Background

The study was designed to take up policy concerns with inclusion, excellence and enjoyment in primary schools and the potential of the creative arts to contribute to them. It also took up concerns about the connections between identity, place and inclusion and how these might be expressed and furthered through inclusive pedagogies. It was situated in Holly Tree Primary, which enjoyed a national reputation as an outstanding primary school and had at its helm the longest serving head teacher in the UK. The school had a long history of involvement in the arts which, at the time the project began, was centred around a self-portrait project in which all Year 5 children worked with a visual artist. The study followed on from a one year un-funded pilot.

Objectives

The project aimed to understand how an intensive creative arts programme in an inner city primary school built identities and communities and thus contributed to social inclusion. There were six specific objectives: to

- Investigate how children understand and articulate their individual and collective social and material place through creative arts practices
- Identify how teachers work with and build children’s academic, aesthetic, social and cultural resources
- Develop ways in which the holistic learning outcomes of the arts project might be measured and evaluated
- Identify how artists assisted children to explore, construct and represent their identities and local place
- Investigate how parents/carers responded to the impact of the arts programme on their child, and
- Critically analyse how the school developed relationships and networks with families and the wider community

The ethnographic nature of the project led us first to work from and with the data that we had. This meant that in addition to our original questions we did four additional things:

a. Holly Tree Primary School was heavily involved with Creative Partnerships. This led us to examine the policy agenda around creativity, in order to make sense of what was happening in the school and the arts programme.

b. We found that the arts programme was strongly steered by the head teacher. We therefore needed to look at leadership and management issues. We
developed a spatial analysis of the school to understand the head’s sphere of influence.

c. We found we had to look at the issue of inclusion across the school in order to theorise inclusion within the arts. We also needed to consider other ways of thinking about equity and social justice.

d. We found ourselves in a situation where there were fewer differences between the pedagogies of mainstream teachers and artists than we had supposed would be the case. In order to understand this, we spent time analysing the pedagogical framing of both teachers’ and artists’ work.

We report on each of these aspects as well as our initial questions in the results section of this report. All of our initial objectives were able to be met, although our ambitious goal for the project – to develop fully an inclusive pedagogic model – is less advanced than we had hoped because of the contextual constraints and framings of the arts programme.

**Methods**

This was a qualitative ethnographic case study which treated all participants, including children, as knowledgeable and capable. The study utilised: in-depth interviews with children, teachers and artists; opportunistic interviews with parents/carers; regular observation and recording of arts activities and events using field notes, photographs and video (Russell, in press); analysis of policy, school and programme texts; analysis of children’s artefacts and writing; discussions at school staff meetings and with the project reference committee, which consisted of school and *Creative Partnerships* personnel.

Visual methods were important to the study. Interpretation of children’s art is dominated by therapeutic and cognitive developmental perspectives. In this project we drew more on cultural studies approaches, focussing particularly on the images children produced and issues of representation. This worked to a point, but we found we gained access to more interesting and richer understandings when we engaged the children themselves as artists talking about their paintings and drawings (Thomson & Hall, forthcoming-b).

Employing a multimodal analysis of video and observation data encouraged us to look carefully at the disposition of bodies and spaces, at movement, rhythms and symbols (Hall, Thomson, & Russell, forthcoming, 2006). We also started to theorise the school as a visual text (see below).

**Results**

- **Policy context**
  From the outset, New Labour policy makers resisted the simple binary of elite versus popular culture which had preoccupied Conservative theorists. The government’s ‘cultural turn’ in 2001 reframed the promotion of creativity, which had been the central concern of the NACCE Report (National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCE), 1999), as entrepreneurialism and innovation (Buckingham & Jones, 2001). *Excellence and Enjoyment* (Department for Education and Skills (DfES), 2003) further promoted this agenda, but there was no moving away from the reform architecture of skills testing, targets and league tables, despite the rhetoric. There was a continuing theme of teachers as deficient pedagogues needing expert assistance; the development of their creativity was added to this list of needs (Hall &
Thomson, 2005; in press). Creative Partnerships (CP) began in 2003 and evolved from a primarily arts focused intervention through ‘creative thinking’ (2004-5) to being seen as providing a vehicle for ‘whole school change’ (2005-6).

In 2004-5 CP funded an artist-in-residence at Holly Tree for one day a week. Next school year 2005-6 this residency was considered to be just ‘good art teaching’ (a negative), and CP funded instead a series of one-off arts projects, while the school found the money to continue the artist’s residency. The nature of the arts activity was thus shaped by the changing goals of the CP programme, as interpreted by the local CP organisation. Our project (from the 2003 pilot onwards) tracked the shift in the school discourse from one about the arts to a more generalised and less focused notion of creativity. This was a creativity which was ubiquitous - everywhere and nowhere tangible, reduced to ‘learning styles’ and ‘thinking skills’.

Holly Tree teachers thought about creativity as something they were lacking (with one exception), although they believed that all of the children they taught had ‘creative potential’. They were thus positioned in accord with policy discourse, but paradoxically their very lack of self-belief also led them to believe that they could not learn a lot from artists since they were not ‘creative people’. They were predominantly concerned with the 3Rs as mainstream policy documents dictated: the arts were marginal to their classroom activities, though they were happy to know they were being covered in the school. When CP shifted to creativity more generally, this appeared to have more bearing on their roles. It sat comfortably too with the idea of the arts as a conduit, a means towards the achievement of other goals, eg. inclusion, rather than an end in their own right. In this model the production of works of art was a by-product of other educational and social processes.

- **The head teacher and the arts programme**

Holly Tree Primary had refused to be reduced to what Michael Fullan (2005) describes as an outdated reform strategy of highly centralised prescription and inspection. Through the Head’s leadership, and her continued self-renewal strategies, they had maintained a strongly child centred discourse, which made tangible an ‘ethic of care’ (Noddings, 1992) in which staff and students alike felt secure and safe. The Head managed this through a highly strategic adherence to bureaucratic requirements, opposition to elements of the National Literacy Strategy including the requirement for a ‘literacy hour’, and continued success in Key Stage tests. The Head’s pastoral efforts produced Holly Tree as a protective/protected territory which she patrolled and guarded, thus shielding staff and students alike from a ‘dangerous outside’. This boundary work ensured that staff stayed in the school, confident that Holly Tree was unique and special (Thomson & Hall, forthcoming-a).

The Head took particular steerage of the CP projects. She sat on the local CP committee and had for years dedicated part of the school budget to arts activities for which she was well known. Unlike other head teachers who had devolved CP to teacher committees, the Head maintained control of CP and had it work in ‘her space’ which was out of mainstream classes: her territory was whole school events, extra curricular activities, small group activities managed by withdrawing children from lessons, and public spaces like the front office, dinner hall and corridor walls – the symbolic/semiotic architecture of the school. She was also responsible for image-related activities such as the production of prospectuses and public events and exhibitions. This latter activity dovetailed nicely with the CP orientation towards products.
The effect of the Head’s ownership and direction of CP was to ensure that, while children enjoyed the benefits of arts activities, the teachers, whose territory was restricted to their classrooms, were relatively insulated from the artists.

This is a finding which speaks loudly to the literatures on leadership and school improvement: these gloss the distinctions between school and classroom to create the rhetorical figure of a leader who has an ‘unrelenting focus’ on learning.

○ An inclusive school?
Inclusion at its most basic means children previously not present in class/school being physically in the same space as their peers. At the other end of the spectrum, inclusion is taken to mean substantive changes to the school to ensure that all children:
  ○ are able to participate in the mandated curriculum, and find it meaningful and relevant (participation and achievement)
  ○ have a positive experience at school (well being)
  ○ can construct a positive sense of self (identity) while supporting the self development of others (critical recognition)
  ○ are able to have some say in school activities (voice)
  ○ and can take action to bring about positive change (agency)

Holly Tree Primary met many of these criteria. The children experienced school spaces, both material and temporal, (breaks and lunchtimes, for example), as secure and positive. Teachers spoke of their efforts to differentiate and adapt the curriculum to individual children and the importance of a rich set of experiences, using a framing Froebel discourse of the child as ‘blossoming’ and the school as a nurturing garden. Children achieved well beyond what could be reasonably expected in most areas of the curriculum and our evidence suggests that the children felt cared for, understood and able to have some agency. Because of the emphasis in Holly Tree on each adult and child as an individual with particular needs, talents and interests, the school did ‘recognise’ everyone. Parents/carers also felt able to come to the school, be genuinely welcomed, and get a sympathetic and fair hearing.

Holly Tree thus met most of the broader criteria for an inclusive school. However the same cannot be said for classrooms.

We found a marked reluctance among teachers to ‘see’ the social (re)production of inequities. While individual homes and circumstances were discussed in terms of family breakdown and hardship, there was no conversation about poverty as a structural condition. Similarly teachers’ analysis of achievement and inclusion did not address gender or race/ethnicity as ‘group’ processes with pedagogical implications. All teachers produced individualised analyses of under-achievement. Despite the currency of discourses like ‘failing boys’ for example, the teachers without exception were remarkably resistant to any kind of social perspective on attainment. This ensured that ‘deficit discourses’ (Valencia, 1997) damaging to particular groups of children were not part of the school, while simultaneously preventing the achievement of an aim designated in the NACCE report (1999: 54) as ‘enabl(ing) young people to recognise and understand their own cultural values and assumptions’. Staff also mobilised Piagetian developmental and ability discourses which promoted a linear, incremental conception of learning. While corresponding to the national curriculum, adherence to such a rational model of learning
may disadvantage children who are unable/unprepared to accommodate it (cf. Hill, Comber, Louden, Reid, & Rivalland, 1998).

This led us to surmise that the school, in so far as it was an aggregation of classrooms, was perhaps at the limits of what it might do to further improve formal academic learning. While individual acceptance and individual syllabus differentiation are important, they are not sufficient to understand and address the complex socially-structured reasons for children’s apparent lack of learning ‘progress’, nor to help children understand their own and others’ cultural identities.

We suspect that in the current UK context, a discourse of ‘inclusion’ is insufficiently robust to ensure that all children are ‘successful’. A social justice perspective is unequivocal in arguing that curriculum and classroom practices themselves might be part of the process of the (re)production of inequalities (Connell, 1993). By contrast, inclusion at Holly Tree appeared to be more about comfort, containment and adaptation, at both the school and the classroom level, rather than about change which would require risk taking and critical challenge, particularly within classrooms. However we recognise that in the current climate this is a lot to expect of a small inner city primary school!

- **Pedagogies of artists and teachers in the Creative Partnerships context**

There were fewer differences between the pedagogies of mainstream teachers and the artists who worked at Holly Tree than we had supposed would be the case. CP however clearly wanted there to be marked differences so that artists/‘creatives’ (current CP nomenclature) could teach their skills to teachers as well as work with children.

*CP* staff were more critical of the artist in residence portrait project than we were. From the outset they saw it as too ‘school-like’. We noticed however that in the second year of the project, some of its more interesting aspects (excursions, sketchbooks) had dropped off to be replaced by a more skills and materials focus and much smaller sized projects. By the third year, the portraits became more diverse again, the sketchbooks were reintroduced, and there was more encouragement for children to become active in choosing how to represent themselves. However the end-point of the project shifted away from an exhibition in a public space (Year 1 and 2) to a display in the school hall. Our view was that the project shifted back to being more about identity and less about cultural knowledge (see later section).

Ironically, at Holly Tree, the artist in residence was viewed by *CP* after one year of funding as being ‘too teacher like’ and so a series of one-off short term projects was commissioned. Our analysis (Hall, Thomson, & Russell, in press) of the pedagogies of the artists on these projects suggests that those deemed most successful by *CP* and the school were those which produced a tangible product and/or performance, fitted within the boundaries of ‘niceness’, were marketable, and produced a good image of the school. Our explication of a critical incident (Thomson, Hall, & Russell, 2006), in which the product of a writing workshop was designated a failure and censored, highlighted the ways in which unfamiliar genres, funds of knowledge external to school and a critical stance were problematic to both Holly Tree and *CP*.

Mobilising Bernstein (Hall et al., in press), we argue that the artists were constrained by the same performance pedagogies which now dominate classrooms. The arts activities which were intended to focus on growth, self expression and critical reflection were severely limited by their framing as ‘projects’ with limited life and funding and
accountabilities to both CP and the school. A pedagogy, in which children’s inherent competence and potential were taken as starting points, was continually compromised by the pressures of producing skills and outputs. In addition, the project outcomes were not formally and rigorously assessed; they thus had little impact on the children’s ongoing learning or the teaching that supported it. Products/performances were judged on their benefits for the school (assumed to be the same as for the child): they did not contribute to a formative understanding of the child’s individual learning.

Notwithstanding the rhetoric of partnership, we saw a significant need for dialogue between artists and teachers, before, during and after projects, in order to bring together different and complementary perspectives and to develop a new ‘discourse community of practice’ (Barton & Tusting, 2006).

Children’s identities and place in the world

Involvement in the self-portrait project allowed children to experiment with multiple identities and make choices about representations – which family members, possessions and versions of home to include or exclude, foreground and background. We found instances where the portraits allowed children to say things that normally were not permissible or possible in school (e.g. a child’s painting of herself enveloped in the arms of her dead father, another child’s portrait of his father as an avenging hero taking revenge on the artist’s little brother).

Children, particularly in Year 1 (pilot phase), were articulate about the choices they made: many had thought hard about what kind of self to represent. We would not have been aware of this if we had not interviewed children individually with their paintings and encouraged them to speak as the artist. They spoke authoritatively about their work, taking note of our readings but insisting on their own interpretations (see methods). They were conscious of audience and what was ‘appropriate’ to put on public view, appreciative of each others’ paintings and gave support to their peers.

In contrast to normal lessons where one could be wrong, in the visual arts projects children experienced provisionality - you didn’t make a mistake, you merely worked more until you ‘got it right’. Judgements were arrived at in negotiation with the artist: there was not an imposed target, children developed an internalised sense of a ‘standard’. The children were proud of themselves and what they had achieved: their projects were often bigger, harder, required more sustained effort, risk-taking and learning of new skills, than they experienced in the ordinary classroom. In the first phase of the portrait project the sheer scale of the paintings was important to the children: they had never worked on anything so ambitious. The majority thus gained a new sense of efficacy and agency, seeing themselves as capable, clever, talented. This was demonstrated in the public arena and reinforced by audience appreciation.

Children also developed a sense of themselves as artists. In most cases this was positive and new: Across all of the arts projects nearly every child was able to find some arena in which he/she could excel. In a few cases, the arts projects provided meaning-making opportunities that children had not found previously in school.

Each child thus formed at least one ‘artist identity’, supported by mastery of techniques and processes used by ‘real artists’ (e.g. comparing your work to reproductions, or having an artist’s model) and the use of different media, materials and equipment (e.g. being trusted with professional video equipment and learning to use it as competently as an
adult). In one case, we saw children initiate a school newspaper and run it, over several terms, as a professional production team (hiring and firing reporters, drawing up contracts, making contact with the editor of the regional newspaper, advertising and selling each issue across the school).

Some children did experience constraints on efficacy and innovation. In the situation we identified as a critical incident (see above), children’s work with a writer produced aspects of identities that were unacceptable to the school (knowledge of alcohol, sex and drugs presented in a satirical genre deemed too ‘adult’ by teachers) (Thomson et al., 2006). We observed and were also told of instances where an artist steered children away from particular representations; we also saw children self-censoring. This constrained the identities that were allowable within the school: another edge to the borders of inclusion.

- **How artists work with children to build identity and sense of place**
  Our definition of pedagogy centres on how artists created the settings, tasks and practices that allowed children to develop the sense of efficacy, agency and self described above.

  **Artists:**
  - Opened up different modes of expression
  - Introduced new materials and media, modelled their use, scaffolded tasks through practice and rehearsal
  - Explicated links between the children’s work and other artists’ work
  - Set achievable challenges and created a sense of possibility and safety within which risks could be taken
  - Established a group and collective purpose in which individual effort was understood and valued – interdependence was lived reality
  - Paced activities so that children had to work hard enough to complete but not so fast that children were frustrated
  - Negotiated about pacing, topic, medium
  - Ensured that the physical resources were sufficient and the organisation of the space was seamless (paint pots always ready)
  - Continually reinforced key messages, eg you can’t make a mistake
  - Maintained conversation throughout the activity – a mix of explication and narrative
  - Created a boundaried space in which the activity occurred, separated off from other school activities; the difference was literally marked
  - Integrated knowledge of children’s interests and youth cultures into the projects but also brought in cultural knowledge (eg. in Elizabethan times they often had bad teeth and this affected portrait painting)
  - Introduced some meta-language, eg notions of representation in the portrait project.

Very few of the artists built a sense of community places – they focussed on homes and gardens but not much on the neighbourhood or the city again limiting cultural understandings and identities.

- **How teachers build children’s academic, aesthetic, social and cultural resources**
  The teachers remained relatively separate from the arts projects. Most involved a teacher who was meant to learn the skills of the artist/s by shadowing or overseeing their organisation. Teachers also had a disciplinary and surveilling role. With one exception (a
former arts practitioner), teachers said they ‘weren’t very creative themselves,’ and did not have high levels of skills. Teachers generally did not find it easy to work alongside the artists, although the difficulties were eased in the case of music and media, where two teachers already had skill and confidence. The nursery teacher was an exception to this. She was keen to extend her own and the children’s creative repertoires: she felt less constrained by the statutory curriculum and was encouraged by Local Authority advocacy of Reggio Emilia approaches.

We saw instances where children brought practices they used in arts projects into classrooms – eg to illustrate projects. Some staff said they learnt from their students.

The head devoted a large part of a teaching assistant’s (TA) time to supporting arts-related activities and displays. This TA became a repository for arts skills and knowledges. She was more accessible to the teachers than the artists were. They felt comfortable with her and felt they were ‘building her up’ by seeking her help; in contrast they sometimes seemed to feel they were diminishing themselves to go to artists.

There was little collaborative planning time with artists and a lack of dialogue among staff at meetings about how the arts projects could ‘fit’ into the curriculum. There was some staff discussion about skills and techniques, but no conversation about congruence, complementarity with curriculum, nor about how what the children did might inform pedagogical decisions related to progress.

We identified what we saw as a significant block to development: the lack, amongst the teachers, of a shared meta-language of critique. The sharing of knowledge and opinions about artistic decisions, outcomes and effects foundered on a lack of means. This related both to teachers’ own professional development and to what the teachers did with their classes. Teachers equated critique with being negative, so the post-production stage of projects was neglected in favour of events centred exclusively on children receiving praise (sometimes indiscriminately). The assessment processes in the final stages of projects yielded relatively little summative information that could be used formatively in future work with individuals and groups. Teachers’ professional confidence developed unevenly because of a shared hesitancy around the language they used to talk about the art rather than the effort the child had made.

The classroom–school distinction we discussed earlier operated here. The head was able to organise public exhibitions, ensure that children went on excursions, eg to a sculpture park and galleries. She also deployed the TA to maintain the school as a rich visual text: we counted over 100 faces of current and former students displayed, in addition to numerous sculptures, paintings and models. This text, we suggest, was simultaneously about: public relations for visitors and prospective parents; the creation of a ‘good student’ and ‘good teacher’ which supported and disciplined staff and students alike, and the provision of a resource to which children and teachers could refer (Thomson, Hall, & Russell, forthcoming 2006).

**Measuring and evaluating learning in the arts**

One of our goals was to explore the applicability of the Productive Pedagogies framework in thinking about the outcomes of arts projects. Productive Pedagogies is a social justice framework developed in Australia (Hayes, Mills, Christie, & Lingard, 2005; Lingard, Christie, Hayes, & Mills, 2003; Lingard et al., 2001). We have found that, while we did not see the full range of aspects of Productive Pedagogies in action at Holly Tree,
the framework was useful to summarise what we did see and what was missing (an overview of our analysis using the Productive Pedagogies frame is in Appendix 1).

Our experiment with the Productive Pedagogies framework in one school suggests that it may well provide a helpful approach in arts activities. Its use relies on prolonged observation over time. It has the potential to involve young people and would certainly be a basis for robust dialogue between artists and teachers.

- **The responses of parents/carers**
  The school enjoys an exceptional relationship with its parent/carer community. Parents/carers regularly drop into the school and are welcomed at any time; they come for advice and support; they contribute to everyday activities on a regular basis and in significant numbers.

  However, in the arts projects, parents/carers were primarily seen as audiences for students’ exhibitions and performances. Those who attended arts events were generally an appreciative audience: nearly all attended the public exhibitions although considerably fewer came to the events at school. The video project was directed towards prospective and enrolled parents/carers as a 'prospectus' and marketing tool. Parents/carers were also asked to purchase their children’s artwork after it had been on display: most did. This gave it status in the children’s eyes but those children whose parents did not purchase their work were of course sad.

- **Relationship with families and wider community**
  The one exception to the parent/carer as audience/consumer within the arts projects was in the use of sketchbooks in the first phase of the portrait project. Here students took home books in which they were drawing and were encouraged to get their families to contribute. We saw evidence of neighbours and extended family working with children in these books: many of these contributions showed more than a modicum of talent and the text was clearly an opportunity for enjoyment, and sharing of knowledges. This was not taken up in the project in any significant way. It was lost in the second year and re-introduced in the third year, but once again, the book was not set up or used as a ‘permeable’ text (see Dyson, 1997) which carried local and family ‘funds of knowledge’ (Gonzales, Moll, & Amanti, 2005) into school and vice-versa. Artist and staff thought that the sketchbook was a useful resource but, in the absence of articulation of how it might support learning, shared understandings and development of its functions and purposes were insecure and susceptible to budgetary cuts.

**Activities**

Conference presentations at:
- European Educational Research Association 2005
- United Kingdom Literacy Association 2005, 2006
- Australian Association for the Teaching of English / ALEA 2005 (keynote)
- Oxford Ethnography and Education conference 2005
- Canadian Society for the Study of Education 2006
- Australian Association for Research in Education 2006
- School of Education Nottingham Annual Research Conference 2006
Outputs

Conference papers given and planned as above
Two refereed journal articles published (English in Education, Changing English)
Three refereed journal articles in press, (British Educational Research Journal, British Journal of Sociology of Education; Ethnography and Education)
Planned publications:
(1) CSSE conference paper to be converted into refereed article for special issue of Literacy journal, new article on teacher identities planned for special issue of Pedagogy, Culture and Society, new article on partnerships prepared for special issue of English in Education (edited C Hall)
(2) Book, in preparation (working title: 'I never thought I could do anything like this': The arts, pedagogy and inclusion). Publisher targeted, Trentham Books.

Impacts

School level impact
Staff at Holly Tree Primary have been interested in our findings but we are not clear how our concerns have been taken up. We suspect that simply reporting results is insufficient and what is required is prolonged dialogue and support: we intend to involve the school in our proposed action research network.

Seminar input

The Self Portrait Project, funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation (£20,000, 2005-6).
This has involved working with the National SCITT in Outstanding Primary Schools to develop and embed, in schools and in the work of initial teacher education, some of the ESRC project findings about arts pedagogies. The project has involved the artist in residence from Holly Tree School; trainee teachers paired with experienced teacher-mentors from ten geographically dispersed primary schools; a documentary team of children from two further schools, the academic manager of the SCITT programme, and ourselves. Our aim has been to distil and reflect upon the learning about arts pedagogy from the ESRC project with the artist, the trainees and mentors. By the end of the current academic year, ten successful school projects will have been completed with year 5 students (including public exhibitions of the work); the findings will have been shared with trainees and mentors at their various SCITT conferences, and the activities of the project will have been recorded and evaluated by student research teams working collaboratively across schools. The SCITT course materials will be revised over the summer to include evidence from both the ESRC and the Esmée Fairbairn projects and to draw implications for practice. Teachers in the SCITT and the Management Board have already articulated their commitment to taking this further.

Creative Partnerships
We held a seminar at University of Nottingham with Creative Partnerships Nottingham, Dec, 2005.
Within the region staff are interested in our theorisation of pedagogy and inclusion and have asked for further consultation and copies of papers. In addition, Thomson has been commissioned to write a discussion paper for CP nationally about whole school change.
Future Research Priorities

We have submitted, together with colleagues from another university, a bid to Creative Partnerships on whole school change.

We intend to apply for further ESRC funding, as flagged in our initial proposal, for an action research network which will work on inclusive arts pedagogies and make further use of the Productive Pedagogies framework.
### Appendix 1. Analysis of data using Productive Pedagogies framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual quality:</th>
<th>Holly Tree arts pedagogies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Problematic knowledge</td>
<td>Considering alternative media, identities, forms of representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Higher order thinking</td>
<td>Limited – situating arts practice in context in portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Depth of knowledge</td>
<td>Only in portrait project – history, media and criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Depth of students’ understanding</td>
<td>Best in portrait project, other short term projects militate against this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Substantive conversation</td>
<td>Writing project, video project, portrait project all supported elaborated conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Meta-language</td>
<td>Portrait and video project supported technical language; portraits supported a lexicon of visual art appreciation, but generally limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectedness:</th>
<th>Projects were all school-centric although not classroom-centric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Connectedness to the world beyond the classroom</td>
<td>Arts projects were balkanised and not multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Knowledge integration</td>
<td>Writing project (censored) worked with television and local knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Background knowledge</td>
<td>Video project involved problem solving via storyboarding, setting up shots, interviewing; portrait project required some problem solving around composition and technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Problem based curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive classroom environment:</th>
<th>Students had some steerage of exhibition at latter stages. But weak throughout since requirements of CP projects create strong direction by artists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Students’ direction</td>
<td>Music, portraits and video had explicit standards of performance articulated during the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Explicit quality performance criteria</td>
<td>Strong social support for all children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Social support</td>
<td>Portrait project produced significant levels of concentration, commitment and ‘flow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Academic engagement</td>
<td>Activities heavily regulated by adults except newspaper development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Students’ self regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working with and valuing differences</th>
<th>None of the projects dealt significantly with diverse cultural knowledges. Did draw on both high and popular cultures. Percussion project touched on different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Cultural knowledges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Musical traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active citizenship</td>
<td>Almost no critical perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the projects promoted active citizenship. Families and community/ies seen as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Portrait project had high narrative process – storytelling community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group identities in learning communities</td>
<td>Lacking – nothing other than individuals, except for the designation of a ‘gifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and talented’ group within school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Portrait and video project explicitly foregrounded questions of individual (portrait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and institutional (video) representation – although video more in marketing sense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School of Education Research Ethics Policy

The School of Education has adopted the BERA Code of Research Ethics and adheres to the Data Protection Act.

Therefore all names in this study are anonymised, and details that might identify the school are confidential. Data lodged for archiving has been carefully reworked to ensure no harm will come to the school or artists as a result of this study. We have continued to identify Creative Partnerships since it is publicly funded and this study might be one that could be re worked as part of a specific examination of that specific public policy.

In addition because this study involved children, we have used the following as guidelines:

‘The Child Speaks to the Researcher’

1. Please treat me and my life with respect.

2. Tell me about this research
   • why are you doing it?
   • who will it help?
   • what is my role?
   • what will you do with what I say?

3. Ask me if I want to participate
   • tell me how I was chosen
   • tell me what I will need to do
   • give me a real choice to decide
   • don’t threaten me if I change my mind

4. Invite me to talk about things which are directly related to the research, don’t trick me with smart questions or pry into the rest of my life. Show me that you are really listening.

5. Share my story in ways that don’t
   • put me down
   • make it worse than it is
   • make me unsafe

6. Please show me what you have done with my words.
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