings are self-organizing; individuals work to eliminate inconsistencies and discrepancies that arise in the setting.

7. Social structures and organizations are emergent products of the perceived orderly features of interpersonal events.

Part Three

Adaptation to the Problem

A major difference between the traditional research models of education and ethnomethodology is an emphasis of the latter upon describing the qualitative dimensions of interpersonal events, as they are experienced and interpreted from the multiple perspectives of the participant members within particular social settings.
The ethnomethodological paradigm has relevance for this investigation's focus upon the methods by which student participants adapt to a studio classroom setting, and specifically how their participation in that setting might be affected by their interpretations of the teacher's classroom appraisal.

It should be noted again that ethnomethodology is a branch of social science - not a methodology. The research methods of the ethnomethodologists are multiple and varied. Their data are primarily descriptive and their methods frequently incorporate participant observation, but do not limit themselves to those strategies alone. Such flexibility will encourage investigators to design a multiple methodology which fits the needs of their research problems, rather than to mold their research problems to fit the methodology, which has often been the case of previous research.

The perceived relationship between art-related inquiry and qualitative description is not entirely new. Several years ago Mooney (1954) offered art educators suggestions for methodological change. He hinted toward methods which bear strong resemblance to those of ethnomethodology. A few of those suggestions follow: The ethnomethodological constructs which bear resemblance to them are presented within brackets:
1. That the researcher accept himself as the creator of his own inquiry. [participant observation and "becoming the phenomenon"]

2. That the researcher honor his feelings as they enter into the unfolding of his work, seeking to bring them as fully into the open as possible. [phenomenological introspection]

3. That the researcher accept his values as the major selector of what he does. [rule-guided structures]

4. That the researcher continually search for his implicit assumptions and tries to make them explicit. [informal awareness, tacit knowing and intentionality]

5. That he clarify the role he is taking in the entire enterprise. [holism]

6. That he make predictions as to what he might find in the field, from particular points of view. [multiple perspective account]

Mooney's insight had little, if any, effect upon art education research in the decade which followed. Hausman (1964) echoed a similar proposal in his review ten years later. He also suggested possible methodological change, promoting inquiry that examined art-related instructional phenomena from a participant perspective.

He wrote:

Empathetic involvement, as related to a student's conception and potential for action, should be studied. How do such factors as intensity, range and direction of idea relate to performance? To what extent can there be internal locus for evaluation? These critical questions should be pursued to provide greater insights into the teaching of art.
The practice of inquiry from a participant perspective was initiated by Beittel (e.g. 1964, 1966, 1972).

Beittel (1972) has acknowledged the influence of Pepper (1942), specifically, in the adaptation of his notion of "contextualism". The assumption behind contextualism is that isolated observations of parts of works of art should not be used for causal explanations, but rather, can only be pointed to, or described in terms of their unique relation to the contextual whole. Beittel perceived the parallel between a contextualist's approach to art criticism and a holistic methodology for the study of "works of social encounter". The relationship to the sociological concepts of holism and naturalism is apparent in his description. He wrote:

Here, then, is a method closely paralleling the way we seem to respond to works of art themselves. We grasp and understand them immediately and totally, then we move back and forth between the whole, an exploration of its parts, and a renewed grasp of the wholes. The two are inseparable and interdependent.

His actual research focused upon the serial description and historical reconstruction of the creative thought process of student artists in a laboratory observation setting. Special attention was given to phenomenological introspection with focus upon the "internal" orderings of creative subjects. Beittel's
aim was to unfold an internal "mapping" of creative
cognitive process and strategy. Of his method he wrote:

The aim of all this participant observation
would be presentational, in either the expressive
or the more neutrally descriptive sense (a feeling
of sympathy, empathy, but with some distance).
I am insisting on a grasp of the complexity and
change close to the chain of lived unique events
in their proper context. It should be, I am
saying, an effort at historical reconstruction.

My position would support a more "active"
participant role, to examine the student creative process
as it more naturally occurs in the classroom setting.
Nonetheless, Beittel's contribution expanded a purely
clinical approach to incorporate the subjective and
experiential realm.

With the exception of Beittel's research,
teaching in the visual arts remained statistical in its
orientation throughout the sixties. In a review of the
state of instructional research, Eisner (1973) con­
cluded that more effort was needed for developing a
qualitative approach. To that point he suggested:

Progress in the study of teaching in general,
and in the teaching of art in particular,
might move more rapidly than it has in the
past of some of the procedures from cultural
anthropology and art criticism were used.

Eisner was referring to the field study methods
and ethnographic techniques. Like Beittel, he felt, that
the descriptive and analytic process, found in art
criticism, may offer another methodological model for
paradigm change.

Interestingly enough, a cultural anthropologist had previously suggested an aesthetic criticism model. Bruyn (1963) perceived the relationship when he wrote:

The field of art has its own contributions to make. A study of the state of the aesthetic observer viewing an art object cannot help but add insight into the role of the participant observer as he observes the actor in the social setting.

Bruyn credits Gotshalk (1947) and his book *Art and the Social Order* for this insight. His review of Gotshalk's critical model led him to write:

The cultural organization of people can be viewed as an aesthetic creation and described from the models of art criticism. For example, culture, like any art object, has many dimensions: its material product, its expression, its form, its function in the social order. If the sociologist were to begin by analyzing the form which culture assumes, by using a model of art criticism, he would guide his study through the principles of harmony, balance, centrality, and development, and pursue his analysis by way of their derivatives - recurrence, similarity, gradation, variation, hierarchy, and progression, all of which can be aesthetically perceived and reported in an empirical study of a cultural system.

Practical applications of Bruyn's suggestion did not develop in anthropology. With the exception of Beittel's research, the potential of the art criticism model has not reached the practice of researchers in the area of art education.
It can be noted, however, that the methods of inquiry and the commitment to holism and naturalism, that are stressed in ethnomethodology, bear strong resemblance to the characteristics of an art criticism model. Despite the parallel, no evidence was found which indicated that the ethnomethodological paradigm had been adopted by art educational researchers. It was found, however, that several ethnomethodologists had used classroom settings for their investigations of social interaction and social development, (e.g. Roth 1972, MacKay 1973, Cicourel 1974, and Jennings, 1972).

Of these few studies, one seems especially relative to this investigation. Mehan (1974) conducted an ethnomethodological study of student/teacher interaction. He demonstrated that the teacher treated similar verbal responses in different, and sometimes contrasting ways. Mehan's analysis of video recordings concluded that the differential treatment of the same answer types cannot be completely explained by the differences in the lesson nor the teacher's expectations for individual student performance. The keeness of the teacher's perception, the focus of her attention, the interpretation she assigns, the history of the lesson, the history of the student's performance, his performance on a particular day and on all previous days all contribute to the teacher's moment-to-moment assessment and evaluative behavior in the judgment
of response appropriateness.

These and other yet-to-be-discovered variables do not enter neatly into a calculus of measurable values, or weigh consistently according to some clear and pre-arranged scaling system. The teacher's attention is demanded in too many directions to make carefully calculated appraisal decisions during the quick flow of conversation that is a natural part of ongoing interaction in the classroom. Performance standards are part of an adaptive dynamic in the moment-to-moment interpretations that structure ongoing interactions.

Although the teacher may claim an awareness of his evaluative criteria, or even articulate them, there is a limitation to how neatly his criteria will apply to ongoing interaction. Appraisal criteria most often focus upon the technical conditions of the task assignment. As the student interacts with the assignment problem, the teacher's attention is often drawn to qualitative dimensions which don't always meet the teacher's anticipation. In fact, the arousal factors which influence attention are often those which tease, or go beyond the expectation (Berlyne 1960). Consequently, the judgment process is affected by aesthetic arousal.

Performance judgment becomes dependent upon the teacher's perception of an ongoing dialectic between the technical and the aesthetic dimensions of the production
process and the changing product. The attention reflexes of the teacher extend beyond pre-arranged standards.

The ethnomethodological interest in rule usage and rule-guided behavior seems relevant for a study of how art students acquire a working knowledge of the aesthetic standards within a particular studio setting. Their position would assert that the study of student achievement cannot be divorced from the participants' interpretations of its attainment and the meaning they assign to evaluative articulation.

Mehan and Wood (1957:82) have written: "The student's performance cannot be understood independently of the assessment procedures that produce accounts of their abilities". Their position asserted further that the student's achievement career is the product of the interaction of the school administration and the teacher. In other words, the variables influencing the maintenance of a particular educational setting are the negotiated priorities of teacher/administration interaction. As such, they structure influence upon the assessment criteria which will affect the contextual interpretation of achievement's attainment.

One does not need to spend great lengths of time observing instructional behavior to learn that teachers, and administrators, spend a great deal of time engaged in a variety of assessment processes. In essence, these are
type categorizations or "typification". Teachers categorize students into classifications of "poor", "weak", "average", "good", "superior", etc., or they rank them, A, B, C, D, or F. Typifying students into classes accomplishes more than grading. It provides teachers with a basis for assessing their expectations and anticipations which, in turn, help them to structure their reciprocal interactions with individual members. In the same sense, the student engages in his own typification process of teachers into categorization types which allows him to anticipate the probable reciprocal interaction in the instructional context.

Role typification and classification ranking provide an informal structure to determine reciprocal action plans in ongoing social encounter. Investigations which focus on classroom interaction in general, and appraisal strategies in particular, might do well to examine the typification process that participants employ for interpretive and evaluating reciprocal interaction.

Triangulation

The ethnomethodological question about social reality is not concerned with an object or fact as given, but rather the underlying presuppositions which make possible the interpretation of facts as being objectively given. The central aim of ethnomethodological investigation
is neutral investigation of the underlying assumptions which make common sense knowledge possible. Hence, ethnomethodologists avoid singular perspective views or a biased observation focus. They are concerned with methods which collect interpretive data from the perspectives of all participants in the scene. The multiple perspective account will be referred to in this report as the "triangulated perspective".

The basic assumption behind triangulated investigations is based upon the belief that singular methods or a singular observation perspective is likely to be a biased account. A triangulated approach is one that provides multiple data and multiple interpretations of phenomena as a built-in cross-validity check against research bias.

When a single measurement or a single observation perspective is used as the absolute measurement device, we have, in effect, isolated the case study design to an absolutism that reduces any potential for generalizability beyond its own context.

VanDalen (1973:209) writes of the advantages of a multiple methodology:

Some case studies overemphasize observational methods and neglect other methods. A multi-method approach may serve as a more valid test of a hypothesis.
Some triangulated approaches have employed multiple perspective comparisons of a single phenomenon, group or unit, at two or more points in time. Others have compared several groups or units at one time. Still others purport to use multiple perspectives to measure but a single unit at a single point in time.

To close the circle, I propose a research design which makes use of the comparison of several groups using a multiple perspective at two or more points in time. This conception will be referred to as, "The Multiple Method, Multiple Perspective, Multiple Comparative Case Study Design". Its explication will be presented more thoroughly in Chapter III. At this point, what can be said is that the design incorporates the researcher's active participation in the roles of student, of teacher, and of trained observer. Several field studies are involved, focusing upon similar cases studied from each perspective. In the final phase of this study, I "triangulated" my position as formal observer, through a variety of cross-validation techniques that were developed from insights gained through previous field participation as teacher and student.

This approach asks whether other plausible interpretations are found from the differing perspectives, while it also functions as a built-in replication technique.
The method quickly draws the observer's attention to similarities and differences, between cases enabling the speedy generation of plausible hypotheses. Its design greatly facilitates the aims of holistic research by offering a broader descriptive account of the research focus.

To my awareness, there are no applied examples of the triangulated comparative model. Perhaps the closest to it might be found in Becker (1961) study of medical students. In their design, they employed several observers in the same setting, who cross-validated their observations and triangulated their methodology through combining qualitative quantification descriptive techniques.

In addition to multiple methods and multiple perspectives, this study incorporates multiple field cases. One reason is pragmatic; that is, to allow for the multiple participatory roles. Obviously, one cannot assume three observation perspectives simultaneously. A second reason is shared by Glasser and Straus (1965), who claimed that a researcher can maximize credibility through incorporating the use of comparison of several field studies. They say that such potential has not been significantly explored and they propose a similar comparative procedure to the one implemented in this study.
Denzin (1970:283) perceived "triangulation" as a combined methodology. He proposed a model which blended the methodologies of ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism. He asserted that this blend could compensate for any weakness of either one taken alone. His rationale for a multiple methodology is supportive of the one taken in this study. It reads as follows:

If the scientific observer is subject to interactional demands, and hence less than perfect as a recorder of social events, then multiple observers and multiple methods, which overcome one another's restrictive biases, become the most valid and reliable strategies of observation.

Concretely, this suggests that any observation based on "triangulated principles" will yield data that are more reliable and valid than an investigation that is not so based. Although the rationale parallels the one taken in this study, Denzin's proposed solution falls short of expectation. Zimmerman and Wieder (1970) take him to task for his misperception of the ethnomethodological stance and the weakness of his theoretic blend. No issue, however, is taken with the perceived value in a multiple method and multiple perspective approach.

The notion of a multiple observation perspective, though not common, is not unique. Beittel (1972) referred to his interpretation as, "The Roshomon Effect" - from the Japanese film which portrayed the same event from several points of view. Lewis (1961) developed the concept of the
"Multi-Faceted Panoramic View". Cicourel (1974) promoted what he called "Indefinite Triangulation". He explained the concept this way:

I use the term 'indefinite triangulation' to suggest every procedure that seems to lock in evidence...The indefinite triangulation notion attempts to make visible the practicality and inherent reflexivity of everyday accounts. The elaboration and circumstances and particulars of an occasion can be subjected to an indefinite re-elaboration of the same or new circumstances of particulars.

His use of the term "indefinite" suggests that multiple data need not be limited to three.

The Promise of a Qualitative Methodology

In the general literature, we find increasing examples which call for the adoption of qualitative methods and ethnographic techniques for the study of instructional settings, (e.g. Cusick 1976, Smith and Geoffrey 1968, Smith and Poland 1969, Wolcott 1970, T. Wilson 1974, Goodland and Klein 1970, Jackson 1968, Spindler 1968, Foster 1973, and King 1974). The general emphasis within this literature has been upon the value of qualitative description through strategies of participant observation.

Singleton (1974), Sindell (1969) and Roberts and Akinsanya (1976) provide us with overviews of the research in education which is related to anthropological methods. Singleton classified six types of education ethnographies: studies of individuals, studies of single classrooms,
studies done by the teacher as participant observer, studies of school and community relationships, national cultural analyses, and experimental anthropology.

Khleif (1971) asserted that the school is a miniature society, or microcosm of the larger society, respectively, tightly related to and reflective of the parent society. Indeed, Smith's work (1967) which involved intensive observation of a single classroom, gave rise to the coining of the term "microethnography".

To my awareness, in the field of art education, there have not been any methodological applications of either the triangulated approach nor the ethnomethodological stance. Qualitative methods in general have been rarely used, although a growing wave of theoretical support is found for their implementation, (e.g. Poland, 1971, Kensler, 1971, Harris, 1971, Steel, 1971, Srubek, 1971, Lewis, 1972, McFee 1972, Wilson, 1972, Stewart, 1972, Kazanis-White, 1973, 1975, Degge, 1975, Laing, 1976, and Johnson, 1977).

After a thorough review of the literature, I feel confident in stating that the qualitative dimension of student and teacher interaction in the university studio classroom has been generally neglected as a focal point of previous research in art education.
A Few Related Studies

Degge (1975) found that qualitative methodology, in general, and participant observation in particular had not been applied to instructional research, in art education, previous to her case study in a junior high classroom. This researcher's own review is supportive of her claim, however, a couple studies were found to have resemblance to the techniques of the participant observer. For example, Edmonston (1961) used himself as the object of his inquiry using introspective techniques which focused on his artistic development as a painting student, though he did not label his account "ethnographic" or his methodology "participant-observation" his method of inquiry promoted a phenomenological stance and employed historical reconstruction and descriptive accounts of his studio classroom behavior. He arrived at the following conclusions which are relevant to this study:

1. an artist can cultivate a sensitivity to his own studio behaviors.
2. he can devise means of recording and analysing his own studio behaviors and enhance his self awareness.
3. he can clarify his understanding of the components of creative process by studying his own behavior.
4. insight into conditions that support studio activity make a teacher more sensitive to conditions that support creative activity in the classroom.
5. cultivated sensitivity to studio process makes the teacher more sensitive to teaching strategies.

6. sensitivity to the effects of artistic activity upon the self-image makes a teacher more sensitive to the effects of interaction upon student production.

Edmonston's study focused on the feasibility of phenomenological inquiry but his success is also supportive of the researcher's capacity to simultaneously assume an active student participant-observer role.

More recently, qualitative description and informal interview techniques were employed by McConnell (1974) in a study of teacher appraisal of student work. Her focus was on the criteria differences in the evaluative rankings of three different judges with the same work. Her design, however, is more like the traditional experiment and her observation methods were more like those used in laboratory settings. The situation was contrived in that three studio teachers were asked to evaluate the student work, from outside the production context. One could raise issue with the unnaturaleness of this approach as well as with the probable effects of her presence upon a "one shot" experiment.

She found, however, that judges perceptions and valuation schemes did differ for the same work. It is
interesting to note that the greatest range of difference was found to be with the work ranked "average" or "mediocre". This finding provides support for the greater ambiguity that can be noted in critical dialogues with "average" students, however, no explanation is given for this phenomena in McConnell's work.

A study which did incorporate participant observation techniques was conducted in England by Madge and Weinberger (1973). Their two-year field investigation placed them in the roles of the observer as participant. Their descriptive study focused on art student life and the attitudes and feelings that were central to both art students and studio teachers. Because their case study focused on a typical British art school, we cannot generalize their findings to American university art departments nor the American art student. Nonetheless, one finding can be compared to a related study conducted by Clements (1967). Madge and Weinberger (1973:274) found that British female art students were significantly more affected by teacher appraisal than were male students. Furthermore, 65% of the females found criticism to be "destructive" while only 25% of the male students shared that view. Clements (1967) reported that American female students were significantly more extrinsically motivated than were the male students. The implication being that female artistic production was more affected by grading
and appraisal dialogue than was the production of male students. Gender is not the only variable which can influence perception. Sherif (1963) has shown that social perception is differential and is influenced by both internal states and external events. The internal factors include: the perceiver's attitude, linguistic interpretation, and the effects of past experience. Sherif's demonstrations also illustrated that members of the social world are also influenced by the norms of their reference group.

Layne (1974) demonstrated that college students of differing geographical and social backgrounds often perceive, or interpret, the same instructional event differently. In relation to this study, he found that one of the greatest discrepancies occurred with the misperception of initiations as personal positive or personal negative judgments.

From the foregoing, we might imply that individual's perception of the teacher's behavior will differ, based on the history of the individual's art training, his comprehension and perception, cultural and biographical background personal preference and gender. A study which examines the effect of critical dialogue must examine those differentials. Methodological provisions should be made for assessing the individual participant's perception of interpersonal events.
This position has significant implications for classroom researchers who have limited their data collection to the scientific "screens" of systematic observation and the singular interpretive perspective of the classroom observer. Observation research which attends to similarity and difference in the interpretive views of participants might provide the field of art education with knowledge and new understanding of the social dynamics of interpersonal events.

Summary

The aim of this chapter was to explicate the major theoretical assumptions of an innovative approach to educational research. The chapter began with an overview of the limitations of previous educational research and reviewed the discontent with the traditional models of the physical and natural sciences. In the second part, the concepts of "holism" and "naturalism" were explored, giving special emphasis to the relevance of qualitative methodologies for the study of classroom interaction. Attention was given to the theoretic stance taken by ethnomethodologists. Their basic assumptions were explored in an attempt to illustrate the relevance of an ethnomethodological stance for the purposes of this investigation. Lastly, a rationale was presented for the development, promotion and implementation of a novel paradigm, which incorporates multiple data collection procedures, multiple observation perspectives and
a multiple and comparative case study design.

Too often, a methodology has been perceived to equal "research". The position taken in this research asserts that no singular methodological paradigm is best. Each offers its own particular advantages as well as its own limitations. Perhaps the most fruitful research might incorporate novel operations and combined paradigms. Cronbach and Suppes (1969:18) made that point clear when they said:

Disciplined inquiry does not necessarily follow well-established formal procedures. Some of the most excellent inquiry is free-ranging and speculative in its initial stages, trying what might seem to be bizarre combinations of ideas and procedures or restlessly casting about for ideas.

One thing seems certain. Until educators have a solid base to collect reliable information about social dynamics in natural situations, the study of schooling will continue to shed but fragmented light on the nature of individual achievement and student learning.
CHAPTER III

A TRIANGULATED DESIGN: DEVELOPMENT AND PROCEDURES

In contrast to most methodologies in which the researcher's special interests and investigation goals are determined a priori, a research design using participant observation methods remains flexible up to and including the initial stages of the field research. While participant observers have strategies to follow, the specifics of their approach evolve as their investigation proceeds.

What distinguishes participant observation and ethnomethodological inquiry from other methodologies is that their initial research questions are exploratory and thus framed in general terms. Practitioners enter the research setting without specific or preconceived hypotheses. They believe that to enter with a set of specific hypothetical expectations is to impose preconceptions, and perhaps misconceptions, on the phenomenon and on the setting. Consequently, the designs used by qualitative researchers are open, general and flexible in their initial implementation.
Overview

The temporally developing design for this study is structured by the underlying premises of the ethnomethodological stance and the participant observation methodology. In general, the design accommodates multiple methods of data collection to achieve the triangulated perspective that was explicated in the previous chapter. The observation perspectives are sequenced from active participation as member to active participation as observer. The basic design emphasis is upon case study investigation in the classroom setting. The investigation focus evolves from event exploration and qualitative description to analytic classification and propositional testing through systematic observation coding and qualitative analysis.

The purpose of this chapter is to reconstruct the historical development of the investigation and to review the variety of field strategies used in the data collection.

This chapter is presented in four parts. The first part examines the general characteristics of field research and the temporally developing nature of the case study design. The second provides a brief overview of the preliminary investigations which serve as the exploratory research phase. The third presents the field
strategies that were employed for obtaining ethnographic accounts in the data collection phase. And, the fourth part discusses the major scientific issues which were attended to in the implementation of this triangulated research design.

Part One

Field Research and the Case Study Design

The scientific observer who investigates social phenomena in the natural setting is said to employ the case study design. A case study design is used to gather descriptive information about the present status, past experiences and environmental forces that contribute to the uniqueness of individual social units. Individual cases are not studied as much for their unique character as much as they are studied as representatives of a class. A carefully selected sample of subjects is used for intensive observation, with the intent of deriving valid generalizations about the population that the sample represents.

The strength of the case study design is that its flexibility increases the potential for heuristic discovery by submerging the investigator into phenomena as these occur naturally and holistically in the setting. Becker (1961:18) has suggested that flexible case study
designs are especially appropriate when "the research focus aims toward discovery of phenomena whose existence the researcher may not yet be aware of." Flexible designs prove useful when the variables themselves are the focus of discovery, rather than the confirmation of a presumed relationship between two or more of them. The assumption is made that inflexible designs place severe limitations upon exploratory investigation and therefore restrict the discovery of a holistic perceptual awareness of the research problem or focus.

A Temporally Developing Design

A temporally developing design is a flexible plan that gradually evolves to meet the changing focus or investigation needs. In the initial stages of the field research, I did not enter a setting with specific hypotheses and a predetermined controlled design. To be sure, I had a general problem in mind, as well as a theoretic framework that directed initial observation toward particular events in the setting.

The aim was to build a holistic sensitivity to the multiplicity of perceptions and events in the studio classroom setting. Initial observation was guided mainly by sensitivities to data derived from both professional background and general notions about the nature of studio instruction and aesthetic evaluation. As I became
increasingly aware of the studio classroom setting, the relevance of a large number of hunches about relationships were tested. Many perceptions fell by the wayside during this initial period, as I attempted to ascertain the meaning of certain events and to place them in some initial order.

During the second phase of fieldwork, I began to categorize and organize the massive flow of observed events. The analysis of field notations is an integrated and ongoing part of the research procedure. Significant classes and subclasses are differentiated within the general phenomenon. As classes emerge, some became more important than others and the initial research focus underwent considerable revision. That is, as the research progressed, my attention narrowed toward the particulars - the fine-grained aspects of evaluative events.

A final stage in the research consisted of an effort to identify relationships among the emerging categories. By this time, the number of propositions had dwindled considerably. Some were short-lived, proving to be inconsistent or incorrect; others were simply lost sight of, or set aside, as the more significant or interesting ones became the focus of analysis.

**Key Propositions**

There are two types of scientific propositions, or hypotheses. The first is usually referred to as the
"casual proposition", (e.g. a perceived disinterest of the teacher causes a decrease in the quality of subsequent student performance). A second type is called the "descriptive proposition" (e.g. high achieving students initiate teacher/student dialogues more frequently than do students of lower achievement).

Researchers who employ the traditional hypothetical deductive model of experimentation are interested in cause-effect relationships. In the previous chapter, it was noted that ethnomethodologists are not concerned with the notions of "causality" and "predictability " but are interested in holistic description of phenomena as they are produced and experienced by the members of a given setting. Research which examines phenomenological experience aims toward the development of theory derived from descriptive rather than casual propositions.

Descriptive propositions assert that (1) some single property is distributed in a particular fashion among the members of a specified population, or that (2) two or more specified variables are associated in a particular fashion among members of a population. In either case, the criteria of evaluation is to determine whether or not the variable(s) is indeed distributed among the members of a population in the manner indicated by the proposition.

The propositions that survived the informal tests of daily observation were increasingly subjected to more
rigorous measurement and statistical analyses in the final stages of the study. McCall (1969:236) referred to this phase as "pinpointing of the specific propositions." He described the phase this way:

This second phase, which has been termed 'pinpointing of specific propositions', seeks actually to measure the relevant phenomena. That is, quite uniform and specific combinations of indicators are formulated and applied to all cases which enter into the final evidence for and against the proposition.

Though most descriptive propositions emerged during the actual field operations, many of them were not discovered or do not reach full maturity until the analytic inspection of the field notations. The key propositions, however, emerged long before the conclusion of the fieldwork.

In the final phases of this study, propositions were derived both during and after the field operations. Besides the descriptive accounts of the field notation journal, audio tapes were made of the daily verbal interactions. This procedure makes it possible for ex-post facto encoding and analysis of verbal interaction episodes. This procedure allows for the collection of qualitative data while in the setting and the post-field analysis or hypotheses testing through analysis and encoding of the recorded interaction. The specifics of this processing procedure for this study will be more
thoroughly outlined in the next chapter. It is mentioned now only to illustrate how participant observation method evolves from a flexible structure to funnel toward research question refinement and propositional testing.

The Emic/Etic Analytic

Interwoven throughout the seven case observation studies is a planned attention to what social scientists have called the "emic/etic analytic". That is, a design pattern can be perceived moving from investigation from the perspective of the scientific community (etic) to the "common-sense" perspective which was gained as a participant in the natural setting (emic).

The origin of the terms "emic" and "etic" can be traced to Pike (1954:8) and the linguistic distinction between sounds that were relevant to a culture, "phonemic" and sounds which were independent of the culture; "phonetic". The distinction was adopted by social scientists and gave rise to extended epistemological debate within the fields of sociology and anthropology.

The "etic" perspective has come to mean an approach coming from outside the system being studied. The "etic" approach to research derives its constructs from scientific theories, external to the phenomena and previous to their investigation. Phenomenal distinctions and sub-classifications are those already accepted by the
scientific community. M. Harris (1968:575) explained it this way:

Etic statements depend upon the phenomenal distinctions judged appropriate by the community of scientific observers. Etic statements cannot be falsified if they do not conform to the actor's notion of what is significant, real, meaningful or appropriate. Etic statements are verified when independent observers using similar operations agree that a given event has occurred.

Systematic observation which employs standardized category classification falls squarely within an etic approach of scientific investigation.

On the other hand, an "emic" approach is concerned with the study of behavior from the perspective of the participants - from inside a single, culturally significant unit. Criteria are used in an emic description that are drawn from contrasts made from within the system itself and are relevant in terms of the internal functions, interpretations and meanings for the participants themselves. M. Harris (1968:578) proposed this distinction:

Emic statements refer to logico-empirical systems whose phenomenological distinctions or 'things' are built up out of contrasts and discriminations significant, meaningful, real, accurate, or in some other fashion regarded as appropriate by the actors themselves. An emic statement can be falsified if it can be shown that it contradicts the cognitive calculus by which relevant actors judge that entities are similar or different, real, meaningful, significant, or in some other sense 'appropriate' or 'acceptable'.
Participant observers make use of the "emic" approach in that they focus upon the purposes, goals, motivation, attitudes and interpretations of the participants of social phenomena. Qualitative research methods are premised upon the assumption that given a choice between the participant and the observer, it is the participant who has better access to his own inner state. It is further assumed that knowledge of that inner state is an essential factor for holistic understanding of interpersonal events.

Although the real-world distinction between the emic and etic perspective is not always as clear as the simplified construction just presented, the distinction can provide a practical framework for structuring participant observation research. In this study, it provides yet another device for triangulating the observation data. The etic perspective served as the entry framework which allowed me to begin the task of organizing my observation perceptions into classes of behavior. As I became more aware of the internal orderings (the emic perspective) I could alter, modify or build upon the initial classification scheme, thus refining the classification and description of social phenomena into a blend of both the emic and the etic perspectives.
Separating each field investigation, and interwoven throughout them, was a conscious effort for formal study of the etic perspectives offered in areas such as cultural anthropology, motivational psychology, linguistic analysis, social interaction, systematic instructional observation, symbolic interactionism, cognitive psychology, creative development and learning theory. Formal study and reading in these areas served to refine the observation focus and research questions for subsequent field investigation. Similarly, the participant observer investigations raised further theoretical questions and suggested areas for further course study or related reading.

Part Two

Phase One: Exploration and Development

This notion of the temporally developing and triangulated research design represents a new approach for instruction research. As a paradigm model, it may lack the sophistication of the more established models. As such, it may be subject to the skepticism that often accompanies innovation. For the purpose of reducing the ambiguity which can give rise to such skepticism, a retrospective history of the design's development will follow, beginning with the preliminary field explorations of the initial phase of this study. These studies are
briefly overviewed as the chain of historical events which preceded the more systematized data collection of the second phase.

Investigations: Phase I

This phase represents the studies in which a full participant perspective was sought. That is, my own participation in the research setting was the focus of observation. I became the subject of investigation first as artist, then as art student and third as studio teacher.

My initial research focus related to creative performance and human motivation. This interest drew my attention to the research that was a part of Harvard University's "Project Zero". The project was founded in 1967 by Nelson Goodman to investigate human symbolic development, creation and comprehension in the arts.

In the summer of 1974 I attended Harvard to participate in an exploratory phase of the project. In retrospect, it is perceived as the initial phase for this investigation. It served as an introduction to qualitative methods. Its emphasis upon multi-disciplined interpretation might be perceived as the germination for the conceptions of triangulated inquiry.
Exploratory Investigation Number One: The Artist Perspective

The observation focus of this first investigation was the internal judgmental or studio production decision-making process. The research objective was to bring to a conscious awareness those aspects of choice making that affected the outcomes of creative task performance. That is, the exploratory study aimed toward the discovery of the task-related variables which were part of the implicit, or taken-for-granted part of the artist's perspective.

The judgmental strategies of several artists, poets, and composers were examined through a variety of techniques, including audio and video recorded playback, time-lapsed and slow motion photography, informal respondent interviewing, self-reflective process analysis and direct observation of self and others. The major goal of the exploratory study was not so much to arrive at conclusions and findings as it was to arrive at and to refine questions for further investigation.

Twenty-five creative professionals participated in the summer project. We examined the working strategies of other artists, while participating in observation of our own creative process. Introspection brought personal strategies of invention to conscious awareness. Diaries, audio tapes and self-imposed questions facilitated introspective process. Participants shared personal
insights in small teams, then proved the finer aspects of strategies of invention through informal interviewing, comparing and contrasting strategies. As participants, we were trained to serve the dual role of subject/researcher.

A second focus of the exploratory study examined the content and style of professional aesthetic criticism. This procedure provided an additional "lens" for perceiving personal evaluative criteria through its focus on traditional aesthetic standards. Project members not only analyzed the writings of critics, they also engaged in critical exercises, followed by self-reflective analysis of their critical performance. Since participants were involved in a process of investigating their own active performance as artists and as critics, it can be said that they were engaged in participant observation research.

The Outcomes for the Developing Design

This first study served to expand my general awareness of the multiple aspects of decision making that occur during the act of creation. Through focus on this awareness, I began to question the relationship of professional, artistic decision-making process to that of the novice student. It seemed reasonable to assume that art students entered the professional training setting with certain aptitudes, goals and operational skills. They would already possess a set of aesthetic standards, however,
in the process of their professional "training" these standards would be modified, expanded or changed.

The outcome of this awareness was the research decision to explore creative performance from the student participant perspective.

At the time, there were no clearly formulated hypotheses, but only an awareness and conviction that this was a perplexity in need of further exploration. As a consequence, new directions for further exploration were determined. The knowledge outcome of the study resulted in personal awareness of my own creative process, as contrasted and compared with the strategies of other participants. This awareness provided a rich base for subsequent self-reflective comparisons of my performance as an art student, and increased my sensitivity to changes that were influenced by the critical standards of a studio teacher.

Exploratory Investigations Numbers Two and Three: The Beginning Student Perspective

In the Fall Semester of 1974, I returned to my teaching position at Western Kentucky University. I had decided to explore performance from a student perspective. As a long-time student of art, I could not really assume a "beginning" art student role. As a studio teacher, I
would be limited in my access to student subjective data. As a solution to this dilemma, the decision was made to assume an active participatory role as a beginning music student. The rationale behind the selection was simply to place myself into a setting that was related to performance learning and in which I had some sensitivity and personal motivation but no technical knowledge or performance skills.

I selected a course entitled, Introduction to Piano. I had never studied a musical instrument before and this particular section had been described as a "creative approach for the beginner". I participated in evening classes as well as the two hour-a-day practice sessions for a fifteen week period. The instructor, the students, and the course were atypical of general music education. I discovered later that the particular section was part of an experimental study on teaching methods. Since my goal was not to make generalizations about beginning music instruction, but rather to study myself in a beginning level context, my participation and the course was valid for those purposes.

At the end of the course, I found I had been more interested in participation than observation and therefore sought an additional exploratory experience against which I could contrast and build upon sensitivity to the beginning
student perspective. In the spring semester, I enrolled for credit in a course called, *The Fundamentals of Acting*. This course was a laboratory experience designed for beginning theater majors. Its objective was to introduce the theater major to the fundamental principles and performance skills of acting.

Once again, I assumed a full participant role, including the acceptance of a minor role in a performance production, as well as the performing of daily laboratory activities and the outside requirements which other student members performed.

In both cases the teachers were not aware of my research intentions. I was treated as student and received grades and course credit for my participation. Since grades serve as measurement of achievement, I offer them as indicators of the degree to which I was successful in carrying out the duties expected of the student role. In that I earned an A for acting and a B+ in piano, it may be inferred that I was successful, by the teachers' standards - I had mastered the "doings" which were expected within the contexts studied.

**The Outcomes for the Developing Design**

At the conclusion of the two experiences, I found that I again had raised more questions than answers. My awareness, as beginning student, was yet at a taken-for-granted level. This was due to the fact that my
concentration was more on the participation than it was on the observation and recording of that participation. There was no formal attempt to collect data which could be organized and analyzed. I did observe, however, that a strong parallel could be perceived in the instructional strategies characteristic of performance-related courses in the arts. Like beginning art classes, these two courses focused upon the introduction of basic principles and concentrated on the mastery of basic performance skills. It became apparent that a good deal of instructional effort centered around the judgment and individual appraisal of student performance or product. That is, it became increasingly apparent that both teacher appraisal and student performance adapted to one another in an ongoing process. Student performance was affected by past appraisal, at least for the period of course encounter. The teacher did have control over what was accepted as legitimate assignment solutions and consequently had the power to delimit the student's creative strategies. How the teacher established and maintained that control became the initial focus for the next investigation.
In the summer of 1975, I returned to the Ohio State University to participate as a full-time art student. By this time, I had built some sensitivity to the beginning student role. I was anxious to contrast this awareness to an art learning context.

In selecting a field experience, I remained sensitive to the issue of my past experience. Consequently, I selected to study lithography, since I had had little previous training in printmaking and none in lithography. Although my conceptual ability proved more mature than the typical beginning student, my technical competence was at the same level. It should be noted that a wide range of artistic ability and experience could be found among the class participants. However, the emphasis of instruction and the focus of instructional criticism remained on a technical rather than conceptual level throughout the course.

Once again, the focus of inquiry was full participation and design development. In this case, to provide a comparative base I also participated in a graduate level studio course in drawing. The rationale for this strategy was that I could more easily become aware of the
characteristics of beginning level instruction by comparing the similarities and contrasts between the two settings.

The Outcomes for the Developing Design

The predominant observational finding, in contrasting the two studio contexts, was an observed switch in the appraisal criteria from a technical focus, at the beginning level, to an ideational or conceptual focus, at the advanced level. In the course of my investigation I had the opportunity to observe both instructors in contrasting level situations. In both cases, the instructors had adjusted their performance standards and switched their appraisal focus accordingly.

One other observation became significant. That is, I observed that the advanced students were skilled in the discovery of teacher expectations. They had knowledge of the instructor's production expectations and production preferences prior to context entry. This knowledge allowed the advanced students to make course selections by discovering situations in which the teacher's assessment criteria would be more likely to be in agreement with their own. Indirectly, this factor contributes to the advanced student's potential for success by maintaining situations in which the advanced student would be allowed to be to his instructors what he wanted to be to
himself. Advanced students were more perceptive of options and match, making course selections which could maintain their personal perceptions of creative integrity. This meant that what has been previously assumed as only the result of artistic maturation involved something more than technical competence. It involved social competence and self-awareness. It involved the process of matching personal standards with the knowledge of the standards of others. The beginning student is likely to have minimal information about the expectations and production standards of his studio instructors. His course choices are based on chance or rumor and his matches are more "potluck" than rational. In many cases, beginning course participation is randomly assigned rather than self-selected.

This observation raised a series of questions related to how the student learned the expectations of his studio instructors and how he gained the social competence to function successfully in the studio classroom setting. The immediate outcome of this awareness was a drifting from psychological concerns to sociological ones. This new emphasis had significant impact on the subsequent direction of the research. Social interaction methods and patterns became the new focus of observation and related study.
The previous participation as student raised new questions related to instructional interaction style. In the Fall Semester of 1975, I returned to my teaching position and decided to explore studio instruction from the studio teacher's perspective. My original intention was to experiment with a variety of instructional treatments. A preliminary study was designed with the long range goal of refining the results into controlled group experimentation. That intention soon fell by the wayside. The study served more to bring to awareness a teacher's perception of studio evaluative events.

The study was conducted at Western Kentucky University in the Fall Semester of 1975, a randomly selected group of sophomore or junior level art majors served as subjects. The class was third-level life drawing. The rationale for the course selection was that all students would have had some technical training and therefore evaluative analysis could focus beyond the technical considerations toward the creative and conceptual concerns. Sixteen art students participated in the study.

The basic instructional treatment was the use of self-reflective analysis as an ongoing part of the
classroom procedure. That is, a variety of self-reflective treatments were applied, including: the use of team observation and description introspective analysis as recorded in diaries, personal value confrontation through the use of audio tape dialogues with self, time lapse photography, group discussion, private conferences and student participant observations. One day per week was devoted entirely to critical dialogue, as opposed to studio production or media manipulation.

In the first half of the semester, students focused on the technical criticism of their working process. Their analysis and deficiency diagnoses were used as the basis for determining the nature of their individualized outside assignments. During the second half of the semester, participants focused upon their conceptual development and their ideational strategies.

My role, as teacher, was to provide interesting stimulation for life drawing interpretations. I posed the model and selected appropriate props. All other decisions related to choice of media, format, size, technique, time, and style were left up to the student. An important part of the treatment was the recording of the decisions and the rationalization for choice making. These served an important function in the student's self-analysis. Another instructional role was to introduce the various treatments and to informally interview the students.
and assist them in the analysis of their production and ideational strategies.

The Outcomes for the Developing Design

As the term progressed, the students became more autonomous in their capacity for delimiting unique artistic problems. They became more aware of themselves as creative individuals and more aware of the strategies of their classmates and the creative alternatives inherent in them. In their final evaluations, all students reported that their performance incentive, production output and general motivation had been unusually high. In order of their perceived importance, the most frequent reasons cited were: (1) a high sense of responsibility for outcomes, (2) high perceptions of autonomy and creative integrity, (3) the high interest level of the instructor, (4) effective feedback and assessment, (5) relevance to their personal needs and goals, and (6) the novelty of the treatment.

To a certain degree, that motivation must be attributed to a "Hawthorne effect". Nonetheless support for the significance of these variables can be found in a related study by Hackman and Oldham (1975). They arrived at a similar set of motivational variables in their study of task performance motivation in the industrial setting.
A wide variety of data was originally collected for the purpose of analysis to design a controlled group experiment with isolated aspects of the various treatments and which would measure differences in some of the emerging motivational variables. Upon completion of the study, I was granted an academic leave to refine the details for the next phase of research - the formal data collecting phase.

Part Three

The Data Collection Phase II

Though many of the methods and procedures employed in the preliminary investigations reflect those of the participant observer, it must be noted that their design was intuitively operationalized and their data collection was somewhat informal. Had these studies been used alone, the reliability of such data might be easily questioned. Realizing this problem, I spent the next academic year in fulltime study of the scientific procedures that would increase the validity and reliability of any further investigation related to the research problem. Specifically, the methods and procedures of participant observation, systematic observation, socio-linguistic analysis and ethnomethodology were investigated. The qualitative research procedures and methods inherent within these
models were perceived to be more appropriate for the collection of data related to a multiple perspective investigation of appraisal activities in a university studio classroom.

The Exploratory Research Questions

Two general research questions served to guide the participant observation focus for ethnographic data collection. These were:

**Question One:** What are the characteristics of the appraisal events and the instructional methods that accomplish the task of evaluating student artistic performance in the context of a university studio art classroom?

**Question Two:** What are the characteristics of the student participant perspectives which allow the student to assign meaning to and act upon the evaluative events that occur in a university studio art classroom?

The first question asks for a descriptive account of the characteristics of task performance appraisal in a university studio classroom setting. The second question seeks a more holistic understanding of those events, as they are experienced and interpreted from perspectives of the studio classroom participants.
The collection of the data related to these researchable questions was accomplished in two successive, but related, case study investigations. In the first case study, I assumed the full participant and concealed observer research stance. To compensate for the observation limitations of full participation, a followup study, using the same teacher in a similar setting was designed. In this second case study, the full observer and the observer-as-participant research stances were assumed. The aim of both case studies was the collection of descriptive data. In addition, during the second case study, audio tapes of classroom events were also collected to be used for systematic encoding for the ex-post facto analyses and final phase of this research.

Field Investigation Number Six: Ethnographic Data and the Art Student Perspective

The focus of this case study was the collection of ethnographic data related to the studio learning experience from the art student perspective. The research focus was my own active participation as student in a studio classroom setting. Certain conditions for participation were predetermined to insure that, in as much as possible, other participants in the setting would respond to me only as a fellow participant and not as a
classroom researcher. These conditions included:

1. My role as classroom investigator would be concealed from the studio instructor as well as from the other classroom participants.

2. I would perform all the task production activities expected of regular student participants in the setting, including the various outside assignments.

3. I would "play down" my graphic skills to be more in keeping with the classroom norm.

4. I be evasive about my biographical background and studio instructional experience.

These conditions were imposed in order that the data collection be reduced of the observer contamination effects. The concealed position allowed for those who came in contact with me to react to me as naturally as they would any other classroom member.

In order to protect my true identity and preserve my concealed role, I found it also necessary to minimize my artistic ability. In the initial weeks of the investigation, I carefully observed the working strategies of fellow students so that I could adopt similar working strategies into my own studio performance. I adopted methods of drawing which were contrary to my own style and more in keeping with those of the beginner. On several "fast sketching" occasions, I introduced the additional handicap of drawing left-handedly. This procedure produced a drawing characteristic that was
more unskilled in appearance and less confident in style. It was no easy task, for it was difficult to swallow artistic pride and I frequently found I had to remind myself of my research intention and consequently accept the inferior judgment of my work.

As the credibility of my student role became secure, I gradually allowed my artistic performance to evolve closer to its more natural state. This strategy had an unanticipated side effect. It helped to establish my credibility as a craftsman, thereby establishing peer recognition, increasing peer solicitation of substantive dialogue and facilitating respondent interviewing. This position also established a credibility as "judge" and therefore put me in an awkward position where I had to tactfully avoid contamination from an overly aggressive evaluative role of others' work.

In the course of classroom interaction, I often found it necessary to deal with student probing for biographically related information. When confronted with such solicitations, I led participants to believe that I was a high school crafts teacher with little background and training in drawing, which satisfied inquisitors without destroying my credibility as student or endangering my concealment as researcher.
The Setting

The study was conducted at the Ohio State University, in the summer quarter of 1976. The particular case study setting was selected for both its feasibility for adopting a student participatory role and for its representativeness as a typical studio learning experience for the beginning art major. The summer term was selected because it was probable that older students, like myself, and public school teachers would be enrolled in such a course. A beginning life drawing class was selected because my own drawing and anatomy skills were "rusty" and therefore my performance could show natural and gradual improvement.

The Instructor

In the final selection of the case study setting, the choice of instructor/subject played a significant part. Since a focus of observation was to be the instructor's interaction with me, certain conditions, or criteria, were established for his selection. First, that he be generally representative of the instruction that students would typically receive in this institution. Secondly, to protect the representative validity of his instructional interaction with me, it was necessary that he not know me prior to the beginning of the course. Furthermore, the instructor was to remain unaware of my observational intentions throughout the contact period.
Mr. Allen (a pseudonym) satisfied both conditions. He was a tenured assistant professor, with nine years of studio instruction experience in related course contexts. His training and major area of interest was painting. He continued to be actively productive and maintained a steady exhibition record. Interviews with former students and colleagues confirmed that he was a representative type - competent, but not exceptional in any way as to make him atypical as a subject.

Secondly, I had not had previous contact with Mr. Allen and could thereby assume the hidden observer role with confidence that I would receive no special treatment as a student.

The Student Population

The student population exhibited a mixed range of age and drawing experience levels. This situation is not uncommon in the summer sessions or more advanced levels of course study. Nineteen students were enrolled in the beginning session (Drawing 202); nine in a second level section (Drawing 502); and six were enrolled for independent study (Drawing 602). The student population was predominantly female with only seven of the thirty-four participants being male. About 80% of the students were under the age of twenty; six of the participants were older than twenty-five; two of these were public school
art teachers. About 40% of the students were majoring in fine arts, the remainder somewhat equally divided between art education and undecided, but art-related. Drawing 202 students were second-year art students; the majority of others were third-year level undergraduates.

The teacher made no distinction in instructional behavior or classroom assignments between the various subgroups. Students made more distinction than did the teacher. This particular item was a source of frequent criticism from the beginning students, who perceived some injustice in comparative ranking with their more experienced counterparts.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Field notation is the basic data recording device of the participant observer. The method involves the keeping of a daily log, describing events and other information retrieved from the field setting.

**Strategies for Watching and Listening**

An unobtrusive observational strategy was employed to protect my true identity and intention. I was sensitive to my daily positioning in the classroom, attempting to achieve maximum visual and listening range, while at the same time consciously rotating my placement and the proximity to specific class members. This strategy served to build a wider range of social and informant relationships
and to protect the data from biased perspective account.

A concealed tape recorder was kept within range of my work station. This strategy was used to help recall my personal dialogues with other classroom members, or to stimulate recall of events during the notation sessions that followed each class period.

A second strategy proved more efficient and eventually replaced the audio taping. Index cards were kept among the art materials, making it possible to make shorthand notations of significant events or utterances. These notated cards were then used as a recall stimulus in the recording sessions which immediately followed classroom participation. My drawings also served as notation stimulus; reflecting back on them through reconstructive recollection proved helpful.

A third strategy was the posting of behavioral categories and sub-classifications as they emerged from the data. Index cards in large print were continually expanded and regrouped on the wall facing my typing station.

A related device proved very useful. At the beginning of the field residence, I photographed the empty studio classroom from various positions in the room. The photographic series was also displayed above my typewriter and a quick glance at a particular scene or categorical card often stimulated a whole chain of new episode
recollections.

**Strategies for Recording**

The actual observation and recording took place daily during the ten week course. Over one hundred hours were accumulated in actual classroom observation and much more than that amount of time was devoted to writing up the observations.

I did not record every event observed; encyclopedic recording is neither possible nor particularly useful. However, this raises some question as to which observations were selected for recording and what criteria was used in isolating them from the many things which could have been recorded.

The concealed observer does not write up his field notes in the setting. Therefore a four-hour block of time was preserved immediately following the field observation to write the notations while impressions were fresh, to begin the process of analysis and to design the subsequent daily focus.

Typically, notations included such things as: the description of classroom events; incidents of student/teacher interaction; verbatim accounts of overheard dialogue; nonverbal behavior; indexical terms and their meanings; reconstructed histories; summary impressions of student responses; subclasses of instructional events;
events related to evaluation, judgment and appraisal; explicit rules or judgmental criteria; frequency counts; attendance patterns; introspective analyses of my participation strategies; methodological notes; and some theoretical speculation and their suggested focus for further testing.

What was included or left out depended upon the particular focus I was pursuing, and the particular relevance to the questions that were of major concern at the time. New concerns or perplexities which gave rise to new questions were also recorded. A running analysis of the field notations, from time to time, helped to perceive emerging propositions and determined any change in observational focal point. When I felt that I had sufficient evidence to substantiate a particular class of re-occurring events, I was likely to assign that class a particular title and then likely to stop recording specific instances of it, or else record it with invented constructs, meaningful to me as a private classification scheme, e.g. "teacher hustle manding followed by student visual eavesdropping".

In short, what appears in the field notations are the recorded perceptions of the observed transactions relating to the particular focus of the day or the isolates of interaction which seemed perplexing at the
time, or which I intuitively perceived to hold some potential relationship to the general research focus. From this one case study alone, some two hundred and fifty typed pages of field notations were accumulated. A typical notation sample is offered in Appendix A.

The basic notation procedure was adapted from McCall and Summons (1969) who suggested that the "field notes" be typed on ditto reproduction masters. At periodic intervals, the notes are reviewed and abstracted categories begin to emerge. As the categories become clear, they are named and classified. The categorical terms are then entered in the margin spaces as supplementary notations.

This system of notation facilitates the analysis and research reporting stage. Field notes can be run off in duplicate sets and then easily indexed or crossfiled. As evidence increased for a particular theoretical notation it was often elaborated into a more lengthy essay and filed under a separate volume of "Theoretical Asides". As support from related readings were uncovered, they were entered as marginal notations to the theoretical aside.

Specific field operations and procedural cautions were extracted from suggestions offered by the following researchers and scholars.
Schatzman and Strauss (1973); Wolcott (1975); Douglas (1970); Wilson et al (1974); Pohland (1971); Speier (1973); Lofland (1971); Edgerton and Languss (1974); Mydral (1967); Cartwright and Cartwright (1974); and Cusick (1976).

Informant and Respondent Interviewing

Informal interviewing was the second major research strategy used for data collection. The specific strategy followed the data reliability criteria established by Wolcott (1975). Three types of interviewing were employed: "Key Informant", "Respondent", and "Informal Summative Reflexive". As was mentioned in Chapter II, the first seeks information or reports about other persons or events from informers who are presumed to be giving information which is factually correct. The second type, respondent, seeks the personal reactions, responses and value disclosures of other participants, and examines them for strands of similarity. The last type was collected, after the course, from persons initially identified as "key informers." They were more formal and sought subjective interpretation and historical reconstruction and evaluation of the learning experience.
Ethical Considerations

Due to the ethical issues of the hidden observer stance, it was necessary to seek permission for the investigation from the Ohio State Committee for Research Involving the use of Human Subjects. The rationale for the hidden stance and proposal for the study were reviewed and permission was granted to conduct the investigation. (See Appendix F).

Two class sessions per week were "open". That is, the students were required to be present and a model was provided, but the teacher did not attend. These sessions were much more informal. Peer interaction was significantly higher. The "open labs" provided an excellent opportunity for informal interviewing as well as eavesdropping upon the open and honest peer dialogues related to course events.

On the days of the teacher's presence, informal interviewing was accomplished during breaks, prior to class sessions and after class. Frequently, exchanges took place on the way to class, at the snack bar or any informal occasion that students were likely to be engaged in open conversation.

A great deal of the earlier encounters were of a purely social nature. These served to establish mutually trusting and sharing relationships and built the necessary
atmosphere for the respondent disclosures that were solicited as the relationships became firmly established. One function of interview in this particular study was to serve as a cross-validity check and contrast against my own responses as student. Interview data became more structured in the follow-up study. However, many of the interview questions and the refinement of interviewing skills were developed during this particular stage of the study.

A conscious attempt was made to collect a wide range of respondents. As researcher I interacted informally with more than seventy-five percent of the total student population, focusing attention to beginning level respondents. Such interactions were recorded in the field notations. Eight "key informants" were chosen because of their leadership roles in the setting, their perceptual sensitivity, their natural aggressiveness and willingness to openly express opinion, and their willingness to provide respondent information when solicited, informally. The reporting of the informal interviewing was summarized and the informants' identities were protected in the notation.

Additional Data

In addition to the field notations and subjective reports in the setting, data was collected outside the
setting context. In the last week of class, three "key informants" were told of my research intentions and granted permission to analyze the data related to their informal classroom responses. They also consented to a tape recorded informal summative interview at the conclusion of the class experience (see samples in Appendix B).

Other forms of data included transcribed classroom interactions, group critiques, taped lecture presentations, photographs of selected student work, slides of the development of my own work style, and posted grades. Former students and teaching colleagues of Mr. Allen were also informally interviewed.

The specific issues related to representativeness of the sample, and the validity and reliability of the research procedures are elaborated more fully in the final section of this chapter.

Upon the completion of the field investigation, the nature of my research intention and the specific data collection procedures were disclosed in a conference with Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen was intrigued with the study and granted his written consent for the use of data related to his instructional behavior in the setting. Disclosure was also made to the key informants, who in turn granted permission for the use of data related to their participation and response. (see Appendix F).
The Outcomes for the Developing Design

The major outcome of this case study was a massive amount of qualitative and descriptive data related to the exploratory questions and focused through the perceptions of the participant as observer. The ongoing analysis of this data resulted in a categorical sub-classification scheme for behavioral and event categories relevant to the research focus. The qualitative description from which classifications were abstracted and served in the third phase as the basis for subscript development for the Observation System for Instructional Analysis (O.S.I.A.), Duncan and Hough (1975).

A second major outcome was the many descriptive hypotheses which were abstracted from the field notations, and which could be selected for further empirical testing in the analysis phase through the measurement and analytic procedures of a subscripted version of the O.S.I.A. The subscript development and an explanation of the O.S.I.A. analytic processing will be more fully presented in the next chapter.

A third outcome was the refinement of the final observational design to be used in the follow-up investigation in which I would assume the full observer stance. The follow-up study was designed to complete the triangulated perspective through collecting further information related to the teacher perspective, expanding the student perspectives and adding the holistic perspective of the
trained ethnographer/encoder.

The investigation problem focus, at the conclusion of this phase, had evolved toward the exploring of the variation in student interpretive reality according to learning types and achievement groups. That is, I questioned the representativeness of the data collected from my own interpretation as an A level student. I concluded that a holistic account of the student perspective should examine whether the individual interpretive behavior or production methods bear any relationship to assigned performance grades.

During the Fall Quarter of 1976, the participant observation data was studied to begin the development of a "context-specific" subscript system for the O.S.I.A., and arrangements were made for the second stage of data collection.

Field Investigation Number Seven: Observation Data and the Triangulated Perspective

Field Investigation Number Seven is the culminating effort of the triangulated design. It was designed as the focal point of data collection with the goal of achieving a triangulated perspective.

The underlying goal for conducting this particular case study was to compensate for the data collection
limitations of earlier investigations using more active participant stances. To close the continuum, and to triangulate the four possible participant observation stances, I assumed a complete observer stance and then gradually moved toward the observer-as-participant stance. That is, in the initial weeks of observation, my activity in the setting was limited to watching, listening and recording. My aim was to gain acceptance as a feature of the setting. By the end of the second week of full observation, I began interacting with the teacher to gain clarification for ambiguities in my perception of transacted events. By the fourth week of observations, I began to interact with the students to build informant and respondent relationships with the students, gathering information related to their interpretation of the events. After the sixth week of observations I took an increasingly active role in the setting using both informal and more structured interviews of both the teacher and the students.

Achieving a Triangulated Perspective

To achieve a triangulated perspective, observations were conducted using three observational approaches: participant observation, systematic encoding, and informant ethnographic observation. During the ten-week observation period, verbal interactions were audio recorded; instructional patterns and events were described; and, the
subjective interpretation of the meanings of those events were collected through interviews with the teacher and selected students.

The features of the scene attended to and recorded included, among other things: descriptive accounts of evaluative events, its historical continuity, its structure and its explicit rules, its informal and implicitly-interpreted rules, the activities and relationships within those rules, and the ascribed and achieved status of the participants. These were the features of the studio classroom setting which the participants constructed and maintained.

From a member's point of view, a setting presents itself as the theater for his actions. From the ethnomethodologists point of view, the presented structure of the scene is viewed as the accomplishment of its members. The features of a scene are recorded as they are known and attended to by the participants. The aim is not to make judgment as to the accuracy of the participant perceptions or interpretations, but to discover and record them and to present an accurate and descriptive account of them.

Data From Participant Observation

Direct observation and field notations were employed for collecting ethnographic data describing studio
classroom events. In the initial stages the field notations were hand written. With the introduction of the audio recording equipment into the scene, field descriptions were categorically indexed and supplemented with an abbreviated daily log.

As the term progressed respondent and informant interviewing became the focus of the participant observation data. All participants were periodically interviewed. At the conclusion of the term summative reflexive interviews with every participant were audio recorded and transcribed.

Three observational approaches enabled studio instruction to be viewed from three different, yet highly related perspectives. These three perspectives are (1) the beginning art student perspective, (2) the studio teacher's perspective and (3) the perspective of an ethnographer viewing the total instructional setting. My earlier field investigation in the student and instructor participatory roles enabled me to establish the conceptual unity of the three forms of observation data. The triangulated perspective was achieved through a combination of respondent and summative interviewing; and finally, the ethnographer-observer perspective was accomplished through the multiple methods of direct observation, ethnographic field notation, interactive event analysis through systematic observation and interaction encoding,
conversational analysis, and ethnomethodological analysis. Ethnomethodological analysis was facilitated by the empathetic projection stimulated from the observer's preliminary experiences in the participant observer role. Empathetic inference techniques generated topics for informal interviewing of the participants.

**Data From Systematic Coding**

Systematic coding was used for interaction event analysis. The actual encoding and analysis was processed from audio recordings in the analysis phase which followed the field residence. The actual code processing and analysis are treated separately in Chapter IV.

**The Setting**

This investigation was conducted at the Ohio State University during the Winter quarter of 1977. The setting was a studio classroom for the course entitled, *Fine Art 102: Studio Art II*. The course was the second course in the required block of three which focused upon the fundamentals of studio performance.

The course was selected because it was in keeping with the focus upon beginning student learning and was representative by definition and classified as a foundational experience for the beginning art major.
The Observation Period

The class met daily for two hours, over the course of a ten-week period. During this period, eighty hours of actual classroom observation were clocked, insuring more than a representative sampling of the classroom events and course development. Many additional hours were spent interviewing participants, analysing and transcribing tapes, and elaborating the field notation.

The Subjects

The Studio Instructor

A significant criteria for the selection of the particular studio context was that Mr. Allen would again be the studio instructor. Of his three teaching assignments, this particular section most resembled the contexts of the previous case studies and was sufficiently representative for the investigation needs.

At the conclusion of the previous field investigation as concealed observer, and student participant, I disclosed the full nature of my research activity to Mr. Allen and solicited his continuation as subject in the follow-up case study.

His acceptance of the teacher/subject role was ideal for the overall design, giving it greater conceptual
unity. My observations as student participant and knowledge of his behavior could now be triangulated through direct and informal interviews with him, and through intense and direct observation, from the neutral position of observer.

Specific instructional patterns could now be encoded while verbal and nonverbal behavior specifically and accurately recorded immediately and directly in the field setting. Finally, his representativeness as a sample had already been established in the previous case study, and his participation served to stabilize the instructor/subject variable.

The Teaching Assistant

The particular classroom setting offered an additional observation bonus. A teaching assistant, Kay, had been assigned to the course. The assistant would be present in the setting on the "open lab" days. Mr. Allen would teach three of the days and Kay would supervise on the two remaining days.

Kay was a female graduate student working toward an MFA degree in printmaking. She had been selected to work with Mr. Allen because her undergraduate education had been from the same mid-western institution from which Mr. Allen had received his graduate training. This was to be her first experience related to studio-instruction.
For the most part, her role was to initiate or supervise the studio activities designed by Mr. Allen. However, she was free to offer her own production appraisals and offered feedback for Mr. Allen's final grading of the students.

With the research setting, course goals, class assignments and student population remaining constant, her contrasting participation as instructor/evaluator provided a rich comparative element in the setting. It facilitated my sensitivity to characteristics that were idiosyncratic of Mr. Allen, and also served to stimulate a whole chain of questions related to instructional interaction and the gender variable.

The Student Population

Seventeen students were enrolled in the course. They were all full-time students pursuing art-related degrees. In a survey taken in the eighth week, 35% were preparing for art education careers, 47% for studio-related careers and 17.5% were still undecided. Sixty-six percent of the subjects were female. The majority of the students were completing their freshman program and the student median age was 19 (three students were older). Eighty-eight percent of the population had attended Ohio High Schools, while 59% had attended urban schools. Seventy-five percent of the students had studied some art
in high school, and all but one had maintained A level grades in their high school art courses. All the students had taken at least one other studio course and the majority were also enrolled in another studio course during the term. According to Mr. Allen, this group was not atypical in any way.

Table One (on page 126) summarizes the biographical information related to the representativeness of the student population.

Subject Consent

On the opening day of class, Mr. Allen introduced me to the students. At that time I disclosed my general research intentions and explained the data collection procedures that would be taking place during the course. After answering related questions, I solicited their individual written consents to record dialogue within the class and to make use of the data related to their participation and performance in the course. A protocol consent form is provided in Appendix F. All participants including the teaching assistant gave full consent.
## TABLE 1

### STUDENT POPULATION: SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
<th>Column 7</th>
<th>Column 8</th>
<th>Column 9</th>
<th>Column 10</th>
<th>Column 11</th>
<th>Column 12</th>
<th>Column 13</th>
<th>Column 14</th>
<th>Column 15</th>
<th>Column 16</th>
<th>Column 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time status</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school art experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art concentration</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Studio courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Art History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other art this term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous exper./painting</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview consent</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. art average</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term grade (171)</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final grade</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Survey taken in the eighth week of the course.
**Strategies for Recording**

The trained observer is limited in how much he can actually observe, judge and classify. Pressure and fatigue factors are very taxing. Many researchers are now taking advantage of the technology of video and audio recordings to stabilize the record of the instructional process so that these can be carefully analyzed at a more convenient pace. This suggested that the collection of data may be better accomplished in three stages - event recording, event encoding and event analysis.

When employing audio recordings for analysis, the researcher is faced with the problem of sound quality and the adequacy of audio "pick-up". Good quality sound transmitting and receiving equipment is essential. To increase the quality of audio recording, the subject was equipped with a transmitting wireless microphone. I was equipped with headphones, and could hear all the audio transactions related to instructional events, including the more "private" transactions with students. When the focus of observation is tutorial interaction, this strategy is essential for accurate recording of everything that the teacher and student say.

The physical situation was such that I could easily accomplish an unobtrusive positioning in the room. The student work stations were arranged in an semi-circle,
allowing the teacher, the students, or the investigator to circulate freely. Recording equipment was stored on a portable slide table allowing for easy and rapid changes in the observation vantage point anywhere around the periphery of the circular grouping.

Though the technological aspects of recording interaction have been maximized for efficient and accurate recording, nevertheless audio recording alone does not "capture" significant gestures, nonverbal responses, or the related aspects of communication phenomena which are visually detectable, but silent. What is lost are important qualitative dimensions of social interaction. To compensate for this limitation, the investigator focused on the nonverbal and qualitative dimensions through ethnographic description.

**Audio Equipment**

The procedure employed a Sony TC-280 reel-to-reel recorder with a dual-track recording option, an Attec P525-A amplifier and a Endor ST-3 wireless transceiver. Classroom verbal interaction was recorded through transmission from the Edcor PM-1 wireless mike worn by the subject. For reporting, I was equipped with an Attec 21D whisper-sensitive mike, so that his descriptive imput could thus be recorded simultaneously along with the actual classroom transaction. The particular whisper sensitivity of this equipment made it possible for
me to describe the transactions without being heard by the other class members. The dual-track stereo feature allowed for simultaneous playback as well as isolated listening for transcription purposes. Qualitative inserts proved invaluable in the post-field analysis and interpretation of the verbal transactions. A transcribed sample of ethnographic description using this method is provided in Appendix D-3.

Outcomes

The major outcome of this case study was the collection of descriptive data related to the perspective views of the studio teacher, the student participants and the trained classroom observer. This data, along with the audio recorded episodes, were amenable to further systematic processing and triangulated analysis.

The specific results and the presentation of this data is the topic of Chapter V.

Part Four

Issues and Concerns of the Case Study Design

Due to its complexity, holistic assessment is apt to have some methodological and interpretive problems. Within the framework of field research and the case study design, six issues must be dealt with for those contemplating field research:
1. The issue of Observer Effect: what effect does the observer's presence have upon the situation and the data he collects?

2. The issue of Distortion Effect: how do you know that the information informants and respondents report is reliable?

3. The issue of Representative Validity: how do you know that the selected case is in any way representative of the larger social class, or how do you know that the time spent in the field is sufficient to yield representative results?

4. The issue of Generalizability: to what extent can the discoveries of one case be applied beyond the particulars of the observed setting?

5. The issue of Semantic Adequacy: how can the complexity of holistic inquiry be translated into adequate linguistic description?

6. The issue of Credibility: what makes the descriptive report plausible and the data reliable?

The Issue of Observer Effect

This issue concerns the degree of influence or "contamination" the observer has upon the setting, and the subsequent effect this may have on the way other members respond and report to him. In this study, four basic stances were maintained for data collection purposes: 1. The complete participant (concealed observer); 2. The participant as observer; 3. The observer as participant; and 4. The complete observer.
The first is the most difficult to maintain, (and in many situations impossible), but, its ideal potential is that, if successful, the investigator has protected his data from the invalidity of observer effect. For example, in the student participant phases of this investigation, had the instructor or the other student members known my real intentions they may have treated me in some unrepresentative way. As a concealed investigator, I was perceived as a regular student participant and as such was treated no differently because of my investigative purposes. This was absolutely necessary for me to experience the normative developments and the way in which student members come to know the essential rules or and "form" which allows them to operate successfully in the studio classroom setting. This special role allowed greater access to student-related data.

Even though the stance of the concealed observer protects the data against the effects of being observed, the strategy has its limitations. As a concealed observer, the researcher has given up much of his mobility and also looses his option to question his host in ways natural to an interview. Hidden identity constrains the researcher to identify primarily with the sub group of which he has become an active part and therefore delimits the nature of the data he has access to.
In assuming the hidden identity I was able to gain access to student respondent information through informal dialogues with "peer" students. However, I was unable to gain access to the teacher's perspective. Had this one participant observation experience been the sole data collection strategy, my account would be less than holistic.

This limitation was somewhat compensated for by other strategies built into the overall research design. That is, upon completion of the course, my true identity and intentions were discussed with the teacher and at that time the teacher was reflectively interviewed about certain aspects of the study. The follow-up case study, using the same instructor in a similar context then allowed for concentration of data related to the teacher perspective. The multiple comparative case study design was conceived as a method of attending to the problem of limited range of data possible from the particular participant observation stance assumed in a singular case study, with each sequential phase focused on a new perspective for data that was limited in the previous field study.

The issue of observer effect may be more applicable to the participant as observer phase of data collection. Several strategies were employed to minimize observer effects. First, since I had already observed the
instructor in a hidden capacity and was thus knowledgeable of his "everyday" strategy and instructional behavior, I was able to detect observation effects or differences in that pattern. In soliciting the cooperation of the teacher, the fact that I already had knowledge of his pattern relieved him of the threat that he would have to behave in some special way.

Secondly, the effects of the observer on those observed may erode over time, and therefore produce a selective contaminant in observational data. The defense against this was to permit the observer contaminant to wear off, and to begin analysis subsequent to the time when the effect is negligible. In the early weeks of the field experience the specific aim was to attend to minimizing observer effects. Although recordings were made from the beginning, these were not used in the final analysis. Their purpose was to acclimate the subjects to the recording procedures and to allow for the natural process of observer contaminant to wear off. The actual data which was used for encoding and analysis was taken from the last four weeks of the course, long after the effects had minimized.

This is not to say that the earlier observations were not useful. They served the most important function—establishing a sense of "structure" for the new setting
and increasing the investigator's sensitivity to indexical meanings of specific classroom events and contextual language. This knowledge was essential for accurate interpretation during the encoding phase of the research. Not only were the subjects getting used to the data collection operations, they were becoming comfortable with my role and my presence. This pre-data period also served to develop rapport with students and to identify students who could serve as key informants or respondents for the interviews which became increasingly important as data in the final stages of the fieldwork.

It should be noted that the experiences provided previously through the concealed observer investigations provided an additional check for assessing the effect of open observation.

A number of writers (e.g. Bain, 1969; Cullahorn and Strauss, 1960; Wax, 1960) have argued for the participant observation method as a device to circumvent some of the contamination of studies employing an "outside" observer. This is certainly true if the participant has no part in structuring the situation. Webb, et al (1966: 138) have emphasized research tactics in which the observer is unobserved, in support of their rationale that such strategy minimizes contamination effects: They wrote:
The secretive nature of the observer, whether hidden in a crowd, or miles away before a television screen, protects the research from some of the reactive validity threats. The subject is not aware of being tested, there is thereby no concomitant role-playing associated with awareness, the measurement does not work as an agent of change, and the interviewer (observer) effects are not an issue.

This suggested another strategy of using recording devices for ex-post facto analysis. In this investigation, analysis and encoding were accomplished selectively from audio tapes after the field investigation. All verbal interaction was taped so that representative samples could then be randomly selected. This strategy reduced the contamination effect of selected taping. On the other hand, it introduced the disadvantage of additional costs and time in the setting.

It would be foolish to claim that there weren't any observer effects. Mr. Allen admitted that the taping did, in fact, make him more conscious of what he was saying and did make him think a little more about his instructional and critical behaviors. However, the investigation focused on the meaning students perceived from what was actually said or done and therefore, whether the observer's presence affected what was said or done is not at issue.

For the students there was also the intervening effect of a third party who was an interested listener. Some of the interviews in the later part of the course focused there attention to the teacher's verbal interaction
to a greater depth than they may have normally been aware of. Some of the interviewing, in which they expressed their actions and rationalized their behavior, brought to a conscious level what might ordinarily be taken-for-granted.

It should be noted that the goal of an ethnomethodological investigation is to bring to a conscious level the taken-for-granted methods and meanings participants employ in the course of social encounters. Obviously, this cannot be done without having some learning effect on those participants. Had the study measured learning or some particular outcome, then the observer effects would need to be more carefully accounted for in the interpretation of results. Since the study focus is with how the participants construct and maintain a particular reality, the effects of the observer are interwoven as a part of the reality the participants act upon. Therefore the effect is not so much related to the means of dealing with the reality, which is the focus of data analysis.

Despite this important factor of ethnomethodological study, every precaution was taken to keep the effects of data collection to a minimal level.

In this study, the triangulated perspective facilitated the investigator's capacity to assess the reliability of his data. The multiple comparative case
study design allows for the inconsistencies and incon­gruities to be brought to the researcher's attention more easily than designs which are limited to singular cases.

**Distortion Effects and the Reliability of Interview Data**

What factors can we expect to influence the informant's reporting under the imposed conditions of the data gathering context? Would there be ulterior motives for biased reports (e.g. wanting to look better than he actually perceives himself to look)? Were there desires to please the interviewer or to provide the type of information that he was perceived to be seeking? Were other idiosyncratic features at play? Did the interviewer slant the information or "beg the question"? These questions reflect some of the potential distortions to the data that can relate to the observer's presence. In order to minimize distortion, the qualitative researcher must attend to the analysis of his reports in such a way as to be sensitive to possible distortion factors. There are four major distortion factors for firsthand respondent reports:

1. The informant's perception and awareness are weak and he cannot recall significant details, or he just didn't register them in the process.

2. His mental set has selectively perceived the situation producing a distorted perception.
3. He unconsciously modifies his report to fit his own emotional needs.

4. He consciously modifies his report to create a favorable impression of his relation to what has occurred.

Beside these distortions, one must also consider the reactive effects of the interview situation upon the received testimony. Did the subject feel threatened? Did he trust the interviewer? Did he feel that his response could be honest without the threat of reprisal? Was the interview situation conducive to valid information? Did the interviewer organize his strategy to develop the informant's skill to recall the facts of the situation? Did his questions stimulate the details of his descriptive account? Was the interviewer skilled at probing for further clarification? Such questions are best answered by examining the protocol interviews of which Appendix B is examplary.

A participant observer builds in a variety of cross-validation techniques to evaluate the validity of the reports he receives. The most important of these is his own direct observation. For example, during the interview he observes and makes record of the non-verbal behavior (e.g. anxieties, stress, fatigue, anger and other reactive effects which may "color" the intensity of his report). Secondly, an investigator must weigh his own observations against those of individual respondents, since his
own purpose in the setting is observation and should be more accurate than those of participants whose intention was participation.

The dangers of perceptual recollection without behavioral data increase the possibility of fallacious inference. People do not necessarily behave as they perceive themselves to have behaved, nor as they remember. Interpreting a respondent's subjective data is difficult when the attitudes, feelings and behaviors are not part of his present feeling state. This is because of the unintentional tendency we all have to modify our recollections of the past to fit our present way of viewing things. With this in mind, respondent interviews were scheduled closely following the actual event.

Triangulated interviews were employed to check the validity of the individual response. That is, several students were interviewed, sometime separately and at other times collectively. The teacher was also interviewed regarding the same event. Students and the teacher were interviewed after a classroom event, then allowed to listen to the verbal playback of that event, then interviewed again to see how their perception may have become changed. The investigator's interpretation of the event served as the third perspective triangulating the analysis and final account of the particular event.
The Issues of Generalizability and Representative Validity

When scientists speak of representativeness they are speaking of the problem of sample selection. This means the degree of assurance they have that the setting, the subjects or the case study is similar to, and therefore has potential generalization for, its more universal counterparts.

Dunkin and Biddle (1974 p. 80) list two problems which may limit one's ability to select representative samples. The first is a question of the feasibility of access, and the second is cost. Depth research in the classroom is especially time consuming and costly. Therefore it is often necessary to place temporal boundaries on the investigation, which always raises the question of whether the limitations allowed for adequate representation of the phenomenon under study.

Rosenshire and Furst (1973 p. 169) explain the problem:

"Representativeness," has received relatively little study. Insufficient attention has been given to determining whether a sample of observed classroom transactions is a trustworthy representative sample of total behavior.

They claim that the degree of significance of this issue is relative to the specific purposes of a study. They say:

If the purpose is to compare the behaviors of one group of teachers with the behaviors of another group, then the number of observations necessary
to obtain a representative group mean may be small. But if the purpose is to relate instructional activities in individual classes to outcomes obtained in these classes, then the problems of representativeness are perplexing and in need of further study.

Another problem that they discuss is that teaching is considered to be a private affair. Many teachers are unwilling to subject themselves, or their students, to observation. Observation studies have been limited to classrooms where teachers and administrators have given permission for observations. On the average, these teachers possess higher self-images, and overall they tend to be better than average in their instructional performance. Consequently, it is difficult to get a random sampling, since researchers still are dependent upon permission to enter the privacy of the education setting. This significant limitation must affect overall representativeness.

In this investigation, the question of a representative sample was first examined in terms of the local context. The sample was selected as representative of the typical studio art education experience offered to the beginning level student at the Ohio State University. The selection of the course setting was determined by its classification as a "basic fundamental"; and, therefore, structured by common departmental goals and desired outcomes. As was discussed earlier, the teacher/subject was selected because of the
informant consensus that he was an "average", but competent and an experienced studio instructor. Whether or not the university beginning studio classes at Ohio State University are representative of all beginning studio classrooms is another issue.

Although case studies are conducted in such a way as to provide detailed information about social units, they are often criticized for being limited in scope and insufficient for transfer to meaningful generalizations. Representativeness becomes the major issue, in the assessment of the quality and the generalizability of the case studied.

On the theoretical level, however, it may be argued that the findings from case studies can refute theory or lend support to hypotheses. Only through the accumulation of many case study findings, from similar phenomena, can we begin to generate statements about the social world that have little or no exception. If the findings of holistic research are based on, at most, a small sample of comparison cases, can they be generalized? What rationale is there for extrapolation from the individual case study to other instances? This is the question of "external validity". The degree to which the conclusions can be applied elsewhere. Holistic research certainly has served as a basis for generalization for practice.
The Issue of Credibility

The issue of generalizability is also an issue of "credibility". What is it in a holistic account that elicits belief in its readers? Validating materials are of course important to offer evidence for assertions that correspond to facts that the reader already knows about the situation. In addition, an account becomes credible, when, the reader can imagine himself in the situation reported, because the account elicits an empathic response. Successful novelists are such because they are sensitive and skillful observers of human social dynamics. Readers empathize with the characters because of the credibility in the portrayal. But, appeal alone does not equal reliability.

What does offer plausibility is that the essential features discovered and reported offer a "syndrome" that goes beyond the individual or the case study being analyzed. The finding is not just about an individual situation, but a credible discovery is found that applies to many, if not most, similar situations. The reader, in essence, finds the explanation plausible for solving his own perplexities in related situations. Robert Weiss (1968 p.350) offers three traditional positions for justifying a generalization from holistic investigation.
The first rationale is:

The system discovered is a necessary consequence of the environmental pressure under which the case functions.

This belief refers to fundamental structures - that the underlying concept of which some structure "is" regulates what an individual system becomes. This argument would stipulate that one studio drawing class is like another because it complies to the concept "studio drawing class"; it complies to the universals of a basic structure. A specific case becomes a subcultural system within a larger class of cultural systems. A second rationale is:

The essential characteristics of a situation itself require a particular system. Here it is not the concept of a unit of study, but the unit itself, its aims, its character, which establishes the system.

On this basis one would argue that one life drawing class is like another in that the function of both is to learn how to draw the human figure. Their processes may differ but their essential function is the same.

The third argument seems strongest and rests upon the notion of "Comparative Research":

If the same system is found in instances which appear dissimilar, then, it may be expected in instances which are more nearly like those studied.

The essential features of structural patterns are verified through a process of comparative analysis and replication.
In the proposed study, for example, I have observed a variety of different settings and contexts (piano class, dramatic class, lithography, beginning and advanced drawing). In these preliminary studies, my focus remained upon the essential features of studio instruction and student participation. The comparative perspective points to the logical consistencies of the phenomenon in question. Such consistencies began to make themselves "known" over time through the strands of similarity that emerge from each different, but related, case study.

In the second phase of data collection, my role and the observation perspective varied. By necessity, the context and setting also changed. However certain criteria were met to keep the contexts as representative of the "same" type of situation as possible in terms of curriculum, function and instruction. Though in reality, each context produced new problems and differing stimulus to react to, the process of "knowing how to respond and interact" remained the constant focus. Respondent and informant interview techniques allowed for cross-validation. The triangulated process allows the researcher to be reasonably convinced of the validity of his conclusions and provides evidence for his own representativeness as a participant and his own reliability as research instrument.

It is a form of "knowing" in the intuitive sense, and its plausibility comes in the writer's ability to
recreate the intercomplexity of the investigation process and the sincerity and honesty with which cross-validation was pursued. The advantage of this evolving methodology is that it allows for confidence in my capacity or ability to make valid inferences. In subsequent cases, through my actual role experience from past comparative situations I was better equipped for empathic projections.

There is seldom any question, from those committed to holistic inquiry, that their contribution represents assertions about reality which are fully supported by the evidence they have found. Glaser and Strauss (1965) express this same point very well when they say:

The fieldworker knows that he knows, not only because he's been there in the field and because of his careful verification of hypotheses, but because "in his bones" he feels the worth of his final analyses. He has been living with partial analyses for many months, testing them each step of the way...not only by observation and interview but also in daily livable fact.

Weiss (1966) argued that the more analytic course may lead to important generalizations, but it will leave unexplored the fundamental characteristic of living systems and the uniqueness of their organizational structure.

Ethnomethodologists, on the other hand, tend to dismiss the whole issue of generalizability. Their premise for such a dismissal is founded upon the practice in phenomenology of suspending the notion of an objective
reality. This practice is referred to as "bracketing" and it is employed to allow the investigator to focus upon the subjective interpretation of interactive events, or social reality.

For them, the reality of a social experience is found in the participants subjective interpretation of events and is therefore a multi-faceted "reality", and therefore beyond the question of singular generalizability or characterization.

Turner (1974 p.11) offered the argument that the aims of ethnomethodological investigation are not "findings" in the usual sense - that is, findings that have real world replicability and universality. He said:

It is for the reader to decide the extent to which research done under the auspices of this relatively new sociology has been successful. Let me close by emphasizing that this research is intendedly replicable, and let me note that quite modest observations and data collection will permit the student to replicate and/or extend the analysis. 

Turner's rationale suggests that the audience is somewhat accountable for replication. In effect, what he is saying is that the research reporter has the obligation to take as many precautions as necessary in his investigation to assure internal validity; and secondly, he must, in his report, present his evidence so that it reflects plausibility. And yet, even though we find credibility in a specific and holistic account, the instances to which we
may generalize must be similar in those characteristics which determine the "form" that a system takes. The participant observer submerged in the setting must come to know such "form" in order to operate as a true participant in that setting. Such personal knowledge of structure allows the researcher to perceive the degree of match or similarity of essential form between differing settings. The researcher's credibility and the plausibility for generalizations increases if he is convinced, and can convince others, that the essential features of his conclusions were and cannot be disproved in the variety of comparative cases explored. The triangulated research design offers built-in replication and verification, that the singular case study cannot offer.

The Issue of Bias and Objectivity

The ethnomethodological assumption about human behavior is that human actions have meaning and that meanings can be understood through participant perspective involvement. There are, however, important differences between the subjectivity of the participants and that of the ethnomethodologist who is careful never to abandon himself completely to these perspectives. As a participant observer, the researcher constantly monitors his reactions. S. Wilson (1974:19) said it nicely:
The discipline of the research tradition calls for him to constantly monitor and test his reactions. In addition to systematically taking the perspective of the subjects, he also views action from the perspective of the outsider. Also, all the participants in a setting rarely share a monolithic perspective. By systematically seeking to understand actions from the different perspectives of various groups of participants, the researcher avoids getting caught in any one outlook. He is able to view behavior simultaneously from all perspectives.

The triangulated technique of the multiple perspective view is a method for bringing scientific objectivity to subjective experiences.

One operational definition of "objectivity" in science is the assertion that, "any independent scientists viewing the same reality with the same techniques would gather similar data", (Wilson, 1974:20). In discussing the participant observer perspective we have discussed that any observer would not be expected to arrive at the same data for every observer would not know all the various participant perspectives. If, however, the phrase "using the same techniques" was interpreted to mean that each scientist took the pains, here described, to become acquainted with participant meanings, then "objectivity" could indeed be claimed. Scientists could be expected to arrive at similar data.

In his search for answers, the researcher like other human beings, is influenced by tradition, by his environment and by his personality. Such factors can affect the focus and perceptions of classroom events.
Therefore, investigators must face the bias of their interpretive perspectives. Gunnar Myrdal (1964:55) asserted that we must identify our value premises. Through such honesty, we bring "objectivity" to our inquiry, in that, we offer our audience potential grounds to discount our findings should they appear overly "colored" by our biased perspective. He wrote:

The only way in which we can strive for "objectivity" in theoretical analysis is to expose the valuations to full light, make them conscious, specific and explicit, and permit them to determine the theoretical research...I am arguing here that value premises should be made explicit so that research can aspire to be "objective" in the only sense this term can have in the social sciences. But we need also to specify them for the broader purposes of honesty, clarity, and conclusiveness in scientific inquiry.

Briefly what is asserted is that there is nothing wrong with value premises, per se, if they are made explicit and not concealed or implied. We cannot be free of value premise, and as such must make every attempt to make it function for us rather than against us. What Myrdal promotes is a three step process:

1. to raise the valuations actually determining our theoreticals cause and effect and our practical means and ends research to full awareness.

2. to scrutinize them from the point of view of relevance, significance and feasibility in the society under study.
3. to transform them into specific value premises for research, and to determine approach and define concepts in terms of a set of value premises which have been explicitly stated.

Translated to field investigation, the advantage of developing a personal knowledge of values enables the researcher to avoid subconscious guiding of his inquiry toward hidden bias, from his own values or assumptions, or too, from the misperceptions or biased views of informants.

The danger of not facing personal bias is that one tends to share relationships with informants who share similar biases or points of view. Consequently, one chances to contaminate the representative validity of the interview data.

**The Issue of Semantic Adequacy**

Qualitative research can rarely make available all the evidences on which assertions are based and description is bound to the limits of language. Becker (1958:660) wrote:

> The data of participant observation do not lend themselves to...ready summary. They frequently consist of many different kinds of observations which cannot be simply categorized and counted without loosing some of their value as evidence. Yet it is clearly out of the question to publish all of the evidence.

The claim to validity must rest on the writer's capacity to organize the multiplicity of materials within some workable and plausible framework. But how does the
investigator have claim of validity beyond this? He knows that it is so, in the same way that he knows anything at all. Thus the development of a valid interpretive scheme rests heavily on the reporting skill of the investigator.

To a certain degree, the strategy of developing quantitative techniques and encoding systems can facilitate the analysis summary of descriptive displays. Duncan and Hough (1975) have suggested that an overall assessment of reliability and validity of descriptive observation accounts can be made by applying the following criteria and assessing the degree to which they have been met.

1. To the degree to which the account provides adequate description of those aspects of instructional situations that were the focus of observation.

2. To the degree to which the account reports specific, concrete illustrations of those events that were focused on during the observation.

3. To the degree that the account is free from the observer's statement of values.

4. To the degree to which the account is free from the observer's statements of inference.

5. To the degree to which the account is free of characterizations [generalized descriptors] by the observer.

6. To the degree to which two different observers employing the same focus and ground rules for observation concur in their account of the instructional situation [interobserver agreement].
The degree to which an ethnographic account is valid and reliable can be estimated by applying the criteria suggested here. No account, however, can be said to be completely valid or fully reliable. Duncan and Hough are the first to admit that "we always miss the 'truth' of the matter in some degree". Where human observers are used, they have fluctuating adaptation levels and response thresholds. There will always be some degree of incompleteness to an individual's perception.

Summary

This chapter began with an explication of the features of a temporally developing research design. It presented the major premise that the case study design served research goals that are primarily exploratory and descriptive. Accordingly, it demonstrated how this investigation had progressed from a general research focus toward keener discriminations and delimitations of the research phenomenon.

In the second part of the chapter, the five exploratory studies were overviewed. The rationale for each investigation, their settings and populations and the essential features of their design were described. The focus of the description was upon the developing nature of the triangulated research design.
The third part of this chapter focused upon the two case study investigations which, together, serve as the central data collection phase for this study. Specific aspects of the two case study designs were outlined and described. These aspects included: the process by which the representative settings and populations were selected, a description of the characteristics of the population and setting, a presentation of the research questions investigated, and the description of the multiple methods and procedures that were employed in the collection and recording of the data.

A second objective of this chapter was to illustrate how the concept of the triangulated perspective was incorporated into a sequentially phased design. Specifically, this chapter described the evolution of a temporally developing design to accommodate a multiple procedure for achieving a triangulated account of studio classroom appraisal.

The chapter concluded with a review of the traditional issues which relate to the limitations of the case study design. It was demonstrated how this investigation attended to those issues through multiple and triangulated investigation procedures. The multiple method approach was presented as a strategy for generating associated validity checks. It was asserted that each research procedure tapped a different source of data and
that the weakness of any one method used alone is compensated for by the strength provided through its combination with others. When a hypothesis can survive the confrontation of a series of methods of testing, it contains a degree of reliability that is unattainable for propositions that are derived from singular techniques of testing and measurement.
CHAPTER IV

THE PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data collection, research design, and data analysis are highly interrelated and interwoven as components of the participant observation methodology. This unique feature is a necessary condition for the temporally developing research design. The progressive refinement of the observation focus and the eventual delimitation and testing of the key propositions are dependent upon ongoing analysis. This means that much of my effort, while still in the studio classroom setting, was devoted to constant reviewing of the ethnographic data.

Because a running analysis accompanied the process of data collection, many of the key propositions were discovered before the conclusion of the field operation phase of the study. Though I may have been certain of conclusion, I had to provide sufficient evidence to support my propositional claims.

To present plausible evidence necessitated that the data be processed for reporting and summary presentations to support the conclusions of my analyses.
Overview

The link between data collection and analysis is data processing. The aim of this chapter is to describe the data processing which was employed to achieve a triangulated approach for the analytic phase of this investigation.

The first part of the chapter describes the processing of ethnographic data for qualitative analysis. The second part describes how the data were then processed into a subscript code system for use with the Observation System for Instructional Analysis. It reviews the procedures for coding the transcribed episodes of evaluative interaction and examines the operations for automatic computer processing. The chapter concludes by describing the quantitative summary displays which resulted from the O.S.I.A. processing operations.

Part One

Processing Data for Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis is the ordered process the researcher employs to make sense of his many pages of ethnographic notation. It is an ongoing process intricately linked to the temporally developing process.
It is the effort to formally identify themes and to construct or support descriptive propositions as they are suggested by the data.

Until the qualitative data is ordered in some way, the analysis of relationships cannot begin. One of the most fundamental operations in this analysis is the discovery and structuring of significant classes of things, reducing the phenomena into the properties or subclassifications which characterize them. This procedure is commonly referred to as "analytic reduction", and is a continuous process aimed toward the discovery of key propositions. Schatzman and Strauss (1973) referred to analytic reduction as the "making of key linkages". Essentially, the operation "links" the classified categories of events, and is a process of making relational connections between the isolated categories. Making key linkages such connection is essential for reaching some degree of analytic closure.

**General Notation Indexing**

In this study, the initial ordering strategy for field notation was accomplished through the use of three shorthand indexes, recorded in the field note margins. These were: "Methodological notations" (MN), "Observational notations" (ON), and "Theoretical notations" (TN) (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973).
Methodological Notations (MN) were used to index descriptive segments related to the procedural operations or methodological concerns of the data collection process. For example, the following field notation excerpt related to my perception of analytic reduction. It is quoted directly from the second week of the last case study.

MN: Aside from the introduction of the audio recording equipment, the most significant methodological activity was the beginning of the review of the notations from the previous field study. After about fifteen hours of analysis, I am only through the second week of notation. It is amazing to see the new perspective and insights I can now add through the stance of complete observer. I am able to fill in answers and make theoretical connections between aspects that seemed so perplexing from the participant perspective. I am able to fill in constructs which developed later as well as perceive new theoretical propositions. The degree to which the data can be expanded through triangulated analysis offers additional support for its implementation. The new perspective is able to add a dimension of holism which was absent in the singular perspective of the student participant. Being away from the problems of participation, and being able to now perceive the isolated instances as a part of the historical progression of events which followed facilitated the easy flow of theoretical connection. The field notations serve the function of preserving the steps of refinement of a problem focus which can come taken-for-granted in the natural progression of events. The notes contain a wealth of information. How I shall ever correlate them into one dissertation is the current perplexity. (January 18, 1977)

Observational Notations (ON) indexed the descriptive accounts of informant perceptions or direct observations of phenomena related to the research problem focus. An example follows:
ON: As the critique progressed the student's body tonus became increasingly relaxed. Students who received judgments that were primarily positive in nature showed less overall tension in bodily tonus. Betty, for example, is verbally aggressive and has been independent throughout the course. Her body stance was open, and her arms moved fluently during conversation. Janice, on the other hand, kept her body rigid, facing the work and not the teacher, and kept her arms tightly crossed across her breasts. The teacher comments that were made were constructive but negative. Betty in contrast, positioned herself in a relaxed leaning pose, with arms widespread and legs crossed. She faced Me. Allen, frequently smiling and joking and varying her facial expressions. Janice kept the same approximate facial expression, occasionally nodding throughout, but made little effort to initiate topics or prolong the critique. Betty's critique lasted seventeen minutes and Janice's was eleven minutes even though both had the same amount of work. (February 10, 1977)

N.B. Betty received an A- for her mid-term grade and Janice received a C-. (marginal insert 2/11/77).

A third type of shorthand classification is the Theoretical Notation (TN). These indexed "key linkage" statements, or propositional hunches, that begin to emerge as the perceived relationship among observed events. For example, a theoretical notation, which followed the observational notation above, reads:

TN: The degree of security and positive self-regard may be indicated by the degree to which the student makes eye contact with the teacher during evaluative dialogue, as well as to the degree to which he initiates or cultivates that dialogue. (February 10, 1977)

Upon the completion of the sixth field investigation, the field notations were reviewed and 186 potential propositions were abstracted from the theoretical
notations. These statements were then analyzed further for the relationships with one another and then grouped into seven related sets. The final field residence served as a pilot investigation to confirm or refine the sets through comparative analyses, field testing, and through the collection of further relevant data which could be encoded, quantified and statistically analyzed.

Any given TN was potentially a mini-proposition. Some theoretical notations became the core of the analytic scheme. When such patterns became apparent and were confirmed in subsequent observation their describable relationship was elaborated in a separate essay, then filed in a separate volume called, "Theoretical Asides".

"Theoretical Asides" receive major support from the qualitative evidence provided in the field notations which both create and endorse them. As the investigation progressed, specific propositions would be abstracted into related classification terms that could serve as specific indexing data.

**Specific Notation Indexing**

Schatzman and Strauss (1973) described three major classifications for specific indexing terminology. These are: common classes, special classes, and theoretical classes.
Common Classes are the common labels, terms or everyday generalizations that are used in conversation. They are the terms that enable us to classify and perceive differences in things, persons and events. They are the descriptive words used in everyday language. Examples of these would be: "evaluation", "beginning student", "demonstration", "sketching", "teacher", "lesson", "assignment".

Special Classes are the special terms or labels that have meaning within the specific contexts in which they are used. Special classes are the classification that persons within selected areas of interests or particular settings use to distinguish things within their immediate province. For the researcher, there are two types - the "emic" and the "etic" classes.

"Etic" classes are those labels employed in the scientific community. These are the array of discriminatory classes, which allow the investigator to organize and classify events in the site. Examples of this type would be: "managerial arrangements", "soliciting clarification", "valence", "cognitive dissonance", "intrinsic motivation", and "positive judgment".

"Emic" classes are those which are the labels and contextual classes used by the subjects themselves. In this investigation, that meant the categorizations and labels employed by the studio teacher or the art students.
Examples of emic classes would be: "open labs", "warm-ups", "group-crits", "gestures", "contours", "portfolio critique", "positive-negative space", "nice stuff", "planer application", and "pointalism".

Theoretical Classes are those which are invented by the researcher. They are his own constructs, whether the nomenclature is borrowed from other sources, or completely novel. They are founded upon the experience of observation and are demonstrably applicable and useful to its analysis. Some examples from this investigation would be: "continuum ranking", "prescriptive manding", "aesthetic eclectic", "flash appraisal", "visual eavesdropping", "hustle mands", and "preference zoning".

This third class is not available to the researcher until he has observed in the field for some time. The investigator begins the initial analysis and organization indexing of persons, events, and acts by using the "common" and "special" classes to establish conceptual continuity and to establish the boundary limitations of his inquiry. As his investigation progresses, he perceives a need to redesign or invent specific classes for relevant variables of his observation focus, he replaces earlier and simpler classification with his own sets of theoretical classes. The result being a set, or sets, of theoretical classes which structure the refined observations and make them amenable for theory construction and testing.
This procedure was adopted and used in relation with another strategy for processing transcribed dialogues and interviews. This related process is known as "zetacoding".

Zetacoding

Zetacoding is an ethnomethodological processing system adapted from Moores (1951, 1956). The procedure is arduous but also useful in illuminating theoretical classes. The procedure is to first collect a large assortment of "field" excerpts from recorded events or interviews, (one statement per index card).

In this study, key statements were extracted from audio tapes during playback analysis as well as taken from transcribed interviews. The cards were then labeled with one or more categorical descriptors, (e.g. "breaching", "eavesdropping", "continuum ranking"). The procedure is similar to developing a library indexing system.

Once several hundred items have been indexed, the analyst begins to "converse" with the deck of cards. That is, he begins to sort and regroup cards, often subdividing them into more qualitative classifications. He searches them for similarity or inconsistency. Descriptors are compared for aspects which may interrelate them, or place them in some hierarchial scheme. Similarly, descriptors with no similar meaning can be contrasted. The
more the researcher "interrogates or converses" with the decks, the more he discovers their individual relation to the larger phenomena of which they are part.

To process the field notations, I made use of the procedure of typing notations on reproducible masters. This procedure enabled the zetacodes to be inserted as marginal indexes and provided a means to file the isolated descriptions. Individual file folders were made for each sub-classification code and the duplicated data were cross-filed accordingly. This process greatly facilitated retrieval in the final analysis and research reporting phase.

**Processing the Audio Recordings**

Isolated classroom dialogues and informal recorded interviews were also indexed and filed. The method involved transcription codes to facilitate dual analysis. Specifically, the method incorporates a variety of typed character symbols to indicate qualitative dimensions of conversational sequencing and linguistic sound production. This processing allowed for an additional ethnomethodological operation - conversation analysis of the methods for producing critical talk. Transcribed episodes using the codes are provided throughout Chapter V and in Appendix B.
I: **Sequencing and Structuring**

// S: well I was //

T: where's the other one?

Tl: Is that the one?

S1: Yeah, right
S2: I think so

S1: Will you
S2: Don't you think

T: are these done at the same time = done over or what?

(34) T: I like this one (4), yeah it's nice.

S: you better believe it -- or else.

II: **Sound Production**

S: We::11 I dunno:w.

(h) S: You're kidding (h)

---

The double oblique indicates the point at which the speaker's talk is interrupted and cut off by the listener.

The single bracket connecting two utterances indicates where the talk of one speaker is overlapped by another.

Double brackets indicate that the two utterances began simultaneously.

The equal sign indicates latching, i.e. no interval between the end of a prior and the start of a new piece of talk. It is also used to indicate an utterance 'repair', that is to correct the prior utterance.

Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in seconds.

The double dash indicates a brief but unmeasured pause.

A colon indicates the prior syllable is prolonged. Multiple colons indicate a very prolonged sound.

The letter h in parentheses indicates laughter.
S: I hate this one.

CAPS S: Like WOW, that's tough.

III: Reader's Guide

( ) S. I think (six) times.

(?) okay (?)

(( )) T: ((The teacher picks up another drawing))

Underscoring indicates various forms of stressing and usually involves a change in pitch and volume.

Words in upper case letters indicate an extreme emphasis in pitch or volume.

Words or phrases in single parentheses indicate that the transcriber is not sure about the word or that the recording was poor at that point.

A question mark inside of a single parentheses indicates an implied question or a rhetorical question.

Material inside double parentheses indicates features of the interaction other than the audio materials, other than the actual verbalizations.

Conversational Analysis

Conversational analysis examines dialogue in order to describe the hearer-speaker relationships and the practices they employ to accomplish conversation. This process investigates conversation structures. Conversational structures may then be examined for the social knowledge and interpretive procedures that speaker-hearers selectively use to construct conversation.
The information that conversationalists need to understand each other is not located completely in the linguistic utterances alone. Utterances are often sketchy or vague or they make assumptions that the listener is knowledgeable of factors which would insure mutual understanding of what is said. Conversationalists must look elsewhere than to what was said in order to interpret the meaning of what was said. They must attempt to contextually provide for features which include the knowledge of the biography of the speaker and his general dialogue or interaction pattern. That is, to perceive the meaning of what is said, participants must be able to infer the speaker's general purpose or intention. To do this, the listener must take into account the circumstances of the context in which the utterance was spoken as well as the antecedent events which qualify the specific usage of words or phrases.

Though this investigation focused on the mid-term critique, the first five weeks of participant observation served to establish sufficient understanding of the antecedent events to enable me to make valid assessments of the meaning of judgmental phrases employed in the critique sessions. Aesthetic criteria and the terms or phrases which are used to represent them are "scenic-bound". That is, their interpretation is bound to the circumstances and the setting in which they are used.
When a second observer was invited to describe the critiques, she found them to be "ambiguous, generally vague and meaningless". My own perception was different. I had little difficulty in classifying the interaction or comprehending the intention of the appraisal terms. As a participant in the scene, I had become aware of the vocabulary as the student participants themselves had become aware of it.

To test the validity of my assumption, a triangulation experiment was designed. A sample critique was transcribed and appraisal utterances were underscored. My own interpretations were then recorded. The student involved was interviewed in relation to her interpretation. Mr. Allen was then interviewed in relation to his intentionality. It was found that though the student was not always able to articulate the concepts or criteria as well as Mr. Allen or myself, she was able to point to instances of it. Some of the criteria were slightly misinterpreted by the student, but their positive or negative connotation remained clear. An additional factor in my capacity to infer the meaning of Mr. Allen's statements was that throughout the early part of the course I had been informally questioning him in relation to the cross-validation of any perceived ambiguity in my observations. This factor, in addition to the fact that I had participated as his student in the previous case
study, provided me with a knowledge of him and the setting that the second observer was denied.

It might be concluded that without adequate knowledge of the scene, prior to coding operations, the systematic observer may be misperceiving the meaning of language or events, since he is unlikely to "see" those events in the same way as the participants.

Therefore, conversational analysis is an operation that begins after adequate knowledge and familiarity with the context in which the conversation occurred. For purposes of this investigation, the analysis focused upon the methods of doing appraisal. Specifically, the analysis attended to such factors as: the initiation of topics, the control of topics, conversational turn-taking, utterance repairs, overlapped dialogue, the interrupted dialogue, and the topic switch, utterance linkages and sequencing, pausing, and sound production characteristics. The reader is referred to Speier (1973) for a more extensive treatment of conversation analysis and the study of face-to-face communication.

The Limitations of Qualitative Analysis

A perennial problem with qualitative analysis is the conveying of the credibility of a proposition or theory. The standard approach to this problem is presenting data as evidence for conclusions, thus indicating the way by which the analyst obtained his theory from the data. However,
since qualitative data do not lend themselves to ready summary, the analyst usually presents characteristic illustrations and, if also attempting provisional proofs, accompanies them with crude tables. If the theory encompasses a multitude of ideas, to illustrate each idea would be too burdensome for the reader. Thus the qualitative analyst will only present enough material to facilitate comprehension, which is typically not enough data to evaluate all the propositions and ideas.

Another way of conveying credibility of a theory along with the use of illustrations is to use quantitative displays through codified procedures for analyzing the data. An effort is made to code all relevant data that can be brought to bear on a point and then the assemblage, assessment and analysis of this data is accomplished in a systematic fashion that will statistically summarize a proof for a given proposition. Part two of this chapter explicates the specific encoding procedures and operations that were implemented to produce quantitative processing of the data for statistical summary and display.

Part Two

The Processing of Data for Quantitative Analysis

We have seen that coding and classification is a natural part of the processing and analysis of qualitative data. Social scientists now promote formal methods of
constructing coding schemes that allow for quantification and statistical analysis of the qualitative dimensions of their research problems. (Becker, 1958), (Tufte, 1970).

This investigation was designed to blend both qualitative and quantitative descriptions of events. This section describes the development of the subscripted coding scheme which has allowed for this blend. It discusses the processing procedures which enabled the qualitative data to be amenable to systematic coding and computer processing.

Classroom Observation and the Problem of Measurement

The fundamental aspect of research is the defining of categories to permit one to classify observations in appropriate ways so that general statements can be made. Each dimensional category will exhibit some intrinsic and mutually exclusive characteristic that permits one to observe its regularities and continuities. From the systematic process of classification and measurement one can move toward reconstruction of the phenomena and eventually toward a theoretical generalization. The measurement process can be broken down into five steps: (1) the property is defined; (2) the material is sorted into observable categories; (3) the researcher tallies observation counts; (4) the counts are reviewed through systematic analysis; and (5) the relationships are developed into
theoretical propositions.

To make a measurement three elements are required: (1) something to be measured; (2) an instrument to be used in making the measurement; and (3) the act of judgment on our part. The process is simple with tangible objects and reliable instruments, (i.e. to weigh a point of copper). If, however, the something to be measured is an abstract concept expressed by a behavioral phenomenon, the problem becomes more complex. The first step involves adequate clarification and operational definitions which establish the ground rules for observation and encoding. A second problem becomes the development of an adequate instrument which can reliably measure, or quantify, dimensions of qualitative events.

Constructing the Coding Scheme

The main purpose of coding is to simplify the handling of many individual responses or observations by classifying them into a smaller number of groups, each containing responses that are similar in content or kind.

There are two basic approaches to the construction of encoding schemes - the inductive approach and the deductive approach. The inductive system records data as closely as possible to their original detail and postpones categorization and encoding. This process of data collection usually employs a combination of ethnographic notation with audio or video recording technology. Code
schemes are developed after the field residency and in relation to the questions that the investigator has raised from having lived in the scene, having recorded the qualitative dimensions of its historical progression events, and having combed through his descriptive notations.

On the other hand, the deductive system requires that the data be encoded in the scene, as the record is being made, and through the use of a precoded classification scheme. The deductive approach is characteristic of traditional systematic observation. Some limitations of the purely deductive approach in the classroom were presented in Chapter II.

The premise was taken that for exploratory research, or pilot investigations, data should be collected without a predetermined or predesigned system of categories. With an inductive system, the procedure is to select a representative sampling of responses and to construct a coding scheme from the categorical typologies that emerged from the ongoing analysis of the ethnographic data.

This is not a simple procedure. Categories are not easily identified. The process involved one of switching back and forth, redefining ground rules for encoding or reclassifying major categories into subclassifications. The chief advantage of the inductive approach is that it allowed for the construction of instrumentation specific to the measurement of variables related to the research focus.
The preference for either system is dependent on the nature of the study and the specific research questions posed in the investigation. Whichever system is chosen, the requirements for a good system are the same. The first requirement is that the coding scheme be linked to the problem under study. The second requirement is that the categories be exhaustive. That is, that the categories be constructed so that each and every response or behavior can be classified. The last requirement is that the categories be mutually exclusive. That is, so that categories do not overlap and that each case is classified only once.

The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (O.S.I.A.)

Of the some two hundred observation systems now available to the classroom investigator, few are flexible enough to meet a variety of contextual needs. An exception, however, is found in The Observation System for Instructional Analysis, (Duncan and Hough, 1975), hereafter referred to as "O.S.I.A." Unlike most systems, O.S.I.A. meets the requirements of both the inductive and the deductive approaches.

The system was originally conceived as a deductive model by Hough (1967), and developed as a modification of the Flanders System for Instructional Analysis, (Flanders, 1960). O.S.I.A. has undergone four major revisions and,
in its current deductive/inductive option, has surpassed most traditional approaches. Its attractiveness is in the built-in feature which allows the investigator to inductively design up to twenty subscript classifications for each of its thirteen basic categories. O.S.I.A. also has been shown to be well-suited to blending systems observation with ethnographic recording, (Duncan and Hough, 1975).

One of its major features is that O.S.I.A. can record eight levels of instructional foci simultaneously. **Figure One** (reproduced with permission of the authors) diagrams the eight levels of instructional events coded by the current versions of O.S.I.A.

In the first level, O.S.I.A. provides for multiple points of view in the observation process (triangulation). One can now look at instruction from the perspective of the teacher, or the student, or any other focus that the investigator wishes to define, (e.g. the teacher's aid). A focus on the student, for example, would attend primarily to the behavior of a particular student. The teacher's behavior would be coded only if it was part of the interaction with the student subject.

The second level of the instructional event is the instructional setting, whether it be with the entire class, a small group, tutorial, or independent or another setting to be described by the observer. In this way
1. What is the focus of observation
   - the teacher
   - a student
   - the instructional setting
   - other

2. What is the instructional setting of the observation
   - a class setting
   - a group setting
   - a tutorial setting
   - an independent setting
   - other

3. What is the source of instructional events
   - a teacher
   - a student
   - other

4. What are the instructional functions
   - Substantive
   - Managerial
   - Appraisal
   - Other
   - Categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
   - Categories 8, 9, 10, 11
   - Categories 12, 13, X

5. What sub-categories of instructional functions
   - Substantive
     - Explicate
     - Arrange
   - Managerial
     - Structure
     - Admonish
   - Appraisal
     - Express
     - Accentuate

6. What communication modes
   - Spoken
   - Unspoken
   - Mediated

7. What communication strategy
   - Direct
   - Expository
   - Interactive
   - Reciprocal
   - Independent
   - Private

8. What specific subscripted events
   - Up to 20 subscripts for each of the basic categories

Figure 1

Eight Levels of Instructional Events Coded by O.S.I.A.
there can be a clearly noted code which will enable the analyst to reconstruct the nature of the instructional event, or allow him to process a specific type of instructional setting, (e.g. tutorial behaviors). The notation of the setting is not encoded with every entry, but just when the nature of the instructional setting changes. In the studio context, this is a frequent occurrence.

The third level of events which can be coded is the source of the instructional phenomena. In the traditional approaches two sources were offered, either the teacher or the student. O.S.I.A. can accommodate other sources, for example, mediated instruction, a cooperating teacher, a student teacher, a principle, and even situations that involve several instructors.

The fourth level of the instructional event is the coding of instructional functions which are divided into four groupings: substantive, managerial, appraisal and other. Instructional subfunctions are the fifth level. They cut across the basic categories, and help identify the basic and gross differences in the way that each instructional category is performed.

The sixth level relates to whether the performance is verbal, non-verbal or mediated. That is it can take into account the significance of the gestural language that gives meaning to instructional behavior, as well as spoken and mediated overt behavior.
The seventh level is the communication strategy, whether it be direct (expository), interactive (reciprocal) or independent (private).

The eighth level provided by the system is the subscript level. Computerized processing allows for up to twenty subscript classifications for each of the O.S.I.A. categories. These subscripts are designed to suit the particular needs of qualitative research by subdividing general categories into the qualitative dimensions of a particular class of behaviors. It is precisely this feature which allows for O.S.I.A. to be used either as an inductive system, or as a deductive system.

Early in the field observations, O.S.I.A. served as an "etic" perspective from which I could initially structure the instructional events. When combined with participant observation and ethnographic description, the O.S.I.A. general categories could be broken down into the qualitative subclassifications pertinent to the studio classroom setting. This procedure was the essential feature in the development of the subscripts that were used in the final analysis of the studio classroom critiques.

O.S.I.A. allows for the design of more subscript codes that could feasibly be handled. The thirteen general categories (22 including the managerial and separation designators) can be multiplied by the eight subfunction levels and then again by the twenty subscript
designators. With the additional designators of teacher, student and other this makes it possible to have as many as 10,560 coded categories, (114 were used in this investigation).

It is possible then, to develop a ninth level of O.S.I.A. if one further subclassifies the subscripted categories and redefines the designator to fit the subclassification scheme.

Ethnographic description allowed me to develop the subscripts through an "emic" perspective that had been gained from participation in the instructional scene. Subscript refinement was initiated from the behavioral classes that were designated during the ongoing analysis of ethnographic data.

O.S.I.A. Category Definitions

The thirteen basic categories of the O.S.I.A. are defined as follows: (Hough and Duncan, 1975)

(1) Thinking: Any nonappraisal behavior in which a person is apparently reflecting on some substantive or managerial aspect of classroom instruction. The behavior is essentially one of being in conscious communication with one's self.

(2) Sensing: Any nonappraisal behavior in which a person uses one of his senses (seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting, smelling) to take in information from an external source. The behavior is essentially one of being in sensory contact with one's external environment.
(3) **Manipulating Artifacts:** Any nonappraisal behavior in which one manipulates (work with) instructional artifacts (curriculum materials).

(4) **Initiates:** Any spoken, unspoken or mediated non-appraisal behavior that presents substantive or managerial information to another or others. The initiating behavior may be an expression of knowledge and/or an expression of feeling states or value preference.

(5) **Responding:** Any spoken, nonappraisal behavior that responds substantively or managerially to an element in the instructional situation (i.e. the antecedent behavior of self or another or an instructional artifact(s)). The responding behavior may be a spoken expression of knowledge, and/or an expression of a feeling state or value preference.

(6) **Soliciting Clarification:** Any manifest non-appraisal behavior (spoken and/or unspoken) that evokes or is intended to evoke from another person the fuller meaning of an antecedent behavior of that other person or a product of his behavior. The antecedent behavior may have involved expressions of knowledge, expressions of feeling states or value preferences, and/or expressions through motor behavior. The behavior intended to evoke the fuller meaning may be in the form of a question, director, or suggestion.

(7) **Soliciting:** Any manifest (spoken and/or unspoken) nonappraisal behavior that evokes or is clearly intended to evoke substantive and/or managerial behavior from another person in the instructional situation. Specifically excluded here are those behaviors which fall in the category of soliciting clarification. The soliciting behaviors may be expressions of knowledge, expressions of feeling states or value preferences, or expressions through motor behavior.

(8) **Judging Correctness:** Any manifest (spoken and/or unspoken) behavior that responds or reacts to an antecedent behavior of the self or another or to a product of such behavior appearing in the instructional situation by judging the behavior or the product of behavior to have been logically, empirically, or normatively correct in some degree. Publically accepted criteria are invoked or could be invoked to support the judgment.
(9) **Personal Positive Judging**: Any manifest behavior (spoken and/or unspoken) that responds or reacts to a person (self or another), an antecedent behavior of the self or another, or to a product of such behavior appearing in the instructional situation by expressing a personal, positive judgment about the person, behavior or product of behavior. The criteria for making the judgment are personal and arise from the feeling states or value preferences of the person doing the judging.

(10) **Acknowledging**: Any manifest (spoken and/or unspoken) behavior that responds or reacts to a person (self or other), an antecedent behavior of the self, or of another, or to a product of such behavior appearing in the instructional situation by acknowledging the person, behavior, or product in ways that indicate that the person, behavior, or product has been perceived. No judgment is expressed.

(11) **Judging Incorrectness**: Any manifest (spoken and/or unspoken) behavior that responds or reacts to an antecedent behavior of the self or another or to a product of such behavior appearing in the instructional situation by judging the behavior or the product of behavior to have been logically, empirically, or normatively incorrect in some degree. Publicly accepted criteria are invoked or could be invoked to support the judgment.

(12) **Personal Negative Judging**: Any manifest behavior (spoken and/or unspoken) that responds or reacts to a person (self or another), an antecedent behavior of the self or another, or to a product of such behavior by expressing a personal, negative judgment about the person, behavior or product of behavior. The criteria for making the judgment are personal and arise from the feeling states or value preferences of the person doing the judging.

(13) **Instructional Nonfunctional Behavior**: This category includes all instances of behavior that are not clearly related in a functional way to instruction or classroom management.
Categories one through seven are also differentiated as being either "substantive" or "managerial". The distinction is defined as follows:

Substantive Behavior: Any manifest behavior that is directly associated with facilitating the attainment of new learnings or sustaining or extinguishing prior learnings that are considered by those in the instructional situation to be a legitimate part of the subject matter of the field under study.

Managerial Behavior: Any manifest, nonappraising behavior that is directly associated with creating nonsubstantive conditions that facilitate the attainment of new learnings or sustaining or extinguishing prior learnings. The creation of such conditions may involve: (1) attaining, sustaining or extinguishing non-substantive learnings (i.e., learnings not directly related to the subject matter of the field under study) that are considered pre-conditions to the attainment of new learnings or the sustaining or extinguishing of prior learnings; (2) the activating, directing, redirecting or terminating previously learned non-substantive behavior in such a way as to influence a person to be set to learn.

This distinction can be indicated by preceding the basic category number with a zero (e.g. T 04).

Feasibility Testing of the O.S.I.A.

So that the feasibility of using the O.S.I.A. could be established for an art education context I conducted a preliminary pilot study in an art education classroom setting. The system proved useful and was judged to be adaptable for the successful encoding of art instructional events. Its potential for subscript development was then explored, developed and refined.
The Sevigny Subscript System for the O.S.I.A.

The function of the subscript is to perform the scientifically fruitful task of providing a highly differentiated, and thereby sensitive, grid that makes it possible for a fine-grained and more precise rendering of the qualitative differences in the site and in the structure of the instructionally related phenomena.

The Sevigny Subscript System for the O.S.I.A. was developed to meet the specific needs of this investigation focus by providing a quantification system for further analysis of the qualitative dimensions of studio classroom interaction.

After the categories were selected they were translated into numerical and letter symbols to be amenable to encoding, computer key-punching and automatic processing. The 114 code symbols and category descriptors are provided in Appendix C.

Processing the Audio Recordings

The investigation focus of observation, encoding and analysis was upon the tutorial summative critique. That is, in the studio classroom setting, students are individually assessed in terms of a feedback summary of their production performance for particular intervals. In the settings studied, two such assessments were conducted - one at the mid-term point and the other at the
course termination. The "mid-term critique" not only served the teacher to give feedback and to grade the work, it also served the student to redefine goals for his subsequent performance in the setting.

Since this critique served the dual function of appraisal and goal setting, it was selected as the focal point both for ethnomethodological and event interaction analysis. The specific procedural operation for collecting audio tapes was described in the previous chapter. A processing of the audio tapes included the ethnomethodological procedures described in Part One of this chapter. The transcribed interaction were then coded using my subscripted system. Encoding was checked for reliability and then translated to computer keypunch cards. Punching was validated and keypunch errors were corrected before computer processing.

Computer Processing

Individual student critique sessions were processed for O.S.I.A. computer display. Individual cases were then selected and classified into four comparative clusters: (1) students consistently earning the highest achievement scores, (2) students consistently earning the lowest achievement scores, (3) students earning mid-range achievement scores, and (4) students who had improved their grade standing by one or more levels between the mid-term grade period and the final grade period.
Variable Control

The Sex Variable

Ethnomethodological analysis had shown that there was a significant difference in the averaged interaction time between the teacher with male students and the teacher with female students. To control for this difference, the decision was made to limit the clustered analysis to female subjects. Because of the class size and the grade distribution, groupings were limited to three students each. Their selection was based upon their rank ordering by the studio instructor's assigned grade for the end of the quarter. (Males were also coded for comparative purpose but analyzed as individual cases).

The Production Variable

The studio work that was critiqued was comprised of the collection of classroom exercises produced by the participants for the first five weeks of the course. The total number of production items was the same for each participant.

Setting Variables

The general managerial operations, and the critique conditions were the same for all students. Data collection strategies were consistent for all students.
Research Subquestions for Data Processing and Analysis

The ethnographic data and audio recordings were encoded and reviewed to provide descriptive information related to the following researchable subquestions:

Subquestion One: Are there any observable and describable differences in the characteristics and pattern of the teacher's summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged high in achievement as opposed to the characteristics and pattern of his summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged as low in achievement?

Subquestion Two: Are there any observable and describable differences in the way that students who have earned higher achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior as opposed to the way students earning lower achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior?

The first subquestion asks for an analysis to describe any differences in the instructor's appraisal interaction with students he judges favorably as opposed to his interaction patterns with those he judges less favorably. The second subquestion asks for an analysis that describes the differences, of any, in the perspective views and the student/teacher interactive patterns of the students who have earned contrasting summative grades.
Validity and Reliability

Validity refers to the extent to which the testing instrument measures those things which it purports to measure. The Observation System for Instructional Analysis was designed to meet the requirements through careful selection of its categorization and careful definition given to each of them.

An exploratory study was conducted by Broadwater (1972) to determine the representative validity of the basic O.S.I.A. He tested the degree to which items represent that which they were intended to measure. Inter-observer agreement was calculated to determine the degree to which an observer's encoding of the same event is in agreement with another encoder's or with the instrument standard.

Broadwater found that encoders were in general agreement regarding the behaviors recorded. However, he found that the substantive behaviors (those dealing with instructional content information) were tallied with a high inter-observer agreement than were the appraisal behaviors. The result of Broadwater's study was that the 1970 version of the O.S.I.A. was revised to re-classify appraisal categories and clarify the definition and to give greater specificity to the particular variations involved. The present expanded version of the O.S.I.A. reflects improvements to instrument validity that result
from the recommendation of Broadwater's study.

**Inter-Observer Agreement**

As part of my indoctrination to data processing using the revised O.S.I.A., I subscribed to two ten-week training sessions to increase the reliability of my own encoding practice. An inter-observer reliability check was calculated in the sixth week of the advanced training session. Eleven trainees encoded the same audio recorded episode, using the standard O.S.I.A. categories. Inter-observer agreement was calculated by using the Scott Coefficient formula, \( \pi_i = \frac{Po - Pe}{1 - Pe} \), where "\( \pi_i \)" is the proportion of agreement, and "\( Pe \)" is the proportion of agreement excepted by chance. "\( Pe \)" is found by squaring the proportion of tallies in each category and summing these over all categories (see Scott, 1955).

Table 2 summarizes the coefficients of agreement for the five highest scoring observers (the trainer was Coder #2 and I was coder #3).
TABLE 2
INTER-OBSERVER AGREEMENT, O.S.I.A. TRAINING PERIOD

August, 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coder</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Group average coefficient = .83
Average coefficient coder #3 = .86

Table 3 indicates the standard interpretation for the Scott Coefficient calculations.

TABLE 3
THE SCOTT COEFFICIENT CORRELATION INTERPRETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.25</th>
<th>.50</th>
<th>.75</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The general standard for research purposes is .80 or better.

Although the overall scores reflect an acceptable research standard, it should be noted that the calculation served a second purpose. Misperceptions in the basic
ground rules, or incongruities of categorical interpretations, were corrected for in the remaining weeks of the training session. The result being that my inter-observer agreement rose consistently to the .90+ range.

Intra-Observer Agreement

Intra-observer agreement is the coder's agreement with himself to the degree that he is consistent over time. For purposes of this investigation, modifications of the O.S.I.A. were necessary to provide for an expanded subscript system. In cases where the investigator has designed a unique system, the designer becomes his own standard. The only means to calculate reliability becomes a check with one's self. This procedure is called "intra-observer agreement".

Intra-observer agreement calculations, using the Scott Coefficient were used to check the consistency and reliability of encoding using The Sevigny Subscript System.

Procedures

Two sample critique episodes were selected. The two samples represented dialogues with mid-range achieving students. The rationale for this choice was that a median achievement range student critique would be likely to have a wider range of both positive and negative appraisal behaviors than would the appraisal interactions with
students in the high or low achievement range.

The basic procedure was to transcribe the recorded episodes. The first copy of the transcribed verbal interaction was encoded using the Sevigny Subscript Modification System. On the following day, a second transcription was again encoded. As a further check to consider the margin of error involved in keypunching, the encoded transcripts were transferred to Fortran code sheets, keypunched, then computer calculated. These computer scores were used for calculating the Scott Coefficient. Two intro-observer reliability checks were made. The first one prior to encoding the investigation data and one at the completion of the encoding phase. In the precoding check a Scott Coefficient of .97 was calculated.

From these calculations, it was assumed that encoding practice, using the extensive subscript system was reliably consistent during the encoding phase of this investigation.

Decoding Operations

Decoding is fundamentally, the reverse of encoding. It is the process of interpreting what the computer displays of coded data to more accurately describe the complex behaviors and events that make up an instructional episode.
The preliminary stage of analysis consists of quite ordinary methods designed to provide straightforward descriptions of the data. Once coded, each item is summarized in some tabular form, and measures, such as averages and percentages, and are calculated to describe instructional event characteristics.

**Frequency Distributions** are sometime referred to as "univariate frequency". They summarize the frequency of observations in each category of a variable. Summarizing frequencies is only the first step in the analysis. Next the frequencies are converted into figures that can be interpreted and interrelated. An absolute frequency is meaningless in itself; it needs to be compared with other frequencies. These comparisons are the ratio and percentage figures.

There are a number of distribution summary display options available to those who use or modify the O.S.I.A. The choice depends on the nature of the research question. Five of these options were employed in this study. These are matrixes, flow charts, variable analysis, subscript analysis, and chain and pool analysis.

**Matrix Displays** are designed to give a picture of instructional patterns, and are particularly useful in studying interactive relationships and instructional strategies. Matrices are ordered to provide information related to sequential pairing and patterning of the coded
behaviors. The matrix display is made up of four multi-celled quadrants. Each cell representing a particular paired sequence. Separate quadrants give information related to teacher behavior, student behavior, student to teacher behavior, and teacher to student behavior. The basic information given by the matrix is frequency of moves and the pattern of antecedent behaviors to reciprocal behaviors (see Appendix E).

Flow Chart Displays give information about the pattern of instructional events in quite a different way than the matrix display. The basic display shows the sequence of events over a period of time, and thus gives information related to the chronological sequencing of events.

Standard Variable Analysis provides mathematical manipulation of the data into percentages and ratios. Events are clustered into sub-groupings and mathematically compared against one another or in proportion and percentage to the remaining coded behaviors. This information is particularly useful in complex or holistic analysis of events.

Subscript Analysis is designed to give an exacting breakdown of categories of events and behaviors that are of particular interest to the researcher. Such displays give the relative percentages of up to twenty different subscript classes of up to forty-three general O.S.I.A. categories.
Chain and Pool Analysis provides the investigator with a frequency and ratio printout of specified "pools" of behaviors, or specified "interaction chains". This feature allows the investigator to retrieve from the data statistical displays related to clustered variables or specified behavioral sequences that may be pertinent to the analysis. This operation is particularly useful in expanding the analysis of the descriptive information provided in the matrix and time line displays. It also allows for clustered variable analysis and chain analysis of specified subscripts. This fine-grained information is not available in the standard matrix or time line displays.

This particular feature offers the investigator a creative potential for analysis and the means to adapt computer processing to the specific needs of his investigation.

It should be stressed that computer displays are descriptive in nature and non-judgmental. Interpretations and judgment are made by the investigator who uses the displays for information related to the research problem and the related investigation questions which serve to focus this analysis.

Summary

Data processing is the link between data collection and data analysis whereby observations are
transformed by some operation into codes that are amenable for analysis. This chapter described the variety of coding procedures that were incorporated into this study. In the first part of the chapter, the processing of the ethnographic data and the organization of the qualitative analysis were presented. The second part of the chapter, provided a description of The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (O.S.I.A.) and the development of The Sevigny Subscript System for the O.S.I.A. How the subscripted coding scheme facilitated the categorization and analysis of studio appraisal events by making them amenable for quantification and statistical display was reviewed. The instrument and inter-observer reliability were then discussed.

The chapter concluded with the description of computer processing and the printout displays that were used in the final analysis of the data.
CHAPTER V

A TRIANGULATED ACCOUNT OF STUDIO CLASSROOM APPRAISAL

I do not have to react to criticism with hurt feelings. It is my interpretation of the meaning that produces the pain.

Hugh Prather

The belief that criticism is good for the individual, and that learning can be facilitated by instructional feedback, is a taken for granted assumption of studio instruction. Given feedback about the quality of his products, it is assumed that the art student will improve in his subsequent performance. Hence, the role definition for studio teaching is heavily weighted toward art criticism.

In social situations, the relationship between different kinds of people is governed by the evaluative consensus that arises. A value question of "right" or "best" poses an interpretive problem for the members of any group. To understand the relation of consensus, the researcher must observe the interaction of one category of people in the situation with other membership types. I classify the student participants into four category types: the higher grade student, the lower grade student, the average grade student and the improved student. In this investigation, classroom observation and interaction event analysis were focused
upon the studio instructor's appraisal patterns with members of these achievement types.

Overview

This chapter provides a descriptive account of classroom appraisal, its characteristics and the participant perspectives which serve to guide or structure it in a typical university studio art classroom. The chapter begins with a descriptive characterization of appraisal related phenomena. In the second part, the instructional interaction is examined as it acts upon the student's initial perspective. Appraisal interaction is described in terms of its general affect on student learning. In the third part, Mr. Allen's specific instructional patterns are examined as they were observed with higher grade students, as opposed to lower graded students. In the final section, some perceived student interaction pattern differences are described.

The chapter focus and organization relates to the funneling character of the temporally developing design. The description, like the investigation, moves from a general focus toward finer qualitative discriminations. In presenting the observation findings, I follow the tradition of presenting illustrative quotations from the field notations and respondent interviews. I depart from the older sociological tradition of always specifying exactly what it is about the quotation that is meaningful. Certain facts are
presented about the situation so that the reader can make his own implication and judgment of the representativeness of the samples. The field notations are identified by the dates they were collected. In this way, the reader can distinguish whether a notation is in reference to the case study as active student and participant observer (1966), or the case study as participating observer (1977).

Part One

**Production Feedback, Aesthetic Criticism and Studio Classroom Appraisal**

The term feedback is used to refer to the interpretation of the information that the student receives about the adequacy of his studio production response. Instructional feedback deals with the communication of the instructor's preference for one response over another, in relation to the context in which the response is made. The notion of feedback includes not only the communication of performance, adequate for the context, but the disclosure of affect toward the product outcome of the response. For feedback to reach its full cycle, however, a student must decode the communicated message. He must interpret its meaning.

I have categorized studio production feedback into three main forms by degrees of information. The three forms are (1) knowledge of results, (2) knowledge of the appropriate response and (3) instructional criticism.
Knowledge of Results provides the student with an indication of whether or not the response was appropriate for the assignment. This form of feedback provides the least bit of information. For example, "That's fine."; "Okay, on that one."; "We're not into that in this class."; "That's not what I meant."; or the symbolic result indicator in the form of the letter grade.

Knowledge of Appropriate Response is different from knowledge of results because it provides the additional information of what is appropriate. For example:

You have a tendency to go after the objects first (pointing). What you are not doing that you should be is paying attention to these shapes in through here (gesturing). This (pointing to a background shape) is as important as this (pointing to a leaf shape) even though you don't have a name for it, like 'leaf'. You have to begin thinking about what the leftover shapes do to break up the page.

Well in this particular area you are right. That is you're making enough changes in the color. There is a good variety of warm and cool. But, you're also beginning by drawing an outline of the shape and then proceeding to fill it in with dots of color. The pointalist's idea was to begin with dots of color and let the shapes emerge. If you put some blue dots here (pointing) then move over here with the blue (gesturing) and here (pointing), then here (pointing). Then begin with another color and keep at it and the shapes will happen gradually as you build up the color.

Instructional Criticism is the form containing the most instructional information. It contains information about the appropriate response and provides in addition an explication of the criteria for judging the appropriateness
or aesthetic merit of the work. It explains to the student why one response is poorer or better than another. For example:

The color doesn't hold together relationally. By 'relationally' I mean how all the colors fit together within the painting and compared to one another. It's getting the colors to work together so one doesn't dominate or stand out. See this (pointing) that's terribly white for this. It kinda glares at you. Here (pointing) it's better. Here (pointing) you have good saturation but it seems inappropriate in contrast to what's happening over here (pointing). Try squinting your eyes at it and if something seems to jump right out at you, perhaps you need to adjust the color of it or the color next to it.

(Field notation 2/11/77)

In this sample of instructional criticism, the teacher first indicates that the response is inadequate, then explains the criterion upon which the judgment is made, (its lack of good relationships between color contrasts); then, points to instances where the criterion is met more appropriately. Not only is the verbal dialogue informative, but so is the nonverbal gesture which point to visual examples of the quality or criterion upon which the judgment rests.

Aesthetic Criticism

Criticism is undoubtedly one of the most evasive referentials for discourse related to art. It is most frequently associated with the accurate description, analysis and judgment of the aesthetic worth of an object or event.
Aesthetic criticism is always made from some value stand - from some preference bias. I have called this bias the aesthetic perspective. Even under the best of circumstances, judgmental process is subject to human bias, prejudice and vested interests. Effective instructional appraisal, however, aims at the transformation of technical norms, aesthetic norms and the interpretive frame of reference. At its upper limits, appraisal merges with creativity and at its lower limits it is destructive of creativity. But, in all senses it is directive and functions to point new directions and alternative perceptions.

Studio art instruction is one part of the larger domain we label "art education". A feature that the components of art education share is the perspective that aesthetic criticism is a substantive focus of the art education instructional concern. In the studio classroom, teachers and students regularly play the role of critic as part of everyday classroom experience. We find then that aesthetic values and art concepts are a dominant focus of much of studio classroom dialogue. For, it is through aesthetic criticism that the studio teacher attempts to persuade the student to perceive the absence or presence of the same qualities or defects that he perceives in a studio product. While production feedback provides information related to the questions of technical adequacy and teacher preference, aesthetic criticism provides information
relative to the question of artistic values and the teacher's aesthetic perspective. I classify instructional criticism into two main categories. I refer the first category as private appraisal. The second type includes all public acts of evaluation. I shall call this type external appraisal. The first type is a part of the subjective experience and are available to the investigator only through active participation and introspection or through indirect observation and respondent interview techniques. External appraisals are overt and interactional events and, therefore, are accessible for direct observation and recording.

Studio Classroom Appraisal

The combined teaching acts which accomplish studio production feedback and aesthetic criticism will be referred to as instructional appraisal. Specifically, studio instructional appraisal is defined as any manifest behavior that reacts or responds to a studio product, the antecedent production of the product or the behavior of a student by judging or acknowledging the person, behavior or product of the behavior.

Feldman (1975) referred to this unique teaching behavior as "pedagogical criticism". He called it the "sensitive interpretation of the student's work to the student." He suggested that its instructional goal was to lead the student toward conducting analysis and judgment of
himself, in order to gain a sense of his own character and an awareness of the direction of his achievement.

**Private Internal Appraisal**

In the following dialogue, Mr. Allen reflects on some private thoughts he entertained in his appraisal of a particular student's performance:

**Mr. A:** Yeah, --okay--well, on this one, although I really talked to her formally about it. I was like impressed by the fact that she selected something that bizarre. I'm like very interested in the choices they made for this particular assignment. I am thinking to myself when I saw this, that it is curious that she would even find this interesting at this point of her training. Because, most students picked out something like an illustration or even the best students, like that guy, he brought in a Maxwell Parish. I think that at the time I saw this I was more impressed by her choice than the actual painting she did. I mean like the painting meets the criteria, but that's it - there's nothing terribly exciting about it other than it fills the requirement.

**me:** Did you tell her that or was that private thinking on your part?

**Mr. A:** I think I may have said something like 'that's a really strange painting' but that's all I would say.

**me:** I transcribed that critique and you said to her, "Is this a Picasso?" she replied "yes" and then you said "Wow, this is weird for a Picasso."

**Mr. A:** Yeah, I was expressing that I was surprised that she would be interested in it.
Three concepts dominate my analysis of how private appraisal is accomplished, the aesthetic eclectic: the aesthetic dialectic and continuum ranking. The **aesthetic eclectic** is defined as the individual's generalization or typification for the ideal artistic product. It is the merging of the individual's production expectation with his aesthetic perspective - his attitudes and beliefs of what constitute "best" for a given art context or art form. The **aesthetic dialectic** is a production generalization for a specific other (individual, self or group). It is the typification which results from a summative appraisal. The dialectic is the individual's qualitative assessment of the merged qualities or defects of some specific unit of production. It is formulated through a process of generalizing the perceptions of production and products for that unit of time. We develop aesthetic dialectics for ourselves, for other individuals and for specific groups. For example, aesthetic dialectics enable this student to say:

I don't think Jeff really deserved a D for his grade. His stuff is not really that much different from Brad's. He's been here every day and works as much as any other person in here. True it may not be as good as Brad's but it isn't that much worse either.

(B level student, 2/13/77)

In order to make this assertion, this student had to have a generalized conception of Jeff's working habits and work products, and for Brad's and one for the class group as a whole. Justification of the grade becomes one
of comparison. This comparative process I call \textit{continuum ranking}.

Continuum ranking is defined as the process of placing an individual dialectic upon the linear continuum representing the normative range of the group dialectic.

The \textit{flash appraisal} is a production sensing phenomena that is frequently employed. It is a process by which the teacher or student formulates an aesthetic dialectic by a quick perceptual glance at a cluster of work. Informal flash appraisals are often accomplished by encircling the studio and making quick observations of individual works. This process is used to formulate an eclectic typification of the \textit{normative performance continuum}. The normative continuum is the individual's perception of the range from "best" to "worst". The student then may appraise the degree of adequacy for a particular production performance by ranking the typification of his own product in relation to normative continuum.

In the previous dialogue, the student formulated a normative performance continuum for her class, using Brad, the highest achiever, as the high point of the group continuum. She then ranks her aesthetic dialectic for Jeff and concludes that he should not be so distanced from Brad on the performance continuum.

The conflict in this case stems from the fact that this student is a beginner and that the aesthetic ranking
continuum that she uses is employed in a high school situation. Her range from A to D is wider and perhaps Jeff would have been more likely to have been placed in the B level of that setting.

The studio instructor also uses flash appraisals. A typical flash strategy follows:

Mr. Allen uses flash appraisals to gain a sense of the normative range. His public appraisals are directed to the typification he formulates for that range. Flash appraisals assist the teacher in evaluating whether or not the group, as a whole, is comprehending the objectives for the activity. They help him to focus the objectives for subsequent classroom production.

Flash appraisals are an initial part of the judgmental process. In this case, Mr. Allen uses them to formulate an aesthetic dialectic for the group, and he compares that dialectic to the aesthetic eclectic which he strives to achieve.

While disclosing his subjective feelings about the work of a particular student, Mr. Allen gives evidence of his use of flash appraisal and continuum ranking strategies:
I thought this was a good painting, the others are more typical, in fact, the whole class - remember we put those up(?) And -- well, maybe two or three were weak, but the rest of the class was rather average, ah so, I know that project, I was thinking that they weren't going anywhere with it, then it seems like the last day they like made a break through they like got like one good one. Most of them though on the whole are real mediocre, but her's are at least average to good. But now that I have seen them all ((the Class)) I think that they may be as good as any in the class (4) yeah these two look pretty good - I THINK. Like when I look at her things again, I think that she understood things very well whereas many still don't. (Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

Students use continuum ranking to gain a general sense of their standing in the class. For example, during the study where I assumed the active role one student approached me and said:

Are you a grad student? Your work is always so much better than mine. If I knew you had more experience I wouldn't feel so inferior?
(Field notation, 7/1/76)

This student has placed herself low on the normative continuum, but is hoping to correct her self-appraisal by making a separate continuum for experienced students, and another for beginners.

To gain confidence in one's private assessment strategies, the individual employs audio and visual eavesdropping. This strategy provides information related to how the instructor assesses others in the class.

When the instructor was in hearing range, I found that I was listening to his comments to others while scanning my own production efforts. I looked for the same merits or defects that were being attended to in his appraisal of others. It occurred to me that what I had thought of as private
domain was really something more. Student eavesdropping provides the student with additional referent cues from which to learn teacher expectations and from which to grasp the meaning of the evaluative terms that operate in the setting. I began to focus my attention to the tutorial action zones. I noted that those students in proximity to the tutorial dialogue would frequently take quick glances at the work of the student being criticized then flash back to their own work. This action was quick and subtle. The opportunity to see a concrete example of an abstract aesthetic principle is a temptation few can resist. When asked about the use of eavesdropping most students denied that they payed attention, yet my observations of them refuted their claim. Eavesdropping is a taken-for-granted part of private appraisal strategy.

(Field notation, 7/24/76)

Eavesdropping behavior provides valuable information regarding the characteristics of the teacher's appraisal perspective. Eavesdropping helps the student to adjust his own perspective to be in keeping with the studio instructor's, by establishing a clearer conception of the criteria which structure evaluation, and which determine one's ranking on the normative continuum. Such knowledge facilitates performance in the setting by providing a knowledge of standards which can guide the production performance.

Continuum ranking is not limited to the comparison of the individual to the group. It frequently occurs as a comparison of the "present self" to the "past self". For example, in my field notations I often found instances where I had appraised my work in terms of my previous accomplishments or style, (e.g. "the drawing I did today was below average" or, "I can see a tremendous improvement in my work.")
These statements could only be made with a generalized knowledge of one's own normative continuum. Calling my work "average" or seeing a "tremendous improvement" are appraisals made by relating a present typification to a past typification, as they compare to the individual's own normative range.

Continuum ranking also appraises the "present self" against the "future self". This occurs when the student ranks his present performance (aesthetic dialectic) to his projected ideal performance (aesthetic eclectic). It is the appraisal of his current status to his desired status. For example, "My roommate wanted to see one of my paintings and I told her not yet, they weren't good enough to be thought of as paintings yet."

Mr. Allen speaks of his continuum ranking this way:

Portfolio grading is difficult to do because what I want to do is to be able to go through all of them and then think back on all of them to arrange them in some sort of order - a respective order, or a ranked order. But, until I've actually done that a lot of the comments I make in the evaluation are just statements about my own observations rather than value judgments. I am not sure at that point about the student's relationship to the rest of the class. Like I might think to myself that his stuff is really bad then find that the next ten students are worse.

(Mr. Allen, 2/12/77)

Continuum ranking is also done through comparison to the dialectic for all past student groups. When commenting to me about his negative appraisal of a particular student's painting he said:
Okay--I've done this project several times, so I--well looking at it I was thinking that it was not as good as what I have had done for me before. As a matter of fact, I didn't think any of them were as good as the ones I have had done before.

(Mr. Allen, 2/12/77)

External Public Appraisal

External appraisals usually take the form of direct communication. Two classroom events are structured with external appraisals, the group critique and the tutorial critique. The group critique involved formal participation and interaction of all group members. The tutorial critique is the appraisal interaction that occurs between the instructor and a single group member. It is a form of paired or dyadic interaction for personalized evaluation and performance goal-setting.

External appraisals are dependent upon the internal judgments which initiate them. However, that does not mean that they are parallel to them or that they are even consistent with them. Indeed, private appraisal is not always shared completely or truthfully in social situations. For example:

I didn't tell her this, but I thought that this was one of the ugliest paintings I have ever seen.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

External group or tutorial appraisals are further classified into two distinct operations: the in-process feedback appraisal and the summative outcome appraisal.
In-Process Feedback is the ongoing instructional feedback loop that accompanies task performance. It serves to monitor the task performance and provide information input about the modifications necessary for successful completion of the task. It is in part punitive, and in part rewarding. It functions as a guide for subsequent performance, and in regard to the learning of new concepts, new skills and the acquisition of a new perspective.

Summative Outcome Appraisal enables the student to know whether an entire finished unit of production or studio curriculum products represents a sufficient development in the particular setting it was accomplished. The summative appraisal usually ends with the assigning of a symbolic numerical or letter grade for the production period. Each of these appraisal operations has its own distinctive characteristics, steps, methods and techniques. Some of those distinctions follow.

Adaptive Studio Appraisal

A unique feature of studio in-process appraisal is that it is not a prearranged act, but rather is adaptive to the reciprocal flow of student behavior. I refer to this flexible strategy as adaptive appraisal. The teacher always adapts out of some frame of reference - out of some aesthetic perspective. He has some "end view" in mind to guide his adaptive response and evaluative reactions to student
Mr. Allen's perspective is perceived in this interview dialogue pertaining to one student's work:

Me: How would that translate into a grade?
Mr. A.: That would be a B, like cause it meets the criteria, but like the student didn't go beyond it, and this one I think like goes beyond the criteria and holds together much better, and (4) ((new ones examined in sequence)) these--I think the drawing aspect is real weak--and ah--again there were maybe two or three in the class that were successful. This drawing aspect is really weak, for example this is a symbol for --((recalling the still life)) guitar or whatever, is real weak as a shape, they are real poorly painted, um -- yeah I think that these are her poorest, at least as far as how the class goes. In relation to the problem, I couldn't even give them a B. It seems to me like this is really non-caring ((attitude toward)) so if I had to like grade this one I would like say a C minus because like it shows a real low level of interest.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

Adaptive appraisal functions as a control and monitoring mechanism. That is, when the student initiates a production response, adaptive appraisal serves to reinforce the desired response and to initiate information related to "corrective" feedback. Adaptive feedback and criticism functions to patrol the boundaries of the instructor's expectations for the task. Adaptive appraisal provides feedback information related to perceived technical error, inadequate response, weak application of criteria, perceptual error, and product or skill deficiency diagnosis. It functions to help the student restructure his goals and the interpretation of those goals into performance strategies.
The effect of in-process appraisal on student goal setting is perceived in the following classroom episode:

I arrived a few minutes late and missed the instructor's introduction to the exercise. Mr. Allen passed me by twice without comment, so I looked around and saw that students were smearing the charcoal more. On the second pose, I smeared the drawing and drew back into it. He stopped and said, "Do you like the diagonal sweep going across it?" The tone of his question caused me to answer negatively to support of what he later called "A bit boring." He pointed to a section of the drawing which he said the "sweeping counteracts itself and is more interesting." I replied, "should I keep turning my paper different ways to get different stroke qualities?" He answered, "No, it's just as easy to move your arm." In the third drawing I began the same way but found myself in strained arm positions trying to accommodate the implication of the criticism. He stopped by again and said it was "much better, but the bottom was a bit dull." My response when he left was to crop the drawing, so that the "dull" part was eliminated.

(Field notation, 9/2/76)

The "main line" of the studio task is fixed to the imposed conditions of task assignment specification. When the student's performance is "off task" or beyond the teacher's tolerance for divergent performance, the resultant shaping strategy is often perceived as judgment of incorrectness. This behavior I call boundary patrolling, a monitoring strategy that is served by adaptive appraisal.

**Manding Behavior**

Mands are social behaviors which attempt to monitor or change the behavior of another person. The term was modified from a construct originally developed by Whiting (1970) to describe how a child got another child to do what
he wanted him to do. The term was derived from words like reprimand, mandate, command, demand, mandatory, etc. Mandating behavior is frequently employed by the studio teacher during in-process appraisal. Mands can be thought of as the rules, wishes and expectations that the studio instructor makes known through direct or indirect communication. I have divided manding behaviors into three main subclassifications: prescriptive manding, proscriptive manding and hustle manding. Prescriptive mands tell the student what to do. The following classroom episode was recorded early in the assignment initiation. It is representative of the typical in-process manding strategy:

Keep your hand on the page and your eye on the model, okay--Draw with your fingers right on the page--try to get an understanding where the plane is--Loosen up, a lot of you are real tight on this--All right, stop. You should have all your materials by now. I want to see all the materials by tomorrow.

(Field notation, 6/28/76)

There are other means for prescribing without verbal mands. Visual samples provide models for students to follow. For example, when the teacher displays one or two samples of what the assignment is supposed to be, or holds up a student's work and says "this is what I meant."

My second classification of mands is the proscriptive mand. This influence behavior tells the student what not to do either directly or indirectly. For example, "Don't screw around with those little picky details;" "I don't want you to make them realistic;" "I didn't say to use color;"
"What hurts you is the way you apply the paint."

The performance shaping, or boundary patrolling effect of instructional manding can be observed in this sample interaction:

Mr. Allen approached Shirley and said: "Why don't you be a little more daring. Everything you paint looks a bit gray and dull. Go in there and turn these (pointing) dull looking shapes into something more exciting, like red or something." Mr. Allen crossed the room and Shirley borrows some red from Beth, then proceeds to paint the central object fire-engine red.

(Field notation, 2/24/77)

It was noted that compliance to manding behavior was usually reinforced in subsequent feedback. Returning to Shirley, Mr. Allen said, "Yeah, that's much livelier, just be careful not to overdo it and get carried away with it." He not only reinforces the mand but uses this adaptive appraisal as an opportunity to qualify the mand.

A third type of mand is the hustle mand. This class of influence behavior attempts to speed up the production tempo. They are the verbal statements or gestural behaviors that intensify the attention to the production effort. For example, "Let's get going;" "Only a few more minutes on this one;" "Come on. Come on;" "Move that charcoal around - real fast on these, I don't want any detail;" "Do a few quick warm ups just to get you going." Hustle mands are often accompanied by nonverbal emphasis, such as a waving of the arms in fast rotation, a mimic of the drawing movement desired and the rhythm or tempo desired, faster circling
around the room or increased speech tempo.

Evidence for the effect of hustle mands is found in this student response: "I do so much better when he's here, otherwise I tend to slack off. He keeps me on my toes 'cause he cracks the whip." or "Okay guys, here comes the 'foreman' back to the 'saltmines'.'"

To avoid critical admonishment from failure to comply to hustle mands, students tend to heed them. It was observed, however, that production output was half the amount on the days Mr. Allen was not present. In his absence, students returned to a casual tempo and to former methods of working.

As an instructional strategy, hustle manding accomplishes several outcomes: (1) it controls the use of student time, (2) it forces the student to build a quick perception of essential features, (3) it makes the student attempt another drawing approach, (4) it serves the purpose of making the students be less conscious of detail and more concerned with general large organizational masses, and (5) it activates a certain spontaneity of style.

Manding behavior serves an important function in the construction of an aesthetic reality for the classroom members. Mand compliance serves to preserve the social structure of the special group through reaffirming the student's dependency on the instructor. Mands serve to communicate the necessary conditions or criteria which are
essential for recognition in the group. They provide an informal set of rules and norms upon which members can interact.

Rule breaking is a danger to any special group, in that it threatens the fragility of the aesthetic reality which maintains the group. Therefore, boundary patrolling through manding behavior serves to define the conditions for membership in the group.

The paradox is that studio teachers don't want to be too prescriptive and do wish to encourage creative interpretation. They therefore devise more indirect methods for manding to satisfy themselves that they are not overly directive or dominating the creative interpretation. Such strategy promotes ambiguity in the setting and motivates the participants to search for interpretable cues from nonverbal behavior or the more subtle verbal strategies.

**Summative Studio Appraisal**

The function of summative appraisal is to determine the effectiveness of the task performance after it has run some temporal cycle. Summative appraisal functions to provide information related to the continuation, termination, and modifications of task performance. Figure 2 provides a graphic representation of my interpretation of the instructional dynamic which accomplishes summative appraisal. Many of the specific behaviors have already been discussed. Therefore, its basic structure will be briefly overviewed.
THE SEVIGNY MODEL
for
SUMMATIVE STUDIO APPRAISAL.

Figure 2
The first stages in the model are representative of the internal processes that are only inferable to other participants. These include the private judgments and the strategy planning which are part of the teacher's adaptive style. This stage involves: (a) reflection upon the antecedent expositions and the imposed conditions of the task assignment, (b) a reflection of the transactions and feedback during the performance stage and (c) the aesthetic experiencing of the completed artistic product. These are then followed by a focus and language selection process for planning appraisal dialogue. It is the stage of focusing the evaluative strategy for administering the summative judgments.

**Appraisal Dialogue**

Stage four represents the verbal initiations and the external, or recordable evaluative interaction and dialogue. It represents the instance of relating a value term or statement to the value object. Student comprehension of the feedback is linked to the communication skills and strategies which transpire during this stage. One skill which affects the success of this step is the solicitation of attention and the clarification of the value referent of the criticism. It must be clear to the student if the teacher is referring to the entire work, a part of it or an antecedent condition in its production. If the focus of the talk is ambiguous, the meaning and implication for the talk is difficult to interpret.
Selecting the Value Term or Statement

Once the evaluative focus has been clarified, the studio teacher is faced with a bewildering task of selecting appropriate terms for conveying his aesthetic judgment. He is faced, on the one hand, with a wide variety of value terms and, on the other hand, with situations where there are not adequate terms. Most qualitative terms represent an abstract dimension that has a qualitative range. Locating the value object within a value range can be difficult. Many value terms are ambiguous and serve only as a focal orientation for the explications which follow. The function of the value term is to direct attention to visual qualities. This makes the comprehension of appraisal dialogue an interpretive problem. The student is faced with the task of assigning a value to the terms or phrases that the instructor employs. To do so, he must have shared in the understanding of the aesthetic concepts which are the topic of appraisal, and he must comprehend the standards which are being addressed. The following value statements are examples of the ambiguous talk made in reference to samples appraised on the first working day of the course:

Lots of **nice stuff** going on in this one.

This one is really beautifully **drawn** with a **real efficiency of line**.

The darker element gets too **localized** next to the **sensitive treatment of the line**.

The lines in this one are **too predictable**.
Nice emphasis on pattern, but more modulation is needed instead of modeling.

This is nice, real direct.

This one is hung up on the shape.

This one could be stronger. It falls apart a little.

The color is particularly strange.

This one works better, it's a fairly complex drawing.

There is really nice closure going on here.

All of the drawings have a nice emphasis on the figure-ground relationship.

(Mr. Allen, 6/22/76)

The first learning task for the beginning student is to gain a knowledge of the way in which Mr. Allen employed such specific terms. At this point the student may only have a sense for favorable or unfavorable judgment, but the comprehension of the meaning of specific qualifiers or criteria remains somewhat ambiguous. Following the episode I wrote:

Mr. Allen showed eight drawings and told us the qualities he admired in them. It helped us to grasp a sense of the product expectations for the course. One drawing was called, "the best he'd ever gotten from a student." I did not like it, nor feel it was that well done. My impression was that it was incorrect in terms of the anatomy, however, I did establish that the course would emphasize a spontaneous and direct approach. As the samples were shown I wrote the following descriptors, fuzzy, loose, sketchy, smear, non-academic, non-modeled, impressionistic, gestural, positive - negative, textural, vehicle for drawing qualities rather than subject for drawing.

(Field notation, 6/22/76)

Value terms are employed as pointers which guide the student's attention toward phenomena and qualities that he had not apprehended before; or that he had no descriptive
label for. For instance, a frequent expression employed by Mr. Allen was "nice stuff". With repeated isolated samples referred to as "nice stuff", the student builds a visual typification of what Mr. Allen means by the phrase. Value terms become clearer as the course progresses. For example, I wrote:

Mr. Allen implies that drawings with "lots of nice stuff" are better. What he means by nice stuff is not too clear, however, his continued use of the phrase, coupled with his pointing to instances of its occurrence is building a concept of how he employs the term.

(Field notation, 7/2/76)

Three weeks later I wrote of a relationship between the instructor's use of value terms and the student process of acquiring an interpretive meaning for those terms. I wrote:

The inadequacy of language for describing aesthetic concepts in visual evaluation can serve the student as a means for developing his own "aesthetic feel". Subconscious cue searching of the visual referents that accompany appraisal talk contribute toward a tacit learning. That is, aesthetic knowing is a result of an inductive process which is motivated to reduce the ambiguity of value reference terms. The flash impressions that are associated with the value term soon build to an aesthetic typification of the aesthetic concept or qualitative isolate which was spoken in the interaction. This learning activity results in a visual knowledge, which is different from linguistic knowledge. This knowledge has been often associated with intuitive knowing "feels right." It is strongly anchored in the subconscious and as such often find itself lost to the student's explicit awareness or beyond his range for verbal description.

(Field notation, 7/27/76)
As part of the testing for this assertion, I asked one student respondent to define the meaning of certain key terms used by Mr. Allen to discuss her work. When asked about the meaning of the term "predictable" the student responded, "I really have no idea what he meant by that." My interview question however brought to her attention a key term which she had yet not found meaning for and the effect was a more conscious effort to discover the meaning for the term. That this occurs is evident in the following interaction a few weeks later:

Me: Did showing those slides tell you anything about his preferences or the criteria by which he judges your work?

Lynn: He doesn't like predictable things. (h) Brad and I started laughing when he used the word.

Me: Why because I had asked you what he meant by that word a week or so ago and you didn't know?

Lynn: Yeah, its -- I know exactly what he means by it. It's--it's //

Brad: predictable. (h)

Lynn: (h) well, it's really the best word for it -- well, he made the distinction between a 'decorative' and an 'aesthetic' pattern.

Me: and 'predictable' is which of those?

Lynn: Decorative.

Brad: Decorative.

Me: Okay--

Brad: cause--it can go on and on and on and it doesn't make any difference when you stop it. (Student respondents, 2/18/77)
Value terms or expressions such as "predictable" have meaning only in terms of the context for which they are employed. Such contextually-bound terms or expressions, are referred to as indexicals. Learned meaning is achieved when an indexical label triggers some qualitative visual equivalent in the interpreter's mind.

Justification for aesthetic judgments is terminally non-linguistic. The successful communication of judgmental criteria is linked to the referential adequacy of the selected value terms. In the above instance, the indexical term "predictable" had now reached a point where its referential power was adequate for these students' comprehension.

When ambiguity exists in classroom encounters, most students are willing to accept the ambiguity under the presumption that the meaning will become clear over time. That is, unclear information is allowed to pass while clarifying information is sought. Contextual information is sought over time to fill the ambiguity of indexical expressions. If and when subsequent information becomes available, the present information is used to clarify the previously unclear events.

The following student response reflects this perspective. It is typical of the responses which were given in the second week when students were asked: "How do you think you're doing in here?"
Mac: I have no idea what's going on in here. But, I think I am beginning to appreciate the ones he is picking out as 'good'. I think I am getting a sense for what he wants us to do but I can't put it in words. It's all kinda fuzzy, if you know what I mean(?)

Me: (Nodding)

Mac: Like--I think it just takes a while. In a week or two I think I'll have a good sense of things. For now, I just kind of need to experience the things -- I mean, I think I know what he's talking about, the words and all, but I don't feel so sure about how to use what he says in my work.

(B level student, 2/18/77)

Grounding the Value Statement

Some summative appraisals end with stage four. This type of appraisal is referred to as verdict giving and offers only knowledge of results. Instructional criticism goes further and provides evidence for value statements and grounds them to some judgmental perspective.

Justifying an aesthetic judgment is an empirical problem for which the instructor must isolate the factual pieces of evidence that are found in the work and which can offer support for his value claim. The task is one of providing factual information to illustrate an asserted preference.

Teachers often fail to distinguish statements of value from statements of fact. In many cases they present a statement of value as if it were fact about the work, when, in fact, it was only factual information about the teacher's affect toward the work.
By making the distinction clear between factual statements and value claims, the student is in a better position to weigh the meaning of those statements in terms of his own perspective. By referring to facts, I mean the features, the antecedents, and the consequences of task performance and product outcomes. Thus, the essential operation in the fifth stage is to make explicit the class of things to which the value object is being compared and the point of view or criterion upon which the value statement is made.

**Outcomes and Response**

Simply stated, this stage of the model represents the student learning outcomes (positive and negative) and changes in the student's perspective which result from the tutorial appraisal experience. Student interpretation of appraisal events may affect subsequent performance in positive or negative ways, or again, the evaluative process may have little relevance to the student and he may remain unaffected by the experience. The characteristics of the outcome perspective are addressed separately in Part Two of this chapter.

**Part Two**

**Art Student Perspectives**

This section provides a descriptive account of the variable factors that are related to the second major
exploratory research question which reads as follows:

What are the characteristics of the student participant perspectives which allow students to assign meaning to and to act upon the evaluative events that occur in a university studio art classroom?

The question called for the exploration, analysis and description of the student perspectives which could be found in a typical university studio art setting. An underlying assumption is that every student is in a constant state of re-evaluating the perspective from which he acts and learns; and should not be studied separately from the perspectives that shape it. Each art student is continually developing his artistic potential. All his student life, he is purposefully becoming what he believes will most express his aesthetic ideal. He is not accidental; he is a choice maker. His becoming is in the direction of effectiveness, in the best way he can define effectiveness.

**The Initial Perspective**

The student enters the studio classroom environment with a set of anticipations and expectations, a set of aesthetic values, a studio production approach and typifications for ideal aesthetic. This initial perspective is modified somewhat in the opening encounter with the studio teacher, or through hearsay from other student informants. For example:

I heard that he was a really tough grader and that his own work is rather messy and spontaneous looking.
My friend Irene took the course last fall and she said you work your ass off in here but even so he grades lower than everyone else in this department. (C level student, 2/26/76)

This initial perspective serves the student as a basis for responding to and participating in classroom events. However, from the beginning, the ideas, actions and values of the studio instructor continually affect the development of the collective perspective by setting the conditions under which the student performance problems arise. The aesthetic criteria, or products standards that an instructor imposes, the ways he organizes and defines the situations in which the art student must perform, the ways in which he interprets and applies evaluative criteria - all these constitute a major part of the environment in which the student interacts.

The initial encounter of the students with the teacher modifies the student perspective. For example, on the first day of class Mr. Allen began with managerial business then provided the following information:

All drawings will be done in class, with the exception of a couple outside assignments. I will be in class on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays only though you will still be expected to attend on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I will probably have someone take the role for me and I am usually around my studio and often drop in. Generally, we have a 'crit' once a week, usually Friday. Sometimes I show slides. I have written a list of things I expect from you. Here are two lists ((hands out two mimeographed sheets)). One is the materials lists of things you'll be needing for the course. The other suggests the things I feel you are responsible for.

(Mr. Allen, 6/21/76)
Mr. Allen then reviewed the required supplies then continued:

Okay--the second sheet-- Daily in class drawing from the model, slides and other sources. Almost all the coursework will take place inside the classroom, therefore attendance is mandatory. It is your responsibility to be here in class. Okay - people already signed up may go and get their materials for tomorrow, we will probably go until ten o'clock. (Mr. Allen, 6/21/77)

The initial encounter was less than fifteen minutes nonetheless, as a student participant, I wrote the following first impression representing my modified perception of the course.

This is a service course to the other art areas. We are going to be doing rapid non-finished drawings. The emphasis was on expendable materials and inexpensive newsprint. Our approach is to be impressionistic and expressive and we are to avoid academic rendering. We are not going to learn anatomical rendering. Developing spontaneous sketching style will be the stress. (Field notation, 6/21/76)

On the second day, Mr. Allen spent the first half hour showing examples (visual manding) of the kind of work students had done for him in the past. This procedure modified our initial perspectives. After class two students were overheard to say:

S1: Do you see the similarity between Mr. Allen and Mr. Kramer?

S2: Yeah, I guess we're just gonna have to start liking those abstract paintings.

S1: The more of them I see the better I get to like them.
S2: Yeah, but what about when you take one home to your mother, how do you make her understand what it's supposed to be when you don't even understand it yourself?

(Field notation, 6/21/76)

The interaction reflects a conflict in perspective between the interpretations of the teacher perspective and the perspective of the student's parent. It also suggests that the student forsees that his own perspective is gradually becoming more tolerant of the perspective which was promoted by his previous instructor, Mr. Kramer, and which is anticipated to be reinforced by Mr. Allen.

I asked one student the effect of seeing the student work. She replied:

Well, I'm not so frustrated now. I sense where he's going. It softens the anxiety to know that what we will be doing is more experimenting and exercises. It takes off the pressures that I'll have to produce abstract paintings before I'm ready to. I am beginning to understand the concept behind the abstract style more and more. The slides helped me to see relationships I hadn't thought of before. Some of them I really liked. Most I don't understand - but at least I know what he likes.

(B+ level student, 1/6/77)

A second student replied:

Ah I was out of it. My roommates had a party last night and I just couldn't get into what he said, but the stuff looked okay but it wasn't exactly what I thought they did in this course.

(C level student, 1/6/77)

Breaching the Initial Perspective

Any conflict or confrontation of the student's initial perspective is a breaching of the student's aesthetic
reality. For instance, when the teacher tells the student that his working methods are inappropriate or inadequate for the course context for a particular assignment, the student is faced with a problematic situation in which the artistic conventions, which were appropriate in previous settings, no longer apply. To function in the new setting he must discover and adopt the behavioral patterns preferred by the teacher in the new setting.

Breaching of the student's aesthetic reality is accomplished in several ways. One occurs when the student meets conflict related to his personal preferences of his criteria for "good"; for instance, when the teacher picks out something for exhibition that the student thought was "bad".

See that one over there, the girl that looks like a frog. He made me mat that as my 'best' work. I was so embarrassed to exhibit it.
(C level student. 9/24/76)

Breaching can occur when the student's long range goals are in conflict with the teacher's.

My whole feeling is that when the teacher writes a synopsis of the course they should tell how it is. As far as I am concerned this was a waste of my money. I came here to learn how to draw figures and he teaches composition and texture. He could care less about anatomy.
(C level student 7/17/76)

Another way is when the student judges his performance in terms of a higher grade than what he ends up with.

I was sure I would get a B+ or an A-. Whenever I got the C- I was ready to give up. I had no idea
that I was doing so poorly in here. That is, 'poorly' by his terms, for me it was pretty good.
(C-level student, 2/15/77)

The novice art student often finds that the criteria working methods and artistic styles that made him successful in high school may not be equally appropriate in the university setting. That is they will not guarantee him the same comparative success. For example this student who was learning to accept her new rating as "average", she said:

I was like the star artist in my high school and I had a pretty high self image there. Then when I got to college I felt like a run of the mill artist, like everybody is good and most of them were great and you feel like average instead of great, and it takes a while to accept the idea that you can be a C student. It's hard to cope with at first and you question whether or not you've made a mistake in selecting art as your major.

(C level student 2/29/77)

Another student demonstrates his acceptance of the breached perspective as a part of the learning experience:

Jim: I really got turned off after the first week. I got the feeling that I had to do it whether I liked it or not and once more I had to get it all done in two hours. I wasn't used to painting that fast.

Me: What made you stay?

Jim: Cause I want new experiences. My ideas may not be all that right. I'm just a beginner. I don't have to stick with one teacher all my life. And I want to get different opinions.

Me: Are you saying you do it cause you know it's temporary?

Jim: Oh yeah, it's just a matter of fact that you're not gonna hit it off equally with all teachers. There are bound to be some
major conflicts along the way. That's art.
(B level student, 3/10/77)

For breaching to effectively change a student's perspectives three conditions are necessary: (1) there can be no time for escape, (2) there can be no place to escape and (3) there can be no one to prove counter evidence (Mehan and Wood, 1975:30). The first condition is enhanced by hustle manding behavior. That is, the teacher increases the production tempo such that students cannot rely on past conventions or realistic drawing approaches. There is no time for anything but the spontaneous style desired. Mr. Allen spoke of this when he said:

In general I try to have the students work real fast for two reasons: one, they're not really conscious of what they are doing and two, seeing if I can push it to extremes, so that students make a lot of marks and mistakes that they wouldn't normally make, which gives new possibilities to their drawings.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

The effect of hustle manding for breaching past artistic conventions is evidenced in this interview:

Babs: I'm not sure what he wants yet. But I got the idea he doesn't want what I want to do, -- cause he doesn't give me time to do what I like. I never felt like there was so much to do in so little time before.

Me: Well what was your work like before this class?

Babs: Well for one thing I'm used to oils and they take longer to dry than acrylics, and for another, when we painted in high school you could plan on six weeks to finish. So I don't know yet what I am doing in here. All's I'm doing is what he says to do. I just try to follow what he says and hope it's
what he wants. I don't understand this abstract stuff too well yet.
(C level student, 1/18/77)

The perspective of the studio classroom teacher affects the development of student perspectives in a second important way. Departments of art are organized in an "authoritation" fashion, the faculty and art department administration have a tremendous power over the students, and, in principle, can influence the students to behave in any way that they want.

In selecting the role of student, the individual accepts a kind of orientation which allows him to accept the external authority of the teacher to determine the "rightness" or "wrongness" of a particular response. In choosing to act more effectively in the studio classroom, the art student must choose to act in the setting, or action space, as he understands it. If curious, he will explore the action space; if satisfied, he will try to maintain it; if not satisfied, try to change or flee from it; if protective, try to defend it; if creative and expressive, try to make some aspect of his self tangible in it. The specific act he devises depends on his understanding of the action space and his perception of his relationship in it.

To the degree that a particular instructor does not or will not employ authoritative control, students will be able to develop original perspectives, and these may
diverge considerably from those of the studio instructor.

The second condition for developing a learned perspective is that there is no contradictory authority. This is evidenced in this dialogue.

Me: All during your critique you were shaking your head like you understood what he was saying and now you tell me you didn't understand a word of it. (?)

Lynn: Well, what do you want me to do, question what he says? He's the boss in here and it's what he thinks that makes the difference if I pass or fail.

Me: Are you saying that you were nodding to let him know that you accepted his judgment rather than mean that you understood it?

Lynn: Right, I was accepting that he has the authority in this class.

(B level student, 2/11/77)

Besides maintaining his authority as judge and increasing the tempo of production, Mr. Allen initiated many studio activities which forced the students to abandon past conventions, producing a third condition which is that the student has no place to escape. Simply stated this is the perception that if one wants to get through a particular program one has to comply to the imposed conditions of that program:

Me: If you're so frustrated, why do you stay in here?

Jeff: Well for one thing it's required. You have to take this class before they let you take your major area of interests. Anyway, it's only for ten weeks.

(D+ level student, 1/22/77)
The imposed conditions of the studio task also structures performance situations which do not allow the student to escape back to former realities. For example, Mr. Allen often had students work from out-of-focus slides to remove the details that they would ordinarily render. He often made them work with an opposite hand. He sometimes projected slides over the still life to distort the real color and pattern. At other times, he had students switch back and forth to work on each other’s drawings to incorporate change. He introduced new media or (technique) conditions which would force a new approach. He might have the students tear up their painting and reassemble it differently, then begin a new painting on top. It was generally observed that most of the studio activities which were introduced were found to have conditions in them which did not allow the students to fall back into their former modes of working. They were methods that "pushed" for alternative qualities.

If the breaching experience is too severe, the student is likely to leave the group.

Mr. A: What ever happened to Richard Adams?

Brad: Oh him, he was into medical illustration. After the first week he thought that what we were doing in here had little to do with what he wanted to become so he dropped the class.

Mr. A: Well, he must have been really frustrated, cause he was always asking me how to put in shadows and stuff, and I kept telling him we
The presumed conformity or nonconformity of students to the instruction perspective raises a question as to how the student decides which criteria are relevant to his own perspective. If the individual finds that his performance or his ideas are in conflict with the teacher expectations he has four choices: to conform, to change or modify his perspective, to remain deviant, or to drop out of the group. How he negotiates and constructs possible action and how he evaluates the result of the completed action constitute his interpretive reality. This includes how general rules, or norms, are evoked to evaluate or justify a course of action, and how an innovative construction or creative divergence is rationalized to modify or digress from the conditions of the setting.

In the first chapter, I described how the student perception of a teacher's judgment became part of the perception of self. Breaching occurs when the perspective of self does not harmonize with what is defined as adequate. Situational learning occurs when the self strives to alter the relationships toward adequacy. The demand for resolution is expressed in the self as a motivated state which can lead to changes in the initial perspective. The alterations which result I have labeled the learned perspective.
The Learned Perspective

It is human nature to relate and to constantly judge and test one's relating. If we think of this process as "self-appraisal", then, in an abstract sense, student evaluation is making meaning out of experience. It is an essential feature of the learned perspective, for no one would be able to learn from his experiences except by utilizing the feedback from those experiences and then by covertly converting them to a meaning for the future.

For the art student, the sum of his classroom experience has meaning as it relates to the artist he is trying to become. His experiences provide data from which he builds a concept of the degree of his own adequacy in that becoming. He learns what things he can do and what things he can't do. He also learns, "if I could do this, I could control that," or "if I could become this, I could become that."

As he relates to the situation around him, he senses that there is greater potential for self-expression, if he could alter the relating somehow. Hence, part of the learned perspective is the concept of the kind of "self" the student needs to become in order to be more effective in the studio setting.

It is not my intention to outline a comprehensive theory of studio learning. However, I do wish to make it clear that, in studio participation, a key process for change in the student perspective is a judging, comparing, guessing,
estimating, testing, fitting - in short an appraisal.

The perception of discrepancies between the self and the expectations of the setting can serve as performance motivators. For instance, if a student begins to feel that his work is not being accepted as he feels it should, he must try to make it more acceptable. If he realizes that he lacks the skill to accomplish that which he is trying to accomplish, he must strive to become more skillful. The student's concern is with his studio production - what the teacher expects, in terms of how much work and what style.

As evidence for perspective change I present the following interview responses to the question "Are you aware of any changes in your skills, attitudes or feelings since the beginning of the course?":

Ah, the first part of the course, I didn't understand what it was that he was trying to teach. I didn't think that it was made that clear to us-what umm, he exactly wanted from us. - and, not knowing that, I just could use whatever skill I acquired through my own little practices. So-- I came to class and I would do just what I had taught myself. I saw something that I wanted to paint -- and I would just begin to paint it in the only way I knew how.

(D+ Level student, 2/26/77)

Like in the beginning, I didn't know what he wanted, so you know that was definitely the first stage of my work. I just painted in my own form like I just did it realistically. I just painted the objects to look as real as I could. I thought that that was art.

(B level student, 3/16/77)

The degree of breaching is dependent upon the student's biography. Students who earned higher grades were
found to have participated in other settings for which the expectations were similar. For instance:

I had taken painting here in the summers while I was in high school so I had an advantage over some of the other kids cause I already knew like what kind of stuff to do.

(A level student, 3/27/77)

One of the students improved her grade from a C- to a B+. The difference in grade may be explained by the fact that her perspective was initially inadequate for the scene and that she acquired a new perspective which enabled her to be more successful:

It sure was a rude awakening for me when I got here. I had spent most of my senior year making pretty still lifes for the nuns in my high school. Well, I had to learn a whole new way of thinking about this thing they call 'art'. I'm still not sure if I understand it all, but at least I know that what I thought was 'art' is not considered 'art' in this department. To be successful, I decided that I would just have to change my ideas and give the abstract style more serious attention.

(Improved student 3/27/77)

A change in the initial perspective begins to occur as the participants interact and check the perceptual cues against those of others. This overheard dialogue reflects one strategy:

Jeff: Most of the assignments in here seem like a science project.

Lynn: Yeah, I agree.

Brad: What do you mean?

Jeff: You come in here and get the directions for the experiment. He's got the answer book for correctness, and you can't vary the
experiment too much or he'll correct you.

Brad: I don't think it's that bad.

Jeff: Maybe not for you.  
(Field notation, 1/24/77)

To determine how the self is fitting to the new setting, the student is on the alert for informational cues which can reinforce his interpretation of his options. When the perceived relation of the self in the setting does not harmonize, the student will search for cues to reconcile the difference:

It used to bother me that most of the time he would pass by my work or stop and never say anything and I would think 'It's either that bad that he doesn't know what to say about it, or I haven't changed my style enough for him to notice or I know he prefers the abstract and I know I don't do it that way and either it's just objectionable to him and he ignores it or else he just can't correct me cause he's not into that style, or it's just against what he likes and he doesn't feel right in making comments about it.'

(B level student, 2/10/77)

Perspectives develop and change at different rates. What follows is a descriptive analysis of the instructional interactions which may influence the rate and degree of such changes.

Part Three

Instructional Appraisal Behavior  
A Case Study

This section presents a triangulated analysis of the case study observations that support the first major proposition, which reads as follows:
There are observable and describable differences in the characteristics, methods, and pattern of the teacher's summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged as high in studio classroom performance as opposed to the characteristics, methods and pattern of his summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged as low in studio performance.

Those observable differences are organized into five types. These are: (a) temporal differences, (b) differences in instructional behavior frequency and distribution, (c) contrasts in instructional interaction patterns, (d) differences in conversational structuring and (e) qualitative dimension differentiations. What follows are the descriptive accounts, interview responses and the statistical summary displays which offer support for the proposition.

Temporal Differences

It was found that there was a differential in amount of tutorial contact time with individual students. The foregoing led to the first minor proposition which reads:

Minor Proposition 1: the length of interaction contact time is related to the positive or negative affect toward the student.

Table 4 provides a summary of the individual subject's tutorial contact time for their mid-term portfolio critiques. It also provides the mid-term and final grades earned.
### TABLE 4

**GRADE AND TUTORIAL CONTACT TIME DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE MID-TERM CRITIQUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Time</th>
<th>% Female Contact Time</th>
<th>Female Final Grade</th>
<th>Male Final Grade</th>
<th>Contact Time</th>
<th>% Male Contact Time</th>
<th>Male Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:05</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6:03</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>4:55</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>8:25</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Percentages are calculated for the relationship of individual contact time to the total time spent with all students.

An analysis of table 4 leads us to the first observable difference:

**Observation 1:** Mr. Allen spent less tutorial time with male students than he did female students.

The average contact time for female and male students is summarized in table 5.
TABLE 5

AVERAGE TUTORIAL MID-TERM CONTACT TIME FOR MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Mid-Term Appraisal</th>
<th>minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average contact time for females</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average contact time for males</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact time for female students was thirty percent higher. This observation indicates that gender is an intervening interaction variable. In order to control for the gender variable, analysis using O.S.I.A. processing was delimited to female cases. Individual female/teacher interactions were grouped into four categories. The earned letter grade was used as the category discriminator. That is, female students receiving a grade of B+ or higher were categorized as "high students". Those receiving a grade of C- or lower were classified as "low students". And, those receiving median level grades were classified as "average students". Students who had received average or low grades at the mid-term but who had improved their grade standing to a different category by the end of the quarter were classified as "improved students" and not used to typify "high", "low" or "average". Appraisal interaction data was pooled for three representative students for each achievement category.
Table 6 indicates that there is a linear relationship between higher grades and longer interaction contact time.

Scattergrams for female and male students display the positive relationship that exists (Appendix E).

Observation 2: a positive correlation exists between Mr. Allen's tutorial contact time and the grade that is given for studio classroom performance.

TABLE 6

MID-TERM APPRAISAL TUTORIAL CONTACT TIME

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average interaction time with high students</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interaction time with average students</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average interaction time with low students</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The total interaction time for the "best" student was 17.05 and the total interaction time with the lowest graded student was 3.30 minutes.

Coefficient calculations, using the Pearson product-moment correlation, are provided in table 7. Correlations were calculated separately for male and female students. The table indicates high correlations, which give support to the minor proposition.

Although quantitative analysis can produce a statistical display of differences and relationships, it does not describe the nature of such differences. Triangulation through qualitative analysis reveals some differences related to the gender variable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
<td>Mid-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.76713</td>
<td>0.84902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$</td>
<td>0.58336</td>
<td>0.72084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate.</td>
<td>178.38130</td>
<td>35.5385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.00482</td>
<td>0.03440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattergram slope</td>
<td>96.56219</td>
<td>18.96324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
<td>0.70854</td>
<td>0.96378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^2$</td>
<td>0.50203</td>
<td>0.92888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of estimate.</td>
<td>186.27736</td>
<td>17.93538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.00733</td>
<td>0.00411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattergram slope</td>
<td>90.80714</td>
<td>18.96324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation 3: Female students are more skilled at maintaining eye-contact and establishing a face-to-face interaction stance. females smiled more frequently and were able to establish longer eye contact with Mr. Allen. With other males, Mr. Allen typically assumed a shoulder-to-shoulder stance, which made face-to-face contact more strained. In recording his interaction with male students, his hand gestures were described as "brisk and angular making use of a thrusting digital pointing gesture." With female students, I described the hand gestures as "more curvilinear and flowing, making use of the wrist action - pointing being accomplished more with the entire hand in a waving gesture rather than with the sharpened point of the finger tip."

The male-to-male interactions were direct and business-like. The teacher and student faced the work and the teacher directed the discourse. An exception was found in the A level male:

Unlike other students, Brad is quick to interject his own perceptions and explanations. He frequently stretches his head around to make face contact with Mr. Allen. When Mr. Allen positioned himself closer to the table, Brad moved to the opposite side of the table to position himself where the work was now between he and Mr. Allen. This move facilitated Brad's potential for conversational turn taking. The act offers further evidence for his general tendency to break patterns or resist norms. Other male students complied with the shoulder-to-shoulder stance.

(Field notation, 2/11/77)

The fact that the male-to-male body stance made physical eye contact more difficult can offer one explanation
for shorter male-to-male contact time. Without face-to-face contact the instructor is not interrupted in the flow of conversation by nonverbal expressions which seek further classification or which motivate and cultivate conversation topics.

Observation 4: in the speaker/listener relationship, the listener has fewer opportunities for conversational turn taking when he cannot see or perceive the facial cues which allow him to initiate a speaker turn.

Experience in the setting and knowledge of an instructor's conversational pattern can increase the student's capacity for conversation turn-taking.

Observation 5: students who are older have the advantage of adult-to-adult conversational skills which allows them to increase their interaction time with the teacher.

The following account is illustrative of the conversational interaction of an older student who improved her standing from a C to a B+.

This student does not allow Mr. Allen to dominate the conversation. She uses strong facial cues which suggest the need for clarification. He is explaining criteria more frequently to her. She often interrupts his statements asking him to define the meaning of specific value terms. She has positioned herself so she can gain Mr. Allen's attention. She steps into the space and moves in and out of the interaction area when she wants control. When he moves she moves. An analogy is perceived of the sheep dog whose quick response counteracts any attempt on the sheep's part to get away.

(Field notation, 2/12/77)

In general, the descriptive accounts of nonverbal behavior reportedly indicate that:
Observation 6: a greater variety and range of body stance and gestural behavior is observed in the teacher-to-female student interaction pattern.

The critiques with females usually began with the shoulder-to-shoulder stance, however, shortly after the initiation of the dialogue, a face-to-face stance would be assumed. For instance:

Mr. Allen would often sit on the edge of the table so that female students could stand facing him or also sit in a three quarter position with the work between them. Sometimes he stepped away from the work and leaned against the edge of the chalkboard, legs crossed and arms widespread. The female's use of special distance and of body "language" that was observed and recorded is typical of what Davis (1971) has labeled "gender signals" and "courting behavior"-the thesis being that natural law provides for gestural differences with sexual communication overtones. Such overtones stimulate male attention and cultivate the male-female encounter.

(Field notation, 2/15/77)

Nonverbal courting behavior tendencies vary. One female student who was an aggressive interactant from the beginning exhibited a skill for cultivating conversation through such behavior. The nonverbal description of her behavior during the critique follows:

She clears her throat with a dainty sound and lowers her eyes frequently. She smiles a lot, often with a giggle. He is soliciting more response from this girl than the last. She is obviously more attractive and "well built". She is much more open in her stance and offers more information than the last. Mr. Allen just stepped back against the blackboard. She takes a step toward him. He turns toward the work but takes a glance at her breasts in passing. She fusses with her hair a lot and flips it over her shoulders. She is now standing with her back rather stiff and her chest protruding. Her snug fitting jersey draws a second glance from Mr. Allen. She fiddles with a
necklace and smiles as she offers a rationale for why she hadn't completed some of the work. Whenever Mr. Allen opens the distance between them, she narrows it again. The proximity seems flirtatious. As a male observer, I am most conscious of how this student uses her gender to obtain maximum attention.

(Field notation, 2/11/77)

This student managed to extend her contact time to 14:30 minutes and is an exception to the general correlation pattern. Conversation analysis revealed that Mr. Allen attempted to make conversation closure on five occasions and the conversation was reopened by the student. Mr. Allen's usual closure cue for dialogue termination was to say "okay--." followed by the opening of his grade book. However, with this student his closure was not accepted:

58T: Okay--the color looks alright on them--((proceeds to open grade book)).

60S: I have to be out of town next week.

61T: Okay--bring me the assignment when you get back. ((starts to look in grade book)).

62S: I have a question about the one with the oranges. It was difficult for me to get the different shades so like that one ((pointing to an orange in the painting)) came out red.

The interaction continued in relation to adjusting the color. After exhausting that topic the teacher again attempted closure:

76T: ...students often discover important possibilities about color just by accident.--okay. ((with more forcefulness)).
77S: ((the student begins to discuss a painting she did last quarter and then asks))-- if I bring it in will you look at it and tell me what's wrong with it?

78T: Yeah=OKAY, alright -- What's your name?

79S: It's Barbara, but my friends call me Babs. (giggle)

80T: ((chuckle)) okay. ((writes in book))

The first closure was attempted in the fifty-eighth utterance, then in the sixty-first, again in the seventy-sixth, again in the seventy-eighth and finally accomplished "flirtatiously" in the eightieth. Had the student complied to Mr. Allen's initial attempts for closure her contact time would have been 9 minutes and in keeping with the average of other students receiving a similar grade.

Another plausible explanation for longer contact time with females is found in Mr. Allen's expressed bias, which favors the female student. In an interview he disclosed:

It sounds like a real sexist statement, but I've found that my best students for the first three and a half years are girls, and ah--I think the reason is that they traditionally haven't been there to like--they're going to school but they're always like somewhere else. You know? That for some reason that's real liberating for them, they aren't so uptight about their work. These guys come in with I'm spending all this money. It's gonna be my career goddammit what am I supposed to be doin'. They are more uptight and self-conscious and want something out of it that applies to a career. And the girls don't talk about career as much. I hear them talking about last night's date or something. I don't know if they are more gifted or if they draw on their self-conscious more, but I think that their work is better, and I give them the grade.

(Mr. Allen, 2/12/77)
The second student whose interaction time is inconsistent with the correlation pattern is the student who earned a B-, but had less contact time than the relational pattern suggests. Two factors may have influenced this time. This student's critique occurred early in the sequence and was preceded by two higher ranked females and the student judged "best" of the group. Another factor was that the critique occurred during a time when many of the students had finished the first assignment. Consequently, immediately after the interaction with this student, Mr. Allen took a break from the appraisals and addressed the class in relation to the conditions of their next assignment. It is possible that realizing that the students were in a state of limbo, he shortened the critique to take care of the class needs. This student served as subject for a triangulation experiment in which she was interviewed about reactions and interpretation to her critique. Following the class, Mr. Allen was asked to review her portfolio in an interview and offered his private interpretation of her performance and his rationale for his assessment. The following interview statement supports the proposition that there was an effect on her grade from following the "best" and preceding the "poorer" students:

For her--((looks in grade book)) I gave her a B. after like seeing them all, well I try to come as close to what I think it is, but after looking at a lot more of them I might think 'well I only gave her a B and her stuff looked as good as any
in the class' and so, I might move her up to a B+.
(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

In the second viewing of the work, Mr. Allen's perception has changed. His reconsideration supports the next observation:

Observation 7: sequential position of the student tutorial interaction and the antecedent interaction can color the teacher's assessment and affect the perception of the student work.

In other cases, students who receive their critiques toward the end of the evaluation period may receive less time due to the fact that other students took more than their allotted share of time.

Observation 8: teacher fatigue or temporal conditions can shorten the tutorial interaction time.

This factor was true in the first case study. I asked Mr. Allen if I could sit in on the second day of critiques. He responded:

"Okay--but they're gonna be a lot shorter today. I don't have enough time to deal with them like I did with the 570 kids." About half way through the period he said to the group, "okay we're gonna have to speed up on these a little cause we're running out of time." His method to shorten the critique was to be more prescriptive. He did not solicit student response of judgment and the tempo of his dialogue was faster.

(Mr. Allen, 7/23/76)

This was not the same case in the final case study. There had been two days allotted for the critiques and with the smaller student population this meant that each student could be allotted as much as fifteen minutes contact time. The critiques were actually completed a half hour prior to
Having narrowed the rival hypotheses, the analysis progresses to the differentiation in the instructional behavioral categories that can be found as a result of the longer contact time, or as a result of the teacher's positive affect toward the student.

**Instructional Behavior: Frequency and Distribution**

The analysis of the qualitative data led to the second minor proposition. It reads:

Minor Proposition 2: there are observable and describable differences in the frequency and distribution of instructional behavior with the students who are graded higher as opposed to with the students who are graded lower.

A sample notation follows:

In summary of the critique dialogues, I have noted that the amount and kind of information that individual students receive is not equal. With the students that Mr. Allen has called "better" more time was spent in discussing the work. With those students judged as "poorer", Mr. Allen spoke in general terms as he continued to flip through the representative samples. This strategy kept him focused on the work and made it difficult for the poorer students to maintain any face-to-face contact. Poorer students assumed a listener role, whereas the better students shared the speaker role.

(Field notation, 2/11/77)

In order to triangulate the qualitative evidence supporting the proposition, quantification techniques for displaying instructional behavior frequency and distribution were employed. Data processing was accomplished by employing the O.S.I.A. coding procedures. What follows is the
presentation and analysis of the O.S.I.A. data.

**Reader's Guide**

For measuring the interaction time variable, the standard encoding procedure is to code the interaction behavior in relation to a five-second interval. Behaviors occurring for less than five seconds are not normally encoded. It is brought to the reader's attention that this ground rule was not adhered to for reasons important to the analysis. Temporal differences were attended to simply by measuring the elapsed interaction contact time. O.S.I.A. codes were employed solely for the analysis of behavior frequency and distribution. Therefore, every instance of a behavioral class was recorded, regardless if it occurred for less than five seconds. Every completed utterance or behavioral act was coded and recorded for analysis. It was my judgment that this change in standard procedure would provide a more complete display of behavioral differences.

A second point is worthy of note. The major propositions call for an analysis of the observable differences in the appraisal interactions between the teacher and students receiving higher grades, as opposed to with students receiving lower grades.

The analysis question does not ask for the description of the median or general instructional behavior. Nevertheless, in the presentation of summary tables, I include the data related to interactions with students receiving average
grades. Fifty percent of the student population fell within the "average" classification. Therefore, such data is representative of the general instructional pattern. The data are provided for the reader who may wish to contrast average classroom behavior with the behavior for higher or lower achievement types. It is brought to the reader's attention that, for the most part, data related to the average categorization will not be attended to in the discussion of findings. The data displays are provided as summary indicators of the classroom norm and are offered for the reader to make his own assessment as to the linearity of the observed differences between higher and lower achievement types.

To facilitate the interpretation of summary tables, the reader may wish to refer to the definitions of the O.S.I.A. interaction behaviors (Chapter 4: pp 180-3) The abbreviations which are used in the table displays follow:

- **F** = frequency of behavior.
- **D%** = the behavior distribution ratio within the achievement classification type.
- **$T** = the behavior distribution in ratio to the total frequency for all three classification types.
- **$** = the subscript indicator symbol. (it is preceded by the letter code for a behavior indicator, e.g. T4$A$).

Table 8 provides a summary of the general frequency and distribution ratio for the recorded behaviors for the teacher in relation to each achievement type.
TABLE 8
FREQUENCY AND DISTRIBUTION OF INTERACTION BEHAVIOR
FOR ACHIEVEMENT TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>achievement type</th>
<th>student behavior</th>
<th>teacher behavior</th>
<th>type total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher students</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average students</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower students</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total frequency recorded 634 1898

A positive relationship is perceived between the frequency of interaction and the achievement type.

Observation 10: students receiving higher grades receive 2.6 times more interaction from the teacher than do students receiving lower grades.

Observation 11: students receiving higher grades interact with the teacher three times more frequently than students receiving lower grades.

However, it can also be noted that:

Observation 12: the ratio of teacher to student behavior is similar for all three achievement groups.

Table 8 displays the total frequency and distribution of teacher and student behaviors. The developing analysis proceeds now to the general classes of instructional behavior as measured by the O.S.I.A.

Table 9 represents a summary of the ten most dominant behavioral classes.
TABLE 9

FREQUENCY AND DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.S.I.A.</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T10</th>
<th>T11</th>
<th>T12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the table indicates support for the second minor proposition. There are observable differences in the frequency and distribution of instructional behaviors. Those differences follow:

**Sensing (T2) and Manipulating (T3)**

Observation 13: the teacher spends more time examining the work of the students he judges higher.

It should be noted that students had equal amounts of work to be examined. The difference is accounted for by the fact that, with the higher level students, Mr. Allen would more frequently return to a previously discussed work to contrast it with a new work. He was observed to hold up or display the work of the higher students and look at it much longer.
than he did the work of the lower achieving students.

**Initiating (T4)**

A significant difference is found in the amount of informational initiation that Mr. Allen provides:

*Observation 14:* students judged as high in achievement receive four times the information that students judged lower receive.

It can also be noted that average students receive three times the information that lower students receive. This difference is interpreted as an increase in the situational learning advantage higher students have over lower students for subsequent studio performance. Since they receive four times more instructional information, they are provided four times the opportunity to learn.

**Responding (T5)**

Responding is a reciprocal behavior. The small frequency indicates that students did not solicit response very frequently from Mr. Allen. Nonetheless, it can be noted that:

*Observation 15:* the teacher responds more frequently to the higher level students.

Seventy-six percent of all response behavior is found in the interaction with the higher level students. This raises the question of whether the higher achieving student is more aggressive and solicits information more frequently, or if the interaction climate favors questioning for one group and discourages it with another.
Clarification (T6)

This category includes the instructor's requests for background information or clarification regarding the production process. The analysis of table 9 reveals that:

Observation 16: students receiving higher grades receive five times as many requests for clarification information as lower students do.

The findings illustrate a linear relationship that offers support for the proposition that the teacher shows interest in the student work by soliciting more information related to the antecedent conditions for producing the work.

Solicitations (T7)

This category focuses upon the response solicitation. The frequency is high because a dominant instructional strategy was the solicitation of visual response through pointing and gesturing. The frequency and distribution indicates that a linear relationship exists:

Observation 17: the teacher solicited three times the response from the students judged higher as opposed to those judged lower.

Judgment of Correctness (T8)

The frequency in this category may appear low for an event which focuses upon student evaluation. It should be noted however that aesthetic appraisal is not concerned with the issue of "correctness". Judgments of correctness are usually directed toward compliance to production conditions and technical execution, or they are made in reference to the
antecedent verbal statement.

Observation 18: higher achieving students receive a larger proportion of judgments of correctness than do lower students.

Personal Positive Judgment (T9)

As might be anticipated:

Observation 19: students receiving higher grades are judged positively three times more frequently than students receiving lower grades.

Acknowledgment (T10)

It can be observed that:

Observation 20: students receiving low grades receive half as many acknowledgments as students receiving higher grades.

An additional observation is worthy of note:

Observation 21: in proportion to the distribution of other appraisal behaviors the acknowledgment category is higher for low students.

This indicates that judgment is proportionately more neutral for the low students. The qualitative data indicate that with lower students, the instructor acknowledged the work by identifying the assignment problem, then frequently put the work back without further judgment or explication.

Judgment of Incorrectness (T11)

It is noted that:

Observation 22: students receive about the same amount of judgments of correctness, however, in proportion to other behaviors, lower achieving students are found to have a higher percentage ratio.
Distribution percentages are similar in this category for all groups. However, in contrast to expectation, it was found that:

Observation 23: students receiving higher grades received 2.5 times as many personal negative judgments as the students receiving lower grades.

This difference in frequency raises further questions for qualitative and subscripted analysis. For example, are the personal negative judgments that the higher students receive the same in type or content focus as the personal negative judgments that the lower students receive?

General observation and qualitative data support the O.S.I.A. findings. It was observed that students employ their perceptions of their interactions with Mr. Allen for assessing the positive regard toward them. For example:

If he likes your work, he talks to you more. He's more interested in how it was done, where the idea came from, the tools you used, the technique. He also talks about what else you can do if you want to go on with more work like it. He exhibits a concern for your development as an artist. If he doesn't like your work he treats you more like a student and less like an artist. I mean he doesn't talk to you on an equal level, he talks at you from a superior level...If he judges you inferior or average, he's just not gonna get into it like he would when it excites him. (A level student, 2/12/77)

In comparison, I present the perspective of a D+ student made in response to his mid-term critique:

After I had finished getting my critique, I had the feeling I had been to the health center and that he was the doctor that didn't know me and so
he begins looking through my portfolio like it was a medical file. And, as he flipped through it he keeps looking at his watch as if to tell me I wasn't long for this world. (D+ level student, 2/12/77)

This student draws an analogy to a public clinic where the treatment tends to be rushed and impersonal. The analogy is formulated on a perceived similarity of subordinate status and the ambiguity of authoritative diagnosis. That is, appraisal or diagnosis is made from the present "symptoms" and past "records" and communication to the patient is a glossing of the teacher's (doctor's) private judgment. Though this student would not interpret the critique in terms of a grade equivalent, his concluding verdict "not long for this world" makes it clear that his general interpretation was that the judgment would not be favorable.

Since the instructor's interaction pattern provides the participants with perceptual cues for interpreting the meaning of the instructor's evaluative interaction, O.S.I.A. analysis of instructional pattern was selected to describe any difference that could be observed and measured in that pattern.

O.S.I.A. time line analysis was employed to examine the general instructional appraisal strategy for the midterm summative critique. Though individual patterns may vary, the basic structure of Mr. Allen's instructional pattern follows:
Observation 24: Mr. Allen was observed to employ the following appraisal strategy:

Step one: (T03) Remove one painting or arrange a group of related paintings from the portfolio.

Step two: (T2) Look at the work briefly (an average of two seconds).

Step three: (T10) Acknowledge the work.

Step four: (T4) Describe the characteristics of the work or explicate the objectives of the task.

Step five: (T07, S05) Solicit the student's attention to a dimension of the work.

Step six: (T8,9,10,11,12) Make a value statement about the dimension attended to.

Step seven: (T4) Explain the criterion or standard.

Step eight: (T6, 7) Solicit clarification or solicit student response or appraisal.

((S5, S8, 9, 10, 11, 12))

Step nine: (T10, T4) Acknowledge response followed by further explication.

Step ten: Repeat steps four through seven.

Having analyzed the general appraisal pattern, the analysis proceeds to an examination of the consistencies of the specific variables within that pattern. I begin with O.S.I.A. standard variable analysis. Summaries for the O.S.I.A. standard variable analyses are found in tables 10, 11 and 12.

Two sets of figures are provided in the tables. The first indicates the calculated ratio for the defined variable. This figure is to be interpreted with caution. In some cases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Variables</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect/Direct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,6,7,8,9,10/4,11,12)</td>
<td>434/271 = 1.601</td>
<td>292/218 = 1.601</td>
<td>152/92 = 1.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Indirect/Direct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,8,9,10/11,12)</td>
<td>240/61 = 3.934</td>
<td>163/50 = 3.260</td>
<td>89/32 = 2.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarification, Acknowledgment/Judgmental Appraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,10/8,9,11,12)</td>
<td>112/189 = 0.593</td>
<td>67/146 = 0.459</td>
<td>40/81 = 0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified I/D in Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-X-&gt;6,8,9,10/1-X&gt;11,12)</td>
<td>147/29 = 5.069</td>
<td>79/19 = 4.158</td>
<td>33/19 = 1.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I/D in Response or Reaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-X-&gt;5,6,7,8,9,10/1-X-&gt;4,11,12)</td>
<td>190/132 = 1.439</td>
<td>106/106 = 1.000</td>
<td>53/36 = 1.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 11

**O.S.I.A. Standard Variable Analysis: Teacher Ratios (Interaction)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Variables</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation, Clarification/Response (6,7/5)</td>
<td>218/22 = 9.909</td>
<td>151/4 = 37.750</td>
<td>69/3 = 23.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation, Clarification/Initiation (6,7/4)</td>
<td>218/210 = 1.038</td>
<td>151/168 = 0.899</td>
<td>69/60 = 1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response/Initiation (5/4)</td>
<td>22/210 = 0.105</td>
<td>4/168 = 0.024</td>
<td>3/60 = 0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction, Initiations/Student Interactions, Initiations (T4, 5,6,7, ∕ S4,5,6,7)</td>
<td>450/256 = 1.758</td>
<td>323/160 = 2.019</td>
<td>132/72 = 1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 12

**O.S.I.A. STANDARD VARIABLE ANALYSIS: TEACHER RATIOS (APPRAISALS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal Variables</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment/ Judgmental Reactions (10/8,9,11,12)</td>
<td>66/189 = 0.349</td>
<td>41/146 = 0.281</td>
<td>31/81 = 0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable/Unfavorable Judgm. (8,9/11/12)</td>
<td>128/61 = 2.098</td>
<td>96/50 = 1.920</td>
<td>49/32 = 1.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Criterion Judgment/ Personal Criterion (8,11/9,12)</td>
<td>23/166 = 0.139</td>
<td>18/128 = 0.141</td>
<td>14/67 = 0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment/ Initiation, Interactive (8,9,11,12/4,5,6,7)</td>
<td>189/450 = 0.420</td>
<td>146/323 = 0.452</td>
<td>81/132 = 0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of relatively low behavior frequency, an inflated figure may result; for example, the solicitation, clarification/response variable in table 11. The relatively low number of teacher responses to low students create a significant differential between the lower and higher groups. However, when the percentage numerator is examined we find that in proportion to other behaviors the ratio is very similar for all groups.

In general, the standard variable analysis supports the third minor proposition:

Minor Proposition 3: the general instructional pattern for interaction, appraisal and climate variables is similar for all students.

This finding seems to indicate that the instructional difference is in amount of interaction rather than in the pattern of interaction. However, since qualitative data indicate that students can sense pattern differences, I concluded that a qualitatively keener analysis of differences within the general behavioral classes was needed. That is, standard variable analysis was judged inefficient for the analysis of qualitative differences.

Standard variable analysis does however indicate a few observable differences:

Observation 25: the general instructional pattern for the tutorial critiques was more indirect than direct as measured by the O.S.I.A. climate variables.

Observation 26: appraisal strategies were more direct than indirect, as measured by the O.S.I.A. climate variables.
The modified indirect/direct in response or reaction variable is calculated for all the student behaviors, followed by positive behaviors, divided by all the student behaviors, followed by negative judgments. The calculations indicate that:

Observation 27: the distribution of judgmental behaviors following student behavior is proportionately more negative for the lower rated student.

In relation to the general appraisal variables, slight variation can be noted:

Observation 28: a slight higher indifference in the ratio distribution of favorable judgments over unfavorable judgments is noted for the students graded higher.

Observation 29: lower students receive a slightly greater proportion of judgmental behavior over interactive behavior.

Observation 30: in general, the appraisal pattern among achievement types is relatively similar.

Since the differences are not significantly greater, as measured by the standard 0.S.I.A. analysis, it was decided that subscripted analyses might indicate qualitative differences that were not apparent in general behavioral class analysis. The triangulated analysis proceeds first to an examination of the appraisal dialogue structuring.

**Differences in Conversational Structuring**

Conversation analysis of the appraisal interactions led to the fourth minor proposition:
Minor Proposition 4: the structuring of the verbal interaction is different for students receiving higher grades than it is for students receiving lower grades.

Appendix D contains protocol samples of verbal interactions. When the conversations with higher students are contrasted with the lower students a significant difference can be observed.

Observation 31: the topic content of conversation with the students judged as low is much more generalized than the topic content focus for students graded higher.

With the low students, Mr. Allen frequently used such phrases as "that's interesting", "those are strange" and "not so bad". His review of the low student work tends to acknowledge the completion of the assignment rather than to serve as an instructional referent. It can also be noted that:

Observation 32: with the higher graded students, the instructor uses more vocabulary that is particular to the special terminology of the substantive focus.

With the higher students can be found the presence of the phrase "yaknow (?)", whereas, this phrase is absent in his interactions with the lower graded students. Since the behavior pattern is consistent it might be inferred that the instructor operates with the assumption that some students "know" and others do not.

Another significant variable in the conversation structuring is found in the analysis of speaker "turn-taking." Though there is evidence for some conversation "cut-offs" (interruptions) with the better students, more
often than not, the better student is allowed to initiate a conversation turn, whereas the lower ranked student is "cut-off."

Observation 33: students who are judged favorably are allowed to interrupt the teacher talk and to steal the speaker turn, whereas the poorer student is expected to assume a listener role.

For example, note how this A level student gains control of the verbal interaction. ("cut-offs" are indicated by //).

Brad: (pointing to one) this is the one that I just took the yellow and flowed it all in through there (gesturing)--then began to just change the yellows very slightly.

Mr. A: mm hmm. It looks good, ah//

Brad: and this (pointing to another) is the one where she had us paint any shapes we wanted then paint over them with the still life. And this first one is in shades of green, except for that red dot that got on it in my portfolio (h).

Mr. A: After you did the shapes you referred to the still life?

Brad: Yeah, right.

In contrast, note Mr. Allen's interaction with the D level student:

Arlene: ...All of my pictures are like//

Mr. A: Do you feel that you do better on them when you have more time?

Arlene: ah I//

Mr. A: Okay.((turns away from this student and picks up another work))

Further examination of the structure of the appraisal dialogues reveals that:
Observation 34: there is a tendency to ignore the response and initiations of the students he judges low in performance, whereas the tendency is to cultivate the conversations of those he judges higher in performance.

Simply stated, the conversational structuring strategy is one of interrupting the speaker turn, either by a more forceful voice projection or through a "cut-off" insertion during a slight hesitation on the speaker's part. Note the use of "cut-offs" with this low level student:

Mr. A: Did you finish the red squares?
Arlene: I finished them, but, I um/
Mr. A: Are you gonna bring em in Monday?
Arlene: Yeah, I/
Mr. A: Okay...

The fact that the student speaks without tonal or verbal assertiveness, and that she makes slight forcefulness pause, facilitates the listener's (Mr. Allen) capacity to insert a conversation turn with tonal emphasis. The result is that, in this case, Mr. Allen completely dominates the conversation topic and the conversational contact time.

The general observation of conversational structuring indicates that:

Observation 35: the instructor will accept the listener role more readily when he judged the student as artistically competent.

This observation receives support from the higher frequency counts for student initiations and responses.
It was noted that though the lower student's response is solicited, it is "truncated" more frequently than not. This finding raises further question about the "indirect" interpretation of the O.S.I.A. standard climate variable analysis.

The qualitative data of the conversational analysis indicate a different interpretation of dominance. O.S.I.A. frequency counts would treat a cut-off response the same as a "listened-to" response. Some responses are also more compliant. For example, the low student was observed to respond in short utterances, e.g. simple "yes/no" or "un hun". Such responses are also coded as "S5" despite their qualitative differential. It is apparent from conversational analysis that such coding practice may result in misleading interpretation of the frequency distribution. It is concluded that:

Observation 36: conversation analysis of instructional initiation and response reveals that the teacher's behavior is more dominant with the students he judges as low in achievement.

Observation 37: the conversation variables which delimit or cultivate talk function as perceptual cues from which the student participant infers the degree of teacher positive regard.

For example, when asked if she knew any secrets for success in Mr. Allen's class, this D level student responded:

Arlene: No. I don't think so--Maybe it's because he really doesn't talk to me about it. He tells me exactly what he wants.
Me: What kind of things do you and Mr. Allen talk about?

Arlene: Oh--we never talk about much of anything. Most of the time he just walks right past me. When he does say something it's usually what to do. I get the feeling that he could care less about what I have to say.

(Student respondent, 2/25/77)

It was noted that Mr. Allen exhibited a tendency to address students from behind when negative criticism was being issued.

Observation 38: when the criticism was favorable, the instructor was observed to establish a face-to-face contact and to position himself at the same eye level as the student, whereas, when the judgment was negative, he spoke without making eye-contact and from a higher eye-level.

Evidence for student sensitivity to this observation is found in the C level student response:

Me: Did anything bother you about his interaction with you?

Irene: His interpersonal relations are distant. He has rarely spoken to me to my face -- always from behind my back. Sometimes I feel like he's having a conversation with my drawing rather than talking to me.

(C-level student, 8/24/76)

Another student who received a C made a similar observation:

Gee, for a teacher he's pretty negative. Yaknow, Mr. Allen has never smiled at me but that doesn't bother me as much as the fact that when he criticizes your work he won't look you in the eye. Have you noticed that he always talks to you from the back.

(C level student, 7/1/76)

The absence of interaction behavior also provides interpretive cues. The need to interpret the meaning for silence or ignoring is reflected in the following field notation:
Betty: I feel like I did two nice drawings today and I am really frustrated that he has just ignored me. I really would like some feedback but it doesn't seem like we're gonna get it. Everybody in here is afraid to talk. I am really feeling insecure and I get the impression that asking him a question is not allowed. I don't know why I feel that way but don't you get the idea that questions would not be welcomed?

(C level student, 7/6/76)

As a participant I shared similar anxiety earlier in the course:

I felt the drawing was good. I was somewhat disappointed that Mr. Allen made no comments in passing. I caught myself checking the type of comments he was making. I found that they were mostly negative. I decided that his attention was toward technical issues and if you are doing all right on those he would pass you by.

(Field notation, 7/2/76)

In order to test the validity of the proposition, I intentionally deviated from the exact technique prescribed. Mr. Allen's behavior confirmed the proposition. Note the interaction:

Mr. A: Aren't you using charcoal?
Me: No, conte pencil.

Mr. A: It would be easier for you to block in those values a lot faster with charcoal. You can smear it with your fingers. You'll never finish at the rate you're going with a pencil.

It was also noted that Mr. Allen revealed personal information, related to his own background or studio work, to those students he judged higher. No instances of self disclosure were recorded for interaction with the lower students, nor with average students.
In summary of the initiation variables, it can be said that Mr. Allen's behavioral pattern suggests a pattern toward providing the better students with an expanded range of information related to substantive content. With the lower ranged students, the initiations are more toward the managerial and admonishment content. Though all the behaviors fall within the initiation classification, sub-classification provides additional cues for interpreting teacher's positive regard, as well as behavioral cues to interpret the instructor's interest in the student, or the products of his performance. When a high proportion of the initiation focuses on prescriptive information or deficiency information related to diagnosis, the student interprets the initiation as teacher-to-student direct influence. Whereas, when the initiations are substantive and deal with the sharing of skills or knowledge, the student interprets this behavior as artist-to-artist indirect influence.

Solicitation of Clarification

Observation 39: there are observable and describable differences in the content focus of the teacher's solicitation for clarification with students he judges as higher in achievement as opposed to with those he judges lower.

Table 14 provides a summary of those differences. The most significant difference is that for the higher students the teacher shows four times as much interest in the development of the problem solution. Whereas, with the low students, not only is the total solicitation less, a
proportion is directed to clarification for the purpose of assessing the reasons for production difficulties. Teacher solicitations related to the evolution of the product outcome was interpreted by the participants as positive regard, while lack of solicitation or probing for the source of difficulty was interpreted as negative regard.

In summary of Mr. Allen's interaction style, it is concluded that his structuring dialogue differs for various achievement types and that these subtle differentiations are frequently used by the student participants as indicators of teacher positive or negative regard.

**Qualitative Dimension Differentiations**

The standard behavioral classes of the O.S.I.A. were examined for further qualitative differentiations. These differences were designed into the Sevigny Subscript Coding for use with the O.S.I.A. subscript analysis. The appraisal interactions were processed using subscripted systems and it was found that:

**Minor Proposition 5:** subscript patterns within the general instructional classes of the O.S.I.A. are significantly different for instructional interaction with the students graded higher as opposed to those graded lower.

What follows are the table displays and discussion of those differences. It is brought to the reader's attention that because of the large number of comparative subscript categories, smaller percentage or ratio differences are interpreted with higher significance as compared to standard
O.S.I.A. analysis.

Initiations (T4)

Observation 40: there are observable and describable differences in the content and focus of the information that the teacher gives to students he judges high as opposed to the information given to the students he judges lower.

Table 13 provides a summary of those differences. The first significant difference is that with higher ranked students, Mr. Allen initiated alternative strategies and interpretations for creative divergences in the student's future. With the students he judged lower there was no evidence for such behavior. The implication being that "poorer" students had not sufficiently comprehended the objective of the assignment so as to comprehend the alternatives. Another difference was that the teacher demonstrated concepts or technical initiations for the better students while no evidence of that behavior was found for the low students. Yet another difference is that the evaluative criteria were more frequently explicated to the higher students than to the lower ones. There was little frequency difference in his explication of vocabulary terms.

Two instances of joking were recorded with the average students and none were indicated for the higher or lower students. Though the inference may be that dialogue at either end of the continuum is more serious in nature, the difference is too slight to generalize beyond its description for the case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information related to alternatives or divergence</td>
<td>T04$A</td>
<td>11 12 100</td>
<td>0 .0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal information about an outside other</td>
<td>T4$A</td>
<td>4 5 83</td>
<td>0 .0 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information through demonstration</td>
<td>T4$D</td>
<td>14 15 83</td>
<td>3 3 17</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal criterion explained</td>
<td>T4$E</td>
<td>14 15 48</td>
<td>12 11 35</td>
<td>8 5 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary term defined or explicated</td>
<td>T4$I</td>
<td>4 6 43</td>
<td>3 3 21</td>
<td>8 5 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking to set climate conditions</td>
<td>T4$J</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information related to what should have been done</td>
<td>T4A$N</td>
<td>22 25 31</td>
<td>30 27 34</td>
<td>30 18 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information related to an outside referent</td>
<td>T4$O</td>
<td>3 4 27</td>
<td>7 6 40</td>
<td>8 5 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive manding (Do's)</td>
<td>T4A$P</td>
<td>16 17 30</td>
<td>23 21 37</td>
<td>32 19 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscriptive manding (Don't do)</td>
<td>T04$P</td>
<td>1 2 17</td>
<td>7 6 50</td>
<td>7 4 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives or process reviewed</td>
<td>T4$R</td>
<td>4 5 29</td>
<td>11 10 59</td>
<td>4 2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-disclosure</td>
<td>T4$S</td>
<td>3 3 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: TEACHER SOLICITATION OF CLARIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification sought for verbal response</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>11 5 38 12 4 30 15 3 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification sought for antecedents to production</td>
<td>T6$A</td>
<td>67 31 46 82 27 40 60 9 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitations about the conception of a production response (creative source)</td>
<td>T6$C</td>
<td>17 8 89 0 0 0 5 1 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification sought for error or difficulty</td>
<td>T6$D</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 1 33 10 2 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits information related to technical aspects of a production response</td>
<td>T6$T</td>
<td>5 1 50 3 1 50 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These are selected subscripts relative to tutorial appraisal.*
Solicitations

Observation 41: there are observable and describable pattern differences in the content focus of the solicitations that the teacher requests of the students he judges as higher as opposed to with those he has judged as lower.

Table 14 provides a summary of solicitation differences. Mr. Allen solicited the visual attention of the higher students to certain details nearly twice as frequently as he did with the lower students. He also asked them questions and solicited their interaction, whereas he did not solicit as much interaction from the lower students, nor did he solicit their continued production.

With all students, the majority of the recorded solicitations structured visual attention for critical feedback. However, with the lower students this behavior is the predominate solicitation. There were no direct requests for verbal responses with the lower students whereas such requests were found to increase significantly with the higher students. This finding offers support for the verbal interaction differentials that students use as cues for determining teacher affect toward them.

The absence of instances of response solicitation was interpreted by the student participants as negative regard, whereas the soliciting response or the solicitation of information related to the student's biography were regarded as positive regard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicits attention to detail</td>
<td>T07</td>
<td>D% 70 F 129 %T 43</td>
<td>D% 77 F 98 %T 32</td>
<td>D% 95 F 72 %T 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits information related to student's biography</td>
<td>T7$B</td>
<td>3 6 60 1 2 20</td>
<td>1 2 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits the student's judgment or opinion</td>
<td>T7$E</td>
<td>2 4 30 3 4 30</td>
<td>3 3 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification solicitation</td>
<td>T7$K</td>
<td>1 2 40 1 2 40</td>
<td>1 1 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(okay(?) all right (?))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits prescriptive continuation of production</td>
<td>T7$P</td>
<td>3 6 60 3 4 40</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubscribed solicitations (for verbal response)</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>19 35 56 14 18 44</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These are selected subscripts relative to tutorial appraisal.
Teacher Judgments of Correctness

Observation 42: There are observable and describable differences in the type and focus of the teacher's judgment of correctness for higher students as opposed to lower students.

Table 15 indicates that there are relatively few judgments of correctness made in relation to the appraisal of art products. The frequency distribution indicates a difference in the instructor's judgmental pattern. With low students judgment of correctness was limited to antecedent statements. No instances were recorded where the lower students' products were judged as correct.

Teacher Personal Positive Judgments

Observation 43: There are observable and describable differences in the type and focus of the instructor's personal positive judgments of the products and production of students he judges as higher as opposed to with those he judges as lower.

Table 16 indicates that there are a variety of qualitative differences within this appraisal category. The first variable indicates that, to a significant degree, the teacher used emphatic or enthusiastic judgments with those he favored. All three of the higher students were asked for work samples for exhibition purposes, whereas neither the low students nor the average were asked to exhibit their work. For average students Mr. Allen favored general value terms, e.g. "this is better", "this is good", "that's nice", without qualifying the meaning of the judgment. The criticism pattern focused on isolated aspects of the works. With
TABLE 16

SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: TEACHER JUDGMENTS OF CORRECTNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D% F %T D% F %T D% F %T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges the correctness of the antecedent statement</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>25 4 40 32 40 100 2 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of correctness with accentuation or emphasis</td>
<td>T8A</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of correctness for the group of which the individ-</td>
<td>T8$A</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated correctness of a projected product outcome</td>
<td>T8$F</td>
<td>32 5 50 34 5 50 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexplicated judgment of correctness (general term)</td>
<td>T8$G</td>
<td>6 1 100 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctness judged for an isolated part or element</td>
<td>T8$I</td>
<td>12 2 29 34 5 71 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctness judged for a group of products (summative)</td>
<td>T8$J</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A judgment of correctness that is qualified by some personal negative judgment</td>
<td>T8$Q</td>
<td>12 2 100 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A judgment of correctness for the whole product or relational aspects within the production sample</td>
<td>T8$R</td>
<td>12 2 100 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**Subscript Variable Analysis: Teacher Personal Positive Judgments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment with emphasis</td>
<td>T9A</td>
<td>14 18 78 4</td>
<td>3 13</td>
<td>3 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment of the antecedent statement</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment about the group of which one is part</td>
<td>T9$A</td>
<td>1 1 25 1</td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td>3 2 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment by display or exhibition of product</td>
<td>T9$E</td>
<td>2 3 100 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment of the projected outcome of a behavior trend</td>
<td>T9$F</td>
<td>13 16 55 8</td>
<td>6 20</td>
<td>10 7 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment made in general terms and without explication</td>
<td>T9$G</td>
<td>33 41 50 20</td>
<td>16 20</td>
<td>37 26 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment of an isolated part or element</td>
<td>T9$I</td>
<td>10 13 31 33</td>
<td>26 62</td>
<td>21 15 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative judgment of a group of products(favorable)</td>
<td>T9$J</td>
<td>4 5 71 3</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference disclosure (likes)</td>
<td>T9$L</td>
<td>7 9 45 9</td>
<td>7 35</td>
<td>6 4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment that is qualified (good, but)</td>
<td>T9$Q</td>
<td>16 20 48 15</td>
<td>12 28</td>
<td>14 10 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment about the interrelationship</td>
<td>T9$R</td>
<td>1 2 18 8</td>
<td>6 55</td>
<td>4 3 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the higher students there were disclosures of preference, as well as more summative judgments about the positive quality of the work. There were no personal positive summative judgments for the lower students and few for the average. The most significant difference in this is in the frequency of positive judgment and in the degree of enthusiasm in the delivery of the judgments.

In general, Mr. Allen's enthusiasm was rare. After listening to a recorded episode of his interaction, he said:

They're right! People have always said I have no enthusiasm. Boy am I negative. Even when I played basketball I was accused of looking like I hated the game. I try, but, I just can't be the bouncy type. (Mr. Allen, 3/25/77)

To use the student typificant his general interaction was rather "low-keyed" and "dry". A slight emphasis in tonality or slight degree of increased tempo in his expression was interpreted as enthusiasm. Its infrequency made its occurrence more significant for positive affect inference. Accentuated judgments also tended to be directed at the whole product or holistic relations in the work. Therefore, another significant differentiation is that when personal positive judgments are made for low students they were usually directed toward isolated elements or aspects or are made in general and unqualified terms. This would seem to indicate support for the student interpretation that much of the personal positive judgment is a glossing strategy when low students are involved, rather than an honest reflection of the
Teacher's affect.

**Teacher Acknowledgments**

Observation 43: there are observable and describable differences in the type and focus of the teacher's acknowledgment of higher students as opposed to his acknowledgments of lower students.

Table 18 indicates the differences in the type of acknowledgments. The first difference is related to student performance in that it is the teacher's acknowledgment of the student initiation. Since higher students initiated more information, verbal acknowledgments are also higher. Related to this are the phonetic acknowledgments or antecedent statements, e.g. "un hun", "mmm hmm" etc. Such acknowledgments serve a conversation structuring function in that they tell the speaker, "go ahead, I understand you and am listening to you." In relation to the earlier discussion, this frequency difference does indicate that with the higher students, the teacher did use more frequent cultivation of student talk through acknowledgment and acceptance of antecedent responses.

With lower students, production acknowledgment was frequently the sole appraisal behavior with a particular work; that is, the teacher used acknowledgment as a glossing strategy when he did not want to make judgment of the work, e.g. "the monochromatic, okay, the last assignment, okay--the collage--"
The most frequently recorded glossing term was "okay". With the higher students conversational content analysis reveals that the teacher often employs the term as a pause to get his thoughts together before delivering an appraisal. The teacher made judgments for each individual work, whereas with the lower students acknowledgment, glossing strategies were used and appraisals were made in general terms and in relation reference to the clusters of work.

Teacher Judgments of Incorrectness

Observation 44: there are some observable and describable differences in the type and focus of the teacher's judgment of incorrectness with higher students as opposed to with lower students.

Table 19 indicates that judgment of incorrectness was the least frequent instructional appraisal strategy. Nonetheless, some differences can be noted. First, higher students receive fewer judgments and those that they did received were related to an element or an isolated aspect of the work rather than to it as a whole. All three of the lower students received a summative judgment of incorrectness, and no such summations were given to the higher or average students.

Teacher Personal Negative Judgments

Observation 45: there are observable and describable differences in the type and focus of the teacher's personal negative judgments with students of higher achievement as opposed to with students of lower achievement.
**TABLE 18**

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: TEACHER ACKNOWLEDGMENTS OF STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment of the antecedent verbal utterance</td>
<td>T10</td>
<td>D% 32 F 24 T 28</td>
<td>D% 34 F 34 T 12</td>
<td>D% 5 F 18 T 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production response</td>
<td>T10$P</td>
<td>D% 24 F 18 T 40</td>
<td>D% 17 F 12 T 27</td>
<td>D% 36 F 15 T 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production acknowledgment using neutral term, indexical to the context</td>
<td>T10$I</td>
<td>D% 5 F 4 T 25</td>
<td>D% 8 F 50 T 9</td>
<td>D% 4 F 25 T 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge humor with laughter</td>
<td>T10$H</td>
<td>D% 4 F 3 T 60</td>
<td>D% 1 F 1 T 20</td>
<td>D% 2 F 1 T 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple &quot;okay&quot; acknowledgment</td>
<td>T10$K</td>
<td>D% 18 F 13 T 32</td>
<td>D% 20 F 14 T 34</td>
<td>D% 33 F 14 T 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple nod or phonetic acknowledgment</td>
<td>T10$N</td>
<td>D% 16 F 12 T 75</td>
<td>D% 1 F 1 T 5</td>
<td>D% 7 F 3 T 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscript Descriptor</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Average Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness about the antecedent statement or behavior</td>
<td>T11</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness expressed with emphasis</td>
<td>T11A</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 1 100 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness about the group of which one is a part</td>
<td>T11$A</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness by demonstration of correctness</td>
<td>T11$D</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated correctness of the outcome of an action trend</td>
<td>T11$F</td>
<td>0 0 0 16 2 100 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness made in general terms and unexplained</td>
<td>T11$G</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 8 1 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrectness judged for a portion or isolated element in the product</td>
<td>T11$I</td>
<td>70 5 30 58 7 47 23 3 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative judgment of incorrectness for a group of products</td>
<td>T11$J</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 23 3 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: (continued)
TABLE 19 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness that is excused or rationalized</td>
<td>T11$K</td>
<td>15 1 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness that is qualified to a degree of incorrectness</td>
<td>T11$Q</td>
<td>15 1 20</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>30 4 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness that refers to relationships or to the whole product</td>
<td>T11$R</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>12 1 34</td>
<td>16 2 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness delivered with sarcasm or irony</td>
<td>T11$S</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>12 1 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 indicates that there are several qualitative differences. Once again, in his focus with the higher students, he issued a generally favorable appraisal of the work and then qualified that appraisal by indicating minor areas which could use improvement. With low students the relational or holistic judgments were about equal to the isolated judgments. Another significant difference is that negative judgments made about the higher students were more frequently qualified, that is preceded by a degree descriptor, e.g. "not so bad", "a little bit too", "just a bit" etc. Secondly, negative judgments were frequently excused or rationalized e.g. "well that's okay cause we really haven't dealt with that yet", or "I don't expect you to get it right the first time." With the lower students, there were no observed instances where a negative judgment was excused. Qualitative discriminations indicate that, despite the fact that the higher students received more negative judgments, we can see that these judgments are more qualified, relate to small aspects of the while, are excused or rationalized, and are used more for goal setting and for performance improvement rather than grading. The issue was not so much what is bad, but rather what is not as good as it could be with additional practice and attention. With the low students the personal negative judgments are more descriptive of the state of affairs and function as the rationale for negative assessment.
### TABLE 20

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: TEACHER PERSONAL NEGATIVE JUDGMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment about antecedent statement</td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>.2 %T</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment expressed with emphasis</td>
<td>T12A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment about the group of which one is a part</td>
<td>T12$A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgments about the concept or idea for the product</td>
<td>T12$C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgments about the anticipated consequence of an action trend</td>
<td>T12$F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment made with general terms and unexplained</td>
<td>T12$G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment about an isolated part or element in the product</td>
<td>T12$I</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable summative judgment about a group of products</td>
<td>T12$J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
<td>D% F %T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment that</td>
<td>T12$K</td>
<td>17 9 75 11 3 25 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is rationalized or excused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dislike is expressed</td>
<td>T12$L</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 4 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgment about</td>
<td>T12$R</td>
<td>8 4 26 15 4 26 25 7 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interrelationships or whole products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal negative judgments</td>
<td>T12$S</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivered with sarcasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified negative</td>
<td>T12$Q</td>
<td>15 8 53 26 6 40 4 1 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20 Continued
O.S.I.A. Pool Analysis

O.S.I.A. pool analysis was used as a comparative measure for percentage and ratio distribution of certain clustered subscript variables, which were relevant to the student perceived propositions. Table 21 provides a summary of the results. It should be noted that with the larger range of 114 subscripted variables, that fractions of percentage distribution differences are much more significant than for the standard thirteen category variable analysis. Percentage distributions were calculated in relation to the total of teacher behavior.

Future/Past Variables

Observation 46: with students judged favorably, the critique is structured in relation to the student's future; whereas, with students judged unfavorably, the content focus is related to the student's past.

The findings reported in table 21 offer support for the student proposition that the teacher focuses his criticism toward the higher student's future, whereas, the dialogue focus is on the past with the lower student.

Manding Variables

Observation 47: in proportion to other instructional behaviors, the instructor issues a higher percentage of prescriptive and proscriptive mands.

The finding does support the student proposition that, in proportion to other behavior, the teacher does tell the low students to do or not to do.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future related {T04$A, T4$F, T7$F, T4A, T8$F, T9$F, T11$F, T12$F}</td>
<td>F 103</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0859</td>
<td>.0835</td>
<td>.0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past related {T4$A$N, T5$N, T04$P, T5$P}</td>
<td>F 37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0308</td>
<td>.0394</td>
<td>.0828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future/Past ratio</td>
<td>2.7837</td>
<td>2.1176</td>
<td>2.0434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0559</td>
<td>.0784</td>
<td>.1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscriptive Manding {T4$A$N, T5$N, T04$P, T5$P}</td>
<td>F 37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0422</td>
<td>.0523</td>
<td>.0618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0125</td>
<td>.0307</td>
<td>.0161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation and positive regard {T6$A, T6$C, T6$T}</td>
<td>F 36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D% .0410</td>
<td>.0430</td>
<td>.0268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humor Related Variables

Observation 48: More instances of humor are found in the dialogues with average students. The general observations support that instances of humor with low achieving students were consistently less frequent than with the higher students.

Solicitation and Positive Regard

Observation 49: with students judged as higher the instructor solicits more information related to the assignment conditions and interpretation.

Table 21 offers support for this proposition. It should be noted, however, that in general, clarification sought from below average students usually related to the task assignment conditions; whereas, clarifications solicited from the above average students, more often related to the development of the technique or the creative interpretation of the assignment problem.

Part Four

Student Interaction and Learning

From my examination of the student perspective, it became apparent that the student's perspective was intricately linked to his achievement in the setting. Accordingly, the analytic account of student behavior proceeds to the evidence which gives support to the second major proposition. It reads as follows:

There are observable and describable differences in the ways that students who have earned high achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior as opposed to the ways students earning lower achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior.
I have categorized the aesthetic perspective acquisition process into five sequential stages: (1) the student becomes aware of the aesthetic labels and judgmental language for a specific setting; (2) he comprehends the meaning and implication of the language and the criteria it represents; (3) he learns about himself in relation to those criteria; (4) he understands how the criteria are translated into performance applications and (5) he becomes convinced that the new criterion is of value.

In terms of the hierarchy of changes which take place, the first change is in the student's cognitive structure - the concept or criterion becomes part of the perceptual awareness. The student then must learn to interpret the meaning of that criterion, and so he searches the setting and his experience to confirm his comprehension. Comprehension results in production attempts to out the criterion to practical application - experimental production strategies emerge. Finally, when the student is convinced of the relevance and understands the application of a criterion to his performance, a change in his value structure occurs. Consequently, his aesthetic perspective is altered. What follows are representative incidents which offer evidence for differences in learning stages and the interpretive perspectives which influence them.
The Perspective of the Below Average Student

Minor Proposition 6: below average students may have an awareness of aesthetic criteria, however, they may not grasp its meaning or its implication for classroom performance.

I have noted that the below average student found much of Mr. Allen's feedback to be ambiguous. It was further observed that this type student often built defenses to maintain and give a sense of security to his initial perspective. Some criteria or elements were blocked off or remained static because, at some stage, the alternative was too threatening. Information which could lead to a change in perspective was never admitted into the perception of needs, and therefore did not acquire relevance. The following statement reflects the typical resistance to the alternative values of the teacher's perspective:

But you see--his reasons for teaching the course and mine for taking it were not all the same objectives. I went there to take the course because I thought I was weak in anatomy. I feel that if you draw the human body it should look right - I mean it had to look proportionally correct. And if you can get that right, then no matter what position the model is in its going to come out right. I still feel I am right. I still feel that I did not get out of the course what I should have been given. If we were going to spend all the time focusing on composition than that should have been made clear in the course description.

(C-level respondent, 9/24/76)

The statement indicates that this student's perspective was altered very little at the completion of the course. Her personal goals and expectations for the course were breached. However, her response was to defend her initial
perspective of what "should be" taught.

Many times, the below average student has insufficient knowledge for interpreting the teacher's criteria:

And when I showed him my work, he picked out the one that I thought was the worst. I really thought it was ugly and he said to me "keep that one for your portfolio." He thought it was really good. I still can't see his reasoning.

(C-level student 9/24/76)

The sample interview provided in Appendix B-2 gives support to the proposition that the below average student continues to perform on the initial perspective he began the course with. The interview reflected that this student's perspective was altered very little as a result of interaction in the setting. The interview reflects a passive interaction style and a dependency on the interviewers direction control.

The Perspective of the Average Student

Minor Proposition 7: the average student is generally at the stage of learning where he understands the criteria, however, he is not fully aware of how the criteria relates to his performance.

Audio and visual eavesdropping was a frequent behavior of the below average student. Because he generally had difficulty making his own translations of criteria into production performance, he frequently observed others for strategy cues. Others were more direct and solicited help from others whom they perceived to be successful in that task. When asked why she had asked Jim to help her, this average student responded:
Well -- cause yesterday when we started to paint expressively -- Jim had his done right away and Mr. Allen came over and held it up. Yaknow I went and did mine the way I wanted and he really liked my colors, but said the way I painted wasn't what he wanted. So, I tried to use more freedom of movement on the next one. I thought it would end up looser, but it was a mess. I just had trouble, so I thought if I could watch Jim do it I might be able to copy the style.

(C level student)

Observation 50: students frequently look to the student they perceive as "better" for informational cues for the desired effects. As part of their learning strategy, they tend to copy the effect, hoping that they, too, can achieve the criteria that they do not fully comprehend or accept.

I call this trick learning. For example, one student who improved his grade standing did so by trick learning:

John: Now though, looking back, I tried to study= tried to concentrate on other peoples work= maybe like Brad for example= I studied what he was doing and I said 'why would he like that and not like mine?' and I looked at it for a while and I unh kinda got the idea that he -- wanted flowing colors. From that= from the second half I started so that the colors would run: from this corner to that corner, and that's what I tried to concentrate on.

Me: So when you found that what you had been doing wasn't what the teacher wanted you began to watch Brad?

John: Not necessarily to copy Brad, I looked at him and I said "he's doing messy things and I want to do pretty things," so: I did my pretty things with the kind of messiness that he wanted.

(B- student)

Observation 51: the descriptive labels that students employ can offer indication of the state of their conviction in relation to a specific criteria or another's perspective.
The criterion quality in the above was labeled as "messiness". Another student responded similarly when asked what she felt Mr. Allen's most important criteria were color

I would say, 'make them fuzzy, (hh) fuzz them up.' If it starts to look real change it. The more grotesque the better. The more fuzzy the better.
(C level student, 9/24/76)

The student description terms, "messy", "grotesque" and "fuzzy" imply a negative affect toward the same qualities that Mr. Allen referred to as "painterly", "expressionistic" and "subtle."

Even when the processed information becomes meaningful as relating to the student's becoming, it is not necessarily true that perspective acquisition has taken place. Such information is used to maintain the system, but it does not necessarily become a permanent change in the aesthetic perspective. The behavior which results imitates a desired product outcome without acquiring the implications of that outcome, or without conviction that the criteria is better.

The result is temporary compliance which gives pseudo evidence for perspective change. For example, note how this student reveals his true feeling to Mr. Allen:

Mr. A: Do you think that you now understand that there are other things to painting besides rendering skills?

Jim: Yeah, well it took me a while to change and that was my problem in the first half of the course.
Mr. A: Do you think that now you could still work as tightly as that ((pointing to an earlier painting)) and organize at the same time now?

Jim: I've been thinking more about it, but you know this 'wild stuff'//

Mr. A: (h) so it seems like 'wild stuff' to you?(h)

Jim: Yeah it does, sorry-- I really liked painting these for my own pleasure, but I don't think I'd want to make a habit of it.

(B- level student, 3/7/77)

Observation 52: average students are frequently aware of the contextual criteria but do not accept them as relevant to their perspective.

For instance:

Ann: I liked doing this one because you can be precise with it and you don't get upset.

Mr. A: Do I usually get upset when you're precise? (hh=)

Ann: Not really upset, but you'd sure rather we didn't.

(C+ level student, 2/11/77)

Appraisal information can be stored as a potential for meaning until the student discovers its pertinence. For instance:

About the mid-term I began to feel that I was beginning to understand color problems and relationships. I think that when he started to show the slides that helped me a lot. I began to see in the examples, samples or uses of the color combinations and relationships he was trying to get at before but I hadn't had enough experience with painting to know what he meant. I think I'm a good listener. Even in the beginning I think I listened to the key things that he wanted but then I just didn't know how to do it.

(B+ level student, 3/17/77)
Observation 53: the average student is likely to operate under the assumption that meaning will become clearer over time, whereas the higher student may be more direct in his solicitation for immediate clarification.

For instance, at the start of his critique, a higher level student said:

Look-- before we get into this I want to know exactly what this course is supposed to be about. Like I sense that the objective in here isn't to like be able to develop a painting that has any realism in it or anything. If I know how you feel about it, I can understand the critique better. (B+ level student, 2/11/77)

One of the cues used by Mr. Allen to determine if learning has occurred, is the student's increased facility with the descriptive language. In reference to his appraisal of a B level student he said:

I think she has a good grasp of the vocabulary and all, and can meet the criteria. But, I gave her a B, like because her work meets the criteria, but it doesn't go beyond just meeting it.

What is meant by "going beyond the criteria" implies Mr. Allen's perception of the qualitative, or aesthetic, characteristics which stimulate his arousal as the "audience" of the work. The inference which might be drawn is that, in Mr. Allen's perspective, the A student not only has the knowledge, he can apply it beyond the assignment conditions by perceiving options that the other students don't.

The Perspective of the Above Average Student

Mr. Allen's perception of interaction aggressiveness is used as an indicator of the "better" student. In
relation to his appraisal of one of the above average students, he said:

Mac, that older boy, like he asked me if - like rendering was an important aspect of the course in my mind, like he seemed like, well he was open about it, he said, like for some reason it was important to him but he didn't know like if that was necessary, and if he knew that it wasn't he was like willing to go ahead. Now he seems more mature to even understand that that's like a certain aspect that you can deal with or not, and a lot of people don't even have any idea.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

There is another motivational state which comes about when there is no sensation of threat. Many recognized discrepancies, especially unexpected phenomena, in the perceived world, arouse a state of curiosity. In this state, the student finds some satisfaction in exploration. This perspective is reflected in this interview dialogue:

Me: Okay you were successful in that you got an A. What hints or criteria could you share with a freshman coming into the course?

Jeff: Basically, I'd tell him what I'd tell anybody. 'Do what you think is best. Don't just try to work for him, you gotta work for yourself.' Right (?)-- Like if you don't believe in what you are doing in your art work then it like shows up.

Me: Lots of kids in there don't/

Jeff: Yeah, I know. But lots of kids in there are very naive. So there isn't any secrets to hand down if the kid isn't ready to use it.

(A level student, 3/22/77)

A similar response came from another A level student:

Me: If I was a freshman coming into this class, what would you tell me to increase my chances for getting an A?
Beth: I would say, just be here and work...try to get as much out of the experience as you can. You gotta be yourself. You can't be me.

(A level student 3/23/77)

**Minor Proposition 8:** the above average student is not only aware of the contextual criteria, he is skilled in innovative application of the criteria to situational tasks.

Unlike the average student, the A students did not offer product recipes for success in the setting. However, they were the models that others followed. They push the bounds of the expectations rather than strive to find them. Mr. Allen's own perspective for making distinction between the A level performance and the B was influenced by the distinction perceived between just comprehending and applying the criteria, or pushing it to new directions. For instance, when asked to disclose his opinion of who the "best" students were he responded:

The one kid, Brad, who had a lot of art in high school seems like understands that stuff pretty well already and yet he isn't bored and I think that it's challenging to him and he does real well, and he pushes all the time, so although he's had a lot of training he keeps like over-stepping the boundaries and stuff. I mean not outrageously but he tries different things - so I have a lot of respect for him.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

The criteria for "best" which can be extrapolated from Mr. Allen's perspective follows:

1. he understands the objectives
2. he can apply them to his work
3. he pushes boundaries, (novel approaches)
4. he does not act bored - his attitude is positive toward learning and experimentation.

5. he shows evidence of past experience which is in keeping with the course focus.

Mr. Allen gave further qualification of his criteria for the student who is above average, but reluctant to change his perspective. He said:

Then there are a couple people that are like real--tenacious. They aren't gonna give up. You could hit them over the head and they still wouldn't quit, and they do all right and they're usually the ones that when they come in, like are really interested in like showing you that they painted before. I mean, they've been doing something and they're gonna keep doing it, like a kind of rendering or something, and it's hard to get them to see another side of it. I think that will be like Jim and also Mac. Like Mac asked me, like he didn't know if that was really like an important part in my mind for the course, and asked me to disclose my objec­tives, which I did.

(Mr. Allen, 2/11/77)

Mac is representative of the above average student. He is much older and socially mature. He is experi­enced enough to realize that the teacher's role is not boss but assistant. He solicits clarifica­tion and is quick to interject talk and explicate his own cause.

(Field notation, 2/18/77)

The summative interview with the "highest achiever" (Appendix B-1) reflects a higher degree of self-confidence and mature conversational structuring skills. Contrast them, for example, with the lowest achieving student. (Appendix B-4). The following observations were noted in the conversational analysis of their verbal interaction:
Observation 54: higher students are able to gain control of the speaker position in their verbal interactions.

Observation 55: as opposed to lower level students, higher graded students dominate the conversation and have greater control over the topic initiations and topic changes that occur.

Observation 56: the above average shows a facility of descriptive language that is missing in the conversations with average and below age grade students.

Observation 57: the above average student makes use of the contextual vocabulary and adopts the appraisal phrases and procedures employed by the teacher.

Observation 58: he can support abstract concepts with concrete examples and can solicit attention to isolated aspects of the work which are exemplary of aesthetic concepts.

Such observations lead me to conclude that there is an articulate stage of learning. The better students exhibited this achievement. The average students can give evidence in their production that they understand concepts, but find difficulty in discussing them. Their knowledge is at a tacit stage of development.

It becomes apparent that what influences the A students to push boundaries is his confidence and independent perspective. He accepts the challenge of risk taking. This element of risk, in his work, may provide a key to the degree of novelty which attracts the teacher's curiosity and interest. The result of increased teacher attention is that the better student's creative behavior is reinforced. The related outcome is that he often becomes the model for others to follow. For example, when asked who he felt was
a good student, Jim replied:

Well-- I think Mr. Allen is very attracted to Brad's work. I think he does do some interesting things. Yeah, in fact, I'm listening to him a lot. He kinda impresses me with his attitude and stuff.  
(B level student, 2/18/77)

Brad's verbal interaction exhibits a conversational skill which allows him to maintain control over the situation and maximize his potential for success. The following excerpt from a summative interview reflects his perspective and offers further support for Minor Proposition 8.

Brad: Well, I was disagreeing -- yes, but I was more like offering my opinion. I didn't disagree with what he said, I made another suggestion. Like we were talking about the last thing I did and he said 'I'd like to see you work more on it.' Well, I didn't see any sense in that at all - to go back and work on that thing, so--I wasn't about to do that -- so he thought I should try more red in this one and more green in that, so I said 'maybe I'll just do another still life.'

Me: Was that your way of getting around it?

Brad: Yeah. I was just getting around it cause I wasn't about to do it, cause I don't see value in trying to patch up an old learning experience, I see more value in starting a- new with the experience of the previous successes and failures to bring a whole new perspective to the new experience. Like I know that he felt the analogous scheme was weak, and I'll be conscious of that in the next thing I do, I don't have to try to fix the weak one I just need to be aware of the problem for the next thing I do.

Me: You didn't tell him that did you?

Brad: No that's one of the ways I am though. I go around and do what I please no matter what, very quietly. And that's what I was
doing in here. I wasn't about to make a commitment that I would do something that I had no intention of doing so I just offered the hint of a more probable alternative. Maybe I shouldn't have(?)

Me: Why did you say that, you shouldn't have?

Brad: Well maybe it would have started a good discussion, but I just let it go. It was just that I knew what he wanted and I know what I would do and I wasn't about to give him the impression that I was going to do that and not do it. I didn't think that made a whole lot of sense because the way he talked about it it was like it was an important painting. And you know that at this stage of the course these are learning exercises not art products, and it had done it's job. I had learned from it. I could apply that to something else just as easy without being bored by redoing something from an earlier part of my learning.

His rationalization indicates that he has strong confidence in his own perspective, and that which is offered as an alternative. Unlike the drop-out or the lower level student who denies the teacher's perspective, Brad perceives value in it, but choses another alternative which is judged to be more appropriate to his own perspective at the time.

**Qualitative Differences in Interaction Style**

The qualitative analysis of the perceptual and perspective differences of achievement types evolved toward questions of the interaction style of these types during appraisal dialogue. What follows are the results of systematic processing the appraisal data and the various O.S.I.A. analyses that were applied for keener qualitative
discriminations and behavioral pattern displays.

Table 22 provides a summary display of the frequency distribution for the ten most dominant general classes of the O.S.I.A. that were recorded for the midterm appraisals.

An analysis of the table reveals that the ratio comparison of student behaviors to total interaction behaviors is fairly consistent for all three groups. However:

Minor proposition 9: there is an observable and describable difference in the overall pattern and frequency of student reciprocal and interactive behaviors.

Sensing and Manipulating (S2, S3)

These behaviors are relatively infrequent and indicate that the students took a subordinate role. The exception was the A level student who took the initiative to pull out or hold up work on four occasions.

Initiating (S4)

Student initiation is significantly different for achievement groups. It was found that:

Observation 59: students who were judged as higher in achievement initiated information more than twice as frequently as the average students and more than nine times as frequently as the low students.

Responding (S5)

This category is a reciprocal behavior for teacher solicitation. The high frequency in the high achievement groups relates to the high frequency of teacher solicitation
### Table 22

**O.S.I.A Interaction Behavior Frequency Distribution for Female Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Type</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
<th>S6</th>
<th>S7</th>
<th>S8</th>
<th>S9</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>S12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%T</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Students</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Grade</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Grade</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**  
D% = Distribution percentage in relation to the total behavior for both the student and the teacher.  
%T = Distribution in relation to the total frequency for all students.
with the students judged as higher. Nonetheless it can be concluded that:

**Observation 60:** students judged as high respond three times more frequently than students who have been judged low.

Pooling the initiation and response categories, we find that the higher students offer 3.5 times the information during the interaction.

**Solicitations (S6, S7)**

The relative infrequency of student behaviors in these categories indicates that the student plays a submissive and dependent role in the critique. Nonetheless, the frequency count indicates that:

**Observation 61:** on the average, students judged as higher in achievement solicit more information from the teacher than students judged as low in achievement.

**Appraisals (S8, 9, 11, 12)**

In terms of self appraisal it was found that:

**Observation 62:** students in general judged themselves more positively than negatively, with the higher level students making more frequent positive statements about their own work than the low students.

**Acknowledgments (S10)**

**Observation 63:** the higher level students acknowledged the teacher three times as frequently as the lower students.

Table 8 (p. 258) summarized the total behavior for the teacher and the student achievement groups. And in general it may be said that:
Observation 64: higher level students were observed to dominate the interaction three times more frequently than lower level students.

The most prominent student behavior is response. This category is somewhat inflated because of the frequent and related instructional solicitation for visual attention. Only fifteen percent of the response behaviors were answers to questions with the lower level students; twenty-six for the average students and twenty-four percent for the higher level students.

O.S.I.A. Standard Variable Analysis

Tables 23, 24 and 25 summarize the standard variable analysis of the O.S.I.A. climate variables, indicate:

Observation 65: above average students are significantly more direct than indirect in their interaction style, as opposed to below average students.

In terms of the effect of their independent judgment during the critique, table 24 indicates:

Observation 66: above average student initiate more personal criterion more frequently than below average students.

Observation 67: above average students initiate a significantly higher ratio of favorable over unfavorable judgments.

Table 25 indicates that above average students are more independent in their general interaction pattern.

Observation 68: above average student uses a proportionately higher percentage of initiation and solicitation and offers more response.
### TABLE 23

**O.S.I.A. STANDARD VARIABLE ANALYSIS: STUDENT RATIOS (CLIMATE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Variables</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect/Direct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,6,7,8,9,10/4,11,12)</td>
<td>269/49 = 5.490</td>
<td>183/26 = 7.038</td>
<td>86/12 = 7.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Indirect/Direct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,8,9,10/11,12)</td>
<td>71/2 = 35.000</td>
<td>79/10 = 7.900</td>
<td>25/4 = 6.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarification, Acknowledgment/Judgmental Appraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6,8,9,11,12)</td>
<td>42/31 = 1.355</td>
<td>31/25 = 1.240</td>
<td>14/15 = 0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified I/D in Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-X→ 6,8,9,10/ 1-X→11,12)</td>
<td>63/1 = 63.000</td>
<td>46/1 = 46.000</td>
<td>22/1 = 22.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I/D in Response and Reaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-X→5,6,7,8,9,10/ 1-X→4, 11,12)</td>
<td>106/26 = 4.077</td>
<td>79/10 = 7.900</td>
<td>30/6 = 5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Variables</td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Average Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgment/ Judgmental Reactions (10/8,9,11,12)</td>
<td>31/31 = 1.000</td>
<td>24/25 = 0.960</td>
<td>11/15 = 0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable/ Unfavorable Judgments (8,9/11,12)</td>
<td>29/2 = 14.500</td>
<td>19/6 = 3.167</td>
<td>11/4 = 2.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Criterion Judgments/ Personal Criterion (8,11/9,12)</td>
<td>14/17 = 0.824</td>
<td>10/15 = 0.667</td>
<td>10/5 = 2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment/ Initiation, Interactive (8,9,11,12/4,5,6,7)</td>
<td>31/256 = 0.121</td>
<td>25/160 = 0.156</td>
<td>15/172 = 0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Variables</td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Average Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation, Clarification/</td>
<td>24/185 = 0.130</td>
<td>7/133 = 0.053</td>
<td>4/60 = 0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response (6,7,5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation, Clarification/</td>
<td>24/46 = 0.511</td>
<td>7/20 = 0.350</td>
<td>4/8 = 0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation (6,7,4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response/ Initiations</td>
<td>185/47 = 3.936</td>
<td>133/20 = 6.650</td>
<td>60/8 = 7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5/4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Numerator</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though O.S.I.A. standard variable analysis can offer evidence for pattern differences, it cannot offer the qualitative discriminations necessary for holistic understanding of those difference. For a keener discrimination, the Sevigny subscript codes and the O.S.I.A. subscript variable analysis were employed.

**Minor proposition 10:** subscript patterns within the general interaction classes of the O.S.I.A. are different for students graded higher as opposed to students graded lower.

Summary displays of differential patterns are provided in tables 27 to 31. From the displayed differences the following are noted:

**Initiations**

Observation 69: the above average students initiate more information related to the problem objectives, what might have been done and their previous experiences.

**Response**

Observation 70: in general, visual attending is the dominant response behavior for all groups. Responses related to the assignment review follow, with the higher students responding more frequently.

Observation 71: average students respond more frequently with a simple "okay."

This observation would support the observation presented earlier which indicated a willingness to allow information to pass, under the assumption that meaning would become clearer over time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General and unsubscribed information</td>
<td>$S^4$</td>
<td>12 4 57</td>
<td>12 2 28</td>
<td>14 1 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal criterion explained</td>
<td>$S^4S^E$</td>
<td>9 3 75</td>
<td>6 1 25</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information related to a future intention</td>
<td>$S^4S^F$</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>6 1 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information related to an opinion of what should have been done</td>
<td>$S^4A$</td>
<td>15 5 50</td>
<td>24 4 40</td>
<td>14 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information which prescribes behavior for the future</td>
<td>$S^4A$</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives or antecedent conditions reviewed</td>
<td>$S^4S^R$</td>
<td>53 18 60</td>
<td>41 7 23</td>
<td>71 5 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-disclosure about biography</td>
<td>$S^4S^S$</td>
<td>12 4 66</td>
<td>12 2 33</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 27

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: STUDENT RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Verbal Response</td>
<td>S5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical response</td>
<td>S5%B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple &quot;okay&quot; or yes/no response</td>
<td>S5$K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response that is prescriptive</td>
<td>S5$P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response that discloses values</td>
<td>S5$S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual attention compliance</td>
<td>S05</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response related to request to review</td>
<td>S5$R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 28

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: STUDENT CLARIFICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Solicitation for verbal clarification</td>
<td>S6</td>
<td>D% 50</td>
<td>F 44</td>
<td>%T 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation for deficiency diagnosis</td>
<td>S6$D</td>
<td>D% 12</td>
<td>F 33</td>
<td>%T 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests further explanation for indexical vocabulary</td>
<td>S6$I</td>
<td>D% 38</td>
<td>F 60</td>
<td>%T 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 29

**SUBSCRIPT VARIABLE ANALYSIS: STUDENT ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>High Students</th>
<th>Average Students</th>
<th>Low Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General acknowledgments</td>
<td>S10</td>
<td>D% 26</td>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>%T 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Okay&quot; acknowledgment</td>
<td>S10$K</td>
<td>D% 16</td>
<td>F 42</td>
<td>%T 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic Acknowledgment (un hun)</td>
<td>S10$N</td>
<td>D% 58</td>
<td>F 18</td>
<td>%T 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscript Descriptor</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Average Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, favorable judgment about the group of which one is part</td>
<td>S9$A</td>
<td>81 50</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>33 1 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and unsupported positive judgment</td>
<td>S9$G</td>
<td>81 50</td>
<td>11 1 50</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment of an isolated part</td>
<td>S9$I</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>33 1 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference disclosure (likes)</td>
<td>S9$L</td>
<td>38 5 45</td>
<td>67 6 55</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment that is qualified</td>
<td>S9$Q</td>
<td>81 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal positive judgment about the whole product</td>
<td>S9$R</td>
<td>81 100</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive agreement with antecedent statement</td>
<td>S9</td>
<td>30 4 57</td>
<td>22 2 29</td>
<td>33 1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscript Descriptor</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>High Students</td>
<td>Average Students</td>
<td>Low Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable judgments about the class group</td>
<td>$S12A$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and unsupported negative judgments</td>
<td>$S12G$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative judgment about an isolated part</td>
<td>$S12I$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excused or rationalized negative criticism</td>
<td>$S12K$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes disclosed</td>
<td>$S12L$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative judgment that is qualified</td>
<td>$S12Q$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative judgment about the whole product or relationship of parts</td>
<td>$S12R$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the large frequency of this visual attention compliance, there is a distortion in the O.S.I.A. climate and interaction variables. The behavior is a compliance behavior; and it's short duration would normally not be included in the O.S.I.A. coding procedures. The reader may wish to take this into account in his interpretation of the general response ratio comparisons.

Clarification

Observation 72: the above average student asks for the clarification of terms and the meaning of talk more frequently than the below average student.

Solicitation

O.S.I.A. Chain and pool analysis indicated that:

Observation 73: the above average student solicited the teacher's visual attention five times more frequently than did the below average student.

Acknowledgment

Observation 74: students tend to acknowledge with phonetic sounds and the term "okay," however, the above average student more frequently acknowledges the teacher with direct statements.

Appraisal

Observation 75: students refrain from judgment of their work in the critique situation. They assume the role of the appraised rather than the appraiser.

The above average students made a variety of type appraisal judgments, whereas, below average students made less frequent appraisals in general. Of those made, none were explicated. It was further observed that:
Observation 76: above average students apply the contextual criteria to their explanations.

This observation is given support by contrasting value terms found in the student summative evaluations provided in Appendix B.

The relative infrequency of unfavorable judgments gives support to the:

Observation 77: students refrain from making unfavorable judgments about their work during the instructional critiques.

It might be inferred that, since the function of the critique was to grade students, they would be unlikely to bring attention to negative aspects of their work. This is not to say that they don't perceive them, for qualitative evidence throughout the course, and in the interview data, indicate the contrary.

As addendum to the standard variable analyses, the qualitative discriminations indicate that though student interaction is dominated by the teacher, the above average student resists complete conversational dominance, whereas the below average student does not.

Summary

The chapter began with a descriptive and holistic analysis of studio classroom appraisal. In the second part, factors related to the art student's performance perspective were discussed. The final two sections of the chapter
illustrated how a triangulated approach to case study analysis could produce a holistic account of the perceived differences in instructional interaction.

Seventy-seven major observable differences were presented along with the qualitative and quantitative evidence to support the ten minor descriptive propositions which emerged from the multiple analyses.

The chapter was organized to reflect the characteristic of the temporally developing investigation which progresses from the examination of a general phenomenon toward keener and more discriminating analyses of the qualitative dimensions of that phenomenon.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The design and execution of this study was premised on the belief that triangulated analyses and multiple comparative case study investigations could provide broader understanding of studio classroom interaction. The descriptive findings and categorical classifications of this study are perceived to offer strong departure points for both replicative and related research. This chapter examines that assertion.

Overview

A brief summary of the study and its findings introduce this chapter. Several implications are then drawn for art educators and classroom researchers. The chapter concludes with a presentation of potentially fruitful directions that might build upon this research.

Summary of the Investigation

The focus of this study was the instructional evaluation of the beginning art student in a typical university studio art context. Instructional appraisal was investigated as it was experienced and interpreted from the participant perspectives of (a) the studio teachers, (b) the art
student and (c) the trained classroom observer. An ethno-
methodological stance asserted that multiple methods rather
than a singular research technique be employed. A "triangu­
lated" investigation design was developed by this researcher.
Its temporally developing structure incorporated the follow­
ing research strategies: participant observation, subjective
introspection, respondent interviewing, systematic observa­
tion, ennumerations and samplings, conversational analysis
and interaction event analysis.

The study had two prime concerns. The first was
with the meanings that participants fashion in order to make
sense of evaluative experiences and from what values they
communicate to one another. Aside from the above, this study
was also concerned with the implementation of a triangulated
research strategy.

The investigation began with general exploration of
interaction phenomena and gradually refined its focus toward
the description of the keener qualitative dimensions of
instructional appraisal. The investigation progressed
through four distinct phases and seven case study investi­
gations.

Phase I consisted of a sequence of five exploratory
and preliminary case study investigations. These served to
develop a general awareness and an interpretive framework
from the perspectives of (a) the artist, (b) the beginning
student and (c) the studio art instructor.
Phase II was the data collection phase, during which two additional field investigations were conducted. The purpose of these studies was to obtain qualitative data and record ethnographic descriptions of representative appraisal events, as well as to gain interpretive responses from the students and teacher. In the sixth case study I assumed the role of active student participant. In the seventh case study, direct classroom observation and interviewing were employed. In both studies the teacher/subject remained the same; what differed was the observation stance. Initially, the observation was focused on my own participation in the setting. In the last study, observation was directed toward behavioral differences of achievement types.

Data processing was the focus of the third phase. During Phase III, observation data were categorized, classified, then organized into propositional statements. Relevant subclassifications were developed into a subscript coding system for use with the Observational System For Instructional Analysis (Duncan and Hough, 1975). The subscripts were organized to produce keener qualitative discriminations of the standard code categories of the O.S.I.A. system.

Phase IV was comprised of the multiple analyses that were employed for triangulating the descriptive findings. To accomplish this, ten major kind of analyses were performed on the data: (1) O.S.I.A. Matrix Interaction Pattern Analysis, (2) O.S.I.A. Time Line Analysis, (3) O.S.I.A. Standard

Utilizing a triangulated approach enabled me to extrapolate and organize the essential features of studio classroom appraisal into a descriptive account. The synthesis from multiple perspectives and multiple cases, allowed for a holistic grasp of classroom phenomena that would not be possible from a singular observation stance or through a singular research strategy.

**Conclusions**

Conclusions of the study are categorized into two types. The first relates to the observation findings, and the second relates to the feasibility of the temporally developing and triangulated design.

**Observation Findings**

A descriptive study attempts to accurately portray the characteristics and status of particular cases. Findings are the observable and describable features of that status. Beside its many general observations, this investigation presented seventy-seven case study observations. These observations were in support of the two major and the ten
minor propositions which follow:

Major proposition one: there are observable and describable differences in the characteristics, methods and patterns of the teacher's summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged as higher in studio classroom performance as opposed to the characteristics, methods and patterns of his summative appraisal dialogues with students he has judged lower in performance.

Minor proposition 1: the length of interaction contact time is related to the positive or negative affect toward the student's products.

Minor proposition 2: there are observable and describable differences in the frequency and distribution of instructional behavior with students who are graded higher as opposed to with students who are graded lower.

Minor proposition 3: the general instructional pattern for interaction, appraisal and climate variables is similar for all students.

Minor proposition 4: the structuring of the verbal interaction is different for students receiving higher grades than it is for students receiving lower grades.

Minor proposition 5: subscript patterns within the general classes of the O.S.I.A. are significantly different for instructional interaction with students graded higher as opposed to those graded lower.

Major proposition two: there are observable and describable differences in the ways that students who have earned high achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior as opposed to the ways students earning lower achievement grades interpret and reciprocate instructional behavior.

Minor proposition 6: below average students may have an awareness of an aesthetic criterion, however, they may not grasp the meaning of the implication of the criterion for studio performance.

Minor proposition 7: the average student is generally at the stage of learning where he understands the meaning of the criterion, however, he is not fully aware of how the criterion relates to his performance.
Minor proposition 8: the above average student is not only aware of the contextual criteria, he is skilled in innovative application of the criteria to situational tasks.

Minor proposition 9: there is an observable and describable difference in the overall pattern and interaction frequency of student reciprocal and interactive behaviors.

Minor proposition 10: subscript patterns within the general interaction classes of the O.S.I.A. are different for students graded higher as opposed to students graded lower.

Many of the descriptive findings are related propositions that may raise a shock of recognition, or a feeling that here is something that the reader knew all along. This is the way it should be. Ethnomethodological analysis of one's culture, or reference sub-group, simply makes explicit the many things that are taken for granted in everyday lives. Describing them, however, can change our relation with them. We can move to an active awareness and understanding of the interaction dynamic which is all too frequently taken for granted. Describing them frees the reader from their perplexing restraints.

It is one thing, for instance, to say that multiple perspectives are operating in the classroom setting, or that a teacher will not interact with all students on an equal basis. However, it is a far more difficult undertaking to present an accurate and qualitative portrayal of those assumed discriminations.
Methodological Conclusions

This study provides classroom researchers in general, and art educators in particular, with an illustrative model of the temporally developing and triangulated research design. It is concluded that, as a design strategy, the methodology can offer a fruitful strategy for classroom investigation. It was demonstrated, for example, that the ethnographic methods allow for discriptive discriminators which produce a keener analysis of the variables which operate in a given setting. This operation expanded systematic encoding to produce more holistic and detailed displays of interaction events.

It was also concluded that without a knowledge of the scene, prior to coding operations, the systematic observer may easily misperceive the meaning of indexical language and situational events - since, he is unlikely to "see" those events in the way participants do. By connecting the spread and depth of the triangulated perspectives of the teacher, the students and the observer, I was able to determine, and therefore grasp, an awareness that was much more extensive than that provided by any one research method used alone.

Implications

The implications for the research conclusions are also presented in terms of those for art education and those for classroom research.
Implications for Art Education

When studio appraisal is directed toward building the student's judgmental competence, we say that it is instructive. Much of the instruction that is presented under the guise of "creative" production is nothing more than convergent leaning toward a specific perspective.

Few studio instructors comprehend the ramifications of their role as critic of student performance and product. Furthermore, the convergent nature of studio learning is a characteristic that few instructors are prepared to admit. Perhaps students would not be so heavily influenced by one teacher's appraisal but for the fact that the teacher's influence often colors the interpretive and evaluative framework of the peer group as well.

This study can serve art teachers as a stimulus for self reflection, introspection or self-confrontation. It brings evaluative strategies to a descriptive level that will allow studio teachers to reassess their own instructional behavior. Studio teachers may be motivated to assess their own discriminatory practices as a result of being made aware of Mr. Allen's.

One of the most deficient areas of knowledge in art teacher preparation has been the lack of understanding of the studio appraisal classroom dynamic. Before teacher educators can train prospective art teachers to be more responsive evaluators, it is important that they have a body of knowledge
describing the characteristics of the evaluative process. This study can make a significant contribution to that knowledge.

As an observation tool, The Sevigny Subscript System could serve classroom supervisors as a means to organize descriptive displays to help them evaluate the instructional patterns of their student teachers.

The descriptive episodes and transcribed interactions might function as protocol materials in the methodological component of teacher training. Protocol samples of recorded classroom events could be employed for interaction analysis, and could be used as a teacher training resource.

In the initial phases of teacher preparation, constructs and propositions from this study could be used for the interpretation of observed evaluative interaction. For instance, through using a protocol dialogue exchange, the teacher educator could raise a whole series of analytic questions for applying theoretical knowledge from other disciplines. Among such questions might be the following:

(a) What is the objective of this discourse?, (b) What kinds of information are fed to the person?, (c) What kinds of information does the student need to know in order to interpret the information?, (d) What is the sequence of the instructional exchange?, (e) In which ways does the teacher influence change?, (g) In which ways could an alternative strategy improve the instructional interaction?
From the discussion of such questions, in relation to a specific episode, the prospective art teacher would be expected to learn such things as: (a) to identify a situation in which an aesthetic concept was being taught, (b) to identify a strategy of instruction, (c) to recognize inadequate methods of communication, (d) to be aware of the sorts of verbals structure that accomplishes appraisal, (e) and to apply theoretical knowledge to the perplexities that are perceived.

Tentative support for the effectiveness of employing interaction protocols might come from the fact that the reader may have been stimulated to make such assessments during the reading of Chapter V. The propositions and observations were non-judgmental. Nevertheless, the reader is likely to infer judgment or make his own assessments, then to self-reflect upon his own interaction style, in contrast to Mr. Allen's.

Application of theoretical knowledge relevant to teaching, to the perceived perplexities of the recorded events could afford prospective teachers an opportunity to practice adaptive skills. Those who claim that theoretical knowledge is not essential for studio instruction are not aware of how this knowledge functions as a part of the art teacher's instructional perspective.
Implications for Classroom Researchers

Perhaps the failure to examine instructional phenomena in the natural setting, and from the point of view of the participants, may account for the limited significance of previous research. The implication to be drawn from the naturalistic and holistic stance is that no singular paradigm is best in the general concept of research. The value of traditional methods is not denied, but used alone, they are judged to be inadequate. If a proposition can survive the onslaught of a series of somewhat imperfect measures, confidence in its reliability can be greatly increased. The promise of a triangulated methodology is the self-correcting aspect which avoids propagating the individual weakness of any one method used alone.

A novel research methodology is not free of limitations or problems. Such problems may have design implications for researchers who are contemplating the adoption of a multiple approach. Holistic assessment takes as its problem the nature of the total system, rather than a particular process or variable within the system. Such a goal results in a mass of data and demands awesome amounts of time for its processing and analysis.

Triangulated inquiry is comprised of many operations each of which is, in effect, a small study with a research design of its own, but each of which is important and holistically related to others. It is difficult to present
any one of these "sub-studies" in isolation from the others to which they are intricately connected. The reliance upon triangulated interpretation confronts the investigator with unusual problems of bulkiness in his reporting.

Tabular summaries did facilitate the reporting by effectively consolidating classroom behavior. A new problem, however, became apparent. The flow of descriptive reporting is easily broken when tables are introduced. The writer is faced with a task of artfully weaving the tabular displays and the very telling and discrete qualitative incidents into a large and coherent pattern that communicates persuasively. There were no models for this study. This dissertation can therefore serve as one place to begin further refinement of "triangulated" reporting skills through a critical examination of the descriptive strategies employed in this report.

A temporally developing design, by its definition, demands a lengthier investigation period. This study evolved over a period of four years of intensive field operations and analysis. Such temporal factors must be considered by those contemplating selection of this type design.

Triangulation was also found to be demanding of a wider range of investigative skills. Furthermore, its potential for heuristic discovery is dependent upon the creative imagination of its implementer. Discovery rests with the insightful perceptions and ability to make "key linkages" among isolated observation variables. Hence,
the method is suggested for those who have confidence in their capacity for creative problem solving.

The very nature of the design's flexibility and multiplicity poses additional concerns of reliability and validity. Chapter III addressed such concerns. Persons who decide to pursue a multiple methodology will perhaps be better able to pre-determine some desirable controls for their own study through a critical examination of that chapter.

Despite the limitations, I would conclude that the triangulated research method and the temporally developing design are particularly well-suited for phenomena related to art, and are also well-matched for the creative talents and empathetic skills of the artist-turned-researcher.

Recommendations

Holistic investigation attends to a wide variety of variables and relationships - some of which are studied in depth, while others are retained for further investigation. This study raises several questions to be pursued toward the advancement of art education. Researchers in the field are encouraged to adopt this methodology as a fruitful avenue for gathering useful knowledge related to such questions as these:

What are the motivational variables which influence a change in the aesthetic perspective?
Do some evaluative strategies emerge as more effective for clarifying production and performance goals?

What is the relationship of social role upon the structuring of classroom talk?

In which ways could the teacher increase the student comprehension level of appraisal dialogue?

How do collective or group perspectives develop?

How are perspectives altered through peer influence and interaction?

What are the most common criteria for appraisal at the beginning level of art instruction?

What patterns or differences can be perceived in the appraisal and interaction patterns with advanced or graduate students?

Do students have the means and influence to alter the instructor's perspective?

How, and in which ways, does the instructional perspective change over time?

In the structuring of instructional talk, how are topics opened, closed, switched or preserved?

In relation to systematic coding, it was found that some of the qualitative dimensions did not easily lend themselves to immediate and direct coding practices. This was because many of the meanings that participants structure are derived from an everyday logic and the perception of patterns emerging over longer periods of time. Isolated phenomena and observable behaviors do not always capture such patterns. Interaction was found to be an orchestration of the presence, as well as the absence of behaviors. Just as the measured pause is as much a part of the music as the actual notes, so too is the absence of behavior significant to the participant's
assessment of interaction patterns. Interaction event analysis could make great strides if its strategies could attend somehow to this perplexity.

Another area for potential study is the notion of informal learning. Interaction analysis gives priority to formal instruction and the verbal interaction. This study indicates that much of the student's interpretive behavior is based upon his perception of the nonverbal dimensions of classroom interaction. The perceptual cues which allow students to interpret meaning of events are in need of exploration. Nonverbal appraisal behaviors, such as silence and ignoring, facial gestures, spacial distancing, face-to-face contact and the like, are in need of qualitative study and fuller description.

Comparative studies are also needed between the studio interaction style of female teacher's and male teachers. For instance, the female teaching assistant was observed to employ different labels than Mr. Allen for similar aesthetic qualities, concepts and criteria. This raises many questions about instructional perceptions, language and gender. For example:

Do male teachers have a different aesthetic perspective than female teachers?

What kinds of descriptor's do females use when evaluating art, as compared to males?

Do females comprehend criticism from female teachers more easily than from male teachers?
Are female students swayed more easily by arguments presented by a male teacher?

Do females have a different appraisal style?

In summary, what is needed is the development of comprehensive theory which can explain the methods of studio teaching and methods of student acquisition of aesthetic standards. There is further need to examine the learning dynamic, in relation to the cultural backgrounds and past experiences that students bring as part of their initial perspectives. There is a need to know more about the lasting effects of productions strategies that are learned for specific contexts. And finally, there is a need for understanding the unexpected outcomes or the informal learning which is a significant part of the student participant experience.

In closing, it should be said that any observation study is influenced by the perspective which determines the investigation focus and influences the perception of events. To that note, Prather (1970) provides an eloquent summary:

I can't make statements about reality without omitting other things that were also true of it. Even if it were possible to say everything about a reality, I still would not have the reality; I would only have words. When I outgrow my names and facts and theories, or when reality leaves them behind, I become dead if I don't go on to new ways of seeing things.
Any research strategy is bound to have its imperfections. I submit, however, that my effort has been sincere in pushing the accepted boundaries of current models to newer directions. Perhaps the imperfections that others might perceive will stimulate the development of alternatives that, heretofore, were beyond the conceptual range of what was understood as "research". This is not only the hope of this study, but its challenge.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today the portfolio critiques began. The procedure was for four students to go to the hallway and to hang their work (the twenty selected pieces) on the exhibition space and to wait for their turn. The model was late and so nine additional students bought coffee and sat around to eavesdrop on the appraisals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eavesdropping Behavior</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher strategy was similar to the class group critiques. In most cases he would ask the student to identify his preferences. Then he would begin to agree or disagree with the choices offering the criteria for disagreement. In one case observed, the student had matted two. The student's selection was based upon the naturalism of the drawings. Mr. Allen did not like those two and suggested she mat two different ones. After the critique the student told me, &quot;I just threw those damn things in at the last minute, I really think they're shitty!&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuum Ranking Behavior</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While the critiques were in progress I noted several student re-examine their selections and make changes. On two occasions I saw students take pieces down from the wall while waiting their turn and replace them with &quot;types&quot; more like those being selected as &quot;better&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Judgment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After observing four critiques the model came and we went into the studio. As we got there one student said to me, &quot;Please help me select my portfolio&quot; I asked why? She said &quot;'cause I think you will know what he wants and after watching the first few, I am sure what I like he won't.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TN 
knowledge of "other"

consensus

This seemed to indicate that she was not successful at cue search or cue match and that she had some sense of who was.

At this point about six students gathered around and one asked, "We'd like to see what you selected" "Why?" I asked. The consensus was that I was one of the better ones so that they wanted to see how they compared. "If we see what your's look like then we'll know better how we stand."

MN

So I showed them, but then began to be concerned that I had been too "good". I decided then to play down the evaluation and to "fudge" the grade disclosure if I did well.

ON

The studio session was way out of pattern. Students were more interested in the evaluative activity and kept taking breaks or finding reasons for prolonged stays in the hall area. During the actual break, about seven of us were sitting on a bench in the critique vicinity. Mr. Allen decided to go for coffee. He tossed his keys and grade book on the chair beside us and left. We all looked at each other and the same thought impishly flashed across our minds. Giggling, one female student said, "Don't you think we have a right to see our grades?" This was followed by "I dare you to look", "You dare me, huh?" in unison, "Yeah". She grabbed the book and fumbled through the pages, "Oh, shit, the bastard gave me a fuckin' C." "Let's see..." We all shared a glance with an eye glued to the end of the hall. I saw that the grades so far were all between C- and B-. We all noted that they were lower than we had anticipated. "I had no idea from the critique that I would get that low a grade. Did you?" Another replied no. The consensus was that his appraisals were ambiguous.
Appendix A - Continued

Critical comments do not seem to have meaning until the student can interpret them through the grade symbol assigned to them summatively.

Students then began by complaining about the instruction. Insult leads to insult. "He never says anything to help you, just goes around giving verdicts like "this is wrong that is wrong", but, never, "here's how to fix it!"

I felt that this was a bit misperceptive. I thought that the directions could be easily inferred from the comments and for him to tell me explicitly would "rub me the wrong way."

Obviously different perceptions are operating in the setting.

One important feature of art learning appears to be the ability to translate linguistic terms into task performance actions. To do so one needs to be aware of the sensuous qualities of media and technique. One needs to know the options. My wider experience range offers more knowledge of options. The beginner only has the options from the course history. Experimentation with media and technical emphasis in fundamental courses develops a "tacit" knowledge of options. Words somehow become referents for that knowledge and when the word is heard, the aesthetic sense triggers potential options.

Here's where I have the edge over the beginner in class and for research purposes. Otherwise, this sensitivity would not have become part of my perceptions today.

Mr. Allen returned soon after the grade book had been returned. Students picked up a casual conversation and pretended that this had been going on all the time.
Appendix A - Continued

preference
zone   ON I began noting that students used some
TN sort of plan for arranging their work.
ON I began to ask. Most were not conscious
TN of a plan, yet when Mr. Allen asked them
ON to pick out their favorites it seemed
TN that there was a plan. The least pre-
TN ferred got on the extreme ends or bottom
TN row. Some arranged them in chronological
TN order, "Perhaps he'll see an improvement"
TN or "I put a few good ones first, sneak
TN in the bad ones here and there and then
TN leave him with a favorable impression"
TN (the selection of twenty drawings was an
TN appraisal event).

student
assessment ON As the day progressed, I noted Mr. Allen
practice TN would check his watch. Interaction time
ON decreased and he became more direct in
TN his comments and solicited less student
TN opinion.

continuum
ranking
TN Perhaps he had a sense of the class by
TN now and could assess more quickly. In
TN the first few he was perhaps building a
TN sense of the group.

aesthetic
eclectic
TN There seems to be some generalization
TN process against which the individual is
TN weighed.

aesthetic
dialectic
TN Students too used this process for self.
TN The consensus at the end of the day was
TN that the experience provided a chance
TN to see all the work together and the
TN consistent patterns became very apparent
TN as well as the differences.

MN (relates to the comparative case study
design)

(TN) Students share insights. One student told
peer informants me that I should take out the oil crayons
as he slighted hers. And that he likes
"messy and smudgy things". That I should
take out my hard edge and design looking
ones before the critique. I thought it
interestign how she had made an index of
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visual eavesdropping
my portfolio selection and wondered why she recalled them. (re-examine the theoretical implications of this)

ON
I found myself taking sweep impressions of each students work as it was hung.

flash appraisal
I thought I was doing observation for the data then became aware that other participants would do the same thing.

aesthetic dialectic
It dawned on me that we are able to take a flash glance of large clusters of work and gain a sense for that work. How and why are questions for further study.

MN
Somehow this process enables you to gain a sense of the class continuum and a similar generalization of one's own work allows for one to place his work on the class continuum. In this sense one gains a sense of equity for the teacher's grading. This is how fairness was judged. How else can participants make such claims as, "I thought I deserved better", or, "Gee, John should have gotten more" We not only are able to judge ourselves on the continuum, we have a pretty good sense of where others should fall, "Don't you think Mary is the one who got the A"

TN
I noted a lot of peer discussion of what went on in individual critiques. This seemed to be a standard procedure to test perceptions to extend meaning of their own critiques. What did he do that was ambiguous? Lots of talk about conflict in anticipations. Lots of clarification sought from peers rather than teacher. It seems that to ask the teacher inferred lack of knowledge and the fear was that would affect the teacher's assessment. Others however, were confident of a favorable assessment and asked....
After the first day of critiques, I had decided I may get an A-. I thought "how did I reach that conclusion" and realized I had done a lot of grading and appraisal of others all day and in all cases compared and contrasted their work against mine.

Why weren't we told grades? What is the secret? This is a bias. He should have told grades that's what we wanted to know. His comments are meaningless to a degree until we know their relative importance in grade language. Others all shared this feeling. We spent the day trying to "guess" grades rather than hear the critique and set goals...

Tomorrow, I shall watch for how the students gain meaning. How they press for grades. How they place their work. How he looks at the work. How he looks at them. Tomorrow is my critique. I shall examine my own reactions to the critique. I shall place a few bad ones in for the sake of experiment and to tone down my grade.
APPENDIX B

SUMMATIVE REFLEXIVE INTERVIEWS

B-1: Interview with the Highest Scoring Student
B-2: Interview with the Lowest Scoring Student
Appendix B-1: Interview with the Highest Scoring Male

Scene: This interview was taped two days after the end of the quarter. The studio was empty. Despite the fact that the spring break had begun, Brad had come in to work on his. He continued working as we talked. The interview began with social exchanges and an explanation of the project that Brad was working on. The transcribed data begins at the point where the topic switched to soliciting Brad's interpretive responses about his experience in the course.

1M: I sensed that in the second half of the course you became more apathetic. (?)

2Brad: Yeah--I got apathetic to him but I didn't get apathetic toward the work. //

3M: well too--you were really getting excited about your sculpture and the sculpture course / /

4Brad: that would be a better explanation because the difference in the enthusiasm levels between these two courses is so: outstanding. This class (sculpt) is invigorating and that one is not -- and I can't really tell you that I didn't learn a whole lot in that class cause I learned a whole lot.

5M: Like what?

6Brad: About how to deal with color. Like before I took this class anything I did with color I was like playing around with paint, I didn't really know what I was doing with it. -- new things are open to me like knowing there are different schemes like complimentary and what and why they work certain ways, and these are all things that you can use now that you understand more about them and now that we have become use to working with them / /

7M: n//

8Brad: and Now I feel like I learned how to talk about it.
Appendix B-1 - Continued

I know how to control it, I know how to watch for its effects on the painting, whereas before, I was just trying things without really knowing about them or being able to talk about them.

9M: Were you just lucky?

10Brad: Not necessarily, I had a feel for what I was doing I just didn't understand it on the same level.

11M: Okay-- well you've been fairly successful in this class, at least in terms of getting the higher grade./

12Brad: I think-- what happens is or what it boils down to is attitude. Attitude of the person towards their work, you understand that?/

13M: yeah, ah//

14Brad: when they sit down and paint=how they approach the painting and a lot of it has to do with self-confidence, cause if you think you're good and you make a mark like you think it's going to be good, the teacher responds.

15M: Do you feel that you were fairly self-confident in there?

16Brad: Yeah I generally think that I am fairly self-confident in anything that I do: If I'm not self-confident, I generally don't do it (h)(h) or if I do, it obviously shows.

17M: Is there anybody in that class that you also perceive as being self-confident?

18Brad: (7)--let's see, I wish I could give you names but I don't know everyone's name in there.

19M: Oh, just describe them then.

20Brad: Okay people are self-confident in different ways like -- Shirley yeah Shirley do you know Shirley?

21M: Yeah
Appendix B-1 - Continued

22Brad: She's confident in a special way about what she does and what she wants to do with her life, she's not confident in other ways though like the value of being in that course. She like believes in herself because she draws from things outside that class and brings them to her work. Her attitude is one that "if I don't do well in here it's nothing to worry about, because I'm not good at it." What's important to her is what it can do for what she wants to do and be.

23M: Okay-- well getting an A you were obviously successful in that class by the teacher's judgment. What suggestions would you have to someone coming into that course fresh if you had to give him some hints or rules or course criteria what would you say?

24Brad: Basically I'd say what I would tell anybody, "do what you think is best" don't just try to work for him, you gotta work for yourself, right-- like if you don't believe in what you are doing in your art work then it shows up.

25M: Lots of kids in there don't/

26Brad: I know, but lots of kids in there are very naive: So there aren't any secrets to hand down if the kid isn't ready for it.

27M: Well your secret to success is being comfortable with yourself so you feel comfortable to experiment, and you can't pass that on to someone else.

28Brad: Yeah-- you're asking me to give you a formula or a recipe for success and it doesn't exist/

29M: CRITERIA exists right?/

30Brad: Well: /

31M: For example, since you are too mature and sharp to buy that question, What do you think Mr. Allen thinks a good painting is?-- in that context=that class.
32Brad: (6) I'm gonna draw a distinction-- between a good student and a good painter: both of them (for grades) takes in consideration motive -- and the good student has the self-confidence, shows up and works. He has an attitude that tries as hard at it can to be (H) a student -- if you know what I mean.//

33M: yeah you said something related to that yesterday in terms of how he treats the better students.

34Brad: Yeah, I talked about that if he likes you, he talks to you as if you were on his level.

35M: How does he do that, do you know?

36Brad: YEAH he'll talk about himself. He talks about how he feels about it, and then he might say about something that HE did-- like it's like an interaction between the two works - his and yours//

37M: what he does to what you have done(?)

38Brad: Yeah and he'll talk about YOUR FUTURE, and if he doesn't like you he won't talk about future//

39M: Cause he doesn't think you have a future(?)

40Brad: Well, if you're really seriously into what you're doing, he won't worry about what you do next, cause he won't think that you are.

41M: Yeah, I think you're right.//

42Brad: So I noticed THAT, he'll give you that sort of attitude. I think that's a good attitude for a teacher, yaknow: as a teacher-- well-- he's stuck-- in this level of a course, he's stuck with a lot of kids that aren't all that serious. They don't know what they are doing. And like they're naive: in all different things and they lack inspiration. And--there are also a lot of people with commercial art, illustration and other things so their intentions are different than those wanting to become artists.
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43M: So you think there are different criteria for different kids, depending on what you come with(?)

44Brad: No, I think it's the same criteria -- he's just faced with a variety of teaching problems.

45M: Well, what about key points. Do you think there were key concepts pushed in that course for everyone? What's the central core of that course in terms of objectives?

46Brad: --his points:-- is to develop a language and an understanding of the terminology = to be able to talk about it, to know for example what hue was and value was so that you could like DEAL with it, like you could say "the value here should be lighter or warmer or cooler in order to go with the value there," to get you used to dealing with color so that you understood it. -- and also to expose you to, since it is a foundations course, basic ideas of organization.

47M: Why is it important to be able to talk about color?

48Brad: Well--you need to understand it. You need to deal with it so you're not just hit or miss. And you need to know the language to get any value out of the critique, I suppose.

49M: OKAY= last question--// PLUS--he was imparting on us

50Brad: his idea of what WORKS and what doesn't. He was trying to get that across.

51M: What works?

52Brad: Well-- I think that the basic idea is that everything that you put on a painting should work to unify the painting= you don't have a part that doesn't=that you could change and it wouldn't make any difference. You know the whole painting works as ONE unit. And that's his main idea I think. That's a general consensus but that's what he says most.

53M: Okay-- Are there any significant events in that class that made things click for you in the things you learned or did they happen gradually?
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54Brad: No, I think it happened gradually, only a couple of the paintings—like after we did the project where we broke it up into six color schemes, I did a painting which was from the still life— the second of the two I did—the lighter one/

55M: with the parrot(?)//

56Brad: No, no, the one I put up in the critique//

57M: oh yeah

58Brad: Yeah, the one with the greens—well it came right after that ((that exercise)) and it was a really good painting, and like I was like dealing with complementary color scheme, which like before that complementary colors was something you dealt with on a color wheel, and now: it's something that is in the painting. So that was a big jump right there

59M: So you were able to take an exercise and put it to a practical application in your painting(?)

60Brad: Right.

61M: You felt then that you knew what you were doing(?)

62Brad: Right, much more than before, you know the feeling?

63M: Yeah, I think I do—okay I guess that's it unless you have any more questions= your questions are better than mine (h)(H)

64Brad: No, I just was interested in the study and how you felt about the setting.

((discussion of the study objectives and the methodology followed))

((in the discussion there was a return to excitement levels and pacing in a course)).. fundamentals can be exciting, my first course was.
What do you think was the main difference that made the difference in making one more exciting than the other?

The teacher's attitude -- the teacher gets excited about your work and treats you like you should get excited about your work. It's not like "yes that's right. Do another one that's RIGHT." ((in low monochromatic voice, mimic of the teacher's interaction style))

How are you evaluating him ((Mr. Allen))?

Well, like I put on the evaluation form-- like when I look at Mr. Allen, he may not be the greatest teacher as far as enthusiasm or in his dealing with kids. But-- I got a lot out of him because I got the impression that he knew what he was talking about= he knew a lot. If you listened real close and if you could pick up the things that relate to his work that leaked out when he talks about other works, that probably go right over their heads= IF you listen real hard you can// learn

Can you think of some of those?

No not off hand-- but I get the impression that he really knows what he's talking about. But--(h) I'd like to see his work.

I would too. I haven't seen it either. Okay-- this was more of a discussion than an interview and I enjoyed it. You really have a lot on the ball, I expect great things from you.
Appendix B-2: Interview with the Lowest Scoring Student

Scene: The interview was taped in the studio classroom on the day previous to the final evaluation. The student had just finished selecting the ten representative pieces that would be graded. The interview focuses on the rational for selection and the students summative reflection on her participation in the course.

1M: Okay ((turning on tape recorder))

2Arlene: I don't really know what to say: about them I just don't have that much to say/

3M: That's okay. Let's begin by just telling me the ones that you really like or the one's you're really happy with--

4Arlene: (looks over work about ten seconds)-- this one--

5M: Yeah: that was one that they talked about yesterday ((in the class critique))

6Arlene: Yeah-- ahm this one.--

7M: That's nice in there (pointing)

8Arlene: I didn't really like having to paint over it.((the painting was completed then torn up and rearranged and repainted, the student liked it in its first stage))

9M: Do you know why he had you do that?

10Arlene: No--not really--

11M: It wasn't too clear?

12Arlene: ehn ehn

13M: ah--so those are your two favorites, why?

14Arlene: Mostly because I go:t to finish it -- I took my time with it and on this one I took extra time, I got here early and worked more on it than on the other ones.
Do you feel like the other ones never really got finished?

Arlene: un hun.

I sense that you felt pressured. //

Arlene: Yeah. //

I can tell from this last one you did that you probably would have liked to spend a lot of time on them drawing the details and stuff. //

Arlene: un hun

Do you like to draw realistically?

Arlene: Ah--it depends on what kind of a mood I'm in.

I notice in your work (pointing to parts of it) that you like to put in lots of these kind of details. //

Arlene: Yeah.//

Were you frustrated having to work so fast most of the time?

Arlene: Nah: it didn't bother me really that much.--

Well on these, [(referring to the ones chosen)] why have you picked these instead of others, are the qualities you looked for there?= that the others don't have?

Arlene: Oh, I don't know. These others were just done so quick and the ones that I like I tended to come in early or put more into them.

Is it because you put the extra time on or because they seem more finished?

Arlene: Yeah, they looked better when I put the more time in -- [(student continued to look through work)](9)
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31M: What was your feeling after the -- critique yesterday= how did you feel after?

32Arlene: I really liked it?

33M: Did you understand it?

34Arlene: Yeah-- He didn't really say that much -- Mr. (X) did-- I had Mr. (X) last quarter and I really liked him a lot better.

35M: I studied him too, and he is a different kind of teacher than Mr. Allen.

36Arlene: He gets you goin. Yeah just about all my pictures= I got them all finished. He would come around and tell me what do do--I dunno but--like Mr. Allen would keep on looking at my pictures then when I was almost done he would come and just paint all over it or tell me what's wrong with it. I had one picture - it was all done= or just about, and he sat down and painted over the entire picture and told me what he wanted after I had painted the whole thing. And He had walked by me about five times and I felt like saying "why didn't you tell me this before:"

37M: Do you feel that he generally ignored you or passed you by?

38Arlene: Yeah, un hun.

39M: Did you do better in Mr. (X's) class?

40Arlene: Oh YEAH--

41M: What kind of a final grade did you get from him?

42Arlene: We'll some of the work I really didn't get finished plus he really counted down for like missing class and like not finishing and missing classes kinda like brought my grade down to the C plus.

43M: You think your real grade would be higher if he didn't take off for missing?
44Arlene: Oh yeah.

45M: Well do you think you have improved in here since the mid-term?

46Arlene: Un hun, I think so, yeah --

47M: In which way? What about your works seems improved?

48Arlene: -- Oh -- I dunno:-- it just seems better, but maybe it doesn't seem so to Mr. Allen and Kay (h), but yknow: just like working faster, knowing that I had to get it done--

49M: If you had=or suppose I was a freshman coming into this course next quarter, what could you tell me to do for this class to get a good grade? Do you think you know something now that might have helped you do better if you were to start over?

50Arlene: I dunno: I still don't understand it--so I don't know what I would say:

51M: You're still not sure what he wants in here?

52Arlene: Ehn ehn-- no/

53M: Well then, how do you do these problems=what do you think about when you are doing one of his problems?

54Arlene: I'm just wondering if I'm doing it right (h)(h)

55M: You mean you just kind of go at it and hope you are right?

56Arlene: Un hun. I just hope that what I end up doing will be right.

57M: Are there any ways that you check during the work to see if you are doing the problem correctly?

58Arlene: Well: sometimes I walk around the room to see what the others are doing.
59M: But if there are secrets to success in here you
don't=you haven't discovered any?

60Arlene: No: I don't think so: Maybe it's because he
doesn't really talk to me about it. He tells me exactly what he wants.

61M: Does that bother you--or are you happy that he
leaves you alone?

62Arlene: No: I wish= I don't want him to leave me alone
cause-- when it's time for him to look at our
pictures ((referring to class critique)) he comes
at me with it. Yaknow "this is wrong, you should have done this" which I think he should have told
me while I was working on it.

63M: Were you like surprised with the grade you got
for the mid-term ((D+))

64Arlene: Un hun.

65M: Did you talk to him about it?

66Arlene: En ehn -- I figured cause like most of my pictures
were like white space, cause I didn't really under­
stand like what he wanted -- I still don't, but: I
think I'm getting it a little more:

67M: Is it like you are beginning to understand what
he wants but--you don't know how to do it yet?

68Arlene: Right.

69M: When he gave you the mid-term critique--what do
you remember about it= was there something that
made an impression that you worked toward during
the second half?

70Arlene: --I dunno: he didn't really tell me what I did
right or not--he just told me what he liked-- I
think he said something good about this one ((pull­
ing one sample from the pile))--

71M: Do you know what?
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72Arlene: --I can't remember just something like all the objects go with it (?).

73M: Let me look at that pile that you didn't pick and tell me why you didn't choose any of them?

74Arlene: (looking)

75M: Pick out one that you think is really bad.

76Arlene: All of them (hh)

77M: (h) well that would take the whole tape (h) they all look like you only got them half finished.

78Arlene: Almost all of them are half white//

79M: Yeah, when you work do you like start with one thing then move to the next one and go as far as you can till the lesson ends?

80Arlene: Yeah, I do--on this one I started on that (pointing to an object.)

81M: What about this one (showing a work that had the whole still life centered on the page))

82Arlene: Well-- when I was working on it everything seemed really big=I never really got far enough away from it to see that they really were too small.

83M: Looking at it now ((six weeks later)) you think that this ((the objects)) is too small and this ((the edges and background space)) is too big(?)

84Arlene: Mm hmm

85M: If you cut down the page do you think it would be okay?

86Arlene: I think something else is wrong--like you can't really tell that there are objects behind or something I dunno-- this one too (pointing) too much background.
87M: Yeah they all have that in common. When did you notice that?

88Arlene: I guess when he talked to me at the mid-term. I wasn't paying attention to background that was left over before. He said to make the objects bigger when I start and that helps.

89M: Okay good, you had a lot to say that will be helpful, good luck on your evaluation and grade.

90Arlene: Okay=sure--
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THE SEVIGNY SUBSCRIPT SYSTEM FOR THE O.S.I.A.
## THE SEVIGNY SUBSCRIPT SYSTEM FOR THE O.S.I.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 1</td>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 2</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/T 2</th>
<th>General sensing related to studio production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 2$E</td>
<td>Audio eavesdropping (listening to verbal interactions of others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 2$V</td>
<td>Visual eavesdropping (unsolicited glances at the production practice or product of another)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 2$G</td>
<td>General sensing of a group of studio products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 2$S</td>
<td>Sensing of the subject matter or still life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSIA 3</th>
<th>Manipulates Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 3</td>
<td>Manipulating artifacts, media, or materials in the process of artistic production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 03</td>
<td>Manipulating media, materials, props, of arranging special conditions for the studio production activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSIA 4</th>
<th>Initiating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4</td>
<td>Unsubscribed initiations related to studio content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 04</td>
<td>Managerial initiations for imposed task conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4A</td>
<td>Advances: information related to what might be happening in the course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 04$A</td>
<td>Information related to alternatives for related production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$A</td>
<td>Appraisals made of the products of non-participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$D</td>
<td>Information through demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$E</td>
<td>Evaluative criteria explicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$F</td>
<td>Information related to future intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$H</td>
<td>Laughter which is informative in a non-verbal sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$I</td>
<td>The explication of indexical terms (vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 04$J</td>
<td>Joking which sets up climate conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4M</td>
<td>Mediated instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$M</td>
<td>Instruction through the use of metaphor or analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4M$0</td>
<td>Visual model presented to illustrate a point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$0</td>
<td>Information related to the production or products of an outside referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4A$P</td>
<td>Prescriptive manding for what ought to be done. (What to do next time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 04$P</td>
<td>Proscriptive manding (what should not be done)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4A$N</td>
<td>What should have been done that wasn't done (follows negative judgment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$R</td>
<td>Information that reviews the objective or procedures for the assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$S</td>
<td>Personal self-disclosure related to a context outside the classroom setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$T</td>
<td>Personal self-disclosure related to a context outside the classroom setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4$T</td>
<td>Thinks aloud making thoughts available to other members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4U</td>
<td>Nonverbal and gestural information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 4U$P</td>
<td>Proscriptive and Prescriptive gestures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSIA 5</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5</td>
<td>General verbal response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 05</td>
<td>Compliance to managerial solicitations for task production activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$B</td>
<td>Response related to biographical background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$F</td>
<td>A response to solicitation about future intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$J</td>
<td>A response that discloses aesthetic preference or judgmental criteria without reference to a specific product or person in the setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$K</td>
<td>Simple &quot;okay&quot; response or &quot;yes/no&quot; response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$M</td>
<td>Response that employs metaphor or analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$N</td>
<td>Response that gives information related to what should have been done to prevent a negative effect that resulted from not doing it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$P</td>
<td>Prescriptive response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$S</td>
<td>A response that discloses information about events outside the context, but not specific to biographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 5$R</td>
<td>Response that reviews the assignment criteria or conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSIA 6 Solicits Clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Solicits Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6</td>
<td>Solicits clarification for antecedent behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 06</td>
<td>Solicits clarification of managerial information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$A</td>
<td>Solicits information about the antecedents which resulted in a specific product outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$C</td>
<td>Solicits clarification related to the underlying concept or creative development of a specific product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$D</td>
<td>Solicits another's interpretation for his deficiency or difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$I</td>
<td>Solicits meaning clarification for the use of ambiguous or indexical terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$O</td>
<td>Solicits clarification for the objectives or the expected learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Subscript Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$P</td>
<td>Solicits clarification related to prescriptive or proscriptive mands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 6$T</td>
<td>Solicits clarification of the technical procedures or the technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 7</td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7</td>
<td>Solicits verbal response by questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 07</td>
<td>Managerial solicitation to initiate production activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7$B</td>
<td>Solicits information related to biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 07$D</td>
<td>Solicits permission to diverge from imposed conditions of task performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7$E</td>
<td>Solicits an evaluation or appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 07$H</td>
<td>Solicits faster tempe (hustles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7$K</td>
<td>&quot;Okay?&quot;, &quot;All right?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7A$P</td>
<td>Solicits production response through pre-prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 07$P</td>
<td>Solicits action expectation by proscriptive disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 7$Q</td>
<td>Questions related to another's future intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 8</td>
<td>Judgments of Correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8A</td>
<td>Accentuated or exaggerated judgment of correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$A</td>
<td>Judgments of correctness for entire group in relation to an individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 8$E</td>
<td>Judgment of correctness by display or exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$F</td>
<td>Anticipated correctness of outcome based upon an action trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$G</td>
<td>General and unqualified judgment of correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$I</td>
<td>Isolated part judged correctly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$H</td>
<td>Judgment of correctness with humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$J</td>
<td>Summative assessment of correctness for a group of products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$Q</td>
<td>Qualified judgment of correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 8$R</td>
<td>Judgment of correctness of the relationship between elements or parts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSIA 9</th>
<th>Personal Positive Judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9A</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment with accentuated or exaggerated emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$A</td>
<td>A personal positive judgment about the group of which the individual is part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$C</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment related to concept or creative interpretation of subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 9$E</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment by display or exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$F</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment of anticipated consequence of an action trend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$G</td>
<td>General and unqualified personal positive judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$H</td>
<td>Humerous personal positive judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$I</td>
<td>Isolated part given personal positive judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$J</td>
<td>Overall personal positive judgment for a group of products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$L</td>
<td>Personal preference, or likes, disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$Q</td>
<td>A qualified personal positive judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$R</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment of relationships between parts or elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 9$S</td>
<td>Personal positive judgment delivered with sarcasm or irony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSIA 10</th>
<th>Acknowledgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10</td>
<td>An acknowledgment of a verbal response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10$K</td>
<td>&quot;Okay&quot; used for acknowledgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10$P</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of a production response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10$H</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of humor with laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10$I</td>
<td>Indexical acknowledgment (neutral appraisals or ambiguous appraisal terms particular to a specific scene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 10$N</td>
<td>Non verbal or phonetic sound acknowledgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 11</td>
<td>Judges Incorrectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11A</td>
<td>Accentuated or exaggerated judgment of incorrectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$A</td>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness of entire group of which individual is a part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$D</td>
<td>Judgment of incorrectness by demonstration or by inference through demonstration of correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$F</td>
<td>Anticipated incorrectness of outcome based upon action trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$G</td>
<td>General and unqualified judgment of incorrectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$I</td>
<td>An isolated element or part is judged to be incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$J</td>
<td>A summative judgment of incorrectness for a group of production products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$K</td>
<td>A judgment of incorrectness that is excusable or is rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$Q</td>
<td>A judgment of incorrectness that is qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$R</td>
<td>A judgment of incorrectness that deals with the relationship between parts or elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 11$S</td>
<td>A judgment of incorrectness delivered with sarcasm or irony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subscript Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSIA 12</td>
<td>Personal Negative Judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12A</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment with accentuated or exaggerated emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$A</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment about the group of which the individual is part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$C</td>
<td>A personal positive judgment about the concept or the creative interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$F</td>
<td>A personal positive judgment about the expected outcome of an action trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$G</td>
<td>A general and unqualified personal negative judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$H</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment by laughter or ridicule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$I</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment about an isolated part or element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$J</td>
<td>A summative judgment about a group of products which is personal and negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$K</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment that is excusable or rationalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$L</td>
<td>A personal disclosure about dislikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$Q</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment that is qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$R</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment related to the relationships within the product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/T 12$S</td>
<td>A personal negative judgment delivered with irony or sarcasm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OSIA 13 Instructionally Non-Functional
APPENDIX D

DATA SAMPLES FROM THE MID-TERM CRITIQUES

D-1: Transcribed and Coded Mid-Term Critique of the Student who Earned the Highest Grade

D-2: Transcribed and Coded Mid-Term Critique of the Student who Earned the Lowest Grade

D-3: Sample Notation Using Dual-Track Recording (Mid-Term Critique Episode)
Appendix D-1

Transcribed and Coded Mid-Term Critique of the Male Student who Earned the Highest Grade


1T Okay -- who's next?
   S05
2S I will be.
   T10$K
3T Okay, bring them up to the table I'll be right with you (finishes an in-process critique while S brings up his work)
   S04
4S Everything is here except that one where you said we could paint the still life in any colors we wanted.
   T06
5T That's the only one you don't have?
   S5$K
6S Yeah
   T10$K T03 T2 T07 S05
7T Okay (begins looking at the work) -- This is the one that followed that? (holding two works up)
   T9$G S4
8S Pretty close, as far as I can remember. I can't remem/
   T4
9T I mean it - it followed it in terms of sequence. -- yeah alright -- (sigh) It looks good, it's/
   S4$R
10S that's the Lautrec one// T10$N T9$G
11T mm hmm -- it's nice
   T2 T9A$G
   (looking further at it) it's, real direct it's
   T9$G T9$G T03 T2
   real beautiful it's a good painting (looking at
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T01 T2
the next) //

T10$N
T03 T2
T10$P

12S
that's the O'Keef

S4$R

13T
mm hmm (looks at the next one) Cezanne: //

14S

the lines

T12$Q

I kinda ((tape fuzzy test is qualified negative
about over use of lines))

T12$Q
T9$Q

15T
It doesn't help this one, I think it works

T9$Q

alright - it looks pretty good in that Lautrec

T10$P

and in the Cezanne it doesn't look bad. That's

T4

what I was telling that other girl a second ago,

T04A

that is if you have a shape like this (drawing

T04A

on the board) sometimes if you do use a line next

To4$A
to the color sometimes if you get it OFF of the

T4$D

eedge, // (dramatizing)

T4$D
T4A

16S
um hmm

T4$D
T4A

17T
(sketches in value) and if you put the change

T4$D
T4$R

right on the edge (demonstrating) you know with a
different color //

T12$Q
To4A

18S
mm hmm

T12$Q

19T
It doesn't do that much for you. If you get it

T4$D

just OFF the edge kinda like that (demonstrating)

T4A$A
To7 S05

or like out here (pointing to an area on sketch)
we get another figure-ground relationship. This is one (pointing) - this is two (pointing) and then we got this one -- (pointing) overlapping these two things (gesturing the relationship). So then you get more figure-ground relationships and so then the probability of a different kind of closure is greater. Here (making reference to the student's painting) you're doing it pretty well// yeah// but that (pointing to another) follows the contour too much.// yeah, but just the way the line is on there. That black just doesn't go with it that well. yeah: (looking at next) this is where we pasted on those papers before we began to paint. Okay -- which one of those came first? I had you do this one first I think. Did I have you do two collages that you painted on? yeah, those were really fun, I learned a lot from them.
The color in this one is a little: -- um Basic./
yeah

You know, the primaries are like kinda all in
equal amount real interesting color doesn't happen
over here. I think that's better. -- (next, coming back) Oh - I dunno: the more I look at this one,
the relationships of the reds in this. It's
real beautiful.

((student pulls one from group)) this one is a
little/

well, it's the only one I think is a little
bothersome. (looking at another)

((fuzzy on tape but student is explaining the
nature of that project))

(next pictures looked at.) and these were done
later. (looking at more) in these first one's I
was leaving too much white.///<

looked at)///<

this one's a little better in through
there.///

that's real nice. I like that one a lot.
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T03 T2
(next one looked at) I like this one too. --
T9$I
Yeah, those look good. (looking at others) That
T9$J
one's NICE: it has a kind of glow in through
T9$G
here. I don't know if I'm real crazy about the
T4$E
white spots but I think it looks okay. -- (next
T12$L
painting) Did I take this one to that meeting
T10$P
that one day?
S5
38S I think Kay took it.
T9
39T Yeah, I think so. It's a nice painting. I like
T9$G
that one a lot. (flipping through)
T9$A$L
40S (Pointing to one) this is the one that I just
T03
took the yellow and flowed it all across in
S07 T05
through there (gesturing) then began to just change
S4$R
the yellows very slightly.
T10$N T9$G
41T mm hmm. It looks good; ah//
S07 T05 S4$R
42S (pointing to another) and this is the one where
S07 T05
she had us just paint any shapes we wanted then
S4
paint over them with the still life. And this
S4$H
first one is in shades of green except for that
T6$A
red dot that got on it in my portfolio (h)
43T After you did the shapes you referred to the
still life (?)
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44S yeah, right.

45T okay, that isn't that bad, I like this one better than that one. This one -- the modulation is too consistent -- they kind of break up //

46S (nods showing understanding)//

47T and it doesn't help it a lot.

48S These three were done about the same time.

49T Yeah -- it doesn't look bad down here -- that color is pretty good. That thing -- is surrounded by dark too much through, if you get rid of that, then the rest of the painting comes into focus, and holds together pretty good. ((pointing to another)) That was from the Gaugain?

50S Yeah.

51T Okay.

52S and that's the other thing, what I did after these (pointing to a cluster of work) this is that one where I sat down and tried to put the analogous color theories to use//

(T) yeah// and tried to put them near the complimentaries to see the effects//

53T This
was the only one I thought you could of - isn't this the one I said you could have gotten more out of it?

hm hmm, you said the forms were weak back in through here.

yeah, why don't you just change those a little bit, I think it looks good otherwise. Next Friday, when I ask for paintings, why don't you give me that stack over there.

That stack (( the teacher had made a separate pile of paintings that he wanted to show his peers))

Yeah, okay (?) I'll take some of those --

Okay --

(pointing to one) This looks good, I'd just change that red thing. See if you can't get it to do more --

I tried, like this one, I was trying to be more subtle like in charcoal drawings how they blend into the paper. Well I tried to do that here and it just looks washed out I thought//

mm hmm/

nothing really happened with it.
63T I think you could of - I guess the thing here was -
was this the color that it really was?
S8
64S Yeah, it was the metal, it was the paper clip.
65T Okay that - I was just saying that here you say
all the changes that it has all the facets and
different colors. Here (pointing to another
section)) I just think you like made it too
simple, you know you assigned green to this and
red, and grey to that. That's why I think that
that one is much more interesting than the rest
of them. I wish that these (pointing to other
parts of a six sectioned study) could have taken
on more of the changes that this has.
66S Yeah, but color wise I like them/
67T Yeah color wise, but I think you could have done
more to all of them. I would like all of them to
have had this many changes. Like the green could
go from a cool green to maybe a warmer green or a
chartreuse, or whatever, and then back again to
almost blue green. I'd like to see you work on it
some more; maybe today or tomorrow, if you just have
those squares to work on. I'd like to see you do
some work on it/
68S Yeah, maybe after I finish up those squares --
69T All right (looking in grade book and thinking about the grade) Brad; is that right?
70S uh huh.
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Transcribed and Coded Mid-Term Critique of the Female Student who Earned the Lowest Grade

February 10, 1977 Contact Time: 3 min., 30 sec.

T07
Anybody else?--
S05
2S
Me.
T10$K
3T
Okay--
S05
(student brings up work and places it on the table)
T07 S05
4S
(looking through work) These (pointing) are the earlier ones?
T6$A
S03
5T
Yeah
T10$P
T2 T10$P T03 T2 T6$A
5T
Just the problems -- okay -- ah -- was this your favorite color scheme or something?
S5U
8S
(student nods)
T03 T2
9T
(Teacher picks up next one) This is a little more interesting I think (picks up next few)
T10$P T04A
all right -- we're gonna repeat this problem. Most of them didn't think it turned out that good. I think they're a little too quick (next work) monochromatic--
T12$Q T03 T2 T10$P
T9$I T4A$N
(next work) nice colors, but you could have pushed it further you know.
S10
10S
Yeah=really-- ah I umm, most of my pictures I like didn't finish.
T6$D
11T
Do you feel like I'm pushing you for time -- all the time?
12S Not all the time but like all of my pictures are like/

13T Do you feel like you do better on them when like you have more time?

14S Yeah-- ah I/

15T Okay. (looks at the next few) These-- I think I already talked to you about being too centrally organized. (looking at the next few) I really think that it would= for you personally, and there are others in here too=and it's a real common like stigma, and that's spend more time looking here (pointing)-- kinda see all these (gestering) objects by looking here (pointing) -- okay?

16S Mm Hm/m/

17T At the interval between the objects. ((flips through as he talks)) because you are obviously= a chair, a tablecloth, a bucket and you're kinda letting this (pointing to negative areas) go to hell, and you gotta like pick up on it.

18S Okay

19T Okay this is a little bit better. You're paying some attention to it. (looks at another) (flips through looking for sample okay-- this is better/}

20S you're holding
it upside down (n)="/ S4$H,
T10$K

21T Okay-- like that?
22S Yeah.

23T Okay-- that's much better though= the green gets a little overbearing though. It would be nice if the green had a little shift in hue or something.
S10$N

24S un hun

T03 T2 T07 S05
25T (picks up another) this one has the same old problem. You're dealing with them as objects (looks at another) the color's good, it looks better, it's beautiful in there (gestures) (looks at another) okay--
T07 S05 T03 T2 T10$K
(looks at another) (looks at another) That looks like a Chagall (?) (looks) That one looks pretty good. See T4 T07 S05
how important those are ((points to the negative shapes that Chagall used in the picture that was copied))?
S10$N

26S un hun T04A

27T Try it upside down (turns picture upside down) That's the best way to look at it. If you can get rid of the figurative aspect of it and just see it as shape= shape the color position and size. Then it does hold together, and -- if we do that on these (picks up two of hers) it's just obvious that they don't = that things aren't really working in it.
28S Yeah/

29T (looks at all the rest) okay-- these were the last ones (?)

T10$K T6$A

30S (nods)

31T Okay-- this (pointing) seems like it could have been stronger. It's just too many little changes (gestures with stabbing motion) The rest of them look pretty good (looks) the color looks good in all of these.

T07 S05 T11$I

That one (pointing) is not functioning as color=it's just black and white//

S10 S11$I

32S Yeah I know//

33T and this one (shifts to another) was the one that you designed (?)

34S Right//

35T the changes look real beautiful (referring to Picasso's colors) like with Picasso it maybe will come clearer. It's real figure/ground and we can switch it like this (gestures) could be ground and we can switch it to figure.

S10$N

36S un hun//

37T see it can go either way= push/pull kinda thing (sigh) see how those shapes are real integral?=

T07 S05 T04 T03 T4$O

just a series of shapes and colors ((still looking at the work as he talks)) (picks up and looks at work)
T9$L
I like that one and this one too. All right = fine.

T03
(begins to write in book and student gathers up her work)

T7
38T Did you finish the red squares?

S5
39S I finished them but I um /

T06$F
are you gonna bring em in Monday?

S5
41S Yeah I // T10$K (T07) (S05y)

T03
42T Okay -- (Who's Next?) ((another student responds))

T1
T1

(teacher stands aside opens grade book) (sighs) (6)

T13
T07
(whistles tune 10) What's your name again?

S05
43S Arlene.

T10
T03
T10
44T un hun (writes in book) okay thanks.
Appendix D-3

Sample Notation Using Dual-Track Recording (Mid-Term)

NOTE: This transcript was made from the ethnographic description of the non-verbal dimension of this student's mid-term critique. The student is representative of the average student. She earned the grade of C for the work being reviewed in this episode.
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 his hands on his hips. The student shrugs her shoulders, the teacher points to part of picture and begins waving hand across certain area -- Teacher points, squints. Student points to work, teacher steps in and takes sip of his coffee -- Teacher nods but continues focusing on work then makes a flash eye contact with the student. Teacher shakes head yes then flips to a new painting and switches topic. Squints and makes comment that student responds to with a nod. The student has a tense erect stance with arms folded tightly across her chest. Student attempts to make eye contact, teacher scratches his nose and looks back to work. Teacher nods and then flips to a new painting, acknowledging the production response but reserving criticism. Squints at new painting and makes a comparative by placing next to another squinting again at them both. His voice tone, carries little expression. Rather direct and bland in tonality no enthusiasm present in his delivery rather business like with coffee sipping offering him thought time. As he makes a negative comment his head makes a shaking gesture. He is demonstrating a concept through symbolizing it on the blackboard trying to show how shape can be defined by color area rather than by linear outline. The student is pointing to a part of the picture which is illustrative of what he wants her to do. Teacher clarifies by pointing to another area in the work and then adding to the blackboard sketch. He is pointing to the part of the work in question and shaking head. When he makes a negative comment his hands move in a jerking gesture a choppy kind of movement across the specific area under criticism. This contrast to a more flowing dancing gesture that accompanies positive and holistic comments that relate to the unification and "the way it works together". With this student, the teacher has taken a position which is more behind the student than with the previous student who he showed more positive affect toward ((the A student)). Hands are inserted in his pockets and now moves closer to the work. Glances quickly at student who remains rather stiff in her stance and neutral in her response. This student seems to accept the teacher authoriative role more than the previous who seemed to interact on a more equal and personal level. -- The teacher uses hands to tie together related or unrelated parts. Hand gestures are necessary and important to direct attention focus to the isolate in question and to often
demonstrate the action of approach necessary to improve the work. Teacher moves hands to hips. Glances at student, probably reading the non-verbal state of comprehension and student nods head as if in agreement with what is being explicated. The teacher then moves to the work and flips to a new painting looking at it for a short bit before comenting that the whole class did poorly and that they would all do it again so he moves on to another. The teacher not only assesses the individual, he makes assessments of the individual in comparison to the group and in contrast to the teaching and general goal achievement. By this time he had already determined that the group had not done well in comprehending the objective of that assignment. He reaches the group of work done from out-of-focus projected slides of artists work. The student responds with a smile to his last comment and makes a quick eye contact. They eye contact here is brief and doesn't last for more than a split second.

A new student came into the room the two look to see who it is then turn back to work and continue their discussion. The teacher is demonstrating the hand gesture for stroke application that would be used in painting the particular object in question. The teacher is gesturing with an angry aggressive and slashing hand movement as he says something negative about the particular painting. He lifts the painting up and draws it closer to them to examine the detail under criticism. Again gesturing with the other hand over the work. Places the work aside and moves to another painting. He is shaking his hand and head simultaneously in a negative gesture as he points to another aspect "that they are done too quick to get into the objective of the lesson". The hands are making judgment by the way he flows them over the work as he flips through. I doubt if the student is aware of this subtle language but it is now obvious to me that the hand gesture has a correlation to the type of comment that accompanies it and sometimes when no comment is given a hand gesture could provide the affect cue necessary for the interpretation of valuation. Shaking head now as he tells her to pay attention to edges and hand waves horizontally back and forth over edge as if saying "this is not right" "no" etc.. Student has a nervous semi-smile which may be interpreted as slight embarrassment for not having perceived that herself. She nods in apparent agreement. Shakes head now more affirmatively when he made a quick eye contact. Again the teacher begins making slashing gestures in the air. These are usually made when the teacher discussed parts that are "cut off" or not related
to the rest of the work. When it works in parts instead of a unified whole, the accompanied gesture "chops" at the work, when it is related the gesture flows over like an imaginary thread that has tied it together. The hands are now being used to demonstrate a measured relationship. Now using the hands to show the relation of certain parts of the still life they had drawn from. This particular student has been told several times during the first part of the term that her paint was too flimsy and that she was attempting too many little details and drawing too small. He is now reinforcing those comments he has made and trying to explain why it's important that she change her approach. Student agrees and he finds evidence in the later work that it is better. His pattern is one of finding something wrong then looking for another isolate which is a better treatment of the problem in question. As he tells her what she ought to be doing there are forceful gestures which suggest pushing, pointing as if making charge, etc. Another student pointed this out saying that if he really wants you to do something he "stabs you with a pointing finger in the air". I can see what he means by that in this interaction. The teacher flips through a couple paintings. Again making gestures to the "neglected edges". Squinting at the work, again stepping back and creating more distance between the student and he, creating authoritative distancing as he gives commands as to what ought to be done or tells what doesn't work. He is consistent in this pattern when he has control of the space. However when positive comments are made he approaches closer to the work and to the student and is more likely to maintain longer eye contact. This strategy is reflected in his in process critiques as well. Negative comments are made from the higher elevation of an erect stance and most frequently from the student's back. Positive statements are usually made face-to-face and when he is sincerely interested in an idea or concept he comes to the student's front and stoops to their eye level. Frowns as he is unsure if the project or the objective and some students perceive this and jump in with explication. With this student he moves to a verbal solicitation "What was this one from?" The student is using similar gestural moves to explain the process and assignment. The teacher found two that he liked especially and is now engaged in a face-to-face request that the student allow him to show these to a faculty discussion group. He puts them aside and asks that she hold on to them until Friday. The student nods and smiles. The teacher closes the original distance after this. He takes another look at the work, picks up his grade book, then turns his back toward her, to enter the grade, and she returns to her work station.
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FIGURES AND GRAPHS
| T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 | T6 | T7 | T8 | T9 | T10 | T11 | T12 | Y | 1  | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 | S11 | S12 | SX | X |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 2  | 2  | 70 | 17 | 1  | 5  | 11 | 12 | 8  | 4  | 2  | 15 | 1  | 1  | 2  | 2  | 4  | 4  | 1  | 4  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 4  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |

**Figure 4**

O.G.I.A. Matrix Display: Average Students
Figure 5

O.S.I.A. Matrix Display: Below Average Students
Figure 6
APPENDIX F

PERMISSION FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

F-1: Approval of Human Subjects Review Committee
F-2: Approval Form for Student Participants
F-3: Approval Form for Teacher Subject
APPENDIX F-1

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

PROPOSED USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS: ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Behavioral Sciences Review Committee has taken the following action:

X 1. Approve

2. Approve with Conditions

3. Disapprove

with regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research entitled: A Research Proposal for a Qualitative Investigation into Evaluative Practice and Events Within the Context of University Studio Art Classrooms. Through Multiple-Operations, Multiple-Perspectives and Multiple-Phase Design Arthur D. Efland/Maurice J. Sevigny is listed as the principal investigator.

The conditions, if any, are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson and by the principal investigator. If disapproved, the reasons are attached and are signed by the committee chairperson and by the medical or other consultant, if any.

Signed (medical or other consultant)

Signed (chairperson)

Date December 17, 1976

PA-025
I consent to serve as subject in the research investigation entitled "Evaluative Practice and Evaluative Events Within the Context of the Studio Classroom".

The nature and general purpose of the research procedure has been explained to me. This research is to be performed under the director of Maurice Sevigny, who has received permission, from the Committee for the Study Involving Human Subjects and from his graduate advisors, to conduct this research.

I understand that any further inquiries I make related to my participation will be answered. I understand that my identify will not be revealed in any publication, document, tape recording, photograph, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent, and discontinue participation at any time following my notification to the Project Director.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: Dec 19, 1976
Time: a.m.

Investigator:

Maurice J. Sevigny, Ph.D. Candidate,
The Department of Art Education
The Ohio State University
Appendix F-3
Protocol No. 76B 476

RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
CONSENT TO SERVE AS A SUBJECT IN RESEARCH

BEHAVIORAL AND SURVEY RESEARCH FORM

I consent to serve as a subject in the research investigation entitled: A Qualitative Analysis of Evaluative Process and Events in the Context of the University Studio Art Classroom: Artist-Teacher as Participant-Observer.

The nature and general purpose of the research procedure have been explained to me. This research is to be performed by or under the direction of Dr. Arthur D. Efland, who is authorized to use the services of others in the performance of the research.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, video-tape, photograph, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Project Director.

Signed ____________________________________________
(Subject)

Date ____________________________________________

Investigator