

# **A Visual Arts Educator-Researcher's Inquiry into the Role of the Teacher in an Intergenerational Arts Program**

by

**Sue Dyer**

Teacher Education (P.D.P.), Simon Fraser University, 1993

B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1992

D.F.A., Langara College, 1989

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

in the  
Arts Education Program  
Faculty of Education

© **Sue Dyer 2017**

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**Fall 2017**

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for Fair Dealing. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, education, satire, parody, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

# Approval

**Name:** Sue Dyer  
**Degree:** Master of Arts (Education)  
**Title:** A Visual Arts Educator-Researcher's Inquiry into the Role of the Teacher in an Intergenerational Arts Program

**Examining Committee:** **Chair:** Susan Barber  
Lecturer

**Susan O'Neill**  
Senior Supervisor  
Associate Professor

---

**Yaroslav Senyshyn**  
Supervisor  
Professor

---

**Lynn Fels**  
Internal/External Examiner  
Associate Professor

---

**Date Defended/Approved:** November 28, 2017

## Ethics Statement



The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library  
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

## **Abstract**

This study explores a visual arts educator-researcher's inquiry of the role of the teacher in the development and implementation of an intergenerational (IG) arts program. Two iterations of an IG arts program were implemented in New Westminster, British Columbia with retired longshoremen and 1) 20 homelearners aged 10–11 years, during eight weekly sessions, and 2) in collaboration with an elementary teacher and his class of 24 Grade 3–4 students aged 8–9 years, during ten weekly sessions. The aim of this inquiry is to explore what it means to be a visual arts educator-researcher within an IG learning context and to examine the social practices that underpin the effectiveness of the program. Reflexive analysis focused on reflection in action and on action, drawing on data collected during the study that included observations, interviews and artifacts. The findings highlight a process for deepening our understanding of intergenerational interactions for artistic learning that emphasize equal group status and provide a framework for viewing teaching as a social practice.

**Keywords:** Teaching as a social practice; intergenerational arts; intergenerational learning; artistic learning; visual arts; equal group status

*I would like to dedicate this thesis to the students and the retirees who so enthusiastically participated in the two intergenerational arts programs for this research.*

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Susan O'Neill for the guidance and encouragement she provided throughout this research process, and in writing this thesis. I have appreciated her patience and support toward my ideas and my professional growth as a researcher, teacher, graduate student and writer. I would like to thank both Dr. O'Neill and Dr. Peter Hall for the opportunity to be part of this research project. I would like to also thank Dr. Hall for his support, and for inviting me to be part of the larger research project that led to the research for my thesis. Thank you to Claire Carolan for her generosity in sharing her observations which helped to lead the direction for this research. Thank you to Dr. Yaroslav Senyshyn (Slava) and Dr. Lynn Fels. I would like to thank Matthew Sol for his support with his students. I would like to say a special thanks to the program participants, Joe Breaks, Gerry White, and Brian Ringrose who donated their time, their life stories, enthusiasm and humour. And also a special thanks to the students for their endless enthusiasm and willingness to jump in without hesitation. The students' and the retirees' made this research thoroughly enjoyable. Without their voluntary contributions this research would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Ken Bauder for pursuing the idea of documenting the retirees' stories of their working life on the waterfront, and two other retirees whose participation in one session of the program provided insight for this research. I would like to thank my family members for their support. Firstly my husband for all his support, my daughter for her valuable contributions with the elementary program, and my son for his humour which gave me perspective, and my father for his encouragement with the final stages of cutting this thesis down to a reasonable length. I would also like to thank the thesis office at Simon Fraser University for all their valuable technical and writing support, with special thanks to David Chokroun. I would like to thank Simon Fraser University, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for providing the funding for the larger partnership development grant, titled *(Re)Claiming the New Westminster Waterfront*. The opportunity for my involvement implementing the IG arts program in this research thesis emerged from and was connected to this larger research project. I would also like to thank the British Columbia Retired Teachers Association (BCRTA) for honouring this IG arts program with an award for its community contributions in bringing split generations together through the local schools.

# Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Photos.....	ix
Introductory Image.....	x
<b>Chapter 1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Intergenerational Arts Research Project.....	1
1.2. Intergenerational Learning.....	4
1.3. Artistic Learning.....	14
1.4. Intergenerational Artistic Learning.....	15
1.5. Teaching as a Social Practice.....	16
1.6. Visual Arts Educator-Researcher.....	19
1.7. Reflective Practice.....	20
1.8. Reflection In and On Action.....	22
1.9. Reflective Narrative.....	23
1.10. Research Purpose and Questions.....	25
<b>Chapter 2. Study and Program.....</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1. Program Description: Homelearners.....	30
2.2. Program Description: Elementary.....	32
<b>Chapter 3. Reflexive Analysis.....</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1. Session One Homelearners: Introduction and Interviews.....	35
3.1.1. Session Two Homelearners: Interviewing Retirees.....	46
3.1.2. Session Three Homelearners: Waterfront Visit.....	50
3.1.3. Session Four: Homelearners' Review Day.....	55
3.1.4. Session Five Homelearners: Working on the Art Projects.....	59
3.1.5. Session Six Homelearners: Working on Arts Projects.....	69
3.1.6. Session Seven Homelearners: Working on Arts Projects/ Imagining the Future.....	76
3.1.7. Session Eight Homelearners: Display Day.....	86
3.2. Elementary School.....	91
3.2.1. Sessions One Elementary School: Introduction.....	94
3.2.2. Session Two Elementary School: Preparation for Interviewing Retirees.....	97
3.2.3. Session Three Elementary School: Meeting and Interviewing Retirees.....	100
3.2.4. Session Four Elementary School: Waterfront Visit.....	107
3.2.5. Session Five: Elementary School Review Day.....	113
3.2.6. Session Six Elementary: Working on the Arts Projects.....	119
3.2.7. Session Seven Elementary: Working on Arts Projects.....	125
3.2.8. Session Eight Elementary: Working on Arts Projects.....	130

3.2.9. Session Nine Elementary School: Finishing on Arts Projects/Imagining the Future/Student Interviews/Student Questionnaires.....	134
3.2.10. Session Ten Elementary School: Display Day, Retirees and Teacher Interviews.....	142
3.3. Summary of Main Findings.....	145
3.3.1. Homelearners Study: Summary of Findings .....	146
3.3.2. Elementary School Study: Summary of Findings.....	148
<b>Chapter 4. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>156</b>
4.1. Limitations of the Inquiry .....	156
4.2. Directions for Future Research .....	156
4.3. Implications for Education and Practice .....	158
<b>References.....</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Appendix A. IG Artistic Inquiry Letter for Parents.....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>Appendix B. IG Artistic Inquiry Letter to Retirees .....</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>Appendix C. IG Art Project Child Interview Protocol.....</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>Appendix D. IG Art Project Retiree Interview Protocol .....</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Appendix E. The World of Work on the Waterfront - Art Project -Student Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Appendix F. The World of Work on the Waterfront - Student Questionnaire ..</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Appendix G. “The World of Work on the Waterfront” Student ART Project Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>Appendix H. Waterfront Program Questions for Teacher:.....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Appendix I. Approval Letter from School Principal .....</b>	<b>176</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Program Overview: Homelearners .....	31
Table 2.2	Program Overview: Elementary.....	33

## List of Photos

Photo 3.1	Students and Joe looking at one of the large photographs brought by the retirees.....	50
Photo 3.2	Gerry working with this group of three girls on the clay sculpture. ....	78
Photo 3.3	Photo of Joe and the students walking at the waterfront with Joe answering their questions.....	109
Photo 3.4	Joe explaining to the students what used to be at the waterfront up ahead as they walked together.....	113
Photo 3.5	Taken as the student lined up this old photograph of the ship and the Pattullo Bridge with the current Pattullo Bridge in the background for a past and present comparison. ....	114



Clay sculpture created in collaboration by students and retirees showing waterfront workers at work on the dock, with a ship tied to the bollards.

# Chapter 1.

## Introduction

In this inquiry, I position myself as a visual arts educator-researcher, researching teaching as a social practice within and through the development of an intergenerational (IG) arts program. The program was part of a three-year partnership development project with university researchers and members of the community of New Westminster, British Columbia. In this thesis, I discuss intergenerational programming, intergenerational learning and artistic learning in general to provide a rationale for the IG arts program. I look at what makes this intergenerational learning environment a social practice, and what makes it effective through intergenerational interactions. Through reflexive analysis, I describe how I apply reflective practice through observations and discoveries as a teacher-researcher that led me to recognize the significance of many social interactions, and what makes the teacher's role effective within these social interactions. I also discuss how I apply reflective practice in developing my view of teaching as a social practice, using reflective narrative, reflecting in and on action, including patterns of participation as part of my inquiry into the role of the teacher in implementing an effective IG arts program.

### 1.1. Intergenerational Arts Research Project

My inquiry is situated within an intergenerational arts research project, titled *Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present and Future*, which was directed by my supervisor Dr. Susan O'Neill, Professor of Education at Simon Fraser University. Dr. O'Neill was Co-investigator of a larger partnership development grant, titled *(Re)Claiming the New Westminster Waterfront*, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Directed by the Principal Investigator, Dr. Peter Hall from SFU's Urban Studies Department. The community partners for this project were the New Westminster Longshoremen's Union (International Longshore and Warehouse

Union, Local 502), the New Westminster School District, and the New Westminster Museum and Archives. The partnership's focus was on the changing world of work on the New Westminster Waterfront over the past 50 years.

My role in this larger partnership was as a member of the Steering Committee, representing the New Westminster School District and as a research assistant working with Dr. O'Neill on developing and teaching an intergenerational (IG) arts program as part of the research project. Other members of the intergenerational arts research team included Claire Carolan (research assistant) and Rose Dyer (youth research assistant). Two teachers were also involved in the project, Mathew Sol (elementary school teacher in New Westminster) and Pat Dyer (secondary school teacher in New Westminster). Further information about the overall partnership and intergenerational arts research project, including descriptions of the program materials can be found on the project website: <http://www.sfu.ca/waterfront.html>

The IG arts program, which was situated within the wider research project, aimed to bring two generations together to share life histories, build intergenerational connections and engage in intergenerational and artistic learning. New Westminster school students and retired Longshoremen engaged in three programs. The first program consisted of eight weekly sessions including a display day with homelearners students in Grades five and six. The second program consisted of ten weekly sessions including a display day at an elementary school in New Westminster with students in Grades three and four. The third program consisted of six daily sessions including a final project sharing day at a secondary school in New Westminster. Only the first two programs will be included in this thesis.

This thesis explores the notion of social practice within an IG arts program. The concept of 'social practice' is defined in various ways by different authors; however, most understand what Giddens (1984) described as a practice (e.g., routinized behaviour involving interconnected elements of bodily and mental activities, objects/materials and shared competencies, knowledge and skills) that is shaped by power relations, structures, technologies and society, while also acting to shape aspects of these wider social systems. In this thesis, I define social practice as the children's and older adults' collective

experiences that include the material and social elements of their participation in intergenerational arts activities.

By focusing on teaching as a social practice, I aim to emphasize what Overgaard (1985) describes as “a form of activity that has grown out of common needs in a community to accomplish certain purposes” and that involve “shared ways of behaving or acting” that are guided by “a complex array of norms” (p. iii). This community engagement approach resonates with intergenerational program objectives and yet there are few studies that examine teaching as a social practice within the context of intergenerational arts programs. I aim to address this gap and broaden the scope on arts classroom practices and pedagogies through a reflexive examination of what it means to be a visual arts educator-researcher within an intergenerational learning context. I also hope that this research will help to forge new ground and further understanding of the social practices that underpin effective intergenerational arts programs.

My research aims to address the following questions:

1) What is the role of the visual arts educator-researcher within the concept of teaching as a social practice in an intergenerational arts program?

2) How do intergenerational interactions within an intergenerational arts program contribute to intergenerational learning and artistic learning?

This thesis consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 includes this introduction and provides a review of the relevant literature. Chapter 2 outlines the research methods, including the objectives, learning outcomes, program development, research sites and participants, data collection procedures and the process of reflexive analysis that was undertaken. Chapter 3 provides an analysis and discussion in chronological order of the research data, and summary of the findings situated within the literature. Chapter 4 describes the limitations of the research, suggestions for future research and implications for education.

# Literature Review

## 1.2. Intergenerational Learning

### *Programming*

According to Heydon and O'Neill (2014), merely bringing two generations together is not enough for intergenerational learning to occur: "the benefits of bringing skipped generations together are perhaps best achieved through intergenerational programs rather than activities" (p. 3). The authors draw on Friedman (1997) in defining the difference between programs and activities, where "programs should be beneficial to all" (p. 105). Activities tend to be one time stand-alone events with little or no sequential activities built in. Activities lack the continuity and depth that programs provide in supporting intergenerational learning. With this type of brief contact and lack of continuity, it is difficult to design intergenerational activities as "beneficial to all" participants in a meaningful way. They "do not allow the level of meaning to exist because they lack depth and long term significance" (Friedman, 1997, p. 105, as cited in Heydon and O'Neill, 2014, p. 3). More time and in-depth content allows more opportunities for learning to occur as meaningful connections are made through shared experiences, knowledge and understandings. Through intergenerational programs, such shared experiences build connections that can "take on meaning relevant to one's life" (Friedman, 1997, p. 105, as cited in Heydon and O'Neill, 2014, p. 3).

Heydon (2013) identifies five elements for planned intergenerational programming. She designed and developed intergenerational programs for groups of young pre-school aged children who are cared for during the day in the same building as a senior care facility. The programs were implemented by the care givers of the care facility. In another study, Heydon and O'Neill (2014) developed an intergenerational arts program, called *Songs of our Hearts*, for kindergarten aged children and seniors living in care. Based on their research, the first element for planned intergenerational programming requires "strategies to[...]acquaint participants with each other and foster community" (Heydon, 2013, p. 28). As part of these strategies to acquaint participants, an outline for the program

was discussed with the participants during the first session giving context and relevance to the activities and purpose for the time invested within the program. In keeping with Heydon's approach, a significant amount of time needs to be built into the program for participants to become acquainted with the relevance and purpose of the program. According to Heydon, this relevance fosters a sense of community purpose among participants and fosters a sharing of common goals. Heydon includes within this first element a need to establish "a sense of safety" (p. 28) and comfort for the participants to support intergenerational collaboration. The teacher implementing the intergenerational program plays an important role here and throughout the program sessions in "modelling[...]behaviour[...]conducive to connection-making and safety" (p. 47) for all the participants within the intergenerational setting.

The second element Heydon (2013) outlines is "a catalyst for that day's project that could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter" (p. 28). This catalyst helps to generate meaningful in-depth interaction between participants related to the curricula content and the common goals.

Providing "explicit instructions, [and] modelling" (Heydon, 2013, p. 28) for the participants' comfort level with the materials and activities, makes up the third element needed for intergenerational programming and allows for more in-depth and elaborate projects within the program.

The fourth element Heydon (2013) outlines offers a significant amount of sequential and consistent time to afford "sustained opportunities to work on the project and to draw on fellow participants for support" (p. 28).

The fifth and final element creates a purpose for participants in providing "opportunities to share the work with an audience" (Heydon, 2013, p. 28). According to Heydon, by sharing with an audience beyond the program participants, a display day creates purpose for participants in working together toward accomplishing common goals relevant to the program, to themselves, and to each other. The IG arts program within this study incorporates each of the above elements. However, there is a key difference between this study and those conducted by Heydon and her colleagues: this study involves school aged children rather than pre-school aged, and healthy independent living

seniors rather than those living in a care facility. Regardless, these five elements of intergenerational programming are considered instrumental in satisfying the conditions of being meaningful, significant, safe and connection-making.

Jarrott (2007) refers to “non-familial intergenerational program[ming]” (p. 7) as needing to “attend to[...]the structure and availability of intergenerational contact” that focuses on “the quality of the contact setting” (Knox et al., 1986; Schwartz & Simmons 2001, as cited in Jarrott (2007, p. 4). Further, Jarrott (2007) states the intergenerational “contact needs to be voluntary” emphasizing “some children and seniors” may “need time to acclimate to the intergenerational setting” (p. 6). The retirees and students who participated in this IG arts program had not met prior to the program, and had no prior connection outside of the program context. The effectiveness in initially implementing this as an intergenerational program relied on the teacher to first acquaint participants within this 'non-familial' intergenerational setting, as Heydon suggests. The planned outline of the program follows Heydon's elements and provided the foundation for the program and the intergenerational learning opportunities.

In discussing the effective implementation of intergenerational programs, this research focuses on the teacher's role in particular for developing “professional knowledge” (Schön, 1983). This professional knowledge requires the teacher to be sensitive toward participants' comfort level when establishing the intergenerational interactions, as Heydon (2013) suggested. To accomplish this, I drew mainly on the literature from Jarrott (2007), Heydon (2013), Heydon and O'Neill (2014), and Brabazon and Disch (1997) for intergenerational programming, Eisner (2002) for art education, Overgaard (1994) for social practice applied to education, and Schön (1983), Munby (1989) and Lyle (2009) for reflective practice. Eisner's (2002) application to the arts and arts education and his reference to Dewey's term *flexible purposing*, was also used in this inquiry in thinking about the teacher's approach. Eisner defines “flexible purposing [as] pertain[ing] to the improvisational side of intelligence as it is employed in the arts”, as being able to “shift direction, even to redefine one's aim when better options emerge” (p. 77). Within this research, flexible purposing is applied with flexible sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction. Being flexible means “ready and able to change so as to adapt to” the unpredictable “circumstances” (English Living Oxford, 2017) within the

intergenerational interaction. A sensitivity develops an “awareness of the needs and emotions”, (Merriam Webster Dictionary.com, 2017) in support of the comfort level between the generations. Drawing from the literature, the teacher’s responses and actions are discussed through reflexive examination in the analysis and findings sections of the thesis.

Participants within intergenerational programs can also “determine programmatic outcomes” (Jarrott, 2007, p. 4) that contribute toward common goals. According to Jarrott, “programs should be able to identify one goal that both groups have in common[...]they should be united in their purpose” for example “conducting life history interviews” (p. 5–6). In the case of this IG arts program, it was the waterfront retirees who initiated the idea of working with the school children to pass on their knowledge through oral history telling of a working world 40 years ago. They also contributed photographs which provided “a catalyst[...]induc[ing conversation” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28) thereby enhancing the intergenerational learning opportunities.

Brabazon and Disch (1997) examined a variety of models for intergenerational programming, in particular an IG arts program involving dance for deaf elders and deaf children. According to Brabazon and Disch, “through dance, age receded and reappeared[...]the children and elders together shared a life-renewing and regenerating experience” (p. 122). A second intergenerational program the authors discuss focused on “Rememberers and Remembrances[...]with Intergenerational Interviewing” (p. 141) between school aged children and senior citizens as part of the students' Language Arts curriculum. The students interviewed the seniors about the changing local community throughout their lifetime, and what it used to be like around 40 years ago. Brabazon and Disch describe this program as offering “an experiential qualitative ‘feel’ for past events” resulting in “a sense of community” for the participants “and personal involvement in it” (p. 144). For this intergenerational program, the authors discuss connections made between the past, the present, and the future in a similar way to the IG arts program discussed in this thesis. The IG arts program for this inquiry focused on exploring the changing world of work on the New Westminster waterfront 40 years ago, looking at the past, present and future of the waterfront working life of the New Westminster community. This is explored through an oral history interview process and an artistic collaborative endeavour to

communicate shared knowledge, as was the program discussed by Brabazon and Disch. Sharing their personal work histories with a younger generation, according to Brabazon and Disch, gives purpose for the seniors to connect their past with the present, providing for intergenerational connections that can result in the intergenerational learning opportunities that these programs afford. The children who participated within this intergenerational arts program lived in New Westminster, and had ties to this community as part of their past, present and possible future. This opportunity enables students to learn new perspectives through the intergenerational interviews about their local community, and thus share with the retirees in a community and enhance, as Brabazon and Disch point out, a 'sense of community' between the generations. According to Heydon (2013), intergenerational programs have benefits for "both generations" in that they "create intergenerational understanding" and "provide opportunities for lifelong learning" (Brummel, 1989) through helping participants recognize their "commonalities across age and culture" (Heydon, 2013, p. 22). These connections can create a sense of community that spans the skipped generations.

### *Equal Group Status*

A key concept for thinking about intergenerational communities is the notion of equal group status. Jarrott (2007) discusses equal group status as an important ingredient for intergenerational programs to be effective. Jarrott describes this as a "condition to mean each participant has something to contribute to and something to gain from the contact setting" (p. 5). According to Heydon (2013), in drawing from Friedman (1997), intergenerational program goals rest on the premise that, by design, the skipped generations' knowledge will be of value to each other. Brabazon and Disch (1997) refer to the benefits in intergenerational programs for the connections between the skipped generations being "egalitarian" (p. 187) in the way knowledge is exchanged and community relations are built. Intergenerational "programs that promote 'reciprocity' are more acceptable to both elders and youth than those that are one-directional" (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 206). According to Jarrott (2007), effective intergenerational programs should encourage and support intergenerational interaction which affords an equal value in the two-directional exchange of knowledge inherent to the program goals based on the participants' prior experience. Rather than both generations contributing the same level or

type of knowledge, intergenerational programs should be designed with the participants' specific skills in mind as being different due to the generation gap, yet compatible as they work together toward achieving the common goals established for the program. Jarrott's application of equal group status within intergenerational programs relies on intergenerational knowledge sharing that the other generation may not have due to life experience, and yet it is of value to them. As partners in learning, the participants in the intergenerational program can offer their separate skills to each other as an exchange, each acquiring new experiences and new understandings in working toward common goals.

In following Jarrott's (2007) definition for equal group status, the development of intergenerational programs should revolve around the specific skill set of the skipped generations involved when designing the curriculum and program goals. The IG arts program for this research was developed for retired waterfront workers to share their knowledge through oral history telling with school aged children. The children in turn were given an opportunity to interview the retirees and share their artistic skills to encourage a collaborative artistic venture and exchange of knowledge. Jarrott's point with regards to equal group status is that all participants within an effective intergenerational program should be able to bring experience and knowledge, valued by the specific intergenerational community that complements the needs of the other participants in working toward the common goals of the program.

Roessing (2012) discusses equal group status in the development and implementation of middle school programs. Although not intergenerational, these programs were designed to encourage positive social integration between groups of students, with the concept of acceptance of *other*. For theory on equal group status, Roessing (2012) draws on Allport (1954) who "held that positive effects of intergroup contact occur only in situations marked by four key conditions: equal group status, common goals, intergroup cooperation" and "support of authorities" (p. 54). Roessing incorporates Allport's concept to establish positive intergroup contact into a planned program that "empower[s] students as they begin to appreciate themselves as experts" (p. xxiii) within designed activities "to create equity in a classroom community" (p. xxiii). She encourages appreciation for the different skills students bring to the classroom community for effective collaboration. Jarrott (2007)

also draws on “Allport’s (1954) contact theory” stating it “provides essential conditions to support positive intergroup contact” for “developing positive intergenerational relationships” (p. 4-6) between skipped generations within non-familial intergenerational programs.

Roessing (2012) applies a comparable interpretation of equal group status to her middle school classroom setting, as Jarrott (2007), and Heydon (2013), and Heydon and O’Neill (2014) do within the intergenerational programs they discuss. Roessing also provides a model for the teacher’s role within a program supporting equal group status.

Drawing on the literature identified above concerning equal group status, the present study expands on these ideas to consider the role of the teacher within this notion of equal group status to address a gap in the intergenerational arts literature. Further, by coupling Overgaards (1985) work on teaching as a social practice, the thread of equal group status as being a critical connecting factor between the program activities, the intergenerational interactions and the teachers’ role is examined. The aim is to explore the impact within these social practices for effective implementation of an IG arts program. Specifically, this research looks at equal group status as a key factor linking social practices and the teachers’ role in effectively implementing an IG arts program within the setting of a home-learners’ art classroom and an elementary classroom.

### *Knowledge Sharing*

Heydon and O’Neill (2014) state “there is a reciprocal relationship between interests and funds of knowledge” (p. 5) with particular connection to life experiences and the knowledge gained from them as forming interests. They designed an intergenerational arts program based on singing and art involving young children and elders focused on “communication and identity options” (p. 5). They determined that previous life experience and acquired knowledge can form the curriculum for an intergenerational program. Such programs would value knowledge gained from life experience and therefore “make learning meaningful and engaging’ (p. 5) for skipped generations. They also claim children can be more open to accepting new ways of knowing, which is a form of knowledge they

can extend to the older generation. According to Heydon and O'Neill, adults tend to feel more constrained with arts activities than children. This is discussed in the analysis and findings of the program sessions of the present study and the influence of the teachers' role within the intergenerational interaction, and through the notion of equal group status, for the intergenerational artistic learning opportunities that emerge.

Heydon and O'Neill (2014) expand on the concept of shared knowledge between skipped generations to include "aspects of who they are, who they were in the past, and who they might be in the future" (p. 26). The intergenerational interaction throughout the program sessions included 'off topic' conversations as determined from the teacher-researcher's perspective. Brabazon and Disch (1997) noted this effect where "formal interviews became dialogues which ultimately became conversations about issues and ideas which concerned both young and old" (p. 147). In drawing on Heydon and O'Neill (2014), Brabazon and Disch (1997), and Jarrott (2007) within this research, 'off-topic' conversations will be discussed as shared knowledge of a kind enabling the participants to learn about each other and further build relationships.

As a method for researching the past, according to Brabazon and Disch (1997), "asking questions of an elder" who personally experienced the events through "the interview experience can give a student access to a kind of information which is unavailable through more traditional means" (p. 144). According to Brabazon and Disch, intergenerational programs can offer younger generations personal connections to the past as experienced through another's eyes. This can develop new perspectives of lived histories and "'insight into" a particular "person's story as a microcosm of the collective story of humanity" (p. 145). Brabazon and Disch describe these life stories of the past as knowledge shared between generations through a sense of humour, reminiscence and slight nostalgia. But also, there is a sense of seriousness for the reality of life stories passed on, as a form of wisdom offered as valuable to the younger generation. Relived memories shared by the older generations in a caring manner create new meaning through the imaginations of the younger generation, rejuvenating the former generation and intriguing the latter (Brabazon & Disch, 1997; Heydon & O'Neill, 2014). In the intergenerational arts program previously mentioned involving deaf children and deaf seniors in a dance program, the elders were observed "pass[ing] on some of their learning

and wisdom to the children through their humour, ability to play, and expressiveness” Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 116). The role and impact on the seniors was also observed as “the elders nurtured and cared for the children, and at the same time regenerated themselves” (p. 116). They offer an impression of skipped generations sharing lived experience through intergenerational programming as a special type of knowledge passed on that forms a living thread between the past and the present, and with it carries the possibility for future lived experiences. Within intergenerational programs the participants each play their role toward developing an “understanding of the cycle of generations and the continuity of human experience” (p. 144).

According to Overgaard's (1985) discussion of social practices within teaching, it could be argued that the social practices within this IG arts program could provide a form of shared knowledge for learning a code of conduct within a specific intergenerational social setting. This shared knowledge consists of behavioural norms the participants engage in, which fosters the intergenerational interactions and collaborative arts activities, including those modelled by the teacher. This constitutes a social practice as Overgaard defines it. The shared knowledge is a way of learning through interacting, talking, listening, and doing. These social practices “involved[...].shared ways of behaving or acting[...].grown out of common[...].purposes[...].with] a complex array of norms” (Overgaard, 1985, p. iii). According to Walsh (2010), “the definition of talking and listening needs to include aspects such as collaborating, investigating, negotiating, enacting, connecting, [and] interacting” (p. 223). The social practices for these talking and listening practices arise from learned behaviours as a form of shared knowledge, initially modelled and established by the teacher, and further built upon by the program participants' engagement. Walsh refers to “talking and listening[...].as] essential to learning and literacy”. In this case, literacy in the form of art projects communicating knowledge and experience shared between the generations, as a “specific knowledge” communicated “through their final designed products” (Walsh, 2010, p. 211).

### *Relationship Building*

For intergenerational programming to support intergenerational learning, Heydon claims participants require a “significant length of time to establish relationships” (Friedman, 1997, p. 105, as cited in Haydon, 2013, p. 24). Without this significant length of time, Heydon (2013) claims the program is reduced to an intergenerational activity as previously outlined. Heydon (2013) states “strong prospects for learning and intergenerational interaction come from contexts that support intergenerational *programming* rather than mere intergenerational *activities*” (p. 23, original emphasis). The literature from Heydon (2013), Jarrott (2007), Brabazon and Disch (1997) claim positive intergenerational relationships emerge from within the context of intergenerational programs. They state these programs need to be designed toward intergenerational learning focused on shared knowledge and common goals. They all clearly state this requires frequent and sufficient periods of time for the participants to feel it worthy of their personal investment in building connections. Heydon (2013) claims enough time needs to be spent together collaborating toward common goals to build meaningful connections that establish relationships. Heydon also points out “more frequent interaction can lead to stronger relationships and better understanding between generations” (p. 22).

Heydon (2013) concurs with Jarrott (2007) in referring to intergenerational programs as “reduc[ing] ambiguities about[...]relationship[s]” in that they “support intergenerational solidarity” (Jarrott, 2007, p. 6). Jarrott cites examples where the benefits of fostering intergenerational solidarity are seen through school programs in which children’s school behaviour and academic performance showed improvement when engaging in intergenerational programming such as mentorships and “living historians addressing students' curriculum” (p. 9). This positive impact, Jarrott reports, would indicate that meaningful connections and positive relationship building resulted from the intergenerational solidarity that Jarrott is referring to. According to Heydon and O'Neill (2014), “children have been found to[...]develop important communication practices within intergenerational relationships” (p. 3).

While improvement of student behaviour and academic performance are not discussed in this research, the impact of intergenerational interaction is discussed in

reference to the social practices, the program goals, and their interconnectedness to the teacher's role in effectively implementing an IG arts program. A teacher's practice "is impacted by and bound together by their re-engagement in other essential discourses and practices" (Alsalm, 2014, p. 5). The teachers' role is discussed in this research in relation to the importance of the teacher recognizing the value and significance of intergenerational interactions in creating "meaning" (p. 5) throughout the program sessions for relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities.

### **1.3. Artistic Learning**

Eisner (2002) identifies the many types of learning that occur when immersed in artistic practice. He states that for the student "perception is refined, imagination stimulated, judgment fostered, and technical skills developed" while "learning to engage" (p. 14) within artistic practice. Eisner presents many lessons that are learned from an arts education, most of which reveal, he states, where our values lie in regards to the arts. He claims artistic learning develops an understanding that there are many perspectives and possibilities, with many solutions and answers to a variety of questions and problems that can emerge. Even the smallest differences can have the greatest impacts in a lesson that the arts can teach. Eisner believes through working in the arts, we learn there is no one fixed way, our minds are opened to many different ways of thinking, communicating and interpreting. In developing this understanding, we learn to manoeuvre through decisions that result in "good judgments about qualitative relationships" (Eisner, 2002, p. 70–92). We learn when to "surrender to the unanticipated possibilities of the work as it unfolds" and to "think through and within" (Eisner, 2002, p. 70–92) the medium to make images real. According to Eisner, the arts provide unique experiences through which our emotional capacities are revealed as we learn to communicate through an artistic language what we feel in response to works of art, and in creating works of art.

Eisner (2002) defines engaging and learning within an artistic practice as a form of "representation" which is "aimed at transforming the contents of consciousness within the constraints and affordances of a material" (p. 6). Eisner defines four "cognitive processes" of representation: "inscribing", "editing", "communicating" and "surprise" (p. 7). Eisner refers to inscribing as preserving the "image or idea" in a different way than

“originally experienced” (p. 6). His second cognitive process of representation emerges from within “this[...]concreteness” as “editing” (p. 6). Editing is applied when the work is re-worked to “achieve the quality, the precision, and the power” the “creator desires” (p. 6). Communication is pursued through working on the art work itself. The outcome of the art work is never truly known until it's finished, and this can constitute an element of surprise which lies in “the discovery of ends in process[...]which generates” (p. 7) this experience of surprise. This process, Eisner describes, can repeat many times before an artist learns the work is complete: “Put succinctly, surprise, a fundamental reward of all creative work” as inherent within the activity is “bestowed by the work on its maker” (p. 7). Eisner appreciates the risks and uncertainty associated with pursuing these surprise moments, as “the maker is guided” and chooses to “surrender[...] to the demands of the merging forms” (p. 7). According to Eisner, learning to take these types of risks in art requires developing flexibility in interpreting, thinking and doing while engaged in this artistic practice. Eisner draws on Dewey in defining this flexibility as *flexible purposing*. Eisner applies the term “flexible purposing [as] pertain[ing] to the improvisational side of intelligence as it is employed in the arts” (p. 77). According to Eisner, this type of intelligence develops “the ability to shift direction” as one learns “to redefine one's aim when better options emerge” (p. 77).

## **1.4. Intergenerational Artistic Learning**

Heydon and O'Neill (2014) collaborated on an intergenerational arts study focused on the artistic learning of singing and art. This afforded multiple ways for intergenerational participants to experience opportunities for “expression of creativity”, where participants’ “familiarity with art was used to support singing” (p. 7). Heydon and O'Neill claim when the curriculum emerged within the moment through the participants’ interests, intergenerational artistic learning opportunities “afforded intergenerational connections, even physically uniting people through the melding of their voices” resulting in “pleasure, creativity and communication”, which “provided meaning to people's lives and practices” (p. 26). Heydon and O'Neill draw on Eisner's (2002) term *enacted curriculum* to acknowledge the curriculum as “what actually gets “played out” in a teaching and real learning situation in real time” (p. 4). This incorporated the participants' interests into

forming an emerging curriculum as a program goal, as they interacted with each other and the situation to “make learning meaningful” (p. 5).

Heydon and O'Neill state that “communication is creative” (p. 24) affording intergenerational artistic learning opportunities within an intergenerational setting in which the curriculum evolves in “real time” (p. 4) enabling participants a variety of ways through which to communicate their interests. Heydon (2013) claims intergenerational arts programs have been shown to increase communication options (p. 4). With communication options shown to increase as a creative outlet, Heydon (2013) provides evidence for intergenerational artistic learning opportunities. According to Eisner (2002), “work in the arts[...]is a way of creating our lives by expanding our consciousness” and “shaping our dispositions” (p. 3). Eisner states we benefit through artistic engagement as a form of communication in “satisfying our quest for meaning, establishing contact with others, and sharing a culture” (p. 3). This research brings together what Eisner claims the arts can offer into the context of intergenerational arts programming and the intergenerational artistic learning opportunities that these programs afford.

## **1.5. Teaching as a Social Practice**

Another key concept in this research is the notion of social practice within an intergenerational arts program. The concept of social practice is defined in various ways by different authors; however, most understand what Giddens (1984) described as a practice (e.g., routinized behaviour involving interconnected elements of bodily and mental activities, objects/materials and shared competencies, knowledge and skills) that is shaped by power relations, structures, technologies and society, while also acting to shape aspects of these wider social systems. In this thesis, I define social practices as the children's and older adults' collective experiences that include the material and social elements of their participation in intergenerational arts activities.

By focusing on teaching as a social practice, I aim to emphasize what Overgaard (1985) describes as “a form of activity that has grown out of common needs in a community to accomplish certain purposes” and that involve “shared ways of behaving or acting” that are guided by “a complex array of norms” (p. iii). Overgaard describes social

practice as “a form of activity that has grown out of common needs in a community to accomplish certain purposes” which “involved shared ways of behaving or acting” that are guided by “a complex array of norms” (p. iii).

Overgaard (1985) defines the implementation of education as a social practice with its own culture and community norms. Overgaard looks at different perspectives on education with regard to their limitations for understanding the culture of teaching and argues that unless schools and classrooms are perceived as social practices their realities will continue to be misunderstood: “To ignore norms in the culture of teaching is to misunderstand the practice of teaching” (p. 146). The present study looks at the norms, the “shared ways of behaving or acting” (Overgaard 1985, p. iii), for the purposes of the common goals of an intergenerational arts program. Social practice is viewed in this research as the driving force for the teacher’s role and the intergenerational activities that make up the program. This analysis looks at the teacher’s role within the specific social practices of this intergenerational arts program for understanding what is required of the teacher’s role for it to be effective. Further, Overgaard (1985) points out the unspoken influence of the norms within the school and classroom environment and the authority this carries as influencing the educational culture within the classroom environment. According to Overgaard, “these norms and standards have authority” and “they are created and recreated” within the intergenerational interactions of the participants “involved in the practice” (p. 111–112).

With this focus in mind, as described by Overgaard (1985), the interactions of the participants throughout this intergenerational arts program are examined for how they create and recreate the norms and behaviours of the social practices throughout the program sessions. This research analysis reviews in detail the teacher’s perspective operating from an awareness of participating in creating and recreating the norms for the social practices alongside the program participants. These norms are discussed as directing the teacher through a continuous changing role of teacher-researcher, learning and listening as an equal participant. Specific focus is given in this research analysis, from the teacher-researcher’s perspective, to the journey of the teacher-researcher in developing awareness for the constant changes needed in the teacher’s role. These changes in the teacher’s role are recognised as an integral part of the teacher’s

engagement within the social practices of this intergenerational learning environment. The teacher's role is viewed as inseparable from the social practices for the effective implementation of the IG arts program. From the teacher-researcher's perspective, this research looks at the teacher-researcher's awareness of this interconnectedness and how the teacher's thinking, responses and actions support or inhibit the social practices that support effective implementation of the IG arts program.

Eisner (2002) looks at art education and the art teacher within the art classroom setting and also incorporates the idea of this being a social practice. He describes the influences within the cultural learning environment of art classrooms in connection with the art teacher's role. Eisner (2002) identifies four forces that effect what students learn in arts classrooms. Firstly, "there are constraints and affordances provided by the activities and the materials" (p. 71) that the teacher defines. Secondly, "prompts, cues and scaffolding that the teacher provides[...]enable the students", and in the case of intergenerational programs, the elders "to succeed" (p. 71). Thirdly, Eisner incorporates social practices, stating "there are classroom norms" as discussed by Overgaard, as "the kind of thinking and behaviour that is encouraged" (p. 71) by the teacher's responses and actions. As the fourth Eisner states, "there is an ambience we can refer to as the milieu" (p. 71) in which the teacher is a participant.

Eisner refers to the classroom as having a sense of community practice in incorporating all participants, students and teachers alike. Eisner agrees with Overgaard's perspective in looking at this community for how it "relate[s] to what students experience and learn" (p. 71). Eisner looks at these forces individually, but states, "although in any classroom all four interact" (p. 71). It is this interaction and interconnectedness in what Eisner refers to as 'forces' that is the focus of this research from the perspective of a visual arts educator in the role of art teacher implementing an IG arts program as a social practice. This research analysis draws from Eisner and Overgaard in looking at the four forces that coalesce to make up the social practices of the program sessions throughout this IG arts program to accomplish what Overgaard (1985) describes as "a form of activity that has grown out of common needs in a community to accomplish certain purposes" and that "involved shared ways of behaving or acting" guided by "a complex array of norms" (p. iii).

Finally, it is important to mention that teacher-researcher awareness is partially accomplished through collaboration with other researchers and teachers. Overgaard (1985) supports *collaborative inquiry* for teachers stating it “could result in shared insights” which “may have more potential to recast norms and behaviours” (p. 180) thus creating a better understanding for the practitioner in the practice of teaching. Overgaard's (1985) claim for understanding the norms within the social practice of teaching in order to understand the culture of teaching is considered in this research. Specifically, a key aim of this study is to examine the art teacher-researcher's role in effectively implementing an IG arts program as a social practice.

## **1.6. Visual Arts Educator-Researcher**

This inquiry is a journey immersed in *reflective practice* (Finlay, 2008, p. 1). This focus was sparked by reflecting on discussions as teacher-researcher, while looking at the role of the art teacher, and being curious about the interest of collaborating researchers on the 'off topic' intergenerational interactions. According to Heydon (2013), intergenerational interaction is a necessary component to intergenerational programming as it leads toward intergenerational relationship building and learning. It was the focus on off-topic conversations that led this research toward considering the intergenerational arts program as a social practice.

My sense is that the process of reflecting on teaching practice as a teacher-researcher mirrors that of reflecting on an artistic practice as a visual artist. This connection leads to employing a combined role of visual arts educator-researcher towards researching the teacher's role in implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. Researching teaching as a social practice through the lens of a visual arts educator-researcher leads to new perspectives. According to Eisner (2002), “what we are after in the arts is the ability to perceive things, not merely to recognise them” (p. 5). This approach allows the freedom and the space to explore and reflect on what is actually happening in teaching moments. Researching as teacher-researcher through the lens of visual artist provides an opportunity to gain new understandings toward the influences of teaching norms on teaching thinking, responses and actions.

## 1.7. Reflective Practice

Reflective practice as Finley (2008) describes is applied within this research analysis to gain a better understanding of the teacher-researchers' experiences, actions and decisions while implementing this IG arts program. The goal for this reflective practice is “to gain new understandings and so improve future practice” (Finley, 2008, p. 1) for effectively implementing intergenerational arts programs as a social practice. Finley (2008) states “reflective practice is understood as the process of learning through and from experience toward gaining new insights of self and/or practice” (Boud et al., 1985: Boyd & Fales, 1983: Mezirow, 1981, Jarvis, 1992, as cited in Finley, 2008, p. 1). According to Finley, engaging in reflective practice enables a teacher to “examin[e] assumptions of[...]practice” (p. 1) in which opportunities for previous teaching practices are open for challenge. The benefits in being open to such challenges, according to Finley, are in enhancing professional knowledge as teacher-researcher, “in being self-aware and critically evaluating” one's “own responses to practice situations” (p. 1). According to Alsalm (2014), “Wegner perceives practice as embedded in a community” (p. 5) which affords further benefits participating within a collaborative research team through the shared common goals of the research project. Through collaboration during the inquiry for this thesis, other researchers' perspectives were accessible to the teacher-researcher through shared reflections and discussions. These provided further insights into teaching practice and the teacher's role within the IG arts program.

This inquiry focuses on a teacher's awareness for teaching thinking, responses and action, in particular toward the 'off topic' conversation and toward the intergenerational interaction in general, and for the influence of the teachers' role as a participant within the social practices. Alsalm (2014) claims “‘participation’ is almost synonymous with ‘taking part’ and being a part” (Sfard, 1998, p. 6, as cited in Alsalm, 2013, p. 4) of an intergenerational learning community. This approach frames the teacher as inseparable from the social practices within the learning context. According to Alsalm (2014), “patterns-of-participation (PoP)[...]aims to understand the role of the teacher for emerging classroom practices” (p. 1). In Alsalm's PoP approach the teachers' participation “in many social practices” (p. 1) is considered as an integral component to understanding the teacher's role, in this case for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program.

Through this approach, the teacher's practice becomes intertwined within the interactions of the program participants, that is the social practices for the “shared goal[s], common engagement, and a united repertoire” (Alsalam, 2014, p. 5).

Maxine Greene (2000) argues, “to approach teaching and learning in this fashion is to be concerned with action” (p. 15-16). According to Greene, taking action requires a change in thinking, response and action. What might have previously been viewed in teaching moments as distracting, unimportant ‘off topic’ conversation, instead becomes worthy of study as significant to the learning context. Greene provides inspiration and encouragement in stating “action implies the taking of initiatives; it signifies moving into a future seen” or unseen toward “possibilities,[...]moving in quest and in pursuit” (p. 15-16) of new understandings. Similarly, Fels and Belliveau (2008) describe “the “aha!” moments... [as] “moments of recognition” that occur during or upon reflection following a performative inquiry” (p. 12). This provides a method of “inform[ing] our understanding of issues and relationships” (p. 12). Further, according to Heydon and O'Neill (2014), and Brabazon and Disch (1997), it is through relationship building that intergenerational learning opportunities emerge.

Daignault's (2005) discussions on listening states, “confidence that the listener inspires and that the listening builds up” (p. 1-2), is reciprocal, in this case within the intergenerational relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities. The teacher's role would therefore follow to model this type of participation to help build up confidence in the participants for collaboration. According to Eisner “the challenge to”, or role of “teachers is not to do nothing, but to act in ways that advance student's thinking” (Eisner, 2002, p. 46). Eisner (2002) claims, “the teacher's task is to be tuned in well enough to make the right decisions about when, how much and how” (p. 73) to contribute. The teacher's role for being 'tuned in' requires attentiveness gained through 'flexible purposing' as defined by Eisner, in drawing from Dewey. 'Flexible purposing' drives how a teacher thinks, responds, and acts with purpose for the needs of the teaching situation; determining how a teacher teaches. Overgaard (1985) claims teaching to be a 'purposive activity', with “reasons for action” (p. 16) as the rationale behind them.

In reference to art education, Fleming states, “it is *how* the subject is taught as much as *what* is taught that is important” (2012, p. 99). Reflective practice during this inquiry was used to examine *how* the teacher teaches within particular social practices, as well as how the teacher was ‘in tune’, and interacted with the participants in a way that encouraged intergenerational interaction, intergenerational relationship building and engagement in intergenerational learning opportunities.

## 1.8. Reflection In and On Action

According to Munby (2012), Schön's (1983) work on *reflection in and on action* refers to reflective practice geared toward further development professional knowledge. When applied to teaching, as discussed by Munby (2012), reflection in and on action enables the practitioner to think within the teaching moments and afterwards. According to Munby (2012) “Schön proposes[...]how to think about professional practice and the relationship of theory to practice” (p. 31-32). According to Finley (2008), in reference to Schön, “professionals[...]draw on both practical experience and theory as they think on their feet and improvise” (p. 3-4). This reflective teaching practice enables the teacher-researcher to value what emerges within the learning environment within 'real time' (Heydon & O'Neill, 2014), incorporating teaching experience with the application of theoretical understanding toward the teaching moments to “inform” immediate “praxis” (Lyle, 2009, p. 294). According to Munby (2012), Schön (1983) defines these moments of 'reflection in action', as “the process by which new knowing-in-action is developed” (p. 31-32). Finley (2008) argues that Schön's (1983) 'reflection-in-action' requires thoughtful and intuitive application of experience and theory to the momentary teaching action. “For Schön, professional knowledge is developed within action” (Munby, 2012, p. 31-32).

According to Finley (2008), Schön (1983) “identif[ies] two types of reflection” firstly as previously stated, “reflection-in-action (thinking while doing)”, followed by a second connected reflective practice that of “reflection-on-action” (after the event thinking)” (p. 3). 'Reflecting on action' affords the luxury of time for thoughtful reflective practice, beyond the pace of the moment to further clarify understandings and inform 'future praxis'. Drawing from Munby (2012) and Finley (2008) in connecting Schön's (1983) 'reflection in and on action' theory to teaching practice, this method of reflective practice enables the

teacher-researcher to observe the moment in which the intergenerational interaction occurs in relation to the teachers' role.

In applying Munby's (2012) and Finley's (2008) perspective on Schön's (1983) theory, both 'reflection in and on action' provide opportunities for examining the influences on the teachers' role to the social practices, and vice-versa, for effective implementation of this intergenerational arts program. Finley (2008) in reference to Schön (1983) describes this type of reflection as "both intuitiv[e] and creativ[e]. Both reflection in and on action allows" the teacher-researcher to "revise, modify and refine[...]expertise" (p. 3-4).

According to Finley (2008), "the practitioner allows" the "experience" of "surprise, puzzlement, or confusion in a situation which" maybe "uncertain or unique" (Schön, 1983, p. 68, as in Finley, 2008, p. 1) to lead. This connects to the perspectives of Lyle (2009) for reflective narrative, and Eisner's (2002) for art education, and parallels the artistic practice previously discussed. The reflective practice as teacher-researcher that Schön outlines enables reflection in the moment for an appropriate response, and reflection afterwards to appreciate what has happened. "Reflect[ing] on the phenomenon" and also "on the prior understandings" gained from continuous 'reflection in and on action', compounds "to generate" further "understanding of the phenomenon", allowing for a more informed recognition of the fluctuating "change" (Schön, 1983, p. 68, as cited in Finlay, 2008, p. 1). In this study, this reflexive examination is approached from the perspective of a teacher-researcher, applying Schön's 'reflection in and on action' practice to teacher thinking, responses and actions, which are identified by the teacher-researcher as supporting or hindering the intergenerational interaction toward intergenerational learning in implementing an IG arts program.

## **1.9. Reflective Narrative**

Reflective narrative is applied within this research analysis as a method for 'reflection-on-action'. According to Lyle (2009), "reflective narrative is an approach which creates space" (p. 294) for a teacher to think through, and look back at what has happened at a distance from the teaching moment. For the teacher as researcher "to engage in critical thought" on events that "may result in wakefulness to alternative approaches" (p.

294). This reflective practice can result in new ways of seeing the role of teaching, including “knowing ourselves” better “as practitioners” (p. 294).

After each project session, I wrote narrative reflections as part of the reflective practice as teacher-researcher 'reflecting on action' as outlined by Schön. Access to this distant perspective enables “experiences as practitioner [to] inform praxis” (Lyle, 2009, p. 294), in this case toward a better understanding of the art teachers' role within the social practices for effective implementation of an IG arts program. Other research collaborators also wrote their narrative reflections of each program session. Reading the perspectives of collaborating researchers enabled me to reach understandings I would not have otherwise seen. “Writing is[...]a method of discovery and analysis[...]viewed through this lens, is more than a tool to collect or disseminate information” (Lyle, 2009, p. 295). In accordance with Lyle, narrative reflections help to interpret events, gather data, and illuminate the changes in a teachers' personal view of their teaching. Reflective narrative writing becomes the “methodology” that the teacher-“researcher”, working “through” the specific “narrative, uncovers the data” (p. 295). The time for thoughtful reflection that Lyle suggests exists within reflective narrative, provides a way to review at a distance both while writing, and afterwards while reading. Drawing from Lyle, this thinking time is applied toward developing an understanding of the impact of teaching norms on the actual practice of teaching, for teaching action as well as teaching thinking. Through this approach, for this research analysis, teaching thinking, responses and actions are examined by the practitioner for direction on teacher participation within the social practices. Bloom (1998) “refers to the reflexive component of this interpretive approach as emphasizing ‘an individual’s experiences as a journey of becoming” (p. 65, as cited in Lyle, 2009, p. 294).

In the case of this inquiry, a journey developing professional knowledge is explored through reflective narrative writing as a visual art educator-researcher and includes the reflective narrative writings of collaborating researchers. This reflective narrative data is used to examine the interconnectedness and influences of the social practices to the teacher's role while implementing an IG arts program.

## **1.10. Research Purpose and Questions**

From the perspective of visual art educator-researcher through reflexive analysis, this inquiry aims to examine what makes the teacher's role effective in implementing an IG arts program as a social practice. The social practices are comprised of the intergenerational interactions, which includes 'off topic' conversations and artistic collaborations aimed toward intergenerational relationship building and intergenerational learning. Questions raised within this reflexive analysis, as teacher-researcher engaged in reflective practice, relate to the interconnectedness between the intergenerational interaction and the art teacher's role for intergenerational learning.

The review of the literature, combined with my own research interests has led me to the following research questions:

1) What is the role of the visual arts educator-researcher within the concept of teaching as a social practice in an intergenerational arts program?

2) How do intergenerational interactions within an intergenerational arts program contribute to intergenerational learning and artistic learning?

Two versions of an IG arts program in New Westminster are examined, firstly the homelearners program, located in the art room at the Homelearners Centre, and secondly the elementary program located in an elementary school. Both programs are examined for the significance of the intergenerational interactions for generating intergenerational learning opportunities, and the role of art teacher. Through reflexive analysis, this study also looks at how the two different settings influence the intergenerational interactions and the art teacher's role.

## Chapter 2. Study and Program

### *Study*

As mentioned in the introduction, the IG arts program in this study was part of a larger partnership development project titled, *(Re)Claiming the New Westminster Waterfront*, funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Directed by the Principal Investigator, Dr. Peter Hall from SFU's Urban Studies Department. Dr. Susan O'Neill was the Co-investigator, Director of the intergenerational research study and my supervisor. The community partners for this project were the New Westminster Longshoremens' Union (International Longshore and Warehouse Union, Local 502), the New Westminster School District, and the New Westminster Museum and Archives. The partnership's focus was on the changing world of work on the New Westminster Waterfront over the past 50 years. My role in this larger partnership was as a member of the Steering Committee, representing the New Westminster School District and as a research assistant working with Dr. O'Neill on developing and teaching the IG arts program as part of the research project.

The origins behind the larger research project that this IG arts program is connected to played a significant part in generating interest among the retirees' in participating in the IG arts program. One of the retired waterfront workers, Ken Bauder, who attended both display days for the two programs in this study, initiated early on in the project the idea of passing on the retiree's knowledge through oral history telling of the past working waterfront. His goal was to preserve and pass on the oral histories of work on the New Westminster waterfront to the next generation. Dr. Hall, as coordinator of the larger research project supported this idea and invited Dr. O'Neill to join the project and provide her expertise in intergenerational arts education and lead the development and implementation of an IG arts program that would provide an opportunity for the retirees to share their oral histories with young people in New Westminster.

I was invited to assist in the development of the IG arts program and to be the art teacher for the program at three sites in New Westminster. My subsequent interest in the intergenerational interactions that took place during the IG arts program became a key

focus of my inquiry, which was initiated by a curiosity expressed by collaborating researchers in the 'off topic' intergenerational conversations. This interest in intergenerational interactions led to my examining the IG arts program as a social practice and exploring the teachers' role in relation to the implementation of the IG arts program.

### *Program*

The program sessions incorporated Heydon's (2013) five elements for intergenerational arts programming as outlined in the previous chapter. These elements provided a basic outline for the program and each session.

This thesis focuses on two versions of the IG arts program: the homelearners program and the elementary school program. The first program consisted of eight sessions including a display day, each lasting one hour and fifteen minutes. This first program was conducted in the art room of the Homelearners Centre, with the exception of the waterfront visit, and the student exit interviews in the library. The following briefly outlines each session's activities for the homelearners program. Session one was the introductions and the students interviewing the retirees. For session two, the students continued interviewing the retirees. Session three was the waterfront visit, and session four was the review of the waterfront visit. Sessions five and six were working on the art projects. Session seven continued as working on the art projects and included drawing imagining the future waterfront. Session eight was the final session with finishing off the art projects and the display day celebration, including the student exit interviews. The retirees were interviewed a few days after the display day.

The second program consisted of ten sessions including a display day, each lasting one hour and 45 minutes, at an elementary school in New Westminster. This elementary program was conducted in Mathew Sol's (Mr. Sol) classroom and the school computer room, with the exception of the waterfront visit, the exit interviews and the display celebration day in the school library. The following briefly outlines each session's activities for the elementary program. Sessions one and two were both established as orientations prior to meeting the retirees. Session three included the introductions and the students interviewing the retirees. Session four was the waterfront visit, and session five

was the review of the waterfront visit. Sessions six, seven, and eight were working on the art projects. Session nine continued as working on the art projects and included drawings imagining the future waterfront. Session ten as the final session was the display celebration day, the students' and the retirees' exit interviews.

### *Participants*

For the homelearners program, the 20 students who participated were in Grades five and six. These students regularly attended classes on a voluntary basis at the Homelearners Centre two days per week. These students had attended art classes with me prior to the start of this program in the art room at the Homelearners Centre.

For the elementary program, the 24 students who participated were in Grades three and four. These students regularly attended this elementary school. Their regular teacher was Mr. Sol. These students had not met me prior to this program.

The older adults who participated in the IG arts program were retired Longshoremen who had worked together on the New Westminster waterfront for forty years. The two main retirees who participated in the first intergenerational arts program at the Homelearners Centre were Joe and Gerry, with the exception of missing one session each; Gerry missed the waterfront session, and Joe missed the review of the waterfront session. Two other retirees each separately attended one session only. Three retirees participated in the second program at the elementary school, Joe, Gerry and Brian. All three retirees attended all eight planned intergenerational sessions, with the exception of Brian who missed the sixth session only. This was the first program Brian participated in.

The students' and the retirees' participation in the IG arts program research study was voluntary. The students knew each other in both programs, but the students had not met the retirees prior to the program, and had no contact with them outside of the context of this program setting.

Prior to giving informed consent for their participation, the study received ethics approval from Simon Fraser University's Office of Research Ethics. Parents were asked

to complete consent forms to enable their child to participate in the art classes (see Appendix A). The retirees also gave informed consent (see Appendix B).

### *Procedure*

The procedure for the IG arts program was designed in collaboration with Dr. O'Neill as project supervisor. The sessions for the homelearners program were implemented in collaboration with Dr. O'Neill, and filmed by research assistant Claire Carolan. The sessions for the elementary program were implemented in collaboration with elementary teacher Matthew Sol (Mr. Sol). Dr. O'Neill attended sessions for both programs, the waterfront visits and she conducted the student exit interviews. The youth researcher, Rose Dyer filmed the elementary program sessions, including the student and retirees exit interviews.

The procedure for my role as art teacher in implementing the IG arts program involved preparing the activities and setting up for each session. I ran each session as the art teacher, and provided all the participants with their art materials and information other than the photographs brought by the retirees and Dr. O'Neill. For the homelearners program, I organised the waterfront visit field trip. For the students in the elementary program, this required considerably more planning and was done in collaboration with their teacher Mr. Sol. As a procedure, and part of my reflective practice, my discussions with Matthew Sol before and after the elementary sessions involved preparations and planning for the following sessions.

### *Data Collection*

Included as data in this inquiry were discussions with research collaborators Dr. O'Neill, Claire Carolan, Rose Dyer and collaborating teacher Matthew Sol. After each program session, I had a brief discussion with Claire and Rose as part of my reflective practice and to gather information about the sessions' events from their perspectives. I also incorporated discussions with Dr. O'Neill and Mr. Sol after some of the program

sessions as part of my reflective practice and for preparations for the following sessions. Also included were my reflections on my interactions with the retirees and the students and my role as the art teacher-researcher. Each program session was filmed, and also included photographs taken of the sessions' events by Dr. O'Neill, Claire Carolan, and I. In addition, the data included the students' and retirees' exit interviews, student questionnaire comments from the elementary program, and the art work that was produced. The descriptions, analysis and findings taken from this reflective practice are conveyed for each program session chronologically.

Dr. O'Neill conducted exit interviews after each of the two programs with the students for their perspectives (see Appendix C for the interview protocol). Claire Carolan conducted the retirees' exit interviews for the homelearners program (see Appendix D for the interview protocol). I conducted the retirees' exit interviews for the elementary program. The documentation from these interviews is incorporated into the analysis and findings within this research. I also gathered information on the students' perspectives from a questionnaire in the elementary program and incorporated this data into the analysis and findings for this research (see Appendix E, F, G). A detailed description of each program is provided below.

## **2.1. Program Description: Homelearners**

The homelearners program consisted of eight sessions, each lasting one hour and fifteen minutes, incorporating 20 students with two retirees, Joe and Gerry, attending most of the sessions. One retiree attended the first session only, and another retiree Dave attended the fourth session only. The collaborating researchers were Dr. O'Neill as project supervisor and Claire Carolan as research assistant filming the sessions. Dr. O'Neill provided on-going discussions, supervised and helped implement the programs' sessions. The table below outlines the activities for each session in chronological order.

**Table 2.1 Program Overview: Homelearners**

Session 1	<b>Introduction and interviews:</b> Location: art room. Students were introduced to the project by Dr. O'Neill and I. Dr. O'Neill spoke separately with the retirees while I spoke further with the students about their possible questions. The retirees were introduced to the students. The retirees brought two large framed photos of the past waterfront scenes showing ships they had worked on. The students asked questions based on the large photographs. The students interviewed the retirees as a class about their past work on the waterfront for the rest of the session. Three retirees attended: Joe, Gerry and other.	Past
Session 2	<b>Interviewing retirees:</b> Location: art room. Interviews continued from session 1. Laminated photographs of the past waterfront brought by Dr. O'Neill were looked at and discussed in small groups with Dr. O'Neill and I, in preparation for using these for the waterfront visit. The retirees arrived ten minutes after the session started. The interviewing continued with the same small groups with the retirees visiting each group. Two retirees attended: Joe and Gerry.	Past
Session 3	<b>Waterfront visit:</b> Location: New Westminster waterfront. Each student had a camera. The laminated photos from session 2 were held up against the present landscape for comparison. Joe led the interaction and oral history telling throughout the waterfront walk. Dr. O'Neill and I participated in the waterfront walk with the students and Joe. Dr. Peter Hall attended also, and parents. One retiree attended: Joe.	Part & present
Session 4	<b>Review Day:</b> Location: art room. Reviewed the waterfront visit and shared the photographs taken by the students brought by Dr. O'Neill. The retirees at this session had not attended the waterfront visit. The discussions were mostly between the students and me as teacher. The retirees left early. The students started plans for the art projects set up by me. Two retirees attended: Gerry and Dave	Part & present
Session 5	<b>Working on Art Projects:</b> Location: art room. Dr. O'Neill invited the retirees to sit with the students and to ask about the art projects the students had started building with clay. I provided the students with their art materials for each group. The students offered clay to the retirees to build an item for the art project. Joe began collaborating on the art project with this same group of students. Gerry provided information about the past waterfront and continued discussions with the students, mostly with one particular group. Two retirees attended: Joe and Gerry	Part & present

Session 6	<b>Working on Art Projects:</b> Location: art room. Joe worked with a different student group on clay building. One student from the previous group visited Joe with this new group asking what he was working on. Gerry shared information and instruction around the room with the student groups. He still focused on one particular group, and joined in with the clay building with this one group. I continued to help with art supplies and support when asked. Two retirees attended: Joe and Gerry	Past & present
Session 7	<b>Working on Art Projects /Imagining the Future:</b> Location: art room. Students and retirees collaborated together on the art projects. I led a drawing activity with the students and invited the retirees to join in for ideas of a future waterfront. The students and Joe created individual drawings of a possible future waterfront. Gerry continued clay building and discussions with a couple of students. Gerry and these students did not participate on the drawing activity. Two retirees attended: Joe and Gerry	Past, present & future
Session 8	<b>Display Celebration Day/ Interviewed students:</b> Location: art room & interview room. The students and retirees together finished the last details on the art projects in the art room. I set up the display of all the art projects and project information in the art room. Dr. O'Neill interviewed the students in groups in the interview room. The displays were complete and the interviews finished. The students sat at the tables with the projects answering the visitors' questions. The retirees and I moved around the room also answering the visitors' questions. This display celebration was attended by other Longshoreman retirees, SFU researchers, other students, parents, teachers and the principal.	Past, present & future

## 2.2. Program Description: Elementary

This Elementary intergenerational arts program consisted of ten sessions, each lasting one hour and 45 minutes, with 24 students in grades three and four and three retirees attending, Joe, Gerry and Brian. The collaborating researchers were Dr. O'Neill as project supervisor and Rose Dyer as youth researcher filming the sessions, and also provided written narrative reflections for each session. Dr. O'Neill participated in some of the sessions, the waterfront visit, the display/celebration day and she conducted the student interviews. Dr. O'Neill provided on-going discussions and supervised the programs' sessions. Mr. Sol collaborated as teacher. The table below outlines the activities for each session in chronological order.

**Table 2.2 Program Overview: Elementary**

Session 1	<b>Introduced Project/ Art activity:</b> Introduced students to the program. Showed art work from homelearners program, and included an art activity	Past
Session 2	<b>Preparations for Interviewing Retirees:</b> Reviewed students' ideas of work on the waterfront, prepared questions for interviewing retirees.	Past
Session 3	<b>Interviewed Retirees:</b> Students and retirees were introduced to each other. Students interviewed the retirees as a class. Retirees brought their very large framed photos of the past waterfront. Retirees answered the students' questions, shared information and stories about work on the past waterfront. Three retirees attended: Joe, Gerry and Brian.	Past
Session 4	<b>Waterfront Visit:</b> Location at the waterfront. Each student group shared a camera. The laminated photos from session 2 were held up against the present landscape for comparison. Joe led most of the interaction and oral history telling throughout the waterfront walk. Three retirees attended: Joe, Gerry and Brian.	Past & present
Session 5	<b>Review Day:</b> Reviewed the waterfront visit and shared the photographs taken by the students, and a few photos taken by the retirees. The retirees at this session had attended the waterfront visit. The students and retirees started plans together for the art projects. Three retirees attended: Gerry, Joe and Brian	Past & present
Session 6	<b>Working on Art Projects:</b> Students and retirees collaborated on the art projects about the past work on the waterfront, based on the oral histories shared by the retirees, and the information gathered from the waterfront visit. Two retirees attended: Joe, Gerry.	Past & present
Session 7	<b>Working on Art Projects:</b> Students and retirees collaborated on the art projects about the past work on the waterfront, based on the oral histories shared by the retirees, and the waterfront visit. Three retirees attended: Joe, Gerry and Brian.	Past & present
Session 8	<b>Working on Art Projects:</b> Students and retirees collaborated on the art projects about the past work on the waterfront, based on the oral histories shared by the retirees, and the waterfront visit. Three retirees attended: Joe, Gerry and Brian	Past & present
Session 9	<b>Finishing Art Projects/Imagining the Future/Students Interviews/Student Questionnaires:</b> Students and retirees collaborated to finish art projects, and drew pictures of an imagined future waterfront. Dr. O'Neill interviewed the students. Students filled out questionnaire on the project. Three retirees attended Joe, Gerry and Brian.	Past, present & future

Session 10	<b>Display Celebration Day/ Retirees &amp; Teacher Interviews:</b> The display was set up by the teacher and the students. The display event in the morning was for other students and teachers in the school. Retirees were interviewed by Sue Dyer. The display event in the afternoon was attended by visiting retirees and SFU researchers.	Past, present & future
------------	---	------------------------

## **Chapter 3. Reflexive Analysis**

### **3.1. Session One Homelearners: Introduction and Interviews**

The analysis for this first session aims to show the significance of the intergenerational interaction for the intergenerational learning that took place, and the role of the art teacher implementing the IG arts program as a social practice. This analysis explores the notion of social practice defined as the children's and older adults' collective experiences that include the material and social elements of their participation in the intergenerational arts activities. By focusing on teaching as a social practice, I aim to emphasize what Overgaard (1985) describes as "a form of activity that has grown out of common needs in a community to accomplish certain purposes" and that "involved shared ways of behaving or acting" that are guided by "a complex array of norms" (p. iii). Social practices were first established that supported the intergenerational interaction, then new ones emerged in support of intergenerational learning, which guided my learning of my teaching role.

This first session established the framework for the social practices through the interaction, and provided context and purpose through which Overgaard states the social practices can only be understood (Overgaard, 1985, p. iii). The purpose in the IG arts program was to encourage intergenerational interaction toward intergenerational learning and artistic learning opportunities. The context or the program goals were to learn about the changing world of work on the New Westminster waterfront over the last 50 years through oral history telling and artistic collaborations. The program goals and purpose provided rationale for the social practices. Overgaard (1985) states within the social practices the "norms[...]are created and recreated in the interactions of those involved in the practice" (p. 111, 112).

Dr. O'Neill and I gave a brief outline of the program to the students before meeting the retirees. Together we explained they were researchers interviewing the retirees about working life on the waterfront forty years ago. I informed the students that the retirees "will wait for your questions." I explained that the retirees were interested in what they wanted

to know about past work on the waterfront. The rationale was to establish this activity as interactive between the skipped generations with the students interviewing the retirees for their research. Brabazon and Disch (1997) claim youth interviewing elders about past life experience connects them to their community and provides a sense of continuity. These authors also show that these interviews offer the elderly an opportunity for “life review”, and a chance to pass on their knowledge which was the purpose in this program for these retirees. Dr. O'Neill and I explained to the students once they had gathered their research they would then collaborate on art projects with the retirees about what they had learned, with a display day at the end. This program outline gave purpose to all the following sessions. It gave relevance to this particular session as one of many opportunities for the intergenerational interaction to provide a “significant length of time to establish relationships” (Friedman, 1997, p.105, as cited in Heydon, 2013, p. 24).

Dr. O'Neill brought the retirees into the room, and invited them to sit down, then introduced the retirees by their first names to the students. This set-up the norm for the students and the retirees for how to address each other, establishing the two generations as socially equal, and as a “strateg[y] to[...]acquaint participants with each other and foster community” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28). When speaking to the retirees, Dr. O'Neill modelled this social norm by always addressing them directly by their first names.

The retirees were offered chairs beside the students' tables, physically situating them as equal members of the art class. The retirees were visually accessible to all students, and the setting was not too formal. According to Heydon (2013), “physical proximity play[s] a role in helping participants become acquainted” (p. 45). These norms were designed to establish the students and retirees as socially equal participants within this intergenerational community. It was important for me as the teacher to understand the need in establishing and modelling norms that created a comfort level and equality between the participants. As Heydon claims, participants comfort level is important in establishing intergenerational connections and a sense of equality between the participants as working together. This creates a sense of equal group status (Jarrott, 2007) to which Heydon (2013) states “can, at least in part, be accomplished through programs that help participants to cooperate and work towards “common goals” (p. 23). Jarrott (2007) found that a particular notion of “equal group status” should be sought in programs

where “each participant has something to gain from the contact setting” (p. 5). One of the retirees did comment to me in a later session that he had felt intimidated at first coming into a classroom setting, but had overcome this feeling during this session once everyone had started talking. This pointed out the need for the teacher’s role to ensure not only the students feel comfortable, but also the older generation. According to Heydon (2013), introductions are important for providing not only “strategies to[...]acquaint participants with each other and foster community” but also to provide “a sense of safety” (p. 28). This “orientation time” provides an “intergenerational arts class” with its necessary components such as “the use of physical proximity, teachers’ modelling of comfort with elders, support for children to know how to communicate with elders, and elective participation” (p. 41-42). Heydon states these components “all coalesce[...]to provide participants with learning and relationship-building” (2013, p. 41-2) opportunities.

Immediately after the introductions, two very large framed photographs were presented to the students by Joe and Gerry providing an instant catalyst for communication to begin. As a necessary component for intergenerational programming according to Heydon (2013) “a catalyst[...]could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter” ( p. 28). The following are examples of the dialogue that took place:

Student: “How long did you work on the waterfront?” Joe and Gerry: “47 years”. Student: “Do you remember the name of the ships you worked on?” Gerry: “No I worked on so many”. Student: “How much were you paid when you started working there?” Joe: “\$2.78 per hour”.

The following was described by research assistant Claire Carolan in her written reflections for this session. These reflective narrative writings are applied as data for my research analysis as teacher-researcher incorporating the perspectives of collaborating researchers into my reflective practice. These writings enabled me to see perspectives I might not have otherwise, and also confirmed my observations.

A fantastic dialogue occurred between the children and the gentlemen from the longshoreman’s union[...].The gentlemen brought two large framed photos with them of scenes from the New Westminster waterfront, one from 1958 and one from 1961. The photos were of ships that the men had worked on and unloaded. They showed the size of the ships, cranes used to load cargo and the train tracks leading up to the side of the docks for

rail-cars to be loaded and unloaded. They were excellent conversation starters as they provided a catalyst for the questions that the children could ask (Claire Carolan's, Written Reflections, Session One).

Evidence for intergenerational learning in this session emerged through the interaction between the students and the retirees as information was shared in connection to the photographs. Through the intergenerational interaction, the students' focus moved from responding to the images in the photographs of the men working on the ships, to an interest in the retirees themselves. The students demonstrated empathy toward Joe and Gerry in concern for their past welfare while at work. The students listened to their personal experiences of what life was like for them working on the waterfront all those years ago. The students' questions and the retirees' responses revealed the intergenerational relationship building and the opportunities that emerged for learning how dangerous the waterfront work was.

Student: "Did you ever get hurt?" Gerry: "Yes, I fell 20 feet. I had to jump off one of the crates or get crushed by a ship." Student: "How seriously were you hurt? Did you miss work?" Gerry: "I'm still alive, my legs went numb and I missed one week of work." Student: "Were you paid during this week?" Gerry: "No, there was not much compensation back then, you had to miss a week, and then wait about a month before you could get any money. Most couldn't wait that long, so guys would show up for work in casts."

Many stories were shared and humorous connections made as the retirees laughed over the memories they were sharing with the students and each other. Joe and Gerry had worked together for 47 years, and clearly had a strong connection with each other. Their comfort level with each other transferred through their interactions to the students as they laughed together over their shared memories. The students laughed with them. Further connections emerged between the two generations through the intergenerational dialogue. The dialogue began to shift from an exchange of factual information about the work experiences to sharing stories aside from the work, such as seeing a cat dive down one of the ship's chimneys never to be seen again. The students were intrigued as Joe and Gerry

talked about the animals that travelled on-board the ships with the sailors. Cats [were] to keep the rats and other vermin in check on the ships, [there were] monkeys from exotic places the ships went to and some dogs. The

children were curious if the animals were working animals, but the men told them that only the cats were there for a reason other than companionship (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, Session One).

Sharing their personal work histories with a younger generation gave a purpose for the retirees to connect their past with the present, providing for intergenerational learning opportunities. As Heydon (2013) explains, the benefits “for both generations” is that such “programs can create intergenerational understanding, provide opportunities for lifelong learning (Brummel 1989)”, and also “help generations locate commonalities across age and culture” (p. 22). This opportunity enabled students to learn new perspectives, which Heydon (2013) claims intergenerational programs can offer between the generations. At the beginning of this session, one student was overheard by Claire Carolan saying “longshoremen are red-necks”. By the end of this session we had all learned through the intergenerational interaction a significant amount about life as a longshoreman 50 years ago, and appreciated with a new-found respect what this entailed. What the students chose to write down from their conversations with Joe and Gerry was evidence of a developing awareness to perceive through a new lens, to learn “what are other ways of seeing” (Haydon, 2013, p.26). The following was taken from students’ notes and revealed evidence for what had been shared from the students’ perspective as meaningful enough to write down.

Pictures from 1950’s, maybe even 40’s[...]up to 15 ships a day[...]ships from England and Japan - the train came in all the time, everyday most people walked to work it was sometimes hard to get work. The youngest people were about 16. “I was paid 2.78 an hour, which was a lot 8:00 am to 5 pm with one hour for lunch. We loaded lumber, lead, zinc, [and] fertilizer was 112 kilos”. Many people were hurt or even killed (Student written notes, Session one, homelearners project).

Question: What was the best part of working there? Answer: “The freedom, because you could work when you wanted.” Question: Was it hard work? Answer: “Very!” Question: Was it dangerous? Answer: “Yes”. Question: Were you ever hurt? Answer: “No, I was very fortunate” (Student written work when interviewing the retirees, and documenting Joe’s answers, Session One, homelearners program).

This session’s dialogue between the students and the retirees began the intergenerational relationship building and the intergenerational learning opportunities. The intergenerational learning opportunities relied on the participants’ interest in sharing

common goals, which developed into an interest in one another during this session. The intergenerational interaction formed the basis of the social practices for this session, and this intergenerational arts program. It was through the intergenerational interaction that the norms, the purpose, and the rationale for the social practices were continued for the program, after being established by the teacher.

The intergenerational interaction as the focus of the social practices for this first of eight sessions was revealed to be significant to the intergenerational learning. This first session established the agenda for the next seven sessions, and showed how effective the intergenerational interaction was for the intergenerational learning within the IG arts program. According to Heydon (2013), “strong prospects for learning and intergenerational interaction come from contexts that support intergenerational programming rather than mere intergenerational activities” (Heydon, 2013, p. 23). This session was established as the first of an on-going program with opportunities for continued collaboration focused on in-depth content. This session was not perceived by the participants as a one-time intergenerational activity, but was connected to the seven sessions that followed.

The majority of the intergenerational interaction was between Joe, Gerry and the students. Interaction with the third retiree, who had planned to attend only this first session, is not mentioned in Claire Carolan’s written reflections or mine, and his name is not recorded. The extent of participation for this particular retiree was as an intergenerational one time activity, rather than the commitment to a program. This investment level may have been reflected in the amount of interaction as the evidence may seem to suggest. This also concurs with Heydon’s (2013) findings for intergenerational programming verses one-time events or activities as being less meaning full for participants, who may be less invested as a result.

The outline explained at the beginning of this session gave context for meaningful interaction and future learning opportunities for the participants. Heydon (2013) outlines five specific elements needed for effective intergenerational programming that were introduced and established in this first session. The outline for this intergenerational arts program incorporated these five elements. This session was originally planned for further discussion about the program with the retirees and the students together, but the

intergenerational interaction took on a life of its own, which was the intention of the program goals and a welcomed surprise to the researchers. Following Heydon's (2013) five elements, this program planning consisted of firstly, the introductions provided as "(1) strategies to[...]acquaint participants with each other and foster community and a sense of safety" (p.28). The photographs brought by the retirees provided "(2) a catalyst for that day's project that could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter" (p.28). Establishing the outline for the program, and the introductions provided "(3) explicit instructions, [and] modelling" (p.28) for the social practices. Dr. O'Neill and I explaining this as the first of eight sessions provided potential for "(4) sustained opportunities to work on the project and to draw on fellow participants for support" (p.28). Informing the participants of a celebration display day for the last session, including the potential for further public display, provided for future potential "(5) opportunities to share the work with an audience" (p. 28). These five elements that Heydon (2013) states are needed for successful intergenerational programming established the purpose in the social practices which includes the activities, and the rationale for the norms for this intergenerational arts program. Overgaard (1985) states "the definition of teaching presupposes a rational relationship between purpose and activity" (p. 16).

These five elements, as Heydon (2013) defines, also provided a basic outline for the program and each session. Elements (1) and (3) as the orientation and interviewing, (2) the waterfront visit and photographs as catalyst, (4) session five, six and seven provided continued time to work on the art projects together, and (5) ending with a display day for the eighth session. The program outline met as Heydon (2013) argues in drawing from Friedman (1997), "some 'essential criteria' for intergenerational programming" as "programs should be beneficial to all" participants, and "should be on going, lasting for a significant length of time to establish relationships" (p. 24). Intergenerational programs also "should serve the community" in some way that participants can connect with, which would also incorporate a "curricular component (p.105)" (Heydon, 2013, p. 24).

The success of the intergenerational interaction within this first session was a welcomed surprise to Dr. O'Neill, Claire Carolan and I. We did not know beforehand that the retirees would bring these wonderful photographs that inspired such rich intergenerational interaction. I was at first surprised to see my role, or teaching purpose,

as focused on the social interaction. I was surprised by the extent to which I needed to respond as teacher with flexibility in my thinking toward this social dynamic as it unfolded in real time (Heydon & O'Neill, 2014). "It is from surprise that we are most likely to learn something" (Eisner 2002, p. 8). This first session revealed to me how significant the intergenerational interaction was to my role as the teacher.

I wrote narrative reflections documenting my perception of each session's events. The process of writing and re-reading these reflections enabled "my experiences as practitioner [to] inform praxis" (Lyle, 2009, p. 294). These narrative reflections helped me to interpret events, gather data, and illuminate the changes in my view of teaching as my research analysis progressed. "Bloom refers to the reflexive component of this interpretive approach as emphasizing "an individual's experiences as a journey of becoming" (p. 65, as cited in Lyle, 2009, p. 294). Other research collaborators also wrote their narrative reflections, which enabled me to reach new understandings. According to Lyle (2009) "writing is[...]a method of discovery and analysis" (p. 295) for the teacher-researcher to use. When "viewed through this lens" Lyle explains "is more than a tool to collect or disseminate information; it is the methodology as the researcher", whom "through narrative, uncovers the data" (p. 295). Reflecting in and on action which Schön (1983) defines as a method through which practitioners develop professional knowledge, enabled me to better understand what was needed from my role as art teacher implementing this intergenerational arts program.

As previously stated during the orientation, I told the students the retirees would "wait for your interview questions." At the time my teaching thinking and actions were focused on prompting the students to initiate dialogue through their questions. On reflection, I had established a norm for the participants learning through the intergenerational interaction. I stated the retirees would *wait* for their questions, and in doing so established a norm in the retirees listening to the students questions and the students listening to the retirees answers. According to Walsh (2010), "the definition of talking and listening" is a form of "collaborating" and "interacting" (p. 223). The social practices in these talking and listening practices arose from learned behaviours toward a form of shared knowledge. This social practice was initially modelled and established through the role of the teacher, and further built upon through the program participants

continued engagement. To listen is to imply an interest in the other party. Daignault, (2005) refers to listening as a gift in “confidence that the listener inspires and that the listening builds up” (p. 1-2), in this case confidence in the intergenerational relationship building. Using the word *wait* implied a special interest worthy of patience from the retirees in listening for the students' questions, and in turn the students' interest in the retirees by listening to the answers. This special interest resulted in relationship building steered by mutual interest in listening to each other for the purposes of the shared common goals. Through reflexive analysis as teacher-researcher engaged in reflective practice, I learned a form of professional knowledge (Schön, 1983), which enabled me to recognize the significance of the words I used for establishing and participating within these social practices. “In sum, the entire environment” according to Eisner (2002), “to the extent that it is a means for fostering the students” and the retirees, “is subject to the professional judgment of the teacher and constitutes a form of teaching” (p. 57).

My role as teacher switched immediately the intergenerational interaction began. Prior to this, I collaborated with Dr. O'Neill in establishing and modelling the social norms through the orientation and introductions that would springboard the program goals. Once the intergenerational interaction began, I immediately focused on the connection between the students and the retirees, and stayed silent so not to interfere in the interaction between the participants. At the time, I was unsure if I should participate more and ask questions. Reflecting in action, I chose to stay silent and let the interaction between the students and retirees drive the rest of the session, mindful of what was being established. The students continued asking questions and the retirees shared their stories. Dr. O'Neill and I said very little. Dr. O'Neill asked one or two questions, and addressed Joe and Gerry by their first name to continue modelling this norm. I spoke only to remind the students of the option to write down the retirees' answers for their research notes, and again to conclude the session because we had ran out of time. I also informed the students we would continue next session. I joined the students to clap and thank the retirees. My role seemed minimal, yet significant for the program goals to thrive through the intergenerational interaction. This teaching role seemed similar to that of a visual arts educator in being sensitive toward students' artistic practice in providing freedom for students by not interfering in, but rather supporting, their working process. This was confirmed for me by another visual arts teacher who attended the workshop at the Surrey

Teachers' Convention Dr. O'Neill and I later presented on this intergenerational arts program. This art teacher commented, "This is how you teach art". This approach also paralleled my artistic practice in reflecting on the work, and being open to the new possibilities the medium provides as Eisner (2002) and Greene (2000) prescribe. In this case, the intergenerational interaction is the medium through which possibilities emerge for the teaching role.

Inspired by this first session, I began to examine my role as art teacher in connection to the intergenerational interaction as a social practice for teaching. This examination occurred through reflecting on my discussions with collaborating researchers Dr. O'Neill, and Claire Carolan, and also on my narrative reflections and those of Claire Carolan. Overgaard discuss this type of analysis as theorizing within a specific context. Overgaard (1985) claims this to be "an important kind of theorizing that can only be done by practitioners (or collaboratively with researchers working with practitioners) in that specific context" (p 180). According to Overgaard (1985) in reference to teaching as a social practice, "the[...]reason[...]teachers need to theorize about their own practice arises from the purposive nature of a social practice" (p 180). This combination of visual art-educator-researcher engaged in reflective practice, afforded the understandings developed in professional knowledge, as Schön (1983) defines, through merging theory with practice in my teaching role for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. Overgaard states with regard to teaching as a social practice that "teachers are to be able to proceed intelligently in the variety of situations that arise in teaching to engage in activities that have a logical relationship to purpose[...]appropriate in the given context," such as within this intergenerational arts program. Overgaard (1985) continues stating, teachers "need to be concerned to question their own activities in relation to the purpose and specific context" (p. 180).

My role as art teacher required listening with flexible sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction as a participant and learner for what came next. My role in listening needed to be mindful toward the connections made for the intergenerational relationship building, and intergenerational learning opportunities. Applying flexibility meant being "ready and able to change so as to adapt to different" (<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/flexible>) interactions fluently and with

sensitivity for “an awareness of the needs and emotions of” (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sensitivity>) the students and the retirees. I applied *flexible purposing* (Eisner, 2002, p.77) with flexible sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction. “The term flexible purposing is Dewey's” (Eisner, 2002, p. 77), Eisner applies the term flexible purposing as “pertain[ing] to the improvisational side of intelligence as it is employed in the arts” (p. 77). According to Eisner this, “intelligence[...]is the ability to shift direction, even to redefine one’s aim when better options emerge in the course of one's work” (p 77).

As a visual arts educator-researcher engaged in reflective practice, this required freedom to think flexibly in support of the social practices. I learned to view my teaching role implementing this intergenerational arts program as one of thinking in support of the social practices for what was needed from me. Thinking was a course of action. This required me to interpret through “two types of reflection: reflection on action (after-the-event thinking) and reflection-in-action (thinking while doing)” (Finley, 2008, p. 3) for when to take no action. “The challenge to teachers is not to do nothing, but to act in ways that advance student's” (Eisner, 2002, p. 46), and in this case also the retirees, through my teaching thinking in support of the intergenerational interaction. In this sense, I applied “artistic thinking related to the nature of the task” (Eisner, 2002, p.46). This type of thinking in my teaching practice afforded me flexible sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction, in applying flexible purposing as my approach toward the social practices for effectively implementing the IG arts program.

At the end of this session an interesting switch occurred within the dynamics of the intergenerational interaction; the retirees asked a small group of students about their life, and about their schooling. The retirees possibly considered this to be the student's working life and they were in turn interviewing the students. Claire Carolan focused on this casual dialogue after the session had finished and mentioned this to me as evidence for a mutual interest occurring between the retirees and the students. She also included this in her written observations. This was my introduction to what I then considered ‘off topic’ conversations being a research focus for other researchers. This introduction afforded “new found perspectives” toward “develop[ing] an awareness to perceive through a new lens, and discover “other ways of seeing”” (Haydon, 2013, p. 26). I was initially surprised

at the importance paid to these 'off-topic' conversations, "it is from surprise that we are most likely to learn something" (Eisner, 2002, p. 8). At the time I was perplexed at what these 'off topic' conversations could possibly contribute to intergenerational learning and artistic learning focused on work on the waterfront. Prior to this discovery, I perceived them as a teaching distraction. In my discussions with Dr. O'Neill in reference to the effectiveness of the IG arts program, Dr. O'Neill stated, "It's the relationship that counts". As the sessions progressed, I began to see the relevance of these conversations for the connections and the relationship building. My curiosity grew as I learned to listen for the value in these 'off topic' conversations. This was what led my interest toward researching, and in learning to view teaching as a social practice. The observations, discussions and narrative reflections of other research collaborators enabled me to reach understandings and perspectives I may not have otherwise seen. Overgaard (1985) states such "collaborative inquiry could result in shared insights and these may have more potential to recast norms and behaviours" (p. 180) in teaching practice.

### **3.1.1. Session Two Homelearners: Interviewing Retirees**

The aim of this session was for the students to gather more research information through further intergenerational interaction. The retirees who attended this session were Joe and Gerry. The collaborating researchers attending were Dr. O'Neill as supervisor, and Claire Carolyn as research assistant filming the session. For this session, the interaction between the students and retirees was planned within small groups to further foster intergenerational collaboration for intergenerational learning opportunities. This resulted in the intergenerational interaction occurring within in a closer setting as each small group sat around their own table with a retiree. I discuss the influence this had on my teaching role. In this session's analysis, I hope to show the significance in the absence of the retirees to my role as the teacher at the start of the session. I then aim to show the change that occurred in the students' interest level when the retirees arrived, and how this influenced my teaching role. The significance in the students' response to the retirees' arrival revealed evidence for intergenerational relationships having already occurred from the first session, and afforded potential for further intergenerational learning. This session provided what Heydon (2013) claims are "strong prospects for learning and intergenerational interaction" that "come from contexts that support intergenerational

programming” (p. 23), through “sustained opportunities to work on the project and to draw on fellow participants for support” (p. 28).

The retirees had not yet arrived when I started this session. Many students commented they already had all the information they needed from last session and had no more questions. Without the presence of the retirees, this session seemed lacking in purpose for the students. As teacher, I needed to direct the students to the laminated photographs provided by Dr. O’Neill which were to be used at the waterfront next session. I asked the students to form groups at their tables and discuss the photographs. This required me to take on a leadership role to explain the relevancy of looking at these new photographs to help generate the discussions beyond the last session. The absence of the retirees at this point, indicated a direct correlation between my role as teacher and the role of the retirees, and also the relevance for the students in this session.

Joe and Gerry arrived after about ten minutes, and did not need any introductions. They instantly participated in what was happening, and the students welcomed them joining their groups. The intergenerational interaction immediately started within the groups focused on the same large photographs that the retirees had also brought to this session. These discussions also included the new laminated photographs brought by Dr. O’Neill. Intergenerational learning opportunities continued through the intergenerational interaction. The large photographs (from the first session) combined with the new photographs (brought for this session), all served as “a catalyst for[...] [the] day’s project that could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter’ (p. 28). This session’s activities gave the students and retirees ‘context’ that Haydon (2013) outlines “support[s] intergenerational programming rather than mere intergenerational activities” (p. 23) which Heydon claims provides “strong prospects for learning” (p. 23).

When Joe or Gerry took turns to visit the student groups separately, they sat at each groups’ table and the students immediately responded to their arrival. The connection was equal for the students with both retirees. All the students were keen to talk to either Joe or Gerry. The students engaged in conversation with them on a first name basis in the established norm as the social practice from session one. This indicated connections had already been made with a “significant length of time to establish

relationships” (Friedman, 1997, p.105, as in Haydon, 2013, p. 24), as a needed ingredient for supporting intergenerational learning. There was evidence for a comfort level and a sense of safety having been established between the two generations. The retirees were sitting at the tables with the students, according to Heydon (2013) “physical proximity played a role in helping participants become acquainted” (p. 45).

This small group arrangement impacted the role I played for the groups that were waiting their turn to speak with Joe or Gerry. In the absence of a retiree to talk to, I initially needed to take a leadership role for the groups waiting, directing their attention toward the laminated photographs, while they waited for their turn to speak to Joe or Gerry. Reflecting in action for my role focused on the social practice, my thinking switched from that of leadership directing the students’ attention to the photographs while they waited to speak with Joe or Gerry, to what Heydon (2013) outlines in modelling as a cooperative group member. I helped to generate discussion for more questions. Instead of group leader, I established myself as an equal participant within the activity, having the same goals as the students in waiting to speak to either Joe or Gerry. Important to intergenerational programming, is the “notion of[...]equal group status” which “can, at least in part, be accomplished through programs that help participants to cooperate and work towards “common goals”” (Haydon, 2013, p. 23). The fluidity within my role required flexible sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) in my thinking for what the moment needed. It was important for me as teacher-researcher to maintain focus on the social practices for effectively supporting intergenerational learning opportunities.

After a short while, I stayed with one particular group only, they had waited the longest. I stayed with this group after Gerry joined because a student wanted my support with writing down questions and answers. I was able to listen to the answers Gerry gave them and be included in the dialogue as an equal member of the group.

I concluded this session because that was all the time we had planned for. Even though this session seemed an extension of session one, and in hindsight the two sessions could have possibly been combined, this second session did provide an

opportunity for “more frequent interaction” which “can lead to stronger relationships and better understanding between generations” (Heydon, 2013, p. 22).

My role as teacher for this session was significantly influenced by the initial absence of the retirees, and then again by the intergenerational interaction once they had arrived and then spoke to the student groups. The intergenerational connections having formed from the first session were continued through this session. This confirmed what Dr. O'Neill had said in discussions with me, “It's about the relationships”. It was through reflective practice, in reviewing my narrative reflections, and reflecting in and on action, that I began to understand my thinking in the moment for how I had chosen my actions. Reflective practice is understood as the process of learning through and from experience toward gaining new insights (Finley, 2008, p. 1). It is from this reflective practice that I began to see my role as teacher-researcher about *how* I think about my teaching in the moment of teaching, and after wards, knowing that my teaching actions will follow, as Fleming (2012) states, “for it is *how* the subject is taught as much as *what* is taught that is important” (p. 99, original emphasis).



**Photo 3.1** Students and Joe looking at one of the large photographs brought by the retirees.

### **3.1.2. Session Three Homelearners: Waterfront Visit**

The analysis for this session aims to show the significance of the waterfront visit to the intergenerational interaction and the intergenerational learning. I aim to show how this visit influenced my role and experience as the teacher implementing this program. The waterfront visit provided a vital “catalyst for” the “day’s project” and the program “that could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28), of even greater significance than the photographs. The experience of being at the waterfront also became a “catalyst” for intergenerational relationship building, resulting in intergenerational learning opportunities. This activity provided “momentum in the form of activating participants[...]interest and curiosity” which worked toward “helping to create purpose” (Haydon, 2013, p. 94) in this session for the social practices and the programs’ common goals.

According to Heydon (2013), teacher modelling of the activities and social practices is the third element for intergenerational programming. Dr. O’Neill helped provide

this for the participants and my role as teacher helping to forge the social practices. Dr. O'Neill interacted with Joe and the students holding up the laminated photographs of the past scenery to match the present landscape. In learning my role through Dr. O'Neill's modelling, and applying reflection in action (Schön 1983) in the way Munby (2012) applies Schön's (1983) reflective practice, led me through this journey developing professional knowledge in teaching for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice.

The past working life was conveyed through Joe's explanations and the laminated photographs given to the student groups. The intergenerational interaction consisted of an equal exchange between Joe and the students, through talking and listening in collaboration with one another within the social practices of the children's and older adults' collective experiences. This social practice "involved[...]shared ways of behaving or acting[...]grown out of" the "common[...]purpose" (Overgaard, 1985, p. iii) in exploring the waterfront for its past and present work. Drawing from Overgaard (1985), social practice can be a way of learning through interacting, talking and listening. According to Walsh (2010), "the definition of talking and listening needs to include aspects such as collaborating, investigating, negotiating, enacting, connecting", and "interacting" (p. 223). The norms were the established behaviours for the interviewing and oral history telling that supported the intergenerational interaction for the purposes of intergenerational learning in connection to the social practices and program goals.

The waterfront visit began to transform for me into a journey through time, as imagination made real through this sensory experience walking along the waterfront, feeling the cold air, the smells, sounds, sights, the birds, the boats, and the remnants of the past still lingering in the bollards. These bollards had been painted red for dramatic effect. This made them stand out as a feature from the past. Joe told us they used to be grey when functioned to tie up the ships. The students were intrigued and curious to match up the red bollards to the ones in the photographs that the ships were tied to. All this researched information provided a vehicle through which the students, retirees and I were able to "cultivate multiple ways of seeing and multiple dialogues' together for an appreciation of how things can change "in a world where nothing stays the same" (Greene, 1995, p.16-18). And in seeing the past through Joe's eyes while encountering the present

through our own, “the doorway for imagination” opened up for us “the possibility of looking at things as if they could be otherwise” (Greene, 1995, p. 16-18).

Joe's explanations of the past waterfront working scene with what the present scene had replaced, drew us into his perspective of lived experience. We welcomed this peek into his working history through his eyes. Both the students and I valued his contributions and were keen to learn more through this interaction, intrigued by his stories of a world no longer there. This experience seemed to convey a clear sense of what the goals of this intergenerational arts program really were; sharing through life stories, a life experience long past that may otherwise be forgotten. Joe was “able to pass on to another generation” his “own life experiences” from which “both the elderly[...]and the young people experience a sense of accomplishment” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 165).

As the teacher and participant, I too was drawn into these connections that were building between Joe and the students through this interactive experience. I was acquiring a sense of equal group status as learner with the students, taking photographs, questioning, listening, and responding with flexible sensitivity in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) toward each interaction and each moment. The notion of equal group status is important according to Jarrott (2007) in effectively implementing intergenerational programs. Claire Carolan commented on this teacher connection in her narrative reflection for this session. Brabazon and Disch (1997) note a similar connection to Claire's observations and mine, that occurred between the teacher and the participants within an intergenerational dance program for deaf children and elders focused on intergenerational relationships and learning. The “social ties with the dance teacher grew as participants began to learn the language of dance through partnering[...]and imaginative improvisation” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 117). The authors describe in reference to the teacher, that this “intergenerational socialization process was cross generational” (p. 117). Their findings infer that the teacher becomes part of the fold within the intergenerational interaction and relationship building. Claire Carolan's reflections afforded insight for me into the role I played as teacher, which Lyle (2009) claims is the benefit that narrative reflection can bring. “A visible relationship has begun to develop between Joe and the children and their teacher” (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, Session Three).

Joe's increased comfort level with the students was evident through his involvement with them as he shared his stories in relation to the students' questions and the immediate surroundings.

Joe is becoming increasingly comfortable with the children and their questions and they are more comfortable asking whatever comes to their minds. Joe has begun to address them by name (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, Session Three).

Joe confirmed what Brabazon and Disch (1997) refer to with regard to seniors' enjoyment in intergenerational programming in response to the younger generations' enthusiasm, as the "benefits from the on-going special attention given to them by the young people" (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 165).

We stopped at various points along the way so that Joe could help with lining up the old photographs and answering questions that the children had. Joe told the children about the rails that used to run alongside the river to give the trains direct access to the ships. He pointed out the cranes on the opposite shore on the Surrey side. He told them about the building of the three visible bridges, Patulla, Queensborough and the Alex Fraser. The children were able to see, touch and sit on the bollards that Joe and Gerry had shown them pictures of in the classroom in previous [sessions], and many of the pictures [taken by the children] included the bollards (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, Session Three).

For one of the students, this attachment moved to an interest in Joe himself, as was evident by him asking to take a photograph of Joe by the waterfront.

One boy in particular, took great care to check with Joe regularly about the alignment of the photos he was taking, and to ask many questions about the ships that were there. He asked[...]if[...]Joe would mind posing so that he could take a picture of Joe with the river behind him (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, Session Three).

The students' took their own photographs documenting what interested them for their research and their art projects. I also took photographs to share with the students later, and to document this experience for my research purposes and for other researchers also. Photographs were taken of the old photographs lined up beside the present scenery for an immediate visual connection between past and present. Holding up the old photographs and lining them up with the current scene provided a visual context for an

immediate connection and understanding of the changes between the past and present waterfront, creating a new way of knowing (Eisner, 2002) This connection was meaningful to us all in the context of learning through intergenerational interaction, and our attachment to Joe. These photographs created opportunities as catalyst for future interactions, for the students to share their reflections of this experience at the waterfront with others and thereby continuing this social practice of oral history telling.

Dr. O'Neill took a group photograph. We all met to give the students' cameras back to Dr. O'Neill. Claire Carolan, Dr. O'Neill and Dr. Peter Hall then left. The students requested to stay longer, providing further opportunities and evidence for continued intergenerational relationship building and learning. Joe and I, with the help of the parents, took the students on an extended walk, including a visit to the Fraser River Discovery Centre and an exploration of a ship play structure. The students were interested in knowing what the other end of the walkway used to be like. This indicated an interest in the students wanting to learn more as this was a cold day. Joe was keen to continue sharing his stories with the students. We all listened attentively while Joe showed us where the old restaurant used to be he remembered eating at, what was left of the old docks, and where the ships used to dock to unload all the cars. One student asked if those would have been the Toyota cars that had been mentioned during the first session. Joe continued explaining that the whole area which is now a parking lot used to be full of Toyota cars he helped unload from the ships. A parent then took more photographs of the area and the current buildings. Joe mentioned this location matched with one of the laminated photographs; we held it up to see and I took a photograph with the past and present landmarks lined up. We walked through the market to see the current work taking place. This session concluded having cemented a bond between Joe and the students, which included me, and as a result had brought about strong opportunities and evidence for intergenerational learning. We thanked Joe for his time.

Joe took the lead role in this waterfront visit through his oral history telling. He led us through his stories and explanations using the old photographs in connection to the present scenery. He learned through the students' interactions with him what they were interested in. He acted as an attentive listener too. The students played their collaborative role as equal participants in learning through their questions, listening and responding to

Joe's stories, taking photographs, inquiring with curiosity. Joe, the students and I, all engaged in a fluid exchange as partners in listening and learning, attentive to each other as collaborators within this social practice for the common goals of the program. It was this strong intergenerational connection and intergenerational learning that directed my role as equal participant, collaborating within the established social practices to enable the freedom needed for the intergenerational interaction and the program goals to thrive. In this way, my role in participating within the social practices for this program paralleled that of art educator and artistic practice, "in the process of working with the material", as in this case the intergenerational interaction as the medium became "the work" which "itself secure[d] its own voice and help[ed] set the direction" (Eisner, 2002, p. 7). This collaboration immersed in equal group status was possible because strong intergenerational connections were forming. The waterfront provided a catalyst of significance which strengthened the intergenerational bonds. This waterfront visit was a critical component to this international arts program, generating significant opportunities for intergenerational relationship building and learning. As a result, this session established my role as teacher as an active equal partner within this intergenerational collaborative team. With all this information, the students and I were able to piece together in our mind's eye an image, as preparation for creating the art projects of what it was like 40 to 50 years ago working on the waterfront.

### **3.1.3. Session Four: Homelearners' Review Day**

The analysis for this session aims to show the significance in the lack of intergenerational interaction to the teacher's role, and the intergenerational connections. Two retirees attended, Gerry and Dave. Gerry had attended sessions one and two. This was Dave's first session, and we had not met him before. Joe was absent for this session. The collaborating researchers who attended were Dr. O'Neill as supervisor, and Claire Carolan as research assistant filming the session. This session took place in the art room. This session was intended as a review of the waterfront visit, and began as a class discussion looking at the slides of the all the photographs the students had taken at the waterfront which Dr. O'Neill had set-up.

There were no retirees present for the start of this session. Gerry and Brian arrived ten minutes after the class had started. After their arrival, the intergenerational interaction was minimal at best and was not as expected after three very successful sessions. This was a bit of a shock. Claire Carolan's narrative reflections for this session outlined the impact of this.

Joe is not here[...].Gerry and Dave are seated together, somewhat separate from the children[...].The children do not know Dave and do not speak to him (Claire Carolyn, Written Reflections, session four).

To help generate class discussion, I described my experience to the students during our visit to the waterfront.

I began viewing the walk as a just visit to the waterfront, but as Joe started to describe details of what was there years before, the walk began to change for me as a journey through time. I imagined being there in the way Joe was describing, while also seeing things as they are today”.

This generated a few responses from the students and a discussion began between the students and me. Claire Carolan observed the events from her perspective, and wrote the following in her narrative reflections, “We go through all the photos. The kids are noisy and unfocused”. As the teacher implementing this session, I felt a distinct change in how the students related to the retirees and vice versa. I documented in my narrative reflections, “I was aware of how hard I had to work to keep the momentum going during this session. It seemed the intergenerational interaction directly impacted my role.” Furthermore, Claire Carolan’s written reflections of the events revealed a sense of irrelevance for Gerry and Dave.

We get to the end of the viewing [of the slides of the student’s photographs] and Sue tries to move into the project part of the class, Dr. O’Neill needs to leave for another engagement. At this point Gerry comes to Sue to say perhaps it would be best if he and Dave leave at this point and come back next week once the children have got going on their projects. Gerry and Dave leave (Claire Carolyn, session four).

The retirees leaving completely defeated the purpose of this being an intergenerational collaborative session. However, I proceeded to continue with the next activity with the students only, as noted by Claire.

Sue gets the kids settled enough to give them instructions on getting into groups, choosing the pictures that they will work off of and getting their materials in order (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, session four).

I noted in my narrative reflections that, “one of the students (named ‘Bill’ for this research) had taken photographs of Joe during the waterfront visit. He had asked for copies of those photographs during this session”, which indicated the student’s attachment to Joe. Reflecting on Claire’s observations, it was clear that a strong connection had formed between Joe and the students which did not carry through into this session because Joe was absent. Gerry had attended the first two sessions, but still the connection was not happening between him and the students. Dave was not connected at all to the previous sessions, he was new to the students, and there was no connection forming. This was not an orientation session, confirming Heydon's (2013) claim in the significance to the orientation element as the first for effective implementation of intergenerational programming.

At the end of the class Sue and I talk about how different today felt and agree that the likely reason is that the children missed Joe. They have had more interaction and more relationship building time with him and then to have that element missing from the class today changed how they reacted to all of it. Sue tried so hard to bring Gerry and Dave into the fold, but because they hadn’t been on the [waterfront] walk, there was a gap in the experience and relationship with the children. As hard as it was to see less success on this day after every class before being so full of great learning, it was also fantastic to see how reliant the exercise is on relationship building and how much the children had bonded with Joe in such a short amount of time. (Claire Carolyn, Session four, written reflections)

After the retirees had left, I continued to work with the students getting them started on their ideas for their projects, and some students started building bollards with the clay using the photographs for accuracy. To give relevance for the students in starting their art projects at this point without the retirees, I reminded them of the display day and a possible public display at the museum for which they shared enthusiasm.

Due to the lack of intergenerational interaction, this session seemed to be lacking in purpose for both the students and the retirees. This lack of purpose resulted in the two generations responding to each other without a common goal. This influenced their behaviour toward each other and to this session’s activities. For the social practices of this

program, during this session, the participants' responses can be interpreted as having changed, and having influenced the “form of activity” which lacked in “common needs” and “purpose[...]” as part of an intergenerational “community”, and did not therefore “involve[...]shared ways of behaving or acting” (Overgaard, 1985, p. iii). Without intention, their behaviour had functioned to diminish the effectiveness of this session in keeping with the social practices. This influenced my role as teacher which became more akin to direct instruction, than collaborative as an equal partner. “Social practices vary in degrees[...]this is largely a result of the relationship between the purpose and the behaviour” (Overgaard, p. 116). It would therefore have been more effective for this particular session, if the retiree Joe who was present for the waterfront visit had attended. However this break in Joe's continuity revealed for my research purposes and for the collaborating researchers' perspectives, the significance in the intergenerational interaction to the relationship building, to the intergenerational learning, and to my role as teacher for effectively implementing this session.

There was consensus from my discussions with Dr. O'Neill and Claire Carolan afterwards as to why this session lacked momentum in intergenerational interaction and relevance to the participants. The consensus was it was most likely because the students had bonded with Joe, who had attended the waterfront visit, all three prior sessions, but not this one. In my discussions with Dr. O'Neill, she emphasized the importance in the same retirees attending all sessions throughout the program; stating that the relationship building required continuity.

Intergenerational learning was clearly enhanced by the relationship building which relied on the continuity of the intergenerational interaction. The lack of the intergenerational interaction, resulting from the retirees being disconnected from the previous session's activities which we were reviewing, reduced this session to an intergenerational activity for which two generations were briefly brought together. Heydon (2013) claims “strong prospects for learning and intergenerational interaction come from contexts that support intergenerational *programming* rather than mere intergenerational *activities*” (p. 23, original emphasis). The differences between these approaches in intergenerational programming verses intergenerational activities, is that programming “provide[s] a way for experiences and interactions to take on meaning relevant to one's

life,” whereas activities “do not allow the level of meaning to exist because they lack depth and long-term significance” (Friedman, 1997, p. 105, as in Heydon, 2013, p. 23)

### **3.1.4. Session Five Homelearners: Working on the Art Projects**

The analysis for this session aims to show the significance in the return of Joe to the intergenerational interaction and intergenerational artistic learning. And also this significance to my role as teacher for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. This session took place in the art room at the Homelearners Centre. Gerry and Joe were the two retirees attending. The collaborating researchers were Dr. O'Neill as supervisor, and Claire Carolan as research assistant filming the session. The activities for this session were designed to offer “sustained opportunities to work on the [art] project[s] and draw on fellow participants for support” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28).

The students were keen to work on the art projects with the retirees. I handed out the clay supplies and bases for the sculptures to each student group. The students set up the project work they had begun last session. The retirees arrived early; so the intergenerational interaction was able to start as soon as this session began. There was a significant difference in the intergenerational interaction in this session compared to last session.

Joe is back! The energy in the room is back to how it was on the [waterfront] walk. Gerry is also back, which is great to see. The children have their projects ready on the tables and jump right into the building and creating of their waterfronts (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session five).

The relationship that evolved between Joe and the students was restored after the one week break. The students were accepting of Gerry as well. However there was not as yet as strong a connection with the students, as had developed with Joe during the waterfront walk.

Joe and Gerry were both disconnected from the clay work with the students at this point. They had missed collaborating on the initial planning stage last session. Joe and Gerry were unsure what the students were doing. This revealed the need to re-establish some social practices for the intergenerational collaboration to continue through to the

artistic practice. Dr. O'Neill applied "strategies to (re)acquaint participants with each other" (Heydon, 2013, p. 28), as the first element Heydon states is needed for effective intergenerational programming. This was aimed toward helping the retirees participate in a new way equal to the students in the project work as part of the social practices by encouraging

Joe and Gerry to take some time to sit at each table with the groups of children and talk to them about what they are building, and to build with them (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session five).

I followed Dr. O'Neill's lead as model for re-establishing these social practices. I observed listening to the interactions, reflecting in action to adapt in the moment. "The PoP [Patterns of Participation] framework[...]views" teachers' "practices as adaptations to social conditions in which they work" (Alsalam, 2014, p. 4).

Joe and [Bill] (student name for this research), who have built a nice rapport with each other during the waterfront walk, have naturally gravitated toward each other and [Bill] invites Joe right into his group's project. Gerry sits to talk to the twins. Gerry asks them about their plan and they proceed to tell him about computer modelling and how they are going to do their project on the computer (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session five).

At this point my role was to take my cue from the students, with them leading the artistic practice. I needed to let the artistic collaboration evolve through the intergenerational interaction that Dr. O'Neill was trying to encourage. Joe and Gerry had no prior experience in creating clay sculptures. Their hesitation combined with Dr. O'Neill's encouragement for the retirees, led toward the students initiating intergenerational reciprocity for the artistic learning. Intergenerational "programs that promote "reciprocity" are more acceptable to both elders and youth than those that are one-directional" (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 206). The students invited the retirees to collaborate in the artistic activity as the retirees had shared their stories, by just handing them a piece of clay without judgment in their abilities. This friendly gesture indicated an acceptance, a trust, and an equality that was being established between the students and the retirees within the intergenerational relations. When first offered the clay however, Joe and Gerry both said, "I'm not good at that sort of thing". It was through relationship building with the students that Joe and Gerry were able to overcome their self-doubt and engage in the artistic practice as described by Claire Carolan.

During the [students'] clay building, the children chat with Joe and work well as a group with him completely integrated. [Bill] is noticeably taking the lead on the project and had assigned tasks to the other children and their project quickly begins to take shape. Joe asks the children at the table what they are building and the children share their ideas with him. Joe tells them that he isn't very good at this kind of thing. [Bill] tears off a chunk of red clay and hands it to Joe and suggests that he build some bollards for their pier. Joe jumps right in with a smile on his face and rolls the clay on the table, taking care to shape the bollard and takes out his Leatherman, a multipurpose tool, and uses it to cut the bottom supports of the bollard in crisp and precise squares, and he pokes small details into the clay. [Bill] approves and takes the bollard from Joe, sticks it onto the model and hands Joe another piece of clay. (Claire Carolyn, Session five, written reflections)

Joe embraced the artistic learning opportunity when he “jumped right in” and willingly engaged in the artistic practice “with a smile on his face” (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session five)). It is in “learning to engage in that process” of artistic practice “that perception is refined, imagination stimulated, judgment fostered, and technical skill[s]” are “developed” (Eisner, 2002, p. 14). Through reflexive analysis of Claire Carolan's written reflections for this session, I realized the students and Joe had both taken on part of my role as art teacher. The students brought Joe into the artistic practice, providing artistic learning opportunities for him. Joe demonstrated technical skills for the students in achieving accuracy with the clay medium using his multi-purpose tool. Bill encouraged further artistic learning for Joe by instantly applying the clay bollard; as he “stick[s] it onto the model and hands Joe another piece of clay” (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session five). In doing so, Bill reinforced a sense of equal group status through his acceptance of Joe, his art work, and their relationship building, as evident in Claire Carolan's comments. “Joe is willing to get in and play with the kids and has a great smile and laughs easily” (Claire Carolan, Session five, written reflections).

Gerry was still reluctant at this point to engage in the artistic practice with the students. He continued the oral history telling, and played a leadership role by giving the students information and direct instructions for the projects. This was Gerry's way of participating with the projects at this point, in the traditional norm of adult-teacher role. He remained distant from the art work, even though he does at times offer small sketches as contribution for what he wants to convey.

Gerry is very focused at ensuring the accuracy of the models and is taking his role in educating the kids about the waterfront seriously. He has brought a book with him this week with pictures that the kids can refer to and is often flipping through the pages to illustrate his point (Claire Carolyn, Session five, written reflections).

Although Gerry wasn't engaged in the actual making of the clay sculptures yet, he was contributing toward artistic learning opportunities for the students in what Eisner (2002) refers to as the 'inscription' and 'editing' stages of 'representation'. According to Eisner (2002), "it is through inscription[...]that the image or idea is preserved—never to be sure in the exact form in which it was originally experienced" (p. 6). Gerry led the students' artistic learning opportunities through these cognitive stages, although separated for him at this point from artistic experience. "It is through this very concreteness" in "inscription" that provides for this second stage in "editing", a "critically important" form of "cognitive process" of "representation. Editing is the process of working on the inscriptions so they achieve the quality, the precision, and the power their creator desires" (Eisner, 2002, p. 6). Gerry had taken on the role as art teacher in guiding the students through this process. I remained a silent observer and learner, focused on supporting the intergenerational interaction and collaboration. As Gerry provided the specific details for the students' ideas and plans, they began building and 'editing' the sculptures to represent his specifications.

“

Gerry is standing at [Bill's] group and talking with them about the model and offering suggestions to make it more accurate. Dr. O'Neill invites Gerry to sit down with them and build, but Gerry politely declines. He looks beside him at Joe who is happily rolling the clay into thin lines before measuring them with his popsicle stick and he says to Joe, "So you're really into this?" and Joe responds with a giant smile "I'm totally into this." At this point Gerry accepts the chair offered by Dr. O'Neill and sits with [Bill's] group for a little bit then gets up and goes back over to the twins (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session five).

The interaction between Gerry and the twins extended beyond the project topic, and was noted in Claire Carolan's written reflections as evidence for 'off topic' conversations. This particular interaction that followed afforded a pivotal moment in my understanding of the interconnectedness these interactions had to the relationship building and the intergenerational artistic learning opportunities. This revealed the reciprocity between the two generations within these social practices for the effectiveness

of this intergenerational arts program. Within this following 'off topic' conversation, Gerry suggests to the twins that clay building for this art project could benefit them for their possible work in later life. In doing so, Gerry reveals a concern for their actions and an interest in their future. "Gerry seems to take his role in this class very seriously and really wants to impart wisdom and life experience to these kids" (Claire Carolan's, written reflections, session five). Gerry's response to the twins also reveals his connection to them as he wants to encourage them to join in with the clay building and the twins respond in kind. Gerry models for the twins by offering them clay, what he had observed between Bill and Joe. The twins then reciprocated, further enhancing the intergenerational relationship building and artistic learning opportunities.

Gerry returns to the twins and sits down. Gerry looks at them and says, "You know, when I was a kid we didn't have computers and you guys, you have to use computers and know all of that and that's great. I can use one. I can turn it on and write a letter and that's about it. But here's the thing and maybe I'm over stepping my authority on this one[...]computers are great for figuring things out and all that, but at the end of the day, those bridges and buildings and things, someone has to build them, so you fellas, you should build something with your hands and get busy, even just to figure out how to do it, build something." Gerry handed them some clay and the boys began to play with it and built some small item for the model. The[...]twins[...]handed some clay back to Gerry and said, "Okay, you too." Gerry prefaced again with "I'm not very good at this stuff," but proceeds to build a small sack out of clay. Gerry stays with them a little bit longer, and asks the twins what they want to do when they grow up. (Claire Carolyn's, written reflections, session five)

These conversations created meaningful memories for Gerry beyond the duration of this project. After this program had finished and some time had passed, I met with Gerry and Joe to discuss the possibility of starting another intergenerational arts program about work on the waterfront with a new group of students. In remembering the homelearners program, Gerry asked "So how are my twins doing?"

These 'off topic' conversations supported intergenerational artistic learning opportunities, and became intertwined within the artistic collaborations and relationship building. After his encounter observing Joe as "totally into this", Gerry then became open to what Eisner (2002) refers to as a new way of knowing through Joe's modelling. Gerry had made a connection with the twins during this session and demonstrated he was more

comfortable now following Joe's lead through his relationship building with them. The intergenerational reciprocity in learning was evident in "the[...]twins[...] hand[ing] some clay back to Gerry and saying, "Okay, you too"" (Claire Carolan, Written Reflections, session five). Gerry prefaced once more with "I'm not very good at this stuff," however as noted by Claire, this time he "proceed[ed] to build a small sack out of clay" (Claire Carolyn, Written Reflections, session five). The twins did for Gerry, what Bill had done for Joe; they facilitated an artistic learning opportunity and initiated reciprocity in intergenerational learning. It took a bit longer for Gerry, just long enough to build up the intergenerational connections for him to feel comfortable taking this leap into the artistic practice. As Jarrott (2007) points out within intergenerational programs, some participants may need more time than others to adjust to the context setting.

The intergenerational reciprocity that occurred within this session was a pivotal event for the intergenerational artistic learning and relationship building. At this point, the students were providing the new information and direction for the artistic collaboration and social practices of this intergenerational arts program. This created an equal balance in shared learning between the two generations, and a respect toward the others expertise, establishing equal group status between the participants for the intergenerational learning opportunities in working together toward the commons goals. Both generations had something to offer the other within the context of working toward the common goals of this intergenerational arts program. Jarrott (2007) defines "equal group status" as a situation in which "each participant has something to gain from the contact setting" (p. 5). Heydon (2013) claims, in drawing from Jarrott, that "equal group status can, at least in part, be accomplished through programs that help participants to cooperate and work towards "common goals" (p. 23).

It was imperative that the learning be led through the intergenerational interaction. Put another way, had I as the art teacher handed a piece of clay to the retirees as I had handed out the clay to the student groups at the beginning of this session, this particular opportunity for intergenerational reciprocity in learning and relationship building and its value within the social practices of this intergenerational arts program could have been denied. As the art teacher my actions needed to be sensitive toward, and responsive in support of the social practices for effective implementation of the IG arts program.

The students continued to explore learning about the history of work on the waterfront from the retirees as the sculptures evolved. Both generations were afforded further learning opportunities together through their interactions, “including learning to listen, how and when to initiate dialogue, how to use clarity and use persuasion in presenting one’s point” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 226). Both generations listened to each other incorporating what each had to offer. They listened through the artistic collaboration and the continued oral history telling. Listening empowers us in our relationships with each other. Listening allows connections to be made that value one another’s contributions (Daignault, 2005). The students listened to Gerry’s suggestions for the clay sculptures. Joe’s detailed artistic contributions were welcomed by the students. Within this interaction, they encouraged and instilled confidence in one another, a “confidence that the listener inspires and that the listening builds up” (Daignault, 2005, p. 1-2). This listening reinforced the value the two generations each placed in their contributions. Jarrott (2007) claims equal group status within intergenerational programs relies on participants feeling equally valued for their contributions.

As the teacher implementing this intergenerational arts program, I too listened to the students and the retirees contributions. Through reflective practice on my role, I too was afforded these same learning opportunities that Brabazon and Disch (1997) refer in listening and dialogue, in this way I became an equal participant. In turn, the retirees and students took on aspects of teaching art as they taught and learned through each other. The intergenerational interaction “advanc[ed]” the artistic learning opportunities, enhanced the “ability to see what” could be done for accuracy “to consider alternatives”, and “assist[ed] in the development of[...]technical skills” (Eisner, 2002, p. 73). This intergenerational interaction nullified part of my usual role as art teacher. The students had taken on my role of helping the retirees participate in the artistic practice and the retirees had in turn applied their skills to the task. Gerry and Joe each provided expertise for accuracy, although in slightly different ways. My role then needed to be more reflective within each moment in support of this intergenerational interaction and intergenerational learning opportunities. In drawing from Eisner (2002), “the challenge to” or role of “teachers is not to do nothing, but to act in ways that advance” not only the “student’s” and the retirees, “but also” in this case my own “thinking” (p. 46) too. This is when my role as teacher became more about reflecting, about thinking and learning about my teaching

role, for my possible responses and actions within the social practices for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program. Eisner (2002) defines the art room in reference to the students, and in this case the retirees, but also the teacher where in action “the art room” becomes “a complex and changing nexus in which a wide variety of forms of thinking and learning are made possible” (Eisner, 2002, p. 69). In this regard a sense of equal group status in learning existed, not only through intergenerational but also cross-generational. Brabazon and Disch (1997) refer to cross-generational connections that include the teacher within the context of an intergenerational arts program for the deaf, in the case of a dance teacher being drawn into the fold of the intergenerational relationship building.

Reflexive examination of my teaching role within the social practices developed my appreciation for the significance of the seemingly small social moments, including ‘off-topic’ conversations. This reflective practice incorporated my own reflective narratives and those of Claire Carolans’, also reflection in and on action, and ‘Pattern of Participation’ in discussions with collaborating researchers. Alsalim, (2014) defines “Patterns of Participation” as a method of reflective practice which “views teachers’ social interaction in a certain community as a piece which is influenced by other pieces of social interactions” (Skott, 2010; 2011; 2013, as cited in Alsalim, 2014, p. 1). My role as teacher required critical thinking toward these social practices, acquired through that which Lyle (2009) states in reference to “reflective narrative” as “an approach which creates space[...]to engage in critical thought that may result in wakefulness to alternative approaches to knowing ourselves as practitioners” (Lyle, 2009, p. 294).

Teaching within this social practice meant applying reflective practice with a flexible sensitivity specifically toward the intergenerational interaction in the task of flexible purposing (Eisner 2002). This required being in a state of ‘wakefulness’ in my approach toward my thinking in each teaching moment for how to respond, for “how and when to initiate dialogue, how to use clarity and use persuasion” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 226) appropriate to the social practices. Dr. O’Neill modelled an example for this approach when she offered a chair for Joe and Gerry to sit with the students and chat about what they are doing in order to indirectly encourage their artistic collaboration, rather than just directly asking them to build something with the clay. Through reflective practice, I learned

to see my role as the art “teacher need[ing] to behave like an environmental designer, creating situations that will in turn, create an appetite” for the two generations “to learn” (Eisner, 2002, p. 47) from each other. I needed to think critically toward my decision making in support of the social practices for the program goals. According to Finley (2008), “reflective practice[...]involves examining assumptions of every day practice” and requires “the individual practitioner” to become “self-aware” in “critically evaluating their own responses to practice situations[...]to gain new understandings and so improve future practice” (Finley, 2008, p. 1).

In recognizing the relevance of the small social moments and ‘off-topic’ conversations to the intergenerational reciprocity and learning opportunities, these connections emerged as “‘pieces’ shap[ing] a ‘fluctuating pattern’[...]in every” intergenerational “‘interaction” (Skott, 2010; 2011; 2013, as in Alsalm, 2014, p. 1). It was familiarity with surprise and reflective practice as a visual artist-educator that led me to view through this familiar lens, the ‘shifting impact’ of the intergenerational interaction for directing my teaching role implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. Eisner (2002) describes “surprise” as “one of the rewards of working in the arts” and claims that “to pursue the surprise requires the willingness to take risks, for while the surprise itself may emerge, its pursuit is a choice, in choosing to pursue surprise one selects an uncertain path” (p. 78-79). Finley (2008) draws directly from “Schon’s words” with regards to the process for improving professional knowledge, “the practitioner allows” the “experience” of “surprise, puzzlement, or confusion in a situation which” is perceived as “uncertain or unique” (Schön, 1983, p. 68, as cited in Finley, 2008, p. 1). The practitioner “reflects on the phenomenon” as it presents itself, “and on[...]prior understandings which serve[...]to generate both a new understanding of the phenomenon and a change in the situation” (Schön, 1983, p. 68, as in Finlay, 2008, p. 1).

Eisner (2002) explains in working with the arts, no matter what the medium, which in this case is reflective practice, in the “process of working with the material the work itself secures its own voice and helps set the direction. The maker in this case the teacher “is guided and, in fact, at times surrenders to the demands of the merging forms” (p. 7), which in this case is the intergenerational interaction. This is when “opportunities in the process of working are encountered that were not envisioned” by the teacher before “the work

began, but that speak so eloquently about the promise of emerging possibilities that new options are perused” (p. 7) in understanding teaching practice immersed in reflective practice. “Put succinctly, surprise, a fundamental reward of all creative work, is bestowed by the work on its maker” (p. 7). I applied this approach as visual arts educator-researcher to my role as art teacher implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice, according to Eisner, “we need to treat teaching as a form of personal research” (p. 56). According to Finley (2008), in reference to Schön (1983), “professionals[...]draw on both practical experience and theory as they think on their feet and improvise. They act both intuitively and creatively. Both reflection in and on action allows them to revise, modify and refine their expertise” (p. 3-4).

As a visual arts educator, my role typically hinges on an appropriate balance between the affordances enabling freedom, and the constraints providing guidance for students to effectively explore artistic learning opportunities as they engage in creative pursuits. This teaching role establishes the “constraints and affordances” within “the activities and the materials[...]prompts, cues and scaffolding[...]to enable[...]student[s] to succeed” (Eisner, 2002, p. 71). In this case, my role as art teacher in enabling students' freedom within their art work needed to extend to the intergenerational interaction for the intergenerational artistic collaborations to lead toward intergenerational artistic learning opportunities. My role as teacher within these social practices was not a passive one, but rather as described by Overgaard (1983), as an active role in “purposive” (p. 16) thinking. Overgaard states “teaching is a purposive activity” applied with intent “it has to be rational” implying “teachers have to have reason for their actions” (p. 16). In short “the definition of teaching presupposes a rational relationship between purpose and activity” (p. 16).

This session’s analysis reveals the reciprocal nature of the intergenerational learning within this intergenerational arts program. Joe’s return cemented the intergenerational relationship building that had emerged during the waterfront visit that was lacking in the waterfront review session. This had a significant impact on the intergenerational interaction for this session, compared to last session. As the 'off topic' conversations and the reciprocity emerged within the interaction, they were revealed to be significant to the intergenerational relationship building and artistic learning opportunities. These encounters revealed the generosity between the students and retirees, and the

reciprocity possible for sharing new ways of knowing (Eisner, 2002) between the generations that benefited both, and created possibilities for equal group status within the social practices. The sense of equal group status appears to be the link connecting the interaction to the learning, and to my role as art teacher within the social practices. My role was to follow Dr. O'Neill's lead, and perceive the value in enabling the intergenerational interaction to lead the artistic practice and learning. Reflective practice became my teaching action. I needed to be receptive to learning "other ways of seeing" (Haydon, 2013, p. 26) in order to "perceive" (Eisner, 2002, p. 5) as Lynn Fels (1999) calls "moments of recognition" for the significance in the small social moments to this teaching context. I needed to be receptive toward learning my role through the intergenerational interaction and artistic collaboration for my role within these social practices, in as much as the retirees and the students were receptive toward learning from each other. The students and retirees had supported and modelled my teaching role for me through their engagement in the social practices, as I had supported and modelled their role for them within these social practices. This was a reciprocal interconnection between my role as the art teacher and the intergenerational interaction, reliant on a sense of equal group status.

### **3.1.5. Session Six Homelearners: Working on Arts Projects**

This session's analysis looks at the connections between the intergenerational interaction, relationship building, artistic learning opportunities, and my role as art teacher. The social practices for this session focused on artistic collaboration as the students and retirees continued working on the art projects. This session took place in the art room at the Homelearners Centre. The two retirees Joe and Gerry attended. Research assistant Claire Carolan filmed the session.

The social practices led this session and took on a life of their own independent from me from the start. The students and retirees were fully engaged in their collaborative experiences. The students set up their projects and began working on them before I had started the class. Claire Carolan noted in her narrative reflections the tone with which this session began.

The kids are eager to get to work on their models. They quickly break off into their groups and dive into their work. The overall energy in the room today is focused and busy and consistent with[...]session] five' (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session six).

I watched the intergenerational collaboration unfold. Joe was already joining in with the art projects, and Gerry was interacting with the students to provide information for the sculptures. Without any input from me to start the session, the retirees and students were fully engaged in the material and social elements these social practices.

The intergenerational connections continued between the same retirees and students as last session. However, the retirees also worked with other student groups during this session. Joe became confident enough to work on the art projects with another group as an equal member within the artistic practice.

Joe has based himself at a different table from [Bill's] group and while Joe works consistently on building alongside them, he is less involved in the chat at the table. He is hard at work making precise railroad ties, measuring each one carefully with a popsicle stick. Joe is interacting less verbally with these kids, but happily ensconced in his railway ties' (Claire Carolyn, written reflections session five).

This new found confidence in clay building afforded Joe the opportunity to work with another group and establish himself as having equal group status within the artistic practice. The relationship building with this group was being established through artistic collaboration, rather than dialogue. The connection between Bill and Joe however is still evident as "occasionally Bill will wander over to show Joe something or see what he is building. This continues throughout the morning" as Bill is "noticeably observing the action at [this] other table from a distance" (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session six).

My role as art teacher at this time was to let these relationships and collaborative efforts unfold, and to mostly ensure everyone had their supplies, offering more clay if needed, providing tooth picks to support the clay structures and anything else the groups requested as I alternated between them. I saw my role as typical for a visual art teacher at this point, with the exception of focusing on the intergenerational interaction. As Eisner (2002) states, an art teachers "relationship to the students is[...]supportive" as the teacher "moves about" the art room "providing individual attention" (p. 73), in this case for both the

students and retirees as interactive group participants. The intergenerational interaction was leading the art work and pivotal to the artistic learning.

As art teacher, my role was to support what was driving the learning. My teaching thinking and actions required flexible purposing (Eisner (2002)) with sensitivity toward this intergenerational interaction as it unfolded. Basically enabling the intergenerational interaction and artistic collaboration to go unhindered, as this was what was driving the artistic learning opportunities. I was careful to not intervene in any of the conversations or the artistic practice. As noted by Eisner (2002), an art teacher's "relationship to the students", in this case the intergenerational interaction, "is skilled, sensitive and supportive" (p. 73). I left the entire process for the art projects to the intergenerational collaborations in support of the children's and older adults' collective experiences with both the material and social elements of this session. These collective experiences formed what Overgaard (1985) describes as "involv[ing] shared ways of behaving or acting" to support "community [needs] to accomplish certain purposes" (p. iii) in this case communicating through clay sculpture shared knowledge of past work experiences on the waterfront forty to fifty years ago, acquired through the oral history telling.

Heydon (2013) outlines five key elements for establishing effective intergenerational programming. The third of which was evident in Gerry's "explicit instructions" that he provided the students for the sculptures, and in the "modelling" (p. 28). Joe also provided a model for Gerry showing him how to join in with the clay building. This session also provided a fourth element of "sustained opportunities to work on the project and to draw on fellow participants for support" (p. 28).

At this point, Gerry appears to be engaged in taking the role of teacher, in providing direct instruction to the students for accuracy, and leading them through the 'editing' cognitive process of 'representation' (Eisner 2002). My role as art teacher was in observing this interaction between Gerry, Joe and the students, in recognizing the different ways they embraced their interactive role as equal participants within the social practices. It was in reading Claire Carolan's written reflections that I was able to recognize the extent to which Gerry had taken on the role of teacher.

Gerry is busy working the room, and continues to maintain a more authoritative relationship with the kids, checking their models for accuracy and stepping in with suggestions where he thinks improvements can be made (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session six).

Despite having participated in the clay building with the twins last session, Gerry is still removed from the experience of artistic practice. He is engaged in the social practices through his instructional interaction. Gerry even said to Joe at a later time, “imagine us teaching, never thought we'd see that”. According to Claire Carolan's written reflections for this session, “Gerry is still reluctant to sit with the kids and work with the clay”. Gerry does appear to be considerate toward participating with all the students as Claire Carolan noted. “He distributes his time equally among the five groups of children, stopping to ask questions or just observe them work for a little while” (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session six). He exhibits confidence in the relationships built last session between him and the twins; he still appears to be most comfortable interacting with them. This is possibly due to the reciprocal relationship that emerged last session. Also the “length of time to establish relationships” (Friedman 1997, as cited in Heydon, 2013, p. 24) that has occurred between Gerry and the twins may be a contributing factor. Claire noted that he mostly gravitated to the twins, and was interested in what they are doing. This indicated a stronger attachment than with other groups.

Gerry[...]seems particularly interested in the twins who have created their project on the computer and are now mounting printed copies of their computer renderings on the poster board and labelling them. Gerry sat to talk with them about the process they went through to create the images on the computer and he tells them he is impressed. (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session six)

Toward the end of this session Gerry made a surprising move, instead of walking around the room and standing watching as he instructs, he sat down with a group of students other than the twins and began to participate in the clay building with them.

Gerry relaxed and became more actively engaged with the children and sat down at the table with them, rather than standing to talk to them. At this point[...]he began to build alongside the group of girls working together. The girls asked Gerry for input into their [clay] model and rather than referring to one of the picture books on hand, Gerry took a piece of the clay and shaped what the girls had asked about (Claire Carolyn, written reflections, session six).

This indicated for Gerry a correlation between the continued intergenerational interaction with the groups of students and the artistic learning opportunities. He had possibly needed more time than Joe. Jarrott (2007) states the intergenerational “contact needs to be voluntary” emphasizing “some[...]seniors” may “need time to acclimate to the intergenerational setting” (p. 6). Gerry became open to the artistic experience learning alongside the students in the clay building, and was able to jump in as Joe had done. “Experience is central to growth because experience is the medium of education” (Eisner, 2002, p. 3). He participated in the 'inscribing' and 'editing' cognitive stages of 'representation' (Eisner, 2002) through the clay building, rather than through instructing the students. He continued to provide this “curricular[...]component (p.105)” (Friedman, 1997, as cited in Heydon, 2013, p. 24) in editing as detailed information for accuracy, but also now engaged with the students as an equal participant within the artistic practice.

This interaction and artistic collaboration generated its own momentum. As the art teacher, my role became intertwined within this dynamic. I listened and learned from both generations to their ideas and their dialogue. I acted as host to make sure everyone had their supplies. I made note of what everyone was planning in preparation for what I should provide for the next session. In this role, I improvised in each moment for what the social practices required of me. The retirees and students collaborated together in artistic learning opportunities. The retirees continued their oral history telling through this sessions' interaction with the students for the common purpose of creating accuracy within the clay sculptures. The artistic collaborations were beginning to take shape in telling these stories of work experiences on the waterfront forty or fifty years ago. “Indeed[...] the arts provide a kind of permission to pursue qualitative experience in a particularly focused way” (Eisner, 2002, p. 4-5). These renderings were evolving as shared stories of the retirees' personal work experiences combined with the students' imagination for what it would have been like. “Imagination enables us to try things out”, it is when “permission is provided to explore[...]the conditions for awakening to the world around us”, it is “in this sense the arts provide a way of knowing” (Eisner, 2002, p. 4). Eisner (2002) claims what is, “needed if the products of our imagination are to make a social contribution to our culture[...]is representation[...]. Representation stabilizes the idea or image in a material and makes possible a dialogue with it” (p. 5-6). The clay sculptures began to generate this dialogue of their own accord; inherent within the activity. “In the process of working with

the material” the voice of the art work is “bestowed by the work on its maker” through which “the work itself secures its own voice and helps set the direction” (Eisner, 2002, p. 7). The sculptures were telling a story of a life conveyed to the students which had created vivid imagery in their “mind’s eye” (Eisner, 2002, p. 5) of working life on the waterfront. As the sculptures took shape, I too participated as a witness to this transformation. As Eisner (2002) states, “imagination fed by the sensory features of experience is expressed in the arts through the image” (p. 4).

I again took a moment to watch as I had at the beginning of this session. This was a rewarding experience in noticing how in tune the retirees and students were with each other as they both worked together toward their common goals through the clay sculptures. I looked across the room as it was busy with artistic collaboration and intergenerational interaction to “self-reflect” on my “teaching” (Eisner, 2002, p. 56) role as participant within these social practices. My focus switched in this moment from observing the intergenerational artistic collaborations to thinking about my “teaching as a form of personal research” (Eisner, 2002, p. 56). I too felt in tune with this intergenerational social 'milieu' (Eisner 2002) as an observer, and yet equal participant, not an outsider. Eisner (2002) claims, “the teacher's” task “is to be tuned in well enough to make the right decisions about when, how much and how” (p. 73) to interact. For the teacher to be tuned in requires an attentiveness acquired through flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) driving teacher thinking, responses and actions for the needs of the teaching situation.

For further data, I began taking photographs of the students and retirees working together. As teacher-researcher this enabled me to focus on specific moments, and also later reflect on them. I experienced through observing, taking photographs and being supportive as an equal member of this community sharing the same purpose “grown out of” the “common needs” of this “community to accomplish certain purposes” (Overgaard, 1984, p. iii). My perception of this as a socially interactive learning community led my research toward viewing my teaching within this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. This new perspective had evolved in real time teaching through reflection in and on action, enhanced by communication with other researchers, and refined through reflexive analysis.

I saw my role as a visual arts educator-researcher within this intergenerational social practice as a creative process in itself. I applied Eisner's (2002) definition of cognitive functions of 'representation', as those of 'inscription', 'editing', and 'communication' to my thinking, responses and action within of my teaching role implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. 'Inscription' was in the planning and implementation of the program sessions. 'Editing' was experienced through reflective practice, applying reflection in and on action, reflective narrative, and discussions with collaborating researchers. The 'communication' was my refined efforts upon reflection applied to the teaching moments, and my reflexive analysis in writing this thesis. 'Representation' as visual artist-educator-researcher engaged in reflective practice occurred throughout implementing this intergenerational arts program viewed as a social practice, and within this thesis. Further 'communication' and 'representation' occurred through displays and presentations.

The artistic learning opportunities for this session emerged through and within the intergenerational interaction and relationship building as the two generations engaged in artistic collaboration, working toward a common goal. Inherent in activities were intergenerational artistic learning opportunities afforded "through their project experiences" in "critical thinking, communication and decision-making skills" (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 226). Gerry helped the students to apply artistic accuracy, generating dialogue and learning opportunities between him and the students, then jumped into the artistic practice. Joe engaged in artistic practice applying techniques in clay building with the students. The intergenerational interaction continued through the dialogue, but also through the artistic collaborations. I observed the retirees and the students working together toward creating and communicating a newly shared experience. Intergenerational learning opportunities emerged through this collaboration, "in communicating through the art of negotiation" (p. 226). As previously stated through Eisner's (2002) claim that, "the teacher's" task "is to be tuned in well enough" the teacher can then learn with equal groups status alongside the students and retirees in support of the social practices for effectively implementing an IG arts program.

### **3.1.6. Session Seven Homelearners: Working on Arts Projects/ Imagining the Future**

The analysis for this session looks at the significance in the 'off topic' conversations within the intergenerational interaction to the intergenerational relationship building, and how this influenced my role and experience as the teacher implementing this session. This session took place in the art room at the Homelearners Centre. The two retirees attending were Gerry and Joe. The collaborating researchers were Dr. O'Neill as supervisor, and Claire Carolan as research assistant filming the session.

The intergenerational interactions in this session included many 'off topic' conversations unrelated to the projects' topic of work on the waterfront. The students and retirees discussed topics together of interest to them ranging from political to personal. Brabazon and Disch (1997) noted this effect where "formal interviews became dialogues which ultimately became conversations about issues and ideas which concerned both young and old" (p. 147). The extent of relationship building through the artistic collaboration was evident in these conversations in this session between the students and retirees. They appeared well in tune with one another as they discussed a variety of issues. They demonstrated a respect for each other's opinions, as though an extension of their acceptance in each other's contributions to the program goals. They had shared an understanding in respecting each other's contributions supported by "sustained opportunities" (Haydon, 2013, p. 28) to collaborate and interact. The intergenerational interaction led this session even more so than the previous session. My role as art teacher implementing this session remained as an active observer in support of the intergenerational interaction, offering techniques and supplies in support of the clay building when requested. There was one addition, introducing the next step in the planned activity for drawing a possible imagined future waterfront. I noted the following in my reflective narrative writing for this session.

This session had already begun early, as I observed from a distance outside the classroom for the first ten minutes or so; the students and retirees were fully engaged in working together creating the projects. I had not yet actually started the class and no one was yet present from SFU. I then walked in quietly, careful to not disturb the dynamics. Both Joe and Gerry were helping to build the sculptures and advising the students on accuracy; the students listened attentively. The retirees were now

introducing suggestions, taking a lead role and fully participating in the creation of the sculptures, yet still enabling the students to direct the decisions as they welcomed this input.

This was rewarding to watch, like the moment standing back to see your art work in need of no more additions from you, and at that moment feels complete. This beginning set the stage for the rest of the session being run by the retirees and the students themselves. I noted in my reflective narrative writings for this session a point at which I did participate as art teacher in making an editing suggestion.

I made a suggestion about a clay building one group had made; I first consulted Joe and the students for specific details. Another group had made a large scale ship which was difficult to support structurally; it kept collapsing, and didn't match the scale of the rest of the sculpture. The students decided to make a new ship more appropriately scaled, despite mine and Gerry's efforts to give suggestions to make it work. It was important to keep the ownership with the students and let them make the final decision. However, I encouraged the group to salvage what they had already made, but they did not want to. Gerry suggested to me, "Let's see what they come up with". This was a time for me to be responsive to the students' wishes and Gerry's willingness to let the students decide, and to become an invisible observer.

Claire Carolan had also noted in her written reflections, in reference to the beginning of this session, about the strong commitment from the retirees and the students; both had arrived early despite the poor weather conditions. This indicated their commitment to the program and to each other in working toward their shared goals.

The weather today was miserable, very snowy and wet[...]which was great because it allowed for the children, Joe and Gerry to get underway a few minutes ahead of me arriving with the camera. Sue also, [but] purposefully, stayed out of the class for the first ten minutes or so allowing things to get underway without direction and giving us a chance to see what would happen without us there to direct. Wonderful things happened. The kids came in, got their projects out and began to work on them. Joe and Gerry came into the class and immediately began to interact with the kids without Sue suggesting a starting place for them. Joe was hard at work sitting with the same group as last week, but doing double duty. He would build something and put it on the model belonging to this group and then turn around to another student, [named Mary for this research] and build something for them. Gerry was back to the girls group, which had been joined by the twins and was actively adding small touches to their model. Gerry[...]became more involved in the building of the model that the girls were working on. There was a good deal of collaboration going on with him

and the three girls, and discussions about the best ways to finish the model (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session seven).



**Photo 3.2 Gerry working with this group of three girls on the clay sculpture.**

As the session went on, Joe worked mostly with Mary. She had taken on a big task by herself, and Joe decided to help her for the rest of the session. After conversations in previous sessions and shared collaboration in this session, they were fully in tune within the clay building together. Mary became completely absorbed in building the clay structure with Joe; both were immersed in the activity, interacting through the material elements of the social practices. There was not much conversation, yet they were both interacting in synchronicity toward their common goal of building a tugboat. Each knew what the other was doing, and it seemed they were anticipating what the other needed. They would pass each other pieces of clay without speaking. Joe commented at a later time, indicating the relationship that had built through the giant clay tug boat, “she insisted it be huge, it took up the entire board, but that’s what she wanted”.

Throughout this session, the intergenerational partners were engaged in “editing[...]a crucial aspect of the creative process, a way of removing the rough edges from one’s work” (Eisner, 2002, p. 6). Each played their role of equal value, collaborating in applying the finishing details to the art works. According to Eisner, “it is in the process of editing that transitions are made graceful, colours harmonized, intensities modulated, and, indeed, seasoning to suit the palette adjusted” (p. 6). I was invited to play a role in this editing process when the students and Joe asked me about representing a metal look for the building they were creating with the clay.

I presented different ways they could simulate the look of metal for the walls. Joe and the students worked together, incorporating the different ideas to create the desired effect and the result was agreed upon by the students and Joe.

My role fluctuated in this session between silent observer and technical advisor when requested. In this last capacity of teacher role, it was essential to support the intergenerational interaction as leading any discussion, decision, or artistic application. The retirees and students trusted one another at this point in their collaboration. My interactions within them needed to be initiated by the students and retirees in order to respect this trust that had developed. This was the editing stage in which final decisions were being made. It was important I didn't influence this process as they asked my advice. It was each other's strengths they needed to rely on for this to remain intergenerational collaboration. “When carefully conceived and implemented, intergenerational programming can[...]incorporat[e] the special qualities and strengths that the generations can give one another” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 111).

My role in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) required a flexible sensitivity toward this delicate balance for how I responded to their request for technical advice. I needed to make sure I responded with a variety of possible suggestions. This left the decision-making, and application to the retirees and students. My role was then to immediately step back again and observe so not to influence the editing choices any further. Reflecting on this balance had become my teaching norm implementing this intergenerational arts program.

The two generations shared ideas, expertise, provided empathy and support toward each other as they enthusiastically worked toward completing their common goals. The students had invited the retirees into a way of communicating that they had not experienced before, after both stating in session five that they were “not good at that sort of thing”. The retirees were able to incorporate their expertise for the accuracy of the sculptures through the editing process. In doing so they shared in the role of art teacher in “advancing[...] students’ ability to see what has been done and to consider alternatives,[...] and to assist in the development of necessary technical skills” (Eisner, 2002, p. 73). The retirees, students and I, each shared in the teaching role, we shared as equal participants with our distinct roles, engaged in the social practices of the collective experiences within the material and social elements. As art teacher immersed within the equal group status, I too became part of this “form of activity that ha[d] grown out of” the “common needs in” this intergenerational “community to accomplish certain purposes” (Overgaard, 1985, p. iii). The social practices effectively drove this session, and my role.

During this session, I invited the students and retirees to join in an activity in addition to the art projects. I asked if they could imagine they were future city planners or architects designing future uses for the waterfront. I hoped to further inspire the students and encourage the retirees to expand their learning “to engage in that process” of artistic practice in which “perception is refined, imagination stimulated” and “judgment fostered” (Eisner, 2002, p. 14). I directed this part of the session for a few minutes toward an appreciation for having learned about the past waterfront use, and after seeing its current use, what could it look like in 40 or 50 years from now?” I provided drawing supplies and paper for their designs of future waterfront scenes. The students worked independently on these drawings. The intergenerational interaction made this collaborative as they talked about possibilities, but the drawing was an individual activity and not collaborative. This I think temporarily separated the generations in their focus, only united at this point through a shared requirement set-up by me. Some students embraced this task with detail. A few students chose to not participate, and Gerry also declined. Claire Carolan noted the intergenerational interactions in her reflections for this session that occurred during this activity.

There was a very short, but great exchange between Joe and one of the students on the benefits that monkey bars would bring to the waterfront;

both agreed it would be a good addition (Claire Carolyn, Written Reflections, session seven).

Gerry commented to one of the students who also declined “My Dad thought I was more useful working in the yard than making art.” He was reluctant to participate in the drawing activity, yet had made great strides in his willingness to work with the clay. He spoke with two of the students, whom immediately shared a moment of empathy with him, as they too did not want to draw images for a possible future waterfront. Claire Carolyn noted in her written reflections for this session that,

Mary and her friend declined to draw[...]saying that they were not good at it. Gerry asked them why they did not want to draw, and then agreed with them that drawing is harder than making things with modelling clay (Claire Carolan, written reflections, session seven).

It was important for me as the teacher to leave the decision to participate or not to the students and retirees. Jarrott (2007) states the intergenerational “contact needs to be voluntary” emphasizing “some children and seniors” may “need time to acclimate to the intergenerational setting” (p. 6), and in this case it seemed to be the change in art medium that made some students and Gerry feel uncomfortable. According to Heydon, (2013) within the “intergenerational arts class,[...]teachers” need to “model” a sense “of comfort” (p. 41-2). This interaction was interesting in that it was relationship building of a sort, in the form of empathy for each other’s response to the activity. At this point I saw the interaction for relationship building as being more important to the social practices for continued intergenerational learning opportunities, than the completion of the drawing. Also, voluntary participation was critical to maintaining a sense of equal group status within this intergenerational community. Overgaard (1985) claims teaching to be a “purposive activity”, with “reasons for actions” (p. 16) as the rationale behind them. My role then became an active role in ‘purposive’ thinking focused on the intergenerational interaction, not so much the art activity. The interaction was the collaborative aspect, the drawing was an individual activity and therefore not as relevant it seemed.

These conversations also contributed to the 'off-topic' conversations. The generations learned more about each other and discovered a sense of “intergenerational solidarity” (Jarrott, 2007, p. 6) through their shared experience in response to the drawing

activity. Clay had now become the comfortable intergenerational artistic medium. Gerry responded to this drawing activity in the same way he initially responded to the clay building. Possibly more time, as Jarrott states, to adjust to the change in art medium might have been what he needed, and possibly the students too. The students may have been more interested in focusing on their clay sculptures at this point. This drawing activity about the future waterfront was open to interpretation, yet was directed by me as the teacher and as a result a change in my role up to this point. Also I asked the participants to stop their artistic collaborations which were their common goals. While this activity was related to the program's topic, it may not have seemed as relevant to the participants at the time. They wanted to continue working on their clay projects. They were doing this drawing for me, because I had asked them in the typical teacher role. This activity was not therefore led by the intergenerational interaction. This could have contributed to some participants declining. Heydon and O'Neill (2014) found a correlation between interest and participation when implementing intergenerational programs.

The interaction for relationship building took precedence over the planned activity. It was important for the role of "teacher modelling" to be in support of "elective participation" for the students, retirees and I, to all "coalesce" within the social practices "to provide participants with" continued "learning and relationship-building" (Heydon, 2013, p. 41-2) opportunities. My teaching role in support of the intergenerational interaction within the social practices was what enabled my participation with equal group status. Equal group status had an impact on the effectiveness of relationship building. The acquired equal group status for the students, retirees and I, was critical to the social practices that had been established and were emerging, and relied on providing choice of engagement for all participants. Jarrott (2007) states that in order to be effective, 'non-familial' intergenerational programs, such as this one, require voluntary participation, and promotion of equal group status.

During my observations throughout this session and previous sessions, with the exception of session 4, I noticed how inclusive the intergenerational interaction and intergenerational learning was for everyone as equal participants, with the exception of the future imagined drawing activity. Not only for the retirees, but also for all the students, no matter their abilities, according to Heydon, and O'Neill (2014), intergenerational

learning “promotes knowledge, equity and inclusiveness where each participant regardless of age or ability, has something to contribute and to gain” (p. 7). All students were fully able to acquire equal group status within the social practices of this intergenerational arts program.

The intergenerational relationships had developed in this session beyond interacting for the purposes of creating the art projects to those of “building a community of common interests” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 111). The intergenerational interactions in this session included many 'off topic' conversations unrelated to the project's topic of work on the waterfront. The students and retirees discussed topics together of interest to them ranging from political to personal. Brabazon and Disch noted this effect where “formal interviews became dialogues which ultimately became conversations about issues and ideas which concerned both young and old” (p. 147). The extent of relationship building through the artistic collaboration with the clay projects was evident in these conversations. The students and retirees appeared well in tune with one another as they discussed a variety of issues. They demonstrated a respect for one another's opinions as an extension of their acceptance in each other's contributions throughout this program's activities. They had shared in an understanding of their common goals and in respecting each other's contributions supported by “sustained opportunities” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28) to collaborate and interact. Brabazon and Disch (1997) state that within intergenerational programs, participants can “expand each other's understanding of real societal problems and reconceptualise how they view their own role as “citizens”” (p. 212). This form of collaboration seemed to occur in the same way they had shared as equal partners in the art projects, the inquiry and oral history telling; each valuing the others' contributions. This collaborative approach and acceptance of each other had carried through to sharing information about their different perspectives due to their ages, and lived experience. Claire Carolan noted these conversations in her reflective narrative writing for this session.

Today was the day that there were more conversations about things unrelated to the waterfront project. Gerry and the twins had an in-depth conversation about global warming in which Gerry was arguing that the problems of people causing pollution and bad situations is not new and the twins arguing that the newer generations were to blame and should be responsible to clean it all up. There was a conversation about the weekly temper tantrum of a younger child that can be overheard in the hallway

outside the classroom and how the girls think it should be handled (Clair Carolyn, Written Reflections, session seven).

Conversations emerged between the generations out of interest in each other. The students developed curiosity toward the current lives of Joe and Gerry, and inquired about Joe and Gerry's observations of them, as though this was a continuation of the waterfront inquiries.

There was quite a large group discussion with Joe, Gerry and the two groups [that] Joe was working with, about Joe's bruised fingernail, how it occurred, strange places and ways to get bruised. It turned out that it happened while Joe was helping his son, upon which, [Mary] offered to the rest of the group that it is his birthday next week. I saw Joe, [Mary] and[...]another student] having a chat about Joe's Leatherman (multi-purpose tool). Joe has been using his Leatherman for a couple of weeks to cut and shape the clay and today the girls asked him about it. One by one he opened up all the gadgets inside the Leatherman. He handed it to them to let them feel the weight of it. The girls handed it back and asked Joe where he got it and he told them it was a gift from his son. The girls then began to question him about his son and his family and Joe shared with them that next week is his grandson's birthday (Claire Carolyn, Written Reflections, session seven).

After learning about these 'off topic' conversations in discussion with Claire, I began to further realize their relevancy within a social learning environment. After this session had ended Claire discussed with me the conversations she had observed during this session between the retirees and the students. It was at this point I realised, as the teacher busy coordinating everything from providing art supplies to observing what was needed from me as technical advisor or silent participant that I actually didn't get to listen to everything as much as I had thought. I was listening for what was needed of my role, focused on my response to it. I had actually missed quite a bit of the interaction. This revealed to me the value in collaborative research. I learned from Claire, the students were very inquisitive toward the retirees, asking questions about Joe's grandson and what he was giving his grandson for his birthday next week. I commented that it is usually these moments that get suppressed in the classroom, due to them being viewed as disruptive and 'off topic'. Yet ironically it was these very conversations that were being researched by Claire. I realized these types of conversations enabled the skipped generations to make connections with each other and establish a rapport that afforded the collaboration required for such a project as this. There was definitely now a strong connection between

the retirees and the students, they were comfortable with each other and did not need me to generate any interaction.

This understanding revealed to me the importance of relationships in education and my role as teacher within these relationships as an adaptive one and advocate for them. Looking at “teaching as a form of personal research” (Eisner, 2002), p. 56) and in recognising the importance of dialogue in learning, I realized my role was to let these connections evolve and not suppress or redirect these conversations because they appear to be ‘off topic’. They actually enrich the social learning opportunities, as they add to the relationship building. They contribute to a collaborative environment and help to build the intergenerational relationships and intergenerational learning opportunities. Claire Carolyn commented in her written reflections for this session on her perspective of our discussion. It was significant as part of my reflective practice for me to read her perspective of this discussion for my recognition and understanding of the change in my teaching approach.

Sue and I had a chance to chat again after everyone had left. We shared what we had observed today. Sue was telling me that the way we are observing this project rather than just focusing on the models or what is being produced has informed the way that she is approaching all of her classes now. She is seeing the benefit in the emerging curriculum, giving it all room to grow and develop organically and she feels that the experience for her as a teacher is far more enriching when she gives the children’s individual personalities and stories a chance to come out. She agrees that to the outsider it may appear chaotic and lacking order, but that the outcomes are far richer than she had thought they could be (Claire Carolyn, Written Reflections, session seven).

This was a transformative session for my understanding of viewing the classroom as a social learning environment in which the dynamics between the participants provide rich learning experiences through social interaction. This understanding enhanced my appreciation as a learner and listener within the art classroom. This new perspective enabled me to better ‘reflect in action’ as a teacher responding to and intuitively improvising through reflective practice with what is needed in the moment when teaching within a social practice. In implementing this intergenerational arts program, the art classroom had become an experience for me rather, than a road map, in teaching in real time. Through a process of reflective practice as teacher-researcher, beginning with an intuitive curiosity towards developing awareness for the influence of teaching norms that

informed my theoretical understanding. I learned to applying theory to practice and vice-versa for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice.

### **3.1.7. Session Eight Homelearners: Display Day**

The analysis for this session looks at the significance of the display day to the social practices and the common goals and in connection to my role as teacher. Both Gerry and Joe attended this session. Dr. O'Neill interviewed the students, filmed by Claire Carolan. The retirees were interviewed later by Claire Carolan. These interviews are analyzed for evidence in support of the social practices, intergenerational learning opportunities and relationship building, and the teacher's role. The display took place in the art room at the Homelearners Centre.

My role for this session was in setting up the display preparations allowing time for the interviews to be conducted and the sculptures to be finished. Dr. O'Neill conducted the exit interviews with the student groups, while the retirees and students focused on completing the last editing touches of their representations. Eisner (2002) states "editing" is "directly related to a third cognitive function of representation" that of "communication" (p. 6) for an audience, as the room was buzzing with excitement and the business of getting the preparations complete. I placed the tables along the edges of the room to display the work with space for the students to sit behind to answer questions. This arrangement was designed for the visitors to easily view all the art projects. The aim was to engineer a physical proximity (Heydon, 2013) between the artwork, the students and the visitors, as well as the retirees, to encourage engagement and social interaction in keeping with the social practices for this program. In designing this display set-up as teacher, it was important to consider a comfort level (Heydon, 2013) for the program participants and the guests in order to encourage the interaction. I also attached the drawings and written work on the future waterfront, and placed the twins computer print outs and their drawings of cargo onto posters and pinned them onto the walls for viewing. When this work was all presented together it was apparent that most of the groups had conveyed a similar theme; transporting cargo on the ships and what that cargo was. This

theme was reflective of many conversations between the retirees and the students that had occurred in the earlier sessions, and also in the student's exit interviews.

The photographs I had taken of the students working with the retirees throughout the projects' sessions were placed beside the artwork aimed to show the process and progress of the project. The futuristic drawings, the photographs taken by the students at the waterfront, and the information explaining the larger partnership '(Re)Claiming the New Westminster Waterfront' research project were displayed. The photograph of the past and present comparison taken at the waterfront by Dr. O'Neill, and photographs of the students and Joe at the waterfront were included. Also included were the two large framed photographs that the retirees had brought to each session as an important component to the program sessions. Dr. Peter Hall and other members of the SFU partnership research project team set up refreshments for the visitors and the students. The interviews were finished and all the work was on display, the students took their places, the retirees were ready, I put the sign on the door, 'Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the New Westminster Waterfront: past, present and future', and invited the visitors in.

The art room quickly became a social interactive gallery space with many people viewing the sculptures, photographs, posters, drawings and information about the larger research project. Conversations immediately began between the students and the visitors viewing the work. These conversations emerged as inquiry from the guests that paralleled the student inquiry model for this intergenerational arts program. The students were eager to respond, explain their work and their experience in the program. The photographs of the students and retirees working together placed beside the sculptures served as a catalyst (Heydon, 2013) for some of this interaction. The students took on the same role as the retirees had initially in session one, waiting for questions. The room was loud and dynamic. I worked my way around the art room as art teacher immersed in the social practices as an equal participant, talking to the visitors, answering their questions, explaining this intergenerational arts program. Joe and Gerry talked to the visitors about their experiences working with the students, sharing their working history and collaborating on the art work. This interaction between the visitors, students, retirees and I, continued the oral history telling and intergenerational learning opportunities, led by the visitors' interest and inquiry, thereby continuing the social practices of this program. As Eisner

(2002) states “forms of representation are means through which the contents of consciousness are made public” (p. 8). This display of work acted as a catalyst for communication of this intergenerational arts program and past history of work on the New Westminster waterfront. According to Eisner (2002) “the transformation into a public forum, which is what representation, is designed to do, is a necessary condition for communication” (p. 6). This session met the fifth component Heydon (2013) outlines as designed for effective intergenerational programming, providing “opportunities to share the work with an audience” (p. 28). The interaction between the program participants and the visitors during this display celebration was a welcomed surprise and further led my inquiry as evidence for this intergenerational arts program being a social practice with my role as art teacher intertwined.

An analysis of the student exit interviews revealed how much the students had valued the retiree’s contributions and enjoyed working with them. In response to the questions posed by Dr. O’Neill regarding what the students thought of having the retirees involved in the project with them, one student commented, “They used to work there so they know a lot.” Another student responded with, “They were really helpful and gave us advice about what it used to look like. We had no clue before we started and when they went on the walk along the waterfront with us, they could tell us what it was like before.” The students’ level of engagement was evident in their interview responses. One student said, “It was fun working with Joe and Gerry. They know a lot more than we do because they worked there. You can ask them questions and you can’t ask questions of a book or even the internet, it isn’t easy to get answers to the questions”. These responses from the students indicated a level of appreciation having developed toward the valuable contributions the retirees had to offer in sharing their life experiences. These comments from the students paralleled what Brabazon and Disch, (1997) mention with regard to an intergenerational program, that “the students expressed how much they enjoyed talking to the seniors” (p. 160). As previously mentioned in Claire Carolan’s reflections for session three, “they [the students] are[...]comfortable asking whatever comes to their minds.” According to Walsh (2010), in “the definition of talking and listening” we should “include aspects such as collaborating, investigating, negotiating, enacting, connecting’ and ‘interacting”” (p. 223). These aspects Walsh lists were incorporated into the social practices for this intergenerational arts program, and were revealed through the students’

exit interview responses. For the interview with group one, Dr. O'Neill asked, "So can you tell me what it was like working with Joe and Gerry? What were they like to work with in class?" One student replied with,

"Well, I think having Joe and Gerry there really helped because we would have had it totally non-realistic if we didn't have them there. We would have had it like there would be the dock here and that house wouldn't be there at all, we would just have buildings that wouldn't be like that back then and we wouldn't have had the ship just here and then the dock here and[...]it would be a shambles if somebody else came in who had worked there and would be, this isn't right that wouldn't be there."

This student is referring to wanting to convey accuracy for the visitors viewing the display. This reveals how much the students had appreciated the information provided by Joe and Gerry. Dr. O'Neill asked, "So you wanted to keep it realistic?" The student replied, "As realistic as we could." The students valued the accuracy with which they were able to create the sculptures with the retirees help. It was important to the students that they depicted what it was actually like as close as they were able to from the information Joe and Gerry gave them. The value the students placed on the information provided by the retirees, reveals a respect from the students for the retirees' life stories. Their desire to convey the oral histories accurately indicated a respect and thoughtfulness in the relationship building the students had developed for Joe and Gerry and their working history, not just for the clay sculptures. Dr. O'Neill asked, "Did they actually help you create anything on your project?" Another student replied, "Joe helped us build the railway and the wood bricks that we made[...]and he helped us make the building and he helped us with a little bit of the dock."

For the interview with group two, Dr. O'Neill said, "I was going to ask you how it was having Joe and Gerry come into your class." Bill replied, "Good! It was really good to have them there to help us out and give us some good ideas." A second student replied, "Yes, it was really fun." Dr. O'Neill then said, "Tell me some of the ideas they gave you." A third student stated, "Well they told us about the different types of materials that they would transport like the lumber and the lead." Dr. O'Neill then asked, "So how did they help you? Was there a part of your project that they helped you with?" Bill replied stating, "Joe did help us make some of the bollards." Another student said, "And one also attached the boat. And also told us what the radioactive ball would look like, so basically a ball

covered in some stuff.” Another student added, “And helped us with the water.” Dr. O’Neill then asked, “So do you think the project that you created came out of being able to work with them in particular?” All three students replied together: “Yes.”

These responses from the students indicated to me as teacher-researcher implementing this IG arts program the value in enabling the intergenerational interaction to drive the learning opportunities. The students' comments also reinforced my developing perspective for teaching as a social practice and learning through dialogue. The intergenerational interaction and collaboration that was conveyed through the students' responses demonstrated the relationship building that had evolved within the social practices as having enhanced their learning opportunities. Their responses also revealed the two generations as having equal group status within the social practices. This was conveyed through how much the students valued the retirees' contributions, and how much it seemed they had felt their inquiries were welcomed by the retirees.

An analysis of the retiree's exit interview responses to working with the students on the projects reflected a quality they valued in the experience connecting with the students. Joe stated after the project had finished, “We were impressed by how fast they learned the information, and how keen they were. It was easy to relate to the students. It was easy to work with them”. Gerry responded with, “I've enjoyed all sessions, the kids were excellent. I find it all interesting and entertaining. It was quite a lot of fun.”

Joe commented,

“Well, I guess they're getting a sense of what went on fifty years ago, you know as much as kids will get that I guess. I guess they'll get that, and they got to compare, like I thought it was neat when we looked at the pictures of back then and what there is now when we were down on the dock.”

These comments from the students and the retirees suggest “how intergenerational programs” have benefits for both generations, especially with the elders “finding great pleasure in contributing to the growth of[...]children” (Brabazon & Disch, p. 158-159). The benefits to the younger generation are summed up by one of the students saying in her exit interview with Dr. O’Neill, “They were so helpful and we would not know half as much without them here. I will miss them”. By “incorporating the special qualities

and strengths that the generations can give to one another[...]intergenerational programs are[...]intentionally created or planned efforts to link generations for the purpose of benefiting the participants, their institutions, and the community at large” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 111). My role as teacher was to “link” the two “generations for the purposes of benefiting the participants” toward their common goals. The social practices needed to be in support of this “link” for the effectiveness of this as an intergenerational arts program. The thread of equal group status was the link throughout the social practices and the interconnectedness within them, which included my role as teacher. The concept of equal group status as discussed in this research analysis draws from Jarrott (2007) as a “condition to mean each participant has something to contribute to and something to gain from the contact setting” (p. 5). Jarrott discusses equal group status as an important ingredient for intergenerational programs to be effective. Brabazon and Disch (1997) refer to the benefits in intergenerational programs for the connections between the skipped generations being “egalitarian” (p. 187) in the way knowledge is exchanged and community relations are built.

### **3.2. Elementary School**

This second elementary IG arts program followed the same program model as the first homelearners intergenerational arts program, but consisted of ten sessions instead of eight. The addition of two extra sessions at the beginning, were planned by me to provide an extended orientation for the students. Each session was one hour and 45 minutes long. These sessions were thirty minutes longer than the homelearners program sessions. The elementary program goals and curriculum content followed the homelearners program model. The goals were sharing life histories through student inquiry and retirees' oral history telling, intergenerational interaction, intergenerational artistic collaborations and intergenerational relationship building geared toward intergenerational learning and intergenerational artistic learning opportunities. The program sessions began with the orientation, introductions with the students interviewing the retirees, learning through oral history telling. This was followed by the waterfront visit, then the review day of the waterfront visit. After which the artistic collaborations between

the students and the retirees began and continued for several sessions until the last session, including drawing of the future waterfront. The last session was the display day.

Due to the larger class size of 24 students compared with 20 for the homelearners program, we had planned for three retirees. These three retirees committed to attend each session with the exception of one retiree missing one session only. No new additional retirees attended any session. This was planned in order to avoid the disconnect that happened between the students and the retirees in session four, of the review day in the homelearners program. The retirees' commitment for the second program hoped to ensure "quality" within the intergenerational "contact setting" (Jarrott, 2007, p. 4). Drawing on the literature from Jarrott (2007), Heydon (2013), and Heydon and O'Neill (2014), this quality of intergenerational contact is discussed in this analysis as it influences the teachers' role in effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program. This research examines the teacher's role as intertwined within the intergenerational contact for its effectiveness.

Dr. O'Neill collaborated as research project supervisor, and Rose Dyer filmed the sessions as youth researcher. As part of my reflective practice incorporating collaborating researchers' perspectives, I was able to include discussions with O'Neill, and access Rose Dyer's written reflections. Also, Dr. Peter Hall attended a couple of sessions; I was able to include his discussions with me, and his participation into my reflective practice. This program took place in an elementary school classroom setting with another teacher's class. This program was implemented in collaboration with this teacher, Mr. Sol, whose perspective I also had access to for my reflective practice.

After examining implementing the first intergenerational arts program as a social practice, and my role as teacher within this, I examined the decisions I had made for the second program in connection to the first program. The research analysis for the second program is focused on the similarities and differences to the first program with regard to the factors of setting, age of students, consistency in, and familiarity for the retirees, the program planning, and the teacher's role within the social practices and the interconnectedness of these factors.

The setting for the second intergenerational arts program was an elementary school classroom in New Westminster, as opposed to the art room at the Homelearners Centre in New Westminster for the first program. These students had all chosen to participate in this research through their parents' consent. This program took place during their regular school day. The students were two to three years younger than in the homelearners program, who were in grades five and six. In this second program, the students were in grades three and four.

The change in setting and age of the students are looked at for the influence on the decisions I made as teacher implementing this second program. The implementation of the program and the social practices are examined in relation to the factors of the setting, age of the students, the consistency of the retirees, and their familiarity in the program for how these factors influenced my role, and my actions. Slight alterations in program planning were made due to these factors and are examined for my reasons as part of the teacher's role for implementing them. These alterations are examined for their impact and effectiveness for what I intended. The alterations consisted of two extra sessions added at the beginning of the program without the retirees in account of the students' younger age, and their lack of access to, and experience in art activities. Also only one interview session prior to visiting the waterfront was planned, due to the sessions being longer in this second program, and also the possibility that two interview sessions may not be needed, and the extended orientation time for the students. This allowed for one more session on the arts projects than in the homelearners program, which I thought might be needed for the reasons mentioned. I also did not plan for a separate introduction session due it not being needed. The surprise in the intergenerational interaction that happened in the homelearners program as soon as the retirees were introduced with their large framed photographs made the interviews begin right away.

This analysis has looked at my role as teacher implementing this second program for how this intergenerational arts program transfers from my art room at the Homelearners Centre to a different setting in an elementary school classroom with another teacher collaborating. In examining my role as teacher in relation to the change in setting, age of students, and this impact on the social practices, this analysis looks at similarities in the intergenerational interaction and relationship building and the differences in the

retirees' confidence with the artistic practice, and my teaching actions. A variety of art media was incorporated and offered to the students. These different mediums are examined for their impact on my role as teacher and on the social practices. Through reflexive examination of my research as the art teacher implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice, I hope to forge new ground and further understanding of the social practices that underpin effective intergenerational arts programs, and the art educator's role within these social practices.

### **3.2.1. Sessions One Elementary School: Introduction**

This session was an orientation for the students before meeting the retirees. Rose Dyer as youth researcher filmed this session. The analysis for this session looks at the decisions made in planning and implementing that were a slight variation from the homelearners program. I discuss the reasons for the changes I had made for this first session in connection to the change in context, age of the students and the addition of various art media. I look at these factors in connection to the teacher's role in establishing the social practices for the effectiveness implementing this session as the first of this second intergenerational arts program.

This was a larger group of students, accommodated by having three retirees attending each intergenerational session. Mr. Sol's contributions indicted the increased level of organization required in the teachers' role due to the larger class size, the younger students and the change in context. With this not being an art room, working with art materials and art activities were not the norm. The program followed the same model, curriculum, and goals, and also included the same retirees, Joe and Gerry, with the addition of Brian who was new to the program. The alterations made to this program included an extended introduction throughout this session. The students in this program were two to three years younger than in the homelearners program. This orientation session provided a more in depth explanation of the program goals, and established it as an arts program, and gave the students time to get to know me. Overgaard (1985) claims teaching to be a "purposive activity", with "reasons for actions" (p. 16) as the rationale behind them. The teaching action in this case was in extending my role as teacher directing the orientation for this first session of this elementary program before the

students met the retirees. I thought the students would need more scaffolding in preparation for the social practices before the program began, due to their younger age and school context of a regular classroom rather than an art room. As Overgaard (1985) points out the social practices make up the context for the rational in teaching approach and norms. According to Eisner (2002), “the teacher negotiates a delicate relationship” within his definition of forces that influence the art room, in this case the elementary classroom, which include “prompts, cues and scaffolding” in support of “constraints and affordances provided by[...]the activities and the materials with which” the participants “work” (p. 71). The context would need to be made appropriate for the social practices for this intergenerational arts program.

In establishing this as an arts program, I presented the clay sculptures to the students from the homelearners program. The students really enjoyed looking at these clay sculptures. They commented that there were no people, and wanted to know if the work had been dangerous. They asked me, “Did anyone ever get hurt? I said “Yes”, and explained the retirees will be here to answer their questions. My answer needed to be brief in order to establish this as an intergenerational program in which the learning occurred through the intergenerational interaction. Yet I did not want to discourage their curiosity, as they appeared to be quite interested. This did have the effect of holding back the students' inquiry for another session when the retirees attended, to wait for answers. The students understood the need to ask the retirees for the correct answers. If I answered their questions, I would have discredited the social practices I was aiming to establish. For my reflective practice incorporating collaborating researchers, I noted Rose had also commented on this in her written observations stating,

how genuinely interested they seemed, with questions ready right away; questions like what a retiree even is, and if anyone had been injured on the job. Overall I was very impressed with the positive vibe in the classroom and thought the class seemed excited to do their own art projects on this topic (Rose Dyer, written reflections, session one, elementary program).

I spoke with the students as I had in the introductory part of the homelearners first program session about the retirees being interested in what they, the students, wanted to know and would *wait* for their questions. It could possibly been better for the retirees to have been present when these questions arose to capitalize on this interest as it first

emerged for spontaneity in the intergenerational interaction and learning opportunities. On reflection, this session could be seen as leading the direction for the students' focus, and in fact setting the stage for the program in more ways than I had considered. The students' inquiry throughout the programs' ten sessions often focused on how dangerous the work was, and by the end of the program, the art projects reflected this and included many injured workers.

The students had a variety of art media to choose from rather than just clay as in the homelearners program. The choices ranged from mask making, posters, iPad comic book, iPad puppet show, wire sculpture, canvas painting, to clay sculpture. These choices were added to expand on the variety of art medium for the social practices. The majority of students preferred to use clay, but all the different art media were distributed and applied to the student groups based on choice and organized by Mr. Sol. The students enjoyed learning about the different types of art medium they could use. I explained the faces of the masks could be expressive to help tell a story as puppets, or for a skit they could perform, or they could use wire figurines. Mr. Sol demonstrated the two iPad options, a comic book and a puppet show, on the Smart board.

From Mr. Sol's perspective as the teacher for his class implementing this program with me, he commented on the benefits to his students. He told me he appreciated the different elements this project brings to the classroom, such as learning about the history of work on the water front, working with and sharing information with an older generation and the opportunity to communicate through the arts. Mr. Sol explained that he was happy to have the project done in his class, it brought in valuable content and good use of time, and the students didn't get many opportunities to work with art materials. This session ended when the school bell rang. Mr. Sol extended the social practices, as their teacher helping to implement this program, by asking the students to think about what they had learned and talked about this afternoon, and to share this with someone after school.

My intention for this session was to establish this project as an artistic endeavour, and to give the students a brief introduction to the variety of art materials they could access, and the different approaches to using each medium. All these elements, in

combination with their unanswered questions inspired their curiosity for more, as evident in their enthusiastic approach toward future sessions.

### **3.2.2. Session Two Elementary School: Preparation for Interviewing Retirees**

The analysis for this session looks at the teacher's role in preparing the students as an extended orientation ready for interviewing the retirees next session. The intent was to have the students prepare their questions for the retirees, as there would be a two week break before the next session interviewing the retirees due to the school calendar, and their teacher Mr. Sol would be absent for the next session. This extra scaffolding was aimed at strengthening the social practices once the retirees joined in for the following session. This analysis looks at the responses from the students to the activities for this session as preparation for interviewing the retirees, and discusses the value in this second orientation session prior to meeting the retirees for the effectiveness implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice.

When I had first arrived at the school for this session, I was met by a student who said, "Oh yes, we are doing that again!" I was also approached by the principle who informed me of the positive feedback he had received about the project, and also by Mr. Sol who said the students were quite excited about it all. The first session had made an impression on the students who were already keen to proceed. This second session hoped to build on this enthusiasm, designed in preparation for the students interviewing the retirees, but seemed a bit disconnected from the project goals in the sense that the retirees were not there. However, the questions could not develop into a dialogue right away. The students' questions were met with "Let's wait to hear what the retiree's say". This did build up anticipation. Documenting the questions during this session in preparation for interviewing the retirees next session, gave this session its purpose for the students. Rose Dyer documented in her written observations for this session that once "again, I found the students involved and enthusiastic, all seeming very excited about this project".

I offered the students a questionnaire intended to gather information and direct the students' focus toward the topic of past work on the waterfront and help develop their

questions. I asked them to draw a scene and describe what they thought work on the waterfront might have looked like. The students initially perceived this as though it was a test, which was possibly a norm for them. Rose Dyer made note of this in her written observations, stating that while some students “glowed with the opportunity to impress[...]others visibly sank”. Reflecting in action, noticing this reluctance, I explained I was gathering research material about whatever their interpretation of work on the waterfront maybe, just as they will be gathering research when they interview the retirees in preparation for the art projects. In Rose Dyer’s written observations she commented, “upon learning there were no right or wrong answers, the atmosphere of the whole class lightened, as it became a fun activity”. Reflecting on action drew my attention to the students’ responses as an artistic learning opportunity in flexible thinking that Eisner (2002) states the arts afford. Eisner presents many lessons learned by engaging in the arts. He claims artistic learning develops an understanding that there are many perspectives and possibilities, with many solutions and answers to a variety of questions and problems that can emerge. Eisner believes through working in the arts, we learn there is no one fixed way. In developing this understanding, we learn to manoeuvre through decisions that result in “good judgments about qualitative relationships” (Eisner, 2002, p. 70-92). According to Eisner, the arts provide unique experiences through which our emotional capacities are revealed as we learn to communicate through an artistic language what we feel in response to works of art, and in creating works of art. This artistic learning opportunity offering many possibilities as an approach to this questionnaire made this activity and this session worthwhile for the students. The students perceiving this an artistic endeavour through which their interpretations become collaborative and unique representations of many variations on the theme of work on the waterfront validated this activity. Through reflective practice, reflecting on action the response to this activity drew me to the belief that I had made a good decision in leading this second session for preparing the students for the material and social elements that make up the social practices for effective implementation of this intergenerational arts program. As discussed by Overgaard (1985), “the kind of thinking and behaviour that is encouraged” by the teacher’s responses and actions determines the norms for the social practice the students engage in.

The pictures they drew as part of this questionnaire had the benefit of leading to some of the students asking questions about the work done on the waterfront. As Eisner (2002) claims, art affords us opportunities to open our minds to many different ways of thinking, communicating and interpreting and in this case questioning. For example, one student had drawn small boxes piled up really high to the top of the page. When I asked him about his drawing, he asked me if they were really piled up that high. I replied with, "I don't know, that would be a good question to ask the retirees." I then took this opportunity to speak with the whole class explaining how the pictures they had drawn can help them think of questions to ask the retirees. Mr. Sol typed them up to show on the large screen. I then handed out a sheet for the students to write down the questions they would like to ask the retirees that interested them. Because there would be two weeks before the next session, due to the school calendar, I thought it best the students write down all the questions they could think of, ready for when we meet the retirees. The students had many questions such as, "How many different jobs were there?" "How long did you work?" "Did only boys work at the waterfront?" "Did a girl ever dress up as a boy to work on the waterfront?" They mostly wanted to know if anyone was hurt or died, if they fell in the water, and if the loads were heavy to carry. I told the students as they ask the retirees questions, the answers they receive may generate more questions and answers, so that it will become a conversation.

After further review of the questionnaires, I noticed how many students wrote they were looking forward to learning about the waterfront and working on the art projects. They seemed eager to write their questions down. Some students even thrived at the opportunity to write down their own ideas. I thanked the students at the end for all their hard work and for helping me with my research, and reminded them that when we next meet in two weeks everyone will get to ask the retirees all their questions, as they are very much interested in answering them.

With this two week gap to consider in the planning for this elementary intergenerational arts program, minimal impact to the intergenerational connections was the priority. This meant the following sessions would not be interrupted by the school schedule. Also these two sessions did establish a focus for the students for the topic of work on the waterfront as an arts activity and learning through the intergenerational

interaction. All this ground work established the start of the social practices for implementing this intergenerational arts program, with the students ready and waiting to interview the retirees. It is debatable as to whether these students being so much younger would have been as focused without this advance time for their orientation. Also to compound this complication, Mr. Sol would be absent for the next session when the students were to interview the retirees. These two orientation sessions potentially entrenched the program goals more than one session alone might have accomplished for these students. However, without these mentioned complications in the school calendar and the absence of the regular teacher for the interview session, I would have combine these two sessions into one and include the retirees into the activities for the second session. This idea would have likely afforded a more spontaneous start to the intergenerational interaction in a similar way to the start of the homelearners program.

### **3.2.3. Session Three Elementary School: Meeting and Interviewing Retirees**

This session's analysis looks at the connection between the intergenerational interaction and the teacher's role within the social practices. This session brought the students and the retirees together for the first time after two orientation sessions preparing the students, who were two to three years younger than the students in the homelearners program. Three retirees attended, Joe and Gerry from the homelearners program and Dave. This was Dave's first session. All three retirees had planned to attend all the sessions for this program, with the exception of Dave missing session five. Planning the retirees' attendance ahead helped to prevent the disconnection between the students and retirees that occurred during the homelearners programs' fourth session. Dr. O'Neill attended as research supervisor, and youth researcher Rose Dyer filmed the session. Mr. Sol, their regular teacher was not present for this session; there was a replacement teacher. For part of this session there was also a Special Education Assistant present.

I entered the classroom with Joe, Gerry, Brian, Dr. O'Neill, and Rose Dyer. Joe, Gerry and Brain sat together at the back of the room. I stood at the front of the room and led the introductions. I introduced this session by mentioning that this program was connected to a larger research project led by Dr. Peter Hall that was featured in the local

newspaper that week, as I held up an example. The students looked at me like a deer caught in headlights which made me act out of concern for their response. The students wanted me to take the lead with the first question. I did not think this through, other than to quickly move on to the students questions. I asked a quick question, then asked who would like to ask next. Several students raised their hands. The retirees looked to me for whose question they should answer first. I then signalled the students taking turns asking their questions as they held up their hands. I hoped to encourage them to feel comfortable speaking, guided by me.

Their questions were read from their lists written during the last session, which they were keen to ask. There was intergenerational interaction, but it felt staged. The questions were asked from a predetermined list, and were not conversation style, but rather occurred in order of who I signalled to next. The students were curious, and asked many questions to which the retirees gave short, direct answers. "Were boys the only people that worked on the waterfront?" "Yes, the work was very heavy." "How heavy was the cargo?" "Sometimes a hundred pounds" "Did any girls dress up as boys and work on the waterfront?" "No." "Were there any siblings?" "Yes, many." Joe, Gerry and Brian took turns giving factual information as the students asked one at a time on my signal. "With the ships, how many would you get in a day?" "Eight." "Did you have to use cranes if the loads were really heavy?" "They used booms to pick up the big cargo loads." "Did any boxes fall on your feet?" "Yes" "Did people break bones?" "There were lots of broken bones." "Did anybody get frost bite?" "Yes." The array of questions continued. "Where were they taking the loads to?" "All over the world" "What were the loads usually of?" "Lumber, wine, cheese, apples, canned beef, animals, olive oil." "How many people usually worked on one load?" "Four people carried one load." "How many cars did they load?" "About three thousand cars." "Were there any pigeons that bugged you?" "Seagulls bothered us." "Did you have any port-a-potties?" "Nothing on the ships, and not many on the dock." "How many cars did they load?" "About three thousand cars." "How old could you be when you retire?" "In your 60's." "How old were you when you started working there?" "17." "How much did you make?" "Started at 79 cents, then two dollars in 1960, now they get thirty-four dollars an hour."

The retiree's answers were then written down by the students for their research, which slightly stunted the flow of interaction. However, this information did provide me with an opportunity to further support the intergenerational interaction and learning for a later session. Waiting for my signal also had the effect of interrupting the flow of the dialogue. It seemed meaningful connections between the generations were not necessarily being made even though the information was flowing. I was leading too much. I mediated between the generations. Rose Dyer described this in her written reflections as "like watching intergenerational ping-pong" with me in the middle. After half an hour of questions and answers, I remember looking at the clock and wondering if I would be able to keep the momentum going for another hour. Reviewing my reflective narrative writing revealed when the momentum begins to change after

Dr. O'Neill walked to the front of the room and mentioned she had heard a story about a cat on one of the ships, and asked the retirees to tell this story. As Joe began the mood changed, Joe and Gerry began to laugh as they told the story, and the students became more relaxed and intrigued to know more.

The focus shifted from waiting to ask the next question and documenting the next answer, to interacting with the retirees in a meaningful way through conversation. The interaction became more conversational with the retirees sharing as oral history tellers rather than answering an array of questions. These stories continued as Brian talked about the car shipments they used to get. The retirees talked about the accidents on the dock. All three retirees were discussing the lack of workers compensation, and what that meant, including responses from Dr. O'Neill and the Special Education Assistant (S.E.A.) who was present for part of the session. Dr. O'Neill asked, "I think you also handled some dangerous goods[...]what was that?" "Uranium, asbestos." Dr. O'Neill then asked, "What did you like most about working?" "Working when you want to, working outside, not when it's raining." All three retirees gave detailed explanations and stories as the interaction evolved. Brian then asked "Do any of you guys want to be longshoremen?"

As with the homelearners program during this interview session, the students began to exhibit interest in the retirees themselves after learning about how dangerous their work had been. The retirees then shared the stories of someone who died while at work after a student asked, "Did anybody drown?" "One person drowned, Ivor Sanregret,

he fell into the river. People fell in all the time when loading logs, sometimes you could not survive, even from the logs. They had to swim to get out of the water.” The students were intrigued and wanted to know more details. One student asked, “If you couldn’t see the guy drown, then how do you know he drowned?” Joe responded by describing waiting for the guy to emerge, knowing he couldn’t stay in the water that long. The students’ curiosity turned to empathy. “Did any of you guys help each other?” “People would help you if you were about to drown. People would drown if you didn’t get help, even from the logs.” “Did any of you get hurt?” “Sometimes” “Did you get compensation?” “No.” “Did any ships sink?” “No, ships could not sink because they were near the rivers.”

At this point the students and retirees were no longer “passive” listeners’ to each other’s questions and answers, they became partners sharing “an active role in the creation of the narratives and in the themes they would eventually” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 147) incorporate into art projects together. Brabazon and Disch (1997) state in reference to intergenerational programs, the value in sharing life stories for bringing split generations together claiming, “sharing of stories bonds people and brings them into a common reality, an experience that is never lost” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 148). Dr. O’Neill pointed out to me later that it’s about the stories. Sharing in life stories was a large part of the social practices for this intergenerational arts program. I commented on this exchange of stories in my reflective narrative writing, and on my participation at this point as an equal member of these social practices rather than as a leader. It was through the oral history telling, with storytelling as the social practice that I was then able to establish my role as having equal group status with the students, learning with them, not leading them. Some students then reciprocated with their own stories. I wrote in my narrative reflections,

I then asked about other animals, knowing there would be a monkey story with which the students were transfixed. The exchange of information shifted again as one student then told a story about a worker he knew of whom had been injured and was sent to hospital. The exchange was now more interactive and less formal, more about conversational storytelling and less a question and answer game.

I participated when relevant, such as joining in with the retirees’ conversation when they began explaining what the flags on the ships represented, what they were used for,

and which flag colour represented which country. As the teacher, within this discussion I recognized a future intergenerational learning opportunity that I could support for a later session in connection to the wall size map in the room.

The mood in the room had changed through the stories especially as one student started sharing his own story about a friend of his fathers who had been injured at work. "During this process the students not only listened to the stories, but in fact collaborated with the retirees in their creations" (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 147). I wrote in my narrative reflections how this change in communication impacted my experience as teacher implementing this session.

I was surprised to see the time go by so quickly after the atmosphere was more relaxed. There was laughter and curiosity over the stories, particularly for the fate of the cat. Before the session had finished, there was even some off topic conversation about school between one student, Gerry and Joe, and two students talked about a movie they had seen.

These off topic conversations also included "Joe chatting with some students about schooling hours after the session had ended", as recorded by Rose Dyer. This 'off topic' conversation about schooling also occurred at the end of the homelearners interview session between the retirees and a couple of students. The connection between the students and the retirees had begun more formally in this interview session than in the interview session for the homelearners program. The communication between the retirees in this session was initiated through me, whereas in the first session of the homelearners program this interaction was initiated between the two generations with the large photographs as a catalyst. The two large photographs were brought to this session too, but didn't seem to have the same impact, possibly due to their physical proximity to the retirees and the students. I had placed the photographs at the front of the room for all the students to see. The retirees sat toward the back of the room, off to one side, which physically situated them less visible to the students, and separate from the large framed photographs. There was some interaction connected to these photographs however, as Joe explained the first job before loading the ship.

Gerry commented that it had been a long time since he had stepped in an actual school, indicating a slight discomfort. Also, this was Brian's first session. There was an

uncertainty for the students in missing their teacher and not knowing any of the adults in the room except me, whom they had only met twice before. Rose Dyer commented on this in her written observations, stating that in “the absence of their normal teacher and the presence of so many new faces really ‘clammed’ everyone up.” There was an issue of discomfort to be addressed for both generations at the start of this session which could have contributed to the restricted flow of intergenerational interaction. Jarrott (2007) states the intergenerational “contact needs to be voluntary” emphasizing “some children and seniors” may “need time to acclimate to the intergenerational setting” (p. 6). In discussing effectively implementing intergenerational programs, this analysis looks at the teacher’s role for developing professional knowledge (Schön, 1983) sensitive toward the intergenerational interaction in establishing the participants’ comfort level that Heydon (2013) suggests is required. In my attempt to address this issue in the moment, I adopted the familiar role of the teacher possibly because I too was unsure in the moment, having not thought this through ahead of time. I stood at the front of the room, although slightly off to the left, as a somewhat familiar face they could look to for support. The students could all see me in front of them as they faced me sitting at their desks arranged as the norm, in a semi-circle with one straight row at the front. The replacement teacher sat quietly at the side of the room. Reflecting on action, this formal physical setting would have likely contributed and set the stage for me mediating and leading the intergenerational interaction. This arrangement possibly inhibited the social interaction being initiated directly between the students and the retirees. When referring to different intergenerational classes, Heydon (2013) states, “there were informal and formal starts to classes, which were key in supporting the relational aspects of communication” (p. 92). This was a more formal setting created by the situation, my teaching responses, and the physical proximity. Heydon (2013) claims physical proximity to be an important factor in establishing a comfort level for participants to engage in intergenerational interaction. Had the physical setting been altered through seating arrangements which fostered an equal presence for all participants instead of the teacher standing at the front, this session might have begun with more effective communication between the two generations. However, in the absence of their teacher, I thought the students seemed a bit lost and so I chose to direct the interaction. This seemed to go on for longer than I had hoped and was not sure how to break the students’ dependency on me for who would ask their question next.

Rose Dyer also thought that the formality in the room affected the intergenerational interaction. She captured this impact and the changes that followed in her written reflections as the interaction became less formal once the sharing of knowledge occurred through stories. Continuing my reflective practice in examining collaborating researchers' observations, Rose Dyer's reflections offered a perspective that served to both confirm my reasons for my actions, and also inform my teaching practice by showing me the sequence of events resulting from teaching actions.

This has been the most formally presented session so far, and I think the students really felt that as well. The absence of their normal teacher and the presence of so many new faces really 'clammed' everyone up. When the question and answer session started, it was like a generational different language they all spoke. They spoke the same words, but with different vibes and inflections, which would change the tone of the conversation; it was really interesting, like intergenerational ping-pong. At first, it seemed everyone was a bit apprehensive about this, but once the stories started flowing, it felt like all generations eased up. It was wonderful to witness the students' excitement, and the retirees desire to share melt that barrier away. By the end of the session, I saw a couple of 'off topic' conversations sprout up due to how comfortable some students had become with the retirees, which was a perfect cherry on top to the whole interaction of the session (Rose Dyer, written reflections, session three, elementary program).

The social practices that I applied at the start were not necessarily part of this program, but my impression of the norm for a school classroom context with the teacher in support of the students as leading them through an activity. Overgaard (1985) describes these norms as unspoken, but carrying authority which direct our teacher actions as "teachers" we "invoke such norms in justifying" our "practice" (p. 145). A change in action requires another social practice to be consciously established and followed. I needed to trust in the social practices for this intergenerational arts program. By trusting, I needed to wait to see what happened despite the students' apparent look of concern, rather than take the lead. Had I begun with the first question as a request for a story, or changed the seating arrangement into three smaller groups each with a retiree this could have generated more free flowing interaction right away. The questions being prepared ahead could have contributed to this session's interaction as seemingly staged until those questions had been passed over for spontaneous stories. Also, the two orientation

sessions with me leading as teacher could have contributed, rather than the social practice of the intergenerational interaction leading the sessions.

#### **3.2.4. Session Four Elementary School: Waterfront Visit**

The analysis for this session looks at the intergenerational interaction and intergenerational connections with regard to the notion of equal group status, in connection to the teacher's role, and the familiarity of the retirees with this activity. Comparisons are made to the homelearners program waterfront visit. All three retirees, Joe, Gerry and Brian attended this session. The collaborating researchers who attended were Dr. O'Neill as research project supervisor, and Rose Dyer as youth researcher who filmed the session.

This session began at the school in the usual classroom. Mr. Sol organised the student groups with their designated adult supervisor. The adult supervisors were Mr. Sol, his replacement teacher, me and several parents. Joe, Gerry and Brian were also included in this role, but shared groups of students to equally distribute the intergenerational contact. Mr. Sol was still on leave and had donated his time for this session. His role as teacher organising this sessions' transportation, parent volunteers and student groups made this field-trip work. The students also seemed much more comfortable with Mr. Sol present, and were happy to see him again.

This waterfront visit required a great deal more planning as a school field-trip than was needed for the students at the Homelearners Centre. All that was needed for the homelearners program was to ask the parents and students to meet at the waterfront. This significantly influenced the teacher's role in leading this field-trip for the responsibility and planning. This aspect meant the teacher was essentially leading the start of this session, especially for the transportation of the students and organizing the groups with supervisors. It was a beautiful sunny day as we left the school for the 45 minute journey by bus and sky train to the waterfront. We walked the ten minutes to the bus with great enthusiasm and excitement. There were many cross-generational conversations between the students, retirees, parents and teachers.

During this session, there were some moments of connection between the students and the retirees that would not have occurred in the same way in a classroom setting. I noted in my reflective narrative writing that,

the retirees took on the role of looking after the students as well as sharing information with them. While on route to the waterfront, Gerry interacted with a couple of boys helping to keep them in check. The boys responded by listening and following his request to stay with the group and not be distracted by the advertisement nearby. Gerry felt a concern for the boys. While on the sky train, Joe interacted with the students giving them information about what they were looking at, and what they were about to see as the train passed alongside the waterfront.

Mr. Sol commented on how quickly the students had accepted the retirees. He had not been there for the interview session, and so this was the first time he had seen his students interact with them. He admitted at the end of the program that he had been concerned about how the students would accept the retirees. He was surprised, he had not expected such a connection, and so quickly.

After arriving at the waterfront cameras were issued, one per group, as well as the same laminated old photographs used in the homelearners program for lining up with current landmarks. Once at the waterfront, a sense of equal group status took over with the students and retirees leading the direction, the adult supervisors, teachers and researchers joined in as they followed along with their groups.



**Photo 3.3** Photo of Joe and the students walking at the waterfront with Joe answering their questions.

The group of students walking with Joe immediately engaged in conversation with him, interested in what he had to say. Joe had attended the homelearners waterfront visit and was familiar with this session's activities. He was the most interactive with the students, while Gerry and Brian waited for the students to approach them and often talked to each other. I often approached Gerry and Brian's groups to see what interested them, and played a slightly more leadership role in these moments due to their being less intergenerational interaction. Gerry would wait patiently with his group of students while they explored what they were interested in, and took photographs. Gerry asked the students "Are you learning anything?" Brian and Gerry looked at the photographs of the past waterfront with the students. Brian and Joe talked about the waterfront, and about the pictures. Brian answered a few questions from his group, but mostly relied on Joe to chat with the students.

The students' focus led this session which gave it a sense of equal group status. The students mostly interacted with Joe regardless of whose group they were in, which could have been a result of his familiarity with this activity. Joe led this waterfront visit as he had with the homelearners waterfront visit. Gerry and Brian were happy to let Joe take this lead. Joe led us through this waterfront walk with his stories and answers to the students' questions, focused on what interested them, and as with the previous session, it seemed these stories bridged the generation gap. According to Rose Dyer's observations,

the students first started off in their groups and followed the retiree they were match up with, though it didn't take long for the students to flock to the retiree who told the most stories about the waterfront. When the students were approached by one of the retirees and asked if they had a question, they rarely replied. Though when one of the retirees started telling a story, [which tended to be Joe], the students would quickly give their attention and then asked questions once the story had finished (Rose Dyer, written reflections, session four, elementary program).

Joe walked alongside the waterfront continually chatting with the students about the past waterfront scene. Joe used the pictures to explain details about the past waterfront to the group of students. One student replied, "You remember a lot of stuff." Joe then explained about two of the ships that were in the photograph. At the students' request, he even explained how ripples in the sand are made. I held up a photograph from the past for all the students to see, accompanied by an explanation from Joe. A parent held up another old photograph to refer to while Joe explained the details about the trains that used to run there. One student asked, "Did you get hit by a train sometimes?" Joe replied, "Nope. Don't want to get hit by a train, you only do that once." The students even called Joe to see a stingray they thought they had seen. Joe also talked with some of the parents too, and also Mr. Sol, not just the students.

Mr. Sol and the replacement teacher followed along with their groups, participating based on the interest initiated by the students. Mr. Sol asked students what they thought a ship from the past would be like if it were at the waterfront today. He also explained dredging to the students. Mr. Sol and I held up photographs of the past in line with the present view for students to take pictures. Dr. O'Neill also took a photograph of the visual comparison, and of the group before we all left the waterfront. We were all learning how

to participate together within the social practices for intergenerational collaboration as equal partners.

My role as teacher was the same as with the homelearners program waterfront visit, as listener and learner alongside the students, sharing in holding up the old laminated photographs against the current scene for past and present comparison. This led to more intergenerational interaction between Joe and the students as he elaborated on what use to be there. After some time, the students dispersed from their assigned groups, except for whom they shared a camera with, and joined their friends. They mostly ended up gathering as a larger group focused on Joe's stories and the bollards. The bollards had also been of interest to the homelearners program students.

There was a distinct connection forming between Joe and the students as had occurred during the homelearners waterfront visit. This was evident in my reflective narrative writing observing Joe's interactions with the students noting this was his second waterfront visit.

Joe was more aware of what to say to the students, he was more comfortable interacting with them. One of the students in Joe's group asked Joe to help him fasten his jacket, conveying a moment of trust and care between the two. After an hour[...]the students were still very involved in the event, looking at the surroundings, listening to Joe, taking photographs, learning about the bollards (My reflective narrative writing, session four, elementary program).

Joe definitely played a more dynamic role than the other two retirees in sharing knowledge with the students and interacting with them. He had learned from the first project what to expect and how to engage with the students through their inquiry. The students were learning from his experience through the engagement in a meaningful way that captured the mutual interests of both Joe and the students. Joe's interest was in passing on his knowledge and stories, and the students' interest was in learning through his perspective. According to Heydon and O'Neill (2014), "a program that resourced participants' interests and funds of knowledge might help[...]make learning meaningful and engaging to people of skipped generation" (p. 5). This relationship building and knowledge sharing through the intergenerational interaction between Joe and the students was reinforcing the social practices, and accomplishing the program goals for this

intergenerational arts program. In effect, Joe took on the teacher role for this session, yet carried this out through the student inquiry accomplishing a sense of equal group status.

For effectively implementing this session as part of an intergenerational program, the waterfront walk served as the 'catalyst for that day's project that could induce conversation and activate schema related to the subject matter (Heydon, 2013, p. 28). Joe's knowledge sharing became the curriculum for this session providing meaningful intergenerational interaction and intergenerational learning opportunities. In support of the goals and social practices for this intergenerational arts program, Joe played a key role for "having one's funds of knowledge form the basis of curricula[...]provid[ing]" for the participants "a means of affirming "richness of lives" and "invit[ing] recognition of [students'] interests" (Heydon & O'Neill, 2014, p. 5). This role Joe played also formed the basis for the sense of equal group status. All I had to do as the teacher was join in as an equal participant with Joe as the lead story teller, led by the students' interests. Joe's contributions to the effectiveness in the catalyst (Heydon, 2013) provides "what Eisner (2005) calls the *enacted curriculum*" for "what actually gets "played out" (p. 147) in teaching and learning situation[s] in real time" (Heydon & O'Neill, 2014, p. 4) and directly impacted my role as teacher. I became a listener, learning in the moment connecting with the students' as an equal partner, with sensitivity in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) towards Joe's stories, and knowledge sharing. I improvised in my role as participant, acting on decisions "made within a context that emphasized the social nature of" the intergenerational "communication" (Heydon, 2013, p. 91). As the moments arose in response to Joe's conversations, Mr. Sol and I both held up the laminated photographs of the past in line with the present scenery for students to take pictures documenting this direct comparison between past and present. The bringing together of this visual imagery paralleled the intergenerational connection that was happening at the same time, and captured the essence of the social practices for this intergenerational arts program.



**Photo 3.4** Joe explaining to the students what used to be at the waterfront up ahead as they walked together.

### **3.2.5. Session Five: Elementary School Review Day**

This analysis looks at the teacher's role implementing this session in support of the intergenerational interaction and connections, and the intergenerational learning opportunities compared to the review day for the homelearners program. The notion of equal group status and the participants' comfort level within the activities is discussed for how this influences the effectiveness in implementing this session. Joe, Gerry and Brian all participated in this review session. Rose Dyer as youth researcher filmed the session. Mr. Sol was absent; and a replacement teacher was present.

For this second program, the retirees were asked to make sure they attended both the waterfront and the review sessions. The review session for the homelearners program had been a difficult one to support intergenerational connections. This was thought to be a result of Joe's absence at the review session after being the only retiree for the waterfront visit. The two retirees attending the homelearners program review session did

not attend the waterfront visit. Also, the review session for the homelearners program had been structured as a class reviewing all the individual students' photographs taken and put on slides. For this elementary program review session, small group interaction for viewing the photographs taken with a group shared camera, aimed to encourage intergenerational connections. The photographs the students had taken at the waterfront served as a 'catalyst' for group discussion of the waterfront visit. The retirees were with the same groups as the waterfront visit to encourage continued relationship building. The students immediately began talking with the retirees about the photographs. I circulated around the room, as an art teacher does (Eisner, 2002) encouraging each group in their discussion by inquiring what the students had found interesting. One student was very interested in the details of the boats. Another group really liked seeing pictures of themselves sitting on the red bollards. A student remembered holding up an old photograph and lining it up with the bridge in the background.



**Photo 3.5** Taken as the student lined up this old photograph of the ship and the Pattullo Bridge with the current Pattullo Bridge in the background for a past and present comparison.

One student had taken a picture of an apartment building, when asked why she replied, "because that was where the office building used to be where they had to go to get paid". I shared a book published by the Vancouver Longshoreman's' union, titled 'Man Along the Shore', to help generate more questions and conversation. One group asked Gerry about the coal in the pictures in the book, and what it was used for. They learned it was mostly used to generate fuel for the ships. One student saw an old photograph of some men who sat posed for the picture, and asked Gerry which one he was. Gerry told the students it was not him,

"these were the men who went to jail for protesting on behalf of the workers because the government thought they should work on a bank holiday. The workers raised the money to get them out of jail. All the workers thought the government was wrong."

The student commented, "That's stupid." Gerry replied, "Well that's what we thought, the government didn't think so." The students from Gerry's group continued asking him questions about the pictures in the book.

Joe talked with his group about their photographs. Brian was recorded in conversation with a student from his group about their photographs saying, "You know what the tug boats do don't you?" To which the student replied, "They tug boats." Brian continued talking with his group about their photographs, and which were their favourites. Gerry continued talking with his group about their photographs, and Joe was explaining something about one of the large framed photographs to his group. Two students giggled and talked about the photographs they took of the bollards, calling them, "these red mushroom like things". One student asked to rearrange the order of the photographs in the sleeve I had put them in, to better represent what she had intended to take a picture of. She was very interested in the details of the boats. I participated with the different group conversations as an equal member, sensitive in flexible purposing toward the intergenerational interaction, as we all shared our impressions of the waterfront visit. I asked students why they chose to take particular photographs and what interested them. I looked around the room, there were many conversations taking place. The retirees, students and I were fully involved in these conversations as partners with equal group status. The intergenerational interaction was far more successful in this review session than had been in the review session for the homelearners program. The consistency of

the retirees and small group discussions of the groups' photographs seemed to hugely contribute to the effectiveness of this session's intergenerational interaction. This activity was led by the intergenerational interaction.

Gerry asked to address the class in explaining some information about one of the large photographs, and the cargo shown being unloaded. Gerry addressed the class twice during this session, and took on a teaching role. He was comfortable addressing the whole group. He expressed his surprise at how impressed he was with himself and Joe in "educating school kids" as he put it. This was a surprise to me also at the time, but on deeper reflection however of the homelearners program sessions narrative reflections, he had actually taken on this role during the homelearners program too, in educating the students for the accuracy for the art projects, but had not extended this to addressing the whole class before. This indicated a comfort level for Gerry having developed for operating within the social practices, through the intergenerational connecting, relationship building and learning opportunities within this program and school context.

There was even some off-topic conversation recorded between Gerry and the students as he continued talking with his group about their photographs, "Do you wear your hat at the table too when you eat?" Also, Gerry showed a few students from his group where to grab people by the hair to make them go where ever you lead. "Try it on yourself don't try it on your classmates". The off-topic conversation then increased between the students, some appeared to no longer focus on the topic of the waterfront or the photographs. I asked more questions in an attempt to generate discussion, in preparation for sharing their photographs with the class. On reflection, I realized the students were relying on Joe, Gerry, and Brian to talk with them. They had reviewed everything they could think of themselves and in their words "were done". This was similar to the homelearners program second session during the small group discussions, for which I had played a leadership role in keeping things relevant for the students while they waited for a retiree to talk to. The students in both cases did not appear to see the relevance in continuing without the retirees.

For reflection in action, in teaching thinking, response and action to this moment, I expanded the small group interaction to the whole class as a teaching norm to help the

students stay focused on the topic of review. Overgaard (1985) describes these norms as unspoken, yet carrying authority, which direct our teacher actions, as “teachers” we “invoke such norms in justifying” our “practice” (p. 145). I asked each group to gather their information to share with the class their photographs, interests and plans for their projects. The groups became focused on the preparations for sharing, and one group could not agree. At a glance this group then seemed in need of teacher support, to lead them through their difficulties. When looked at a little closer, through reflective practice, listening with sensitivity in flexible purposing toward their interaction as I had with the intergenerational interaction, they were debating what to do with their differences of opinions. Within equal group status, “each collaborator brings to the work a different set of strengths and resistances[...]provid[ing] both irritation and inspiration” as “the grit for each other’s pearl making” (Nachmanovitch, 1990, p. 95).

Claire Carolan noted in her reflective narrative writing for the session seven homelearners program, in reference to my changing teaching perspective toward the social interactions as learning opportunities, “that to the outsider it may appear chaotic and lacking order, but that the outcomes are far richer than she, [I], had thought they could be.” I decided to plan for extra materials for the next session just in case this particular group needed dividing, but would leave this decision to Mr Sol who had initially organized the groups. Mr. Sol commented to me during the next session about this group, “I’m not here to sort everything out for them, they’ll work it out”. This collaborative approach for reflective practice, incorporating other educators’ and researchers’ perspectives, reminded me that group discussions can be difficult as part of the learning process. I noted however that this group had less intergenerational interaction than others, which could have contributed to their difficulties in collaborating for this situation. They had not included Joe, Gerry or Brian in their debate. This lack of intergenerational input may have added to their difficulties negotiating. The retirees did notice this group was having difficulties but did not intervene; they had not been invited by the students to join in with their dispute. By keeping their distance unless invited, Joe, Gerry and Brian maintained equal group status with this group for future collaboration.

The change in structure from small group discussions to the whole class sharing seemed to switch the emphasis for the students from the intergenerational interaction on

to their performance. On reflection, this decision for the class to share was not necessarily in support of the intergenerational interaction, as it did not seem to contribute to the intergenerational connections. Many students were hesitant to share their photographs and interests with the class, yet some embraced the opportunity. All the groups did share their photographs and information with the class, because it was the norm to complying with the teacher's request. However participation in this activity did not appear voluntary. Jarrott (2007) states the intergenerational "contact needs to be voluntary" emphasizing "some children and seniors" may "need time to acclimate to the intergenerational setting" (p. 6). In discussing effectively implementing intergenerational programs, it is pertinent that the teacher's role focus on developing professional knowledge (Schön, 1983) sensitive toward the intergenerational interaction in establishing the participants' comfort level that Jarrott (2007) and Heydon (2013) suggest is required. In my attempt to address this issue of the students' discomfort, I adopted the familiar role of the teacher supporting the students sharing with the class by holding up their photographs with them and asking them questions. Heydon (2013) states physical proximity is important for participants comfort level, standing at the front of the room may have also contributed to their discomfort.

I informed the students they had gathered their information and were ready to start the plans for the projects. This sessions' project planning included the retirees, whereas during this part of the homelearners program review session the retirees left mid-session as it did not seem relevant to them to stay. To reinforce the retirees involvement in the project planning this time, I made mention to the students that Joe, Gerry and Brian were there to join in with their project plans, ready to answer questions and help with ideas. A sense of equal group status returned as Joe, Gerry and Brian helped the students with their ideas and their documentation, including the list of materials needed. Gerry helped his group fill in their project ideas sheet. Brian was helping students from his group spell the word, 'bollard'. This support afforded intergenerational relationship building, as one student said to Joe, "Thanks for helping, I'm done."

Afterwards, I brought the students and retirees together again as a whole group to end this session providing information in an artistic form to help enhance their imaginations and provide inspiration for starting the art projects next session. I read some poems written

by a retired local resident born and raised in New Westminster, who now lived on the waterfront. She remembered the ships that arrived from all over the world and commented on how much the waterfront has changed in her poems. I also read a section from a story book about the life of a Sturgeon on the Fraser River.

In summary, the small group discussions were far more interactive than sharing as a whole class. With the focus needing to be intergenerational it worked best when Gerry addressed the whole class rather than me for a class activity. The students appeared more enthusiastic during the small group discussions, and during the group project planning time, except for when a retiree wasn't with them. This analysis as teacher-researcher has enabled me to develop an understanding toward a teaching pedagogy like that of a "connoisseurship" as "the art of appreciation[...]where someone really knows by virtue of experience and study what he or she is attending to" (Eisner, 2002, p. 57) by looking more deeply at what is actually 'played out'. In order to accomplish this Eisner (2002) states "we need to treat teaching as a form of personal research. We need to use the occasions of our performance as teachers as opportunities to learn to teach" (p. 56). Teaching as a reflective practice then becomes the teaching action in support of the social practices for the teaching situation. As the teacher acquiring equal group status, this needs recognition through reflective practice in the value of the 'off-topic' conversations and group dynamics in support of the intergenerational interaction for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program.

### **3.2.6. Session Six Elementary: Working on the Arts Projects**

The analysis for this session examines the intergenerational interactions, and artistic learning opportunities within a sense of equal group status. Within this analysis comparisons are made to the homelearners program for the role of the retirees and the students within the intergenerational reciprocity. The teacher's role is discussed in connection to the supporting the artistic collaborations within this intergenerational setting. Joe and Gerry attended this session. Brian was absent. Rose Dyer filmed this session as youth researcher. Mr. Sol helped to implement this session as teacher-collaborator. There was also a Special Education Assistant present for part of this session, and the school principal joined in toward the end.

Mr. Sol was back to the delight of the students, and helped the students organise into their groups. He worked with the students on the iPad options for the comic book and puppet theatre creations. The students had all been eagerly waiting to start the art projects since they had seen the homelearners program art project examples in session one. This high level of enthusiasm for working on the art projects was also evident within the homelearners program. The students in both programs for the start of the art projects were determined in their decisions, and were not hesitant with the art materials, even though these elementary students had not used them before. Their enthusiasm drove this session and gave the retirees direction. For this session, the retirees knew how to jump right into the artistic practice with the students. They no longer claimed they were not good art activities. Joe and Gerry brought their experience in artistic learning gained from the homelearners program to this elementary program and shared this knowledge with the students.

The “intergenerational continuity” due to the consistency of the retirees in the previous sessions contributed to meaningful learning opportunities (Heydon, 2013) and generated “the emergence of a sense of camaraderie” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 216) between the two generations. This comfort level afforded an intergenerational exchange as the students shared their own stories and interests with Joe and Gerry in a relaxed conversational manner. Both generations valued the other through their artistic collaborations and stories. Brabazon and Disch (1997) claim both generations benefit through this “collaboration process” as it unfolds “within a non-judgemental atmosphere of mutual support” (p. 213). This helps to create a sense of equal group status (Jarrott, 2007) as it “teaches the youth and the senior adults that they have something to give to society and that their views and contributions are valued” (Brabazon & Disch, 1997, p. 213) within this intergenerational community.

Joe and Gerry played a major role in helping to start the art projects by supporting the students with their decisions. Within this session, the intergenerational reciprocity was revealed through the students leading and telling the retirees what to do, and in the retirees being happy to follow their orders as they found this amusing while they helped with the art techniques. The retirees provided the students with ideas and support for what they found difficult, and the students provided enthusiasm and direction for creating the art

projects with the retirees. Gerry said when making the wire sculptures, "I'm just doing what I've been told", as though he was still working on the waterfront, just doing his job. He made three wire sculptures to represent waterfront workers. Gerry worked with the wire following instructions from the information poster and from me, as well as directions from the students. One student began making a box with clay and wire, and asked, "How big were the boxes?" Gerry unfortunately didn't hear her, possibly because he was absorbed in making the sculptures, to which she laughed waiting for him to respond. Gerry became immersed in making wire figurines as he interacted with the students about working life on the waterfront. Eisner (2002) states "the arts teach" us "to think through and within a material" (p. 70-92). Gerry revealed a sense of equal group status learning alongside the students through his willingness to jump in and work with materials he had not used before in an artistic role

In my reflective narrative writing for this session, I commented on how effective this collaboration was for intergenerational relationship building and equal group status. In reference to Gerry and the students I wrote,

He took on the role of helping them as they asked him, and was happy to be directed by them. This made for a great partnership; the two students gave him the trickiest job, making miniature men from wire, while they worked on the clay base and the ideas for a wire ship.

The students gravitated to the clay even though they had started with a different medium with the wire. The clay seemed easiest for them to work with, so they gave the wire to Gerry while they interacted with him.

Three students chose to make clay relief sculptures individually, and each expanded them into a more three dimensional sculpture. Mr. Sol gave one of these students string to use as rope to tie around the bollards in their sculpture and Joe showed the student how they would tie the rope to the bollards. The retirees didn't join in with these students' art projects other than this. Joe and Gerry mostly stayed in one place; they were kept busy with the groups they were working with. My role with these students was to make sure they had what they needed and felt included in any intergenerational interactions if they had any questions. I set up the painting area for the one student who chose to work alone on her painting of the waterfront. I helped the mask group start

working on their moulds; the students started to make masks representing the faces of the waterfront workers. I worked a lot with this group; it was a challenging medium which could have contributed to Joe and Gerry not working with them on their art project. Possibly Gerry was already busy making the wire sculptures, and maybe he preferred to sit down, as they were standing the entire session at the sink. Heydon (2013) states physical proximity is a key ingredient to intergenerational programming. There was considerable intergenerational interaction however as this group worked right beside Gerry.

Another group of students who worked on their posters did not collaborate in the artistic practice with Joe or Gerry either. They did however talk to Gerry as he worked with the wire sculpture group right beside them. They asked Gerry questions before putting something on their posters. They focused on the waterfront wildlife, and the natural inhabitants of the river, including the Sturgeon that I had read part of a story about last session. Gerry told them about the wildlife he remembered seeing.

Only having two retirees present for twenty-four students working with many different types of media, could have likely led to some students not working with the retirees on their art projects. Those students who were able to start independently with the clay, or had support from me were not necessarily who the retirees started working with. Gerry had gravitated to the wire sculpture group who asked him to make the wire men for them. Joe gravitated to the group who had difficulty working together last session. They figured out with Joe's help how they could collaborate through the clay medium. They were keen to get going with Joe in their group and plan for the large clay tug boat. Joe applied the artistic learning experience from building the large clay tug boat with Mary in the homelearners program to working with this group on another clay tug boat. They had many questions for him. Joe showed one student how to plan out their clay sculpture, and another student also used Joe's idea. Joe asked one student while he was making clay bollards for another student, "Do you want a bollard too or do you want to make your own?" The student replied, "I'll make my own." Joe worked and interacted mostly with these students for this entire session. The intergenerational interaction and collaboration emerged through the physical manipulation of the clay toward a common goal of creating a tugboat and a dock with workers, including injured ones. Joe's interaction with this group

through the artistic medium modelled a way that helped these students accept each other's contributions as equal members with equal group status.

The students noticed that Brian was absent. One student asked Joe "Where's um, Brian?" Joe replied, "Brian's in, uh, Las Vegas." The student asked, "What[...]does he play poker?" Joe replied: "I don't know what he's doing." Another student said, "I bet he won't gamble." The Special Education Assistant also commented, "What? He's missing this for Vegas?" This 'off-topic' conversation indicated a connection had formed between the students and Brian as they wondered where he was and what he was doing, in effect why he wasn't there for this session.

Mr. Sol worked with the two iPad groups in the computer room to help them get set up with the Apps for creating a puppet show and a comic book. After a short time, these groups returned asking for Joe and Gerry to join them. When Gerry and Joe returned to the classroom, Gerry said, "I feel like a news caster", indicating how much he had enjoyed participating in the activity in sharing his news story. The students had created puppets of themselves, including Joe and Gerry for their iPad puppet show focused on interviewing the retirees about their past work on the waterfront. The comic book group had incorporated a dialogue as an interview with Joe and Gerry into speech bubbles to match their caricatures of them which generated much excitement amongst the students and humour between the students and the retirees.

Throughout this session, Joe and Gerry were fully engaged in collaborating with the students, helping to problem solve around the material for what the students wanted. They capitalized on their previous experience from the homelearners program. Eisner (2002) claims when working with artistic medium that in "manipulating form, artists manipulate experience" and in doing so "transform[...] capacity to ability" which "depends on what the individual brings to the environment" (p. 20). Gerry and Joe both fully integrated themselves into the artistic practise equal to the students, and at the students' direction. The students and retirees both embraced the artistic learning opportunities in the cognitive stages of representation as inscription and editing (Eisner, 2002, p. 6) through the artistic medium. These representations that were beginning to emerge, reflected impressions the students had of the retirees past working world, combined with

what the students' imaginations had focused on. "Imagination enables us to try things out", it is when "permission is provided to explore[...]the conditions for awakening to the world around us", it is "in this sense the arts provide a way of knowing" (Eisner, 2002, p. 4).

There was a milieu (Eisner, 2002) within the room now filled with artistic collaboration and interaction. Eisner describes this milieu within the art room as incorporating the social practices, the teacher's role and the setting within an interconnected community. I continued throughout this session to move around the room, helping the mask making group, checking on each group, and handing out more clay. As the teacher-researcher, I applied reflective practice, reflecting in action, careful to not intervene in the art projects as I helped, but to give them autonomy and to let the intergenerational interaction drive the direction. I supported when requested as technical advisor for the materials. I had effectively turned this elementary school classroom into an art room, and was now in my element able to respond as a visual arts-educator through reflective practice in the role of teacher-researcher with flexible sensitivity in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) toward the intergenerational interaction.

My role as teacher for this session focused on the third component that Heydon (2013) outlines for intergenerational programming as providing "explicit instruction, modelling, and support to use the media in the project" (p. 28). I provided a variety of instructional methods, modelling the use of media, including posters with step by step instructions, examples and short group demonstrations on how to manipulate the wire to form a figurine, in applying the paint to the canvas, in laying the plaster cast strips into the face moulds for making the masks without air bubbles. Due to the variety of media used and the younger age of the students, my role was much busier in helping to get the projects started than had been for the homelearners program.

The students demonstrated pride in what they were making; they showed Mr. Sol and the principal the art projects. Mr. Sol showed the class the iPad puppet show so far which brought all the groups together as an intergenerational community sharing in a common goal. For this session, these intergenerational interactions, artistic collaborations, and intergenerational artistic learning opportunities, developed relationship building imbued with a sense of equal group status.

### **3.2.7. Session Seven Elementary: Working on Arts Projects**

This sessions' analysis looks at the development of the intergenerational interaction and relationship building for the humorous moments, acceptance and reciprocity imbued with a sense of equal group status through the artistic collaboration. The teacher's role is seen as intertwined within these social practices. All three retirees attended, Joe, Gerry and Brian. Rose Dyer filmed the session as youth researcher, and Mr. Sol collaborated as teacher for this session working with the iPad groups. Throughout this session, the students and retirees continued working on the art projects.

Heydon (2013) describes "intergenerational art class[es]" as "beautiful examples of curriculum and pedagogy" (p. 5) evident in this session as the intergenerational relationships emerged into shared humorous moments, revealing an acceptance between the generations. This acceptance "created opportunities[...]to communicate and learn together within the context of relationship" (Heydon, 2013, p. 5). I commented in my reflective narrative writing for this session about,

how great Gerry and Joe are with the students when the students tell them exactly what they want them to do; Joe said about one student, "She was the boss" with a slight laugh. Gerry mentioned about the group he was working with on this project, 'I was told to make the wire men, so that has been my job".

The retirees modelled in their humorous manner a perspective of their working culture through their interactions with the students, as being one of acceptance in having to get a job done you've been told to do. I observed how this acceptance afforded a sense of equal group status through a non-judgmental approach the students and retirees shared in working with each other. I commented in my reflective narrative writings for this session, providing insight for reflective practice. This insight inspired my focus in my role as teacher as both supporting and participating within this intergenerational setting.

This approach makes for a wonderfully non-judgmental and comfortable atmosphere for the children to feel as though they can determine the outcome of the art projects working toward a common goal with Gerry, Joe and Brian there to help them along the way.

When Joe added cargo to one of the sculptures, he joked with the students about how the cargo looked like marshmallows. A student complimented Joe on his forklift made from clay, "It's really good." Joe then added his forklift to the sculpture. There was something special about the reliance on each other, and the ease with which it happened, demonstrating "the reciprocity of intergenerational relationships" (Heydon, 2013, p. xii). The retirees empowered the children through their openness to their questions, ideas and goals as though with an unconditional acceptance as these students "beg[an] to appreciate themselves as experts[...]creat[ing] equity in a classroom community" (Roessing, 2012, p.xxiii). The students reciprocated by enthusiastically including the retirees into their school life, if only for eight sessions, and empowered the retirees through their interest in the retiree's perspective, life stories and contributions. Both generations enjoyed each other's attention and company. Gerry commented after the project, "I enjoyed it, I'd like to do another project", and Joe stated, "It was a lot of fun, I'd do another one". This provided "an illustration[...]of what can happen when young and old are brought together[...]through formal[...]intergenerational learning programs where child and elder share" meaningful connections through acquired common goals. This "offer[s] insights into how the curricula in such programs might expand participants' communication[...]while helping to foster and support intergenerational relationships" (Heydon, 2013, p. 5).

Brian was able to jump into the artistic collaboration, despite this being his first intergenerational arts program. Following Gerry's lead, he participated with the wire sculpture group. Brian's absence last week didn't affect his connection with the students, they put him to work right away on the wire sculpture with Gerry, and spoke with him as freely as they did with Gerry and Joe. They even asked him about his time while away as an example of further relationship building and 'off-topic' conversation. Gerry commented humorously while making the wire sculptures, "Maybe I could make some of these and sell them on YouTube or something, eBay or whatever. What do you think girls, any market for this kind of stuff?" One of the students replied, "I don't know".

The group creating the posters combining wildlife on the river with the working life on the waterfront, asked Gerry what was said if someone was not working, "Oh I can't repeat that here" Gerry said with a smile and laughed, "but one thing that was called out when something was about to fall was, "Heads up!" And so "heads up" was incorporated

into the poster in a speech bubble. The students were very comfortable asking in a conversational manner anything they wanted to know, even if they weren't at the same table as the retirees, they would go up to them and just start talking. Claire Carolan noted this same comfort level in her written reflections for the waterfront visit for the homelearners program, describing how the students interacted with Joe, in asking anything that came to them. Mr. Sol commented to me how the children were so excited when it was time for the retirees to come to class, indicating the relationship building that was occurring.

The group that had chosen to create a wire sculpture had decided to incorporate more clay into their art project. The students preferred to work with the clay which was easier for them, and so continued to delegate the wire work to the retirees. I was also given a job to help the students build a boat with the wire. I had not joined in with the art work in the homelearners program, I had not been invited, but in this case I was as an equal collaborator. The student who had just finished her painting joined in with this same group in the clay building after sharing her painting with me. I documented what she had captured in my reflective narrative writing that she was excited to show me. She had captured a unique perspective of work on the waterfront from a bird's eye view of the "image of a ship docked waiting for its load to be emptied, and a seagull flying above" (my narrative reflection, session seven, elementary program), as though the image is from a seagull's perspective. Through artistic renderings such as this, Greene (2000) states "we find ourselves actually entering into" the art students' "realit[y] by means not solely of our reasoning power but of our imagination" (p. 3). Through imagination in looking into the painting, I became the seagull looking down on the waterfront scene, as seen through the students imagined perspective of a past reality based on the retirees' stories, the waterfront visit and the old photographs. Eisner (2002) claims what we are aiming for through artistic expression and artistic learning is not just to look, but to perceive. In my art teacher's role, maintaining equal group status within the social practices, I was careful to keep this perspective her own. I offered a possible suggestion that might help others see with more clarity what she was communicating through the painting about the waterfront work. I noted in my reflective narrative writing that for editing (Eisner, 2002, p. 6), "I suggested painting the floor of the ship a different colour from the dock to visually separate the two". Eisner (2002) claims, "it is through the editing process that attention to

the “wee bit” that Tolstoy believed defined art is conferred upon the work” (p. 6). She chose to apply this addition and announced she was done.

The retirees had not worked with her on the painting, but she had talked to them quite a bit throughout the process. The physical proximity or the painting medium did not seem to encourage intergenerational artistic collaboration, possibly due to the small size of the canvas; a larger size may have enticed more collaboration. I had made the bases for the group clay and wire sculptures the same size as the bases of the sculptures for the homelearners program, with intergenerational artistic group collaboration in mind, to help support the same level of group interaction. However, I had not considered this factor for the size of the canvas. This is a role for the teacher in planning for effectively implementing intergenerational arts programs in considering the size of the art medium for enabling easy access for many participants to work together. Even though this student had worked by herself on the painting, she remained connected to the social practices interacting with the retirees and other students as she worked close by them. This enabled her to comfortably join in with the clay and wire sculpture group.

The students who made the masks also did not work with the retirees on their mask projects, but these students did however interact with the retirees as they worked beside them. These students also joined in with the same clay and wire sculpture with Gerry and Brian after completing their masks representing Joe, Gerry and Brian as waterfront workers. These students were working at the sink as it was a messy medium to use. This could have been a factor as to why the retirees didn't join in with their art project. Also there may not have been the physical opportunity for the retirees to work with them due to limited space around the sink area and nowhere for the retirees to sit. Comfort may have contributed to where the retirees were physically located as Heydon (2013) claims comfort and proximity impacts intergenerational contact. Gerry and Brian were both sitting comfortably at the table with the students making wire sculptures. The posters showing the step by step techniques for wire sculpture had worked well for this groups' intergenerational interaction and artistic collaboration, but the mask-making group needed more “explicit instruction, modelling and support” from me “to use the medi[um]” (Heydon, 2013, p. 28) than any other group. This possibly inhibited the intergenerational artistic collaboration due to my involvement. The clay medium seemed to allow for the most

collaboration and appeared to serve as a catalyst for the intergenerational interaction possibly due to it being more malleable and easy to use. It was interesting that the students, who had completed their art projects of the painting and the masks without a retiree, gravitated straight to the clay building where Gerry and Brian were working. This was possibly due to the relationship building that had occurred as they interacted with Gerry and Brian while working on their own art projects. The mask making had been a difficult medium to control, the masks revealed holes due to trapped air bubbles when separated from their moulds. The students were concerned as they had tried hard to eliminate this when they applied newly learned techniques from my instructions. In response to their disappointment, I was careful to maintain my role participating within the social practices with a sense of equal group status. I reflected in action and jumped in enthusiastically with a suggestion, which I noted in my reflective narrative writing.

“Well they did get injured, you could maybe use these areas to show that”.  
The students were immediately excited to get to work and painted the areas red to represent blood and cuts.

They matched the retirees’ eye colour with paint, noted their current hair colour through grey wool, and represented as they looked today with injuries implied from their past. Brian commented on one of masks: “That kind of looks like Gerry eh? A little bit?” In seizing this opportunity for representation where “imagination[...]permits us to give credence to alternative realities” (Greene, 2000, p. 3), the students valued my suggestion enough to pursue through the art medium the aspect of the retirees stories they wanted to tell, as dangerous. It seemed I played more of an editing role within this session than I had in the homelearners program, with the mask making and the painting. This was likely due to the retirees not collaborating on these particular art projects, even though there was still intergenerational interaction occurring between the retirees and these students. Possibly, I was providing the role for these students that Gerry had provided for the homelearners program students with his editing suggestions.

The two iPad groups worked with Mr. Sol in the computer room to control the sound for recording their voices, taking Gerry, Joe and Brian out of the classroom at times to be included in their puppet show and comic book. The contact between these students and the retirees seemed more limited due to the iPad groups being in a separate room, with

Joe, Gerry and Brian visiting when they were invited to participate. Both generations really enjoyed creating the puppet show and the comic book with the iPad. The technology was the catalyst for their interaction. When I asked the retirees if they thought they were able to join in with these two groups who were using the iPads as easily as they could with the other groups that were using clay and wire, Joe replied, "Once we figured out what they were doing, once we understood, we could", and the others agreed. According to Dr. O'Neill, the students felt they had not had as much interaction with the retirees as the other student groups. Joe's response indicated that Joe, Gerry and Brian seemed to measure the interaction through the activity, and the students possibly measured the interaction in terms of the amount of time spent together compared to the amount of time they thought the retirees spent with other groups. The response from the students also indicated the relationship building, and that they possibly would have liked to have spent more time with Joe, Gerry and Brian.

### **3.2.8. Session Eight Elementary: Working on Arts Projects**

The analysis for this session looks at the continued intergenerational interaction, for the relationship building, humour and equality within the intergenerational learning and artistic learning opportunities. My role as teacher is discussed as a participant within these social practices immersed in equal group status. All three retirees attended, and Dr. Peter Hall joined us for this session. Rose Dyer filmed this session. Mr. Sol helped to implement this session and continued working with the students on the iPad projects.

In preparation for this session, I provided the students with coloured printouts of the different flags. This planning was inspired by the intergenerational interaction in earlier sessions about the flags the ships flew. Gerry, Joe and Brian had first told the students about the flags in session three. The students had written this information down during that interview session. I refer to my reflective narrative comments for my role in introducing the flags for this eighth session.

I thanked the students, as I was able to refer to their notes (from the interview session) for the different countries the ships came from. I asked Gerry, Joe and Brian if they could tell us about the other flags and what the messages were. Brian replied, "They used to fly a red flag for quarantine". I also asked the retirees about the specific cargo that came from each

country. The groups that had built clay ships incorporated flags into their sculptures according to the country of origin they chose. The group working on the posters had incorporated all the flags into their project. I asked [this group] if they would like to put the flags on the wall map. They took up the job, looking up which flag belonged to which country using a book Mr. Sol provided (my narrative reflections, session eight, elementary program).

I took some time at the beginning of this session addressing the students and retirees together to share information about the flags and a book I had found on Greater Vancouver working waterfronts for opportunities to further the art projects and the intergenerational interaction. I showed everyone the photographs in the book which included a painting by a local artist who regularly visited the waterfront many years ago. I explained how this artist had focused on the ships' flags as the main source of visual imagery for his paintings. One student commented, "I don't think that is art". I answered briefly explaining this was abstract art designed to create a feeling of what it was like to be there, rather than copying it exactly. I took this opportunity to say that they were creating images of the working waterfront through their impressions.

The room was busy with artistic collaborations as the students and retirees continued working on their art projects. Gerry started making another wire sculpture. A group of students were talking with Dr. Peter Hall while working on their clay sculpture. Brian helped a student using a rolling pin on a piece of clay. A pair of students worked together on their project with Gerry and Dr. Peter Hall. Other students were working on their individual projects with help from Joe and Brian. Brian began working with Joe's group to begin with, as Joe worked with one student on their clay sculpture. Brian then joined Gerry and Dr. Peter Hall, working with the pair of students on their project. Brian said in jest, "Look what all the training on the waterfront did for us." Mr. Sol took Gerry's picture for the comic book project while they worked. Dr. Peter Hall helped one of the students and said in referring to a piece of clay that had been added, "Oh no, take that out of there." The student replied, "Why?" Dr. Peter Hall said, "Why? Are you making an island?" The student said, "Yeah." Dr. Hall replied "Oh, okay." Dr. Peter Hall then continued helping the student with the clay sculpture.

The iPad group of students recorded the audio for their virtual puppet show with Joe in the computer room. They continued recording the audio with Joe, Gerry, and Brian.

Gerry and Brian were answering the students' questions for their comic book. Mr. Sol wrote down Gerry's answer to a student's question, and then wrote down Brian's answer to another student's question. This information was then applied to the comic book on the iPad. Mr. Sol also took Brian's and a student's photograph for the comic book. Then Mr. Sol took Gerry's and a student's photographs also. These iPad art projects required a great deal of teacher scaffolding (Eisner, 2002) for success, yet did support intergenerational interaction and intergenerational collaboration, despite the students commenting on having less time with the retirees than other groups. The direction and decisions were driven by the students, and the retirees provided the content, making this a partnership which included the teacher providing the technical assistance. This medium did rely on the teacher more, as the mask-making also had, but not as a leader, rather as an equal collaborator. This equality in roles supported the social practices for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program.

After working with the iPad group, Brian and Gerry returned to working with the students on their clay and wire sculpture. Joe also returned to working with his group on their clay sculpture. Then structural problems seemed to occur, Joe exclaimed, "We just killed about 15 Longshoremen here." Brian replied, "Oh no, what happened?" A student said, "You're going to get fired!" Brian asked, "Did the gear fall down?" Joe replied, "The Samson post went down, the gear and the tank, the whole thing!" They all smiled and worked to rebuild it.

My role within the social practices was as an equal member once I had provided the information for the flags at the beginning of the session. I joined in with Gerry and Brian helping the students with their clay and wire sculpture. In reference to the future museum display, one student asked me "What one is it?" I replied, "New West." The student then asked, "So it's going to be in New West?!" I answered "Yes, it's going to be in the New West Museum." A student said, "I'll have to go see mine." Brian added "Yeah you'll have to, eh?" I was able to participate in this session as an artistic collaborator. I helped to create the wire ship with a student in Gerry and Brian's group. This included Dr. Peter Hall as I negotiated with the student what she wanted for what the materiel could afford. The student insisted there be two layers to the ship, I was unsure if this would work. I asked Dr. Peter Hall for his thoughts on this with the student included in the conversation.

In keeping with the sense of equal group status, he replied in support of the student's idea, "Sounds like a good idea, see if it works", he said. So we set about creating two albeit floppy layers to the wire ship, and it worked. In this case, the sensitivity applied to flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) needed to focus on maintaining equal group status in my interaction with the student, and Dr. Hall, in keeping with the social practices.

I was also able to work with one of the students on the large Tugboat sculpture that Joe had been working with while Joe was with the iPad groups. The student and I worked on editing (Eisner, 2002) the edges for a realistic look, using a photograph for accuracy. The students in this group were interested in accuracy as the homelearners program students had. Joe had provided the information for most of this. His group had needed to leave early this session, and so I took this opportunity to join him as he was left to work alone. I asked him as we worked on this project together, building the tug boat with clay, "Are you enjoying this project now? I remember you saying at the very beginning you weren't that interested?" He replied, "Yes I am enjoying this, it's interesting and I like making the tugboat". The intergenerational interaction, relationship building and artistic collaborations afforded for this student what "the arts" are able to "provide" as artistic learning in the form of "a kind of permission to pursue qualitative experience in a particular focused way" (Eisner, 2002, p. 4) which he could not envision at the beginning. I then asked if he had enjoyed learning about the waterfront, and he replied, "Yes". He then asked me if I was an artist. I told him I was an art teacher. This teacher-student collaboration and exchange was imbued with a sense of equal group status, modelled from the intergenerational interaction and collaboration.

The energy during this session was very positive and energetic. Dr. Peter Hall commented on this, especially with regard to the retirees' interaction with the students and their participation in the arts projects. Jarrott (2007) claims intergenerational programming helps to "reduce ambiguities about[...]relationship[s]" (p. 6), as in this case, the students and retirees were understanding each other, and valued each other's contributions. Jarrott (2007) continues in saying the intergenerational interaction that intergenerational programming affords "lesson[s] social distance" (p. 6) between the skipped generations and gives them something to connect through as they work together toward a common goal. Evidence that the social practices for this intergenerational arts program

“support[ed]” such “intergenerational solidarity” (Jarrott, 2007, p. 6), lay within the retirees’ artistic endeavours and their willingness to participate with the students, and the students enthusiasm toward the retirees involvement, their collaboration, and the intergenerational comradery this generated.

### **3.2.9. Session Nine Elementary School: Finishing on Arts Projects/Imagining the Future/Student Interviews/Student Questionnaires**

The analysis for this session looks at my role as teacher within the social practices for the intergenerational interaction, the intergenerational learning and artistic learning opportunities. This session was planned to incorporate finishing the art projects, the drawings of an imagined future waterfront, student questionnaires, and the student exit interviews conducted by Dr. O’Neill. All three retirees attended this session. Dr. O’Neill interviewed the students in their groups in another room with Rose Dyer filming the interviews.

As part of reflective practice as teacher-researcher, I documented in my reflective narrative the intergenerational interaction resulting from new photographs brought to this session by Brian and Gerry on a CD to share with the students. We all looked at these together as a class with me showing each photograph on the Smart board at the front of the classroom. These images served as a catalyst for intergenerational interaction in a similar way the large framed photographs had in the first session of the homelearners program. The students were used to seeing information shared on the Smart board and so seemed more responsive than when looking at the large photographs. These images were quite dramatic and reflected the interests these students had exhibited throughout the previous program sessions in the dangerous aspect of the work. By incorporating these images, Brian and Gerry demonstrated the attention they had paid to the students’ questions, comments and interest for the art projects. The following is taken from my narrative reflections for this activity, discussing the images and their impact on the intergenerational interaction. These were images of

disasters, showing cargo falling and floating in the water, a ship sinking and being rescued, different coloured ships docked (colours denoted the country of origin), including one stuck on the land after the tide had gone

out. This photograph demonstrated the immense size of these ships as the people worked around it looking miniature in comparison. The students enjoyed looking at these pictures, as they engaged in conversation about their content. I paused moving from one picture to the next to allow these discussions to develop around the room between the students and the retirees (my narrative reflections, session nine, elementary program).

The interaction was very relaxed and conversational between the two generations. This was similar to other sessions in which the students had appeared comfortable asking the retirees whatever came to their minds, such as during the waterfront visit in the homelearners program as noted by Claire Carolan in her written reflections. My role as teacher in support of this intergenerational interaction was to follow along listening with sensitivity in flexible purposing (Eisner, 2002) toward affording the time needed. This flexible sensitivity focused on time created the space for these intergenerational connections to thrive in the moment. Some images needed more time, others less, according to the flow of interaction the image generated. I was also learning along with the students about the content through their questions, and the retirees' responses. The intergenerational interaction led the activity so long as I played my role in support of this social practice. In this sense, my role in participating within the interaction was not the same as the students and retirees, but carried equal value for its contribution to the interaction. This sense of equal group status within each participant's role afforded intergenerational relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities through giving the time for the intergenerational interaction to thrive. The teacher's role participating within this social practice reveals the interconnectedness between each member of this learning community as imperative to effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program. My role as art teacher in applying sensitivity with flexible purposing toward each moment for what the intergenerational interaction needed provided scaffolding for this interconnectedness.

I briefly discussed with everyone the past work compared with the work done on the waterfront today in New Westminster waterfront, such as selling food. I asked everyone to draw a design as architects of the New Westminster waterfront 30 or 40 years in the future, imagining they were architects designing the future New Westminster waterfront. We had a class discussion, some students wanted to create a better environment for wildlife, some would prefer the ships return with their cargo, and other

students suggested a theme park with entertaining rides while they watched the river. This discussion was mostly between the students and I, rather than intergenerational. I was leading this discussion as the teacher situated at the front of the room with the class looking at me. This arrangement naturally followed from looking at the photographs with me standing at the front of the class. This social practice did not create a sense of equal group status within the activity for me as I was leading the interaction too much. Heydon (2013) states, physical proximity can impact intergenerational interaction. Possibly if I had structured this discussion through a set of three groups, each with a retiree this could have encouraged more intergenerational interaction, rather than student-teacher interaction.

The students immediately began drawing; they had a clear idea of what they wanted to see at the waterfront in the future. I offered paper and drawing pencils to Gerry, who at first said, "Me? No I don't draw". This was interesting because he had demonstrated drawing in showing the students in the homelearners program what he was trying to convey. His reluctance could have been for drawing from imagination. However, I later looked around the room and saw Gerry sat at a desk drawing. Joe had taken a piece of paper, sat beside one of the students and began drawing right away. Brian was also offered some paper, but he was not comfortable drawing, and so did not participate. Joe and Gerry had done this before, and were therefore familiar with this activity, whereas Brian was not. Joe jumped right in, and Gerry was resistant at first, but demonstrated his willingness for accepting an artistic learning opportunity. One difference in this session to the homelearners session in drawing the future waterfront was in the students' responses. All the students in this case immediately and enthusiastically began drawing, whereas in the homelearners program session, some students had joined Gerry in not participating as they empathized with Gerry in their discomfort for the activity. Gerry had no support for resisting drawing in this session.

The students put a lot of thought and detail into these drawings, they spent most of the session on them. Mr. Sol took photographs of the drawings and connected his camera to the computer to display their drawings on the Smart board at the front of the classroom. These drawings were displayed on a rotation for all the students and retirees to see. They were all very excited about seeing them, and proud of their future plans.

Dr. O'Neill interviewed the students in their groups during the drawing activity, filmed by Rose Dyer. Dr. O'Neill and Rose Dyer both commented on the overall positive answers the students gave, except for one student who acknowledged he didn't connect much with the retirees because he had not asked the retirees many questions. This student was mostly concerned with the details on his project. He had worked alone on a clay project and was insistent he have more time to work on it during this last session. Mr. Sol offered him more time to ease his concerns. It was important to this student he be able to complete the editing part of the cognitive process of representation (Eisner, 2002) to his satisfaction before participating in the communication stage. Mr. Sol had given the students some time to add any final touches to their art work prior to the start of this session, unfortunately without the retirees, but we were now out of time. The art projects were complete and ready for the display.

I asked the students to complete two questionnaires after they had finished drawing. These questionnaires focused on asking the students what they thought they had learned about the waterfront from interacting with the retirees, and what they thought they had communicated through the art projects based on the intergenerational interactions and collaborations. The students' answers to these questionnaires provided information that was helpful for my research and my reflective practice as teacher-researcher for effectively implementation of this intergenerational arts program. In viewing teaching itself as a reflective practice, I have learned to include everyone's perspective as teacher-researcher including the students, the retirees, collaborating researchers and collaborating educators, for examining my role in effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program.

My analysis of data collected from the student questionnaires looked for how effective the social practices were from the students' perspectives, and the learning opportunities afforded to the students. The students' comments on the questionnaires revealed evidence for the value the students placed on the retirees' contributions, and what the students themselves felt they contributed that was of value (Jarrott, 2007) for what made the equal group status effective. This would hopefully shed light on the role as art teacher in support of the social practice within a sense of equal group status for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program.

In the first questionnaire the students were asked, "Did you enjoy working with the retirees who used to work on the waterfront?" Twenty four students participated in this program, and eighteen of these first questionnaires were returned. Seventeen replied "Yes" to the first question, one student replied, "sort of", but didn't elaborate. Some students elaborated by adding, "It was amazing to spread my ideas and their ideas". "Yes! It was really cool meeting people from the waterfront." "Yes. I did enjoy working with Gerry, Brian and Joe." The second question asked, "What did you like about working with them?" In their replies the students elaborated further indicating how much they valued the contributions from Joe, Gerry and Brian to the art projects and for what they offered the students. "I liked working with them because they told us answers." "I liked working with them because they told us stories about the waterfront." "Because they were really helpful when it came to questions" "I like how they could answer my questions." "I got to compare things." "How much they helped, they are like telling you exactly (exactly) what happened." "I liked how they helped me and told me useful things." "I liked to hear what new things that they have to say. It's cool to learn things that I've never heard before." These next responses reveal the relationship building that occurred. "I liked working with them cause their nice." "I really liked getting to know Joe, Gerry and Brian".

These responses repeated a theme from the homelearners program student exit interviews in stating how much the students had felt their questions were valued by the retirees, and how much the students had enjoyed asking the retirees questions. This value placed on the student's inquiry led the direction for the intergenerational interaction and also the art projects. The retirees gave the students autonomy for whatever they wanted to know, creating a sense of equal group status between the students and the retirees as the students directed the flow of information provided by the retirees. Participants within intergenerational programs can also "determine programmatic outcomes that will contribute to" (Jarrott, 2007, p. 4) the common goals. According to Jarrott, "programs should be able to identify one goal that both groups have in common[...]they should be united in their purpose" for example "conducting life history interviews" (p. 5-6). In the case of this intergenerational arts program, it was the waterfront retirees who initiated the idea in passing on their knowledge to the next generation through oral history telling of a working world 40 years ago They also contributed photographs which provided "a catalyst[...]induc[ing conversation]" (Heydon, 2013, p. 28) from the very first session in the

homelearners program. With the same goal in return, the students initiated their inquiries and also contributed photographs they had taken at the waterfront which served as catalyst for conversation in the review session of this elementary program during the small group discussions.

In drawing from Brabazon and Disch (1997), Jarrott (207) and Heydon (2013), a sense of safety with a sense of community within the contact setting creates a sense of purpose for the participants. It is this combination in purpose that affords a sense of value for the participants as “programs should be beneficial to all” (Freidman, 1997, p. 105 as cited in Heydon, 2013, p. 24). This value in purpose as “beneficial to all” in working toward a common goal creates a sense of equal group status within the intergenerational contact setting. Focusing on the value the participants place on their own, and each other’s contributions can be looked as a measure for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program. In looking for further evidence for this value required for equal group status within the social practices, I turn to the comments the students gave in response to the second questionnaire.

The second questionnaire focused on the art projects. The first question asked, “Did you enjoy showing what you had learned through an art project?” All twenty returned questionnaires stated, “Yes.” Some elaborated by adding, “I enjoyed it because I learned a lot of new stuff.” “I hope I can do it again!” “My favourite part.”

The correlation below of each student’s answers to the sequence of five questions indicated the value they had placed in the retirees’ knowledge sharing, their contributions to the art projects and what the students could then communicate through the art work as a result. The students in the elementary program mostly conveyed their understanding of the danger in the past waterfront work, as knowledge having gained through the intergenerational interaction. This representation was indicative of the focus for the students’ inquiry that began in the first orientation session when a student asked if anyone got hurt. This theme was followed throughout the program sessions and the art projects, depicting through clay sculpture injured workers on the dock and waterfront workers in the fallen in water. The masks also represented the injuries the students imagined were sustained by the retirees while working. The Special Education Assistant who attended

parts of some of the sessions commented “I think the students developed an appreciation for how dangerous the work actually was.”

The following outlines five questions asked in the questionnaire, continued by examples from five students' comments correlated in order of the questions as shown. 1) What information about work on the waterfront did you put into your art project? 2) What do you think someone seeing your art project will learn about work on the waterfront? 3) What did you learn from the retirees as you worked on your art project? 4) Did you enjoy working with the retirees on your art project, if so what did you like? 5) What do you think you taught the retirees as they worked with you on your art work? Student number one:

1) What information I got was that only boys worked on the waterfront, so I made my mask a boy. I also know that when you work on the waterfront you will get hurt so I put cuts on my mask.” 2) “I think they (the viewer) will notice that the boys get badly injured because I have cuts on my mask.” 3) “I learned from the retirees that you would have to be strong to work there. I also learned it was very dangerous noisy place to work at.” 4) “I liked working with them because the things they know I can put into my project.” 5) I didn't really teach the retirees anything.”

It is evident from this student's answers to questions one through four, that the information gathered from the retirees was highly valued to this student's project, and succinctly applied to the art work with an intent to communicate the danger in the past waterfront work. This student didn't actually work with Joe, Gerry or Brian on the mask making art project, but worked beside them as she interacted with them about work on the waterfront. The answer to question five in stating she “didn't really teach the retirees anything”, indicates the art medium might have an impact on the intergenerational interaction for collaborating on the art projects, and therefore the possible exchange in knowledge. This could also reveal her perspective on what she thought she had to offer. Another student working with the mask making however wrote, “I think I taught them how to make the masks with bandages.” Student number two:

1) Building and transporting.” 2) “That Australian boats are green.” 3) “That some of them fell in the water.” 4) Yes because they are funny and fun to craft with.” 5) “Who I am and my personality.”

This student's answers from questions one through three, indicate the variety of information he appreciated from the retirees' stories. A sense of equal group status is

revealed within his answers to questions four and five, as a shared kind of knowledge for intergenerational relationship building and an acceptance for each other that occurred within the intergenerational interaction within the social practices. Student number three:

1) Mostly only men worked on the waterfront." 2) "I think people will learn that they transported animals." 3) "We learned the boat carried logs." 4) "I enjoyed working with the retirees a lot. My favourite part was taking pictures." 5) "How to take pictures."

These responses to questions one through three indicate the variety of information the student gathered from the intergenerational interaction, and what he chose to communicate through the art project. This student's responses to questions four and five revealed evidence in the sharing of knowledge of most value to the student. In teaching the retirees how to take photographs, he shared with them his knowledge for his favourite activity. This indicated a sense of equal group status within the relationship building through how much this student valued the retirees enough to share with them his favourite part of the program. Student number four:

1) "I asked questions if it was a dangerous place." 2) "They'll learn about an iPad." 3) "We learned things like 2 people drowned and how much cargo fell." 4) "Yes I liked learning about different coloured ships and the colours of ships." 5) "How to work an iPad."

This student communicated through the answers to questions two and five that he feels his contributions of value to others were in the technical skills for using an iPad, and that he had learned about the dangers through the intergenerational interaction about the waterfront work. He liked learning from the retirees, but instead focused his answer to question two on what value he thought he had brought to the project. Student number five:

1) "A boat with cargo." 2) "How many boats from different places." 3) "That how old you are you still remember what speachal (special) things are like." 4) Yes I liked it all!" 5) How talented we are."

This student's responses to questions three and five are imbued with an exchange of relationship building, humour and a sensitivity for appreciating the value in what we share with each other no matter our ages. This exchange as a type of knowledge brings with it a sense of equal group status within the intergenerational interaction and relationship building through the social practices.

The last question asked the students what they thought they had taught the retirees as they worked with them on the art work. The students' answers to the last question mostly indicated they felt they had contributed something of value in return. In drawing from Jarrott (2007) for equal group status, the participants each need to feel they have something valuable to contribute to the program goals.

This session concluded all the program sessions, ready for the last sessions' display day. The planning in preparation for the display day took place at the end of this session as a collaborative effort between Mr. Sol, the principal Mr. Millard, and I. We decided the display would take place in the library to allow for more room for viewing the projects. And as a last-minute idea for the morning of the display day, there would be a practice run for the students, inviting the other students and teachers in the school to view the projects on display.

### **3.2.10. Session Ten Elementary School: Display Day, Retirees and Teacher Interviews**

The analysis for this session discusses the teacher's role in the display and the surprises from the teacher's perspective. There were two display events, morning and afternoon. The morning event is discussed for its relevance to the social practices. Mr. Sol's interview is discussed for its relevance to the teacher's role implementing this intergenerational arts program as a social practice. The retirees' interviews are discussed for their perspective on working with the students in this program. Rose Dyer attended and filmed the interviews, but did not film the display event.

Mr. Sol and his students had prepared the project displays before I arrived. I included the information on the larger research project that this program was connected to. The teacher played a major role in the set-up of the displays for both this elementary program and the homelearners program. The retirees did not attend the morning display event. This event was arranged as a practice run for the afternoon event which included the retirees, other interested parties, researchers and educators. The morning event became the main display due to the students' responses and the high level of interaction compared to the afternoon event. On reflection, the two events should have been combined, the retirees' participation would have enhanced this further with the

intergenerational component included. In discussing the morning display event, I will refer to the students who participated in this intergenerational arts program as 'Mr. Sol's students', and the other students from the school as 'visiting students'.

The visiting students entered the room with no introduction, and it immediately lit-up. They all rushed to a table to ask what it was all about. Mr. Sol's students were keen to explain. The sculptures suddenly had crowds of visiting students around them. The program was explained to the visiting students by Mr. Sol's students. I stood back in surprise and amazement. I offered the photographs to Mr. Sol's students taken at the waterfront for them to include in their display. They all accepted them; one student took it from my hand and immediately began explaining to the visiting students at her table all about the waterfront visit and the pictures she had taken. In my reflective narrative, I captured my experience of this event.

I stood back and watched as new groups of students entered the room, the energy and enthusiasm the students had for sharing with each other in this learning experience was incredible. Mr. Sol's students were proud of what they had to share and the other students were eager to learn about it (my narrative reflections, session ten, elementary program).

The students continued the social practices for oral history telling and inquiry and in doing so revealed the intergenerational learning opportunities this program had afforded for them. The enthusiasm remained strong throughout the full hour until the lunch school bell rang. This morning display event was surprisingly a highlight of the program, and was missing only one element, the retirees!

After the students had left for lunch, the retirees arrived and brought the large framed photographs, which I placed on the walls behind the clay projects. I interviewed the retirees before the afternoon display event started. They told me they were impressed by the speed with which the students had learned the information and how keen they were. This response was similar to what Brabazon and Disch (1997) found from intergenerational programs, in that "senior adult volunteers expressed surprise at the students' creativity and competence as learners" p. 217). All three retirees felt they had found it easy to relate to the students and work with them. I asked if any particular projects were easier for them to work on and connect more with the students than others due to

the medium used, for example the clay as opposed to the iPad. They were in full agreement with their reply “No, once we learned what they were doing with the iPads, we were just as able to join in and connect with the students”. When I mentioned this to Dr. O’Neill, (as previously discussed in session seven's analysis, 3.2.7), she told me that based on the students' responses during their exit interview with her, the iPad student groups felt they did not have as much contact with the retirees as other groups.

Before the afternoon guests arrived, I presented with all Mr. Sol’s students, a thank you card the students had signed for Joe, Gerry and Brian. The card had the group photograph from the waterfront visit and a picture of the old ship lined up with the current Patullo Bridge. We all thanked Joe, Gerry and Brian for giving their time and sharing their experiences with us. It was a moving moment, with the retirees returning the thanks and appreciation, revealing the relationship building this program had afforded.

During the interview with Mr. Sol, he confirmed a few things as a challenge for a classroom teacher implementing this program.

“The organization required ahead of time, and the amount of time required to devote to it could cause a teacher to hesitate. With so many requirements in the curriculum, could this really be feasible? But once looked at more deeply, the curriculum requirements are included, just in a different way; being able to realize this may not be obvious.”

When asked if he thought there was any particular moment that stood out to him, it was the students sharing with other students from the school so willingly, and with such enthusiasm that had surprised him. This was a highlight and surprise to me too from an event that had been arranged at the last minute to give the students some practice at presenting. According to Jarrott (2007) participants within intergenerational programs can also “determine programmatic outcomes that will contribute to” (p. 4) the common goals of the program. I asked Mr. Sol if he had learned anything new or useful as a teacher. His reply included how surprised he was at how easily the students connected with the retirees. He was at first unsure how this would unfold, he thought the students would be more reluctant and would hesitate to include them. He was very surprised at how quickly these connections happened. On reflection, this success was likely due to the planned intergenerational programming as the social practices. Also in how the retirees interacted

with the students as they gave the students autonomy through their interest, inquiry and the art projects, and the sense of equal group status for all participants including the teacher.

During the display, one of the students in the tugboat group interacted more than I had seen him in previous sessions, answering questions and sharing with the visitors. He participated as an equal member of the group with the other students, clearly enjoying communicating about the experience. This also occurred for a student in the homelearners program whom I thought might not join in with the interaction. I asked Mr. Sol what he thought this success was due to, as he had also been surprised by this result. He told me how he thought this program was inclusive and replied by explaining why, "I think it is due to how open the project is there are many different ways a student can work with this". The intergenerational interaction and the intergenerational collaborative art projects allowed students more freedom to communicate, according to Heydon and O'Neill (2014), "children have been found to develop important communication practices within intergenerational relationships" (p. 3).

### **3.3. Summary of Main Findings**

In this inquiry, I positioned myself as a visual arts educator-researcher, researching teaching as a social practice within and through the development of this intergenerational arts program. Through reflexive analysis, I described how I applied reflective practice through observations and discoveries as a teacher-researcher that led me to recognize the significance of the social interaction and for what made the teacher's role effective within it. Equal group status is the main finding for what makes the interconnectedness between the social practices, and the teacher's role effective in implementing this intergenerational arts program. Equal group status is found to be what makes this intergenerational arts program inclusive for all participants, and "of benefit to all" (Heydon & O'Neill, 2014, p. 105) for its effectiveness as a social practice. The teacher's role is identified as a reflective practice, significant to supporting equal group status within the intergenerational interaction. The findings also indicate that the teacher's participation within the intergenerational interaction also relies on equal group status for effectively implementing this intergenerational arts program. The findings highlight a process for

deepening understanding of intergenerational interactions for artistic learning that emphasizes equal group status as a way to promote inclusiveness, and how these social practices combined with teaching as a reflective practice might provide a useful framework for viewing teaching as a social practice.

### **3.3.1. Homelearners Study: Summary of Findings**

The first session of this first program with the homelearners students generated spontaneous intergenerational interaction in the form of an exchange between the students' inquiries and the retirees' interest in sharing their stories. This exchange happened faster than expected, and was a welcomed surprise. The large photographs brought by the retirees provided the catalyst (Heydon, 2013) for this interaction. The first sessions' intergenerational interaction set the milieu for the rest of the program sessions. This forged the direction for the social practices, and my research inspiration in my teaching role as equal participant within the social practices that were being established.

The second session began without the influence of the retirees, and seemed to lack relevance for the students as a result. This influenced my teaching role toward directing the students within the small group activities in the absence of the retirees. Once the retirees joined in with the student group discussions, the intergenerational interaction made the activity relevant to the students, continuing the social practices established in the first session. The re-established social practices redirected my role toward equal participant, learning and listening with the students. This intergenerational interaction further built upon the classroom milieu from the first session, and served to enhance the intergenerational relationship building.

The third session at the waterfront further enhanced the intergenerational relationship building with Joe as the only retiree to attend. The waterfront scene, the planned activities with the laminated old photographs held up against the present day scene, and the student cameras for taking photographs of what interested them, all coalesced to provide a catalyst for this session's rich intergenerational interaction. This intergenerational interaction guided my role as teacher toward equal group status as a participant within the social practices.

This fourth session was the only session in which I encountered difficulty. There was a lack of connection between the retirees and the students. The session was lacking in relevance for them. Joe was absent. Gerry attended this session, but not the waterfront visit which we were reviewing. A retiree Dave attended whom we had not met before. This disconnect did however prove valuable in serving to enhance the importance in the consistency of the retirees, and their connection with the students and the session's activities. The connection between the retirees and the students was revealed to be at the core for effective implementation of the sessions for this intergenerational arts program.

The fifth session required attempts at re-establishing connections as the student and retirees switched roles for intergenerational learning from oral history telling to artistic practice. The students now afforded artistic learning opportunities for the retirees. Joe and Gerry were encouraged by Dr. O'Neill to sit with the students and chat about what they were doing. This temporary distance between the two generations was enhanced by the retirees having missed collaborating on the start of the project plans with the students at the end of the last session. Once this hurdle was overcome through the students initiating the retirees' involvement by just handing them clay to build with, the exchange in learning became reciprocal, and a sense of equal group status was established through this exchange in knowledge.

The sixth and seventh sessions continued this relationship building through the artistic collaborations, a little quicker with Joe than Gerry. However, Gerry played a key role as teacher instructing for the accuracy the students wanted in the clay sculptures. He did eventually join in with the clay building and he too became immersed in the artistic practice, creating these representations through the cognitive processes of inscribing, editing, and communicating (Eisner, 2002). The students and retirees' artistic collaborations were given autonomy for their direction. My role as teacher was to join in as needed for support when asked, and to listen for what was required next from my role in support of this intergenerational interaction and learning opportunities.

The eighth session saw a division in labour, the retirees and students collaborated together finishing the art projects. Dr. O'Neill conducted the exit interviews with the student groups. I set up the display preparations. Once the display began, we were equal in our

roles interacting with the visitors, answering their questions and explaining the program. We were thereby continuing the social practices in the oral history telling and interviewing beyond the program participants into a public format. This is what Eisner (2002) claims communication as a cognitive process of artistic representation is intended to do.

### **3.3.2. Elementary School Study: Summary of Findings**

In the analysis for the elementary program I looked at the transferability of this intergenerational arts program model from the art room in the Homelearners Centre with my grade 5 and grade 6 students, to an unfamiliar elementary school classroom with grade 3 and 4 students in collaboration with their teacher Mr. Sol. There were a few slight variations to the program model than was used for the homelearners program. The elementary program had two additional sessions at the beginning for an extended orientation in preparation for meeting and interviewing the retirees due to the younger age of the students needing more support. There happened to be a break in the school calendar after the second session, which I wanted to ensure didn't happen after the retirees joined in. Also the students' teacher would be absent for the interview session and the review session. A greater variety of art media was incorporated providing further choice and exposure to art materials.

The first session was an orientation for the students without the retirees, providing an explanation of the program and scaffolding the students in their understanding of the goals and activities. The social practices were introduced as learning through interacting with the retirees, gathering research by interviewing them for their oral history stories about their past work on the waterfront, and collaborating with them on the art projects communicating this shared knowledge. After these discussions and art activity was introduced to help establish this as an arts program. The response from the students was positive, they seemed excited to work on the art media and learn more about the program.

The second session was a continuation of the orientation with a goal to prepare the students' questions ready for the next session interviewing the retirees. As the teacher, I led the discussions with the students focused on what they wanted to know. I included an imaginative drawing activity on a questionnaire sheet on what they thought work on the

waterfront looked like. The students' questions were written down by Mr. Sol and displayed on the Smart-board for the students to copy, ready for the next session when they met the retirees and interviewed them.

For the third session, the introductions and interviews were combined. This was a significant session in my reflective practice for recognizing my role as teacher-researcher within the social practices as impacting the intergenerational interaction. Mr. Sol was absent and with many strangers in the room, I had stepped into a different social practice as leader in support of the students' concern that I felt in the moment was expected from a teacher within a school classroom setting. The retirees and students looked to me to start the interaction. The physical proximity between the students and retirees did not necessarily support spontaneous intergenerational interaction with the retirees sitting together toward the back of the room, and me standing at the front. The interaction seemed staged as it went through me; I signalled to each student for their turn to ask a question from a predetermined list, inhibiting spontaneous interaction. Rose Dyer described this as "like intergenerational ping-pong" Dr. O'Neill walked to the front of the room and asked for a story about the cat that she had learned from Joe and Gerry during the homelearners program. The tone immediately changed as the story began; laughter and curiosity grew into more stories. The interaction was now direct between the two generations. It was now my role to listen in support of the intergenerational interaction, as an equal member of the group within the social practices for this intergenerational arts program.

The fourth session took place at the waterfront. Dr. O'Neill joined us, as did a few parent volunteers. Joe, Gerry and Brian participated, but Joe was the only experienced retiree having led the homelearners waterfront session. He led the students through most of the intergenerational interaction for this waterfront session through his stories and in listening to the students' questions. The students were curious about the bollards, about Joe's descriptions of what the waterfront used to be like. The old laminated photographs were held up and served as a catalyst for this interaction. Pictures were taken of these old photographs lined up with the present scenery for a visual comparison of past and present, providing much intergenerational interaction and learning opportunities. Gerry and Brian joined in with the students to a lesser degree, they were happy to let Joe take the lead. As

teacher, my role was equal to the students in mostly listening to the intergenerational interaction, and participating in holding up the laminated photographs in support of the questions and stories this generated, furthering intergenerational relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities.

The fifth session was the waterfront review and took place in the classroom. Joe, Gerry and Brian attended this session. It was thought to be important they attended both the waterfront and the review sessions for intergenerational continuity. Mr. Sol was absent. This session began with group intergenerational interaction looking at the photographs the students and retirees had taken at the waterfront. My role as teacher in support of the social practices and participant within these discussions was to listen and join in when relevant. I offered a book on the history of local waterfront workers as catalyst to generate further intergenerational interaction. Gerry told the students stories about the people in the pictures within the book. In noticing increased 'off-topic' conversation, I responded to this thinking I needed to create a further purpose in these discussions in sharing their findings with the class as a whole group. On later reflection, I had stepped outside of supporting the social practices in not recognizing the value in the 'off-topic' conversations. The groups then prepared their information to share, and the intergenerational interaction was not as prevalent. One group had a great deal of difficulty collaborating for what to share. Planning the art projects with the retirees brought back the intergenerational group interaction in preparation for the next session, as the retirees helped the students plan, document their ideas and materials.

The sixth session was the beginning of the artistic collaborations. Mr. Sol was back. Joe and Gerry attended, but Brian was absent to which the students commented. The different media used created a significant role for me as art teacher in setting up the groups. Joe and Gerry played a large role in starting these art projects due to their consistent attendance, and their prior experience gained in the homelearners program in artistic learning. The students were keen to get started on the art projects. I provided posters with instructions to encourage intergenerational artistic learning as the students and retirees collaborated together. The students immediately put Gerry to work with the trickiest job of making wire sculptures of waterfront workers to which he delightfully obliged. Joe worked with the group who had difficulties collaborating last session. Through

Joe's partnership skills and experience gained in clay sculpture, he modelled a way these students could work together with him as a partner in their group designing a large tugboat. This group were thrilled to work with Joe and embraced his ideas and the artistic learning opportunities. Mr. Sol worked with the two iPad groups, for their comic book and puppet theatre. I worked mostly with the mask-making group and with setting up the student painting on canvas. I also rotated around the room to check all the groups had what they needed. For this session, my role was as a typical art teacher, with an extra sensitivity toward the intergenerational interaction as leading the direction for the art projects.

This seventh session continued the intergenerational artistic collaborations with Brian back, and Joe and Gerry also attending. The students put Brian to work with Gerry making wire sculptures of waterfront workers. The intergenerational relationship building drove this session through the artistic collaborations. There were a few students who created art projects without the retirees collaborating with them, using paint and mask making media, and some as individual clay projects. However, the intergenerational interaction was still maintained and contributed to the development of these art projects. Once these students had finished their projects, they jumped right in with the clay building in Gerry and Brian's group, and were immediately accepted. The painting student completed her solo painting from a bird's eye perspective of the working waterfront scene, incorporating her imagination from the retirees' stories, the old photographs and the waterfront visit. I made an editing suggestion to enhance the visual effect she was aiming for. Also for the masks, as art teacher I suggested an editing option for the unplanned air holes that had emerged. For these suggestions, I was careful to participate within the social practices with equal group status. They embraced my idea in their own way with enthusiasm to portray these holes as workers' injuries through their intrigue in how dangerous the work was. Mr. Sol worked with the iPad groups in a separate room, incorporating Joe, Gerry and Brian when they were requested for the voice recording. The retirees moved between the rooms and art projects with ease. My role as teacher within this session was imbued with equal group status within the social practices and the intergenerational relationship building. I was put to work with Gerry and Brian on the wire sculpture. This was the first time I had been invited to participate in creating the sculptures by the students as an equal partner.

Session eight began with me revisiting information about the flags that had emerged through the intergenerational interaction from the interview session. My role as teacher implementing this program was to look for opportunities to support further intergenerational interaction and intergenerational learning opportunities. I couldn't help but notice the giant wall map and had prepared small flags for the students to use in their art projects. I invited one group to put the flags on the wall map. I helped generate an intergenerational class discussion on the flags and their meaning to the waterfront workers. Many students incorporated the flags into the projects. Dr. Peter Hall joined in this session and helped to build the clay and wire sculpture. He was immersed within the social practices and the artistic practice, including negotiations with the students for the sculptures. I too was included in the wire sculpture group helping to design and build the wire ship to the student's specifications. Negotiations for these specifications took place between the student, Dr. Peter Hall and I, in keeping with the social practices and what the medium could support. These negotiations were imbued with a sense of equal group status, careful to keep the students' ideas paramount. There were some humorous moments as structural problems arose for Joe's group. My role in this seemed to parallel the retirees as I interacted and participated in the artistic collaborations. The artistic collaborations, the intergenerational relationship building, the intergenerational learning and artistic learning opportunities all interconnected as each participant played their significant role within the social practices imbued with a sense of equal group status.

Session nine began with new photographs introduced to this session brought by Gerry and Brian. The images were on a CD and were shared as a class together on the Smart-board. The students responded with enthusiasm as the images represented the dangerous side of the work, and reflected the attention Gerry, Brian and Joe had paid to the students' interests. These images generated much intergenerational interaction revealing the relationships that had built over the program sessions. I participated in this social practice by leading everyone through the images, sensitive in flexible purposing toward the time needed for each interaction for each image. My role as teacher involved participating within the discussions led by the intergenerational interaction, but also to listen for my next cue to switch photographs, and to learn alongside the students. This activity led straight into the futuristic drawing of the waterfront. I led the discussion on possibilities for ideas. This did not seem to generate as much intergenerational interaction,

as I was leading the discussion. The students had many ideas and were keen to draw their plans to which they applied detail. Joe jumped in right away, and Gerry hesitated at first, repeating as he had in the homelearners program that he was not good at drawing. All the students participated with Joe, modelling for Gerry who eventually began drawing resulting in an intergenerational artistic learning opportunity. Brian, who was new to this activity in drawing from imagination, did not participate. Jarrott (2007) states voluntary participation and a comfort level for all participants is an important consideration for intergenerational programs. I had prepared two student questionnaires for their opinions on creating the art projects, working with the retirees, learning about work on the waterfront, and what they had enjoyed about the program. Dr. O'Neill conducted the student exit interviews. The art projects were complete, and we were ready for the display session.

The tenth session was the display day. This was a planned effort by Mr. Sol, Mr. Millard the principal, and I. It was conducted in the school library for a bigger space, with a practice run in the morning for other students in the school in preparation students for the afternoon display when the research guests arrived. The display was set up in the morning by Mr. Sol and his students before I arrived. The visiting students charged into the room full of enthusiasm for learning about what Mr. Sol's students had been working on. Their curiosity was met with an excitement for sharing newly learned knowledge, continuing the social practices for oral history telling, inquiry and interviewing. As teacher, I stood back stunned at the response from the students for how interactive and student directed this practice display event was. The dynamic interaction conveyed the extent of intergenerational learning opportunities that had occurred throughout the program sessions and how much the students valued the experience. The only people missing were Joe, Gerry and Brian. Had I realised this potential, I would have suggested the retirees and the guests join this mornings' display event instead of the afternoon. The afternoon display was much quieter, and provided fewer opportunities for the students to share than they were hoping for. I interviewed Joe, Gerry and Brian in between the two display events. Their comments suggested how surprised they had been in the students learning pace, and how easy they thought the students were to work with. After the afternoon display, I interviewed Mr. Sol who expressed his surprise in the students' willingness to share with the other students and how easily his students had accepted the

retirees. Mr. Sol's and the retirees' responses indicated both the students and retirees had found it easy to connect and work together in relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities.

My analysis of this elementary intergenerational arts program has examined the transferability of this intergenerational arts program model from the art room in the Homelearners Centre with my Grades 5 and 6 students to an elementary school classroom with Grades 3 and 4 students in collaboration with their teacher Mr. Sol. As teacher-researcher examining my role in effectively implementing this second IG arts program as a social practice, revealed the significance in my thinking, responses and actions to the intergenerational interaction, intergenerational artistic collaboration, intergenerational relationship building and intergenerational learning opportunities. The variations made in this elementary program to the program model that was used for the homelearners program, revealed advantages and disadvantages for the social practices. The two additional sessions at the beginning as an extended orientation before meeting and interviewing the retirees due to the younger age of the students as possibly needing more scaffolding may not have been needed to this extent. The advantage was in the students fully understanding what the program was about, and their role. The disadvantage for when the interview session began and the students finally met the retirees (possibly compounded by not having their regular teacher present) was that it seemed staged. I had set this stage as leading the first two sessions without the retirees, instead of participating as an equal member within the social practices with the retirees. Possibly these two sessions could have been combined, and on reflection, incorporated the retirees into these sessions' activities. These activities could have served as catalyst for more spontaneous intergenerational interaction when the students' questions first emerged, particularity through the drawing of what the waterfront work might be, and in discussing the homelearners program art project examples. As teacher-researcher examining these changes to this program, and incorporating my observations from the homelearners program into this elementary program, enabled me to recognize my influence on the social practices. My reflective practice has enabled me to examine my thinking, responses and actions in relation to their impact on the social practices for this program's effectiveness as intergenerational, for the interaction, artistic collaboration and learning. I developed awareness for the outside influences on my thinking, responses and

actions of a different social practice as the teacher leading. The influence of this other social practice occurred outside my comfort zone as art teacher in the art room of the Homelearners Centre, and outside the social practices for the IG arts program. When I adopted this other social practice for the teacher leading, the intergenerational interaction was diminished. The intergenerational interaction was at its highest when I became immersed within the social practices in support of, and as a participant within equal group status alongside the students and retirees.

## **Chapter 4. Conclusion**

### **4.1. Limitations of the Inquiry**

This inquiry only discusses two programs that were implemented for this intergenerational arts program model, the homelearners program and the elementary program. This presents a limited research sample. Implementing more programs based on this intergenerational arts program model could help determine consistent data from multiple programs for what makes implementing an intergenerational arts program effective as a social practice.

This research was also limited in the number of teachers implementing different programs for the consistency in data over multiple programs for what makes the teacher's role effective implementing intergenerational arts programs. This was a qualitative reflexive analysis from my perspective as a visual arts educator-researcher into what makes the teacher's role effective in implementing an IG arts program. Collaborating researchers' and teachers' perspectives contributed a valuable part to this research, revealing the importance in collaboration for reflective practice. This research was limited by the small number of collaborating researchers, and educators. Implementing multi programs could afford opportunities for more collaborating researchers' and educators' perspectives for consistent data for what makes implementing the IG arts program model effective as a social practice. The limitations as mentioned due to this being a small sample size suggest the findings and data collected from implementing these two programs may not necessary transfer to all intergenerational arts programs, and to all teachers' experiences implementing intergenerational art programs.

### **4.2. Directions for Future Research**

Two further research questions emerged from this research. The first research question relates to what happens to the intergenerational connections after the intergenerational arts program ends. Dr. O'Neill commented on this stating that the connections unfortunately also end. Gerry asked a couple of years after the homelearners

program had ended, “How are my twins doing?” There was no contact between Gerry and the twins after the program ended. This suggests research possibilities for how these intergenerational connections can be continued. In the literature on implementing intergenerational arts programs, Heydon and O'Neill (2014) note the participants' interest level to be relevant to their level of participation, and Jarrott (2007) states voluntary participation is needed. Drawing from Jarrott, (2007) and Heydon and O'Neill (2014), in connection to the 'off topic' conversations that emerged between the retirees and the students as evidence for the interest in relationship building, begs a further research question. Could these 'off topic' conversations provide inspiration for continued intergenerational programming based on the topics of interest that emerge through these 'off topic' conversations, and thereby provide an avenue for voluntary continued intergenerational connections based on mutual interest.

The second research question that emerged from this research analysis relates to how to examine what is learned within an IG arts program that is meaningful to the participants' lives beyond the program's end. This research analysis discussed intergenerational learning opportunities, but not in any depth what was learned other than how it related to participating within the social practices for the program goals. A future research inquiry could examine what exactly is learned that is meaningful to the participants' lives. In the literature on intergenerational programming as opposed to intergenerational activities, Heydon (2013) states the former provide opportunities for more meaningful intergenerational learning relevant to the participants' lives. Intergenerational programs then have potential to afford such learning opportunities. A direction for future research then leads to how to determine if such meaningful learning has occurred, and if so what was it? In drawing from Eisner (2002) for what affords learning opportunities in the arts, I look to the element of surprise. Also, in drawing on this research analysis in implementing this intergenerational arts program, it was what surprised me in the value of the 'off topic' conversation placed by collaborating researchers' that I learned to view this contact setting as a social practice. In drawing from Overgaard (1985) in teaching as a social practice, I learned to see my role as teacher implementing this intergenerational arts program as engaged within these social practices for effectively implementing the program. In short, I learned from this research analysis through what surprised me. Future research might then focus on what surprised the participants. And

rather than asking the participants what they learned, the research question to determine what they learned that was meaningful to them could be, “What surprised you?” Gerry did make mention of how surprised he was to find himself teaching children. The students did hint in their exit interviews with Dr. O' Neill that they seemed surprised at how much the retirees knew. Mr. Sol also commented on how surprised he was at how quickly the students accepted the retirees and connected with them. He was also surprised by how enthusiastic his students were to share with other students in the school what they had learned. This indicates possibilities for learning through the element of surprise for all participants within IG arts programs, including the teacher, that are meaningful to their lives. As a future research question, asking students what surprised them could potentially be applied to other areas of educational assessment for possibly determining what is learned that is meaningful to students lives by looking at what surprises them, as “moments of recognition” in learning.

### **4.3. Implications for Education and Practice**

Reflective practice as teacher-researcher was applied to this research analysis as methodology for gathering data, and forming pedagogy for the role of art teacher implementing an IG arts program. Eisner (2002) suggests teachers view teaching as a form of personal research for insight into their practice. Through this inquiry as art teacher engaged in reflective practice and my role in implementing this IG arts program, I hope to provide insight into a teacher’s experience, through my thinking, responses and actions from my perspective as art educator, and in teaching as a form of inquiry. I’m suggesting this reflective practice as teacher-researcher could be applied to implementing other IG arts programs, but also other teaching contexts beyond this IG arts program model. Also, viewing teaching as a social practice, while engaged in reflective practice as teacher-researcher, afforded insights for an awareness of the social practice I was participating in. Developing this teacher awareness through reflective practice for operating within a social practice could support teachers beyond this program model for recognition in the value of the social practices they engage in. In drawing from Overgaard (1985), Schon (1983), Munby (1989), Eisner (2002), Finley (2008), Lyle (2009), and Alsalim (2014), in presenting teaching as a reflective practice within a social practice, this combination presents

possibilities for teachers' determining their teaching practices as engaged in, and in support of, the social practices most effective for their specific teaching situation.

IG arts programs can bring to the general classroom an experience that appreciates different types of knowledge shared between skipped generations as valuable for presenting a continuous thread of human experience within communities. Also, effective intergenerational programs that support equal group status can provide role models for students and elders alike for accepting others' differences as strengths in working together toward common goals. As Jarrott (2007) discusses, intergenerational solidarity is a benefit in intergenerational programs; therefore, I'm suggesting that further implementation of IG arts programs in schools could extend this sense of solidarity through equal group status further into school communities to promote inclusiveness that is beneficial to all.

## References

- Asalim, L. (2014). A new approach to understanding teachers' classroom practices. *SFU EdReview*, 1 (1), 1-11.
- Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology, new vistas for qualitative research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Brabazon, K., & Disch, R. (1997). *Intergenerational approaches in aging: implications for education, policy and practice*. New York, The Haworth Press.
- Daignault, J. (Fall 2005). Mixed autobiography or the acousmatic modality *Educational Insights* 9 (2).
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press
- Fels, L (1999). *in the wind cloths dance on a line: performative inquiry as a (re)search methodology*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Fels, L., & Belliveau, G. (2008). *Exploring curriculum: performative inquiry, role drama, and learning*. Vancouver, Pacific Educational Press.
- Fleming, M. (2012). *The arts in education, an introduction to aesthetics, theory and pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Flexible. [Def. 1.2]. (2017). Oxford University Press. In *English living Oxford dictionarie.com*. Retrieved March 15, 2017 from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/flexible>.
- Finley, L. (2008). Reflecting on 'reflective practice'. *Practice-based Professional Learning Centre*, CETL paper 52. The Open University. [www.open.ac.uk/pbpl](http://www.open.ac.uk/pbpl).
- Giddens, A. (1984). *Constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuralism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heydon, R. (2013). *Learning at the ends of life: children, elders, and literacies in intergenerational curricular*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Heydon, R., & O'Neill, S. (2014). Songs in our hearts: affordances and constraints of an intergenerational multimodal arts curriculum. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 15 (16), 1-32.
- Jarrott, S. (2007). Programs that affect intergenerational solidarity. *Gerontological Society of America*, 3, 1-16.

- Leitch, R., & Day, C. (2000). Action research and reflective practice: towards a holistic view, *Educational action research*, 8 (1), 179-193
- Lyle, E. (2009). A process of becoming: in favour of reflexive narrative approach. *The Qualitative Report* 14 (2), 293-298.
- Munby, H. (1989). Reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, *Education and Culture* 9: 1, (4).
- Nachmanovitch, S. (1990). *Free play: improvisation in life and art*. New York: Penguin Putman Inc.
- Overgaard, V. J. (1985). *Teaching conceived as a social practice*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Victoria.
- Roessing, L. (2004). *No more "us" and "them": classroom lessons and activities to promote peer respect*. Plymouth, UK: The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing.
- Sensitivity. [Def. e]. ( 2017). *Merriam Webster Dictionary.com*. Retrieved March 15, 2017, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sensitivity>.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Walsh, M. (2010). Multimodal literacy: what does it mean for classroom practice? *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 33 (3), 221-239.

# Appendix A.

## IG Artistic Inquiry Letter for Parents



8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6

FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
Arts Education Program, Simon Fraser University  
Dr. Susan O'Neill  
TEL 778.782.4129 [@sfu.ca](mailto:susan.o'neill@sfu.ca)  
FAX 778.782.4203 [www.edu.sfu.ca](http://www.edu.sfu.ca)

Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component - 2011sXXXX  
*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*

### **INFORMED CONSENT** **(for parents/guardians of children)**

Our research team is conducting a research project involving an intergenerational (IG) art project into the world of work on the waterfront with children from the New Westminster Home Learners Program and volunteer retirees from the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), Local 502 (New Westminster). We would like to invite your child to participate in this research. The study aims to explore what makes for successful IG artistic inquiry curriculum and what can be done to help build local community knowledge and shared understanding through children's collaboration on an art project with adults who spent their working lives on the waterfront.

Information for this research will be collected during the weekly art classes that your child will be attending for an eight-week period with their art teacher, Mrs. Sue Dyer. This will involve videotaping your child's involvement in the art classes, observing the classes, and photographing interactions between participants during the program. At the end of the project, we will invite your child to be interviewed about his/her experience during the classes, and what he/she learned from the project. All research will be conducted during the IG art project classes and therefore it will take up no more of your child's time than would ordinarily be spent at this activity. Children who are interviewed may spend from 10-20 minutes of their time depending upon the amount of time they choose to spend in the interview.

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and the participants' names will not be used. For illustrative purposes, short segments of the videotapes and/or photographs may be used in future presentations or publications of the research (e.g., scholarly conferences, IG program training sessions). They will not be used for commercial use. Individuals will be identifiable to those viewing the images; however, a different name will be used. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential and will be stored in paper format and recorded via digital voice and video recorders for a five-year period, after which time they will be destroyed.

Please be aware that participation in this study is voluntary. Your child may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. Those who decide not to participate in the research may still participate in the IG art project classes and will be seated so that they do not appear in the videotapes or photographs. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from the study will have no adverse effects on your involvement in the program. There are no known risks to participating in this study. You may obtain a copy of the results of the research by contacting Dr. Susan O'Neill at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca or

Page 1 of 2

the Principle Investigator of the Partnership Research Project *Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront*, Dr. Peter Hall at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca.

If you have any questions or complaints about the conduct of this study you may contact the Director, Hal Weinberg, Office of Research Ethics, Simon Fraser University at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca.

If you have any questions about this research, or any comments to make now or at a later date, please contact Dr. Susan O'Neill at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca.

---

*Please complete **this** portion of the form and return to Mrs Sue Dyer at the Home Learners Program.*

Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component - 2011sXXXX  
*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*

**CONSENT FORM**  
**(for parents/guardians of children)**

I have read the Letter of Information (above) and had the nature of the study explained to me. I have explained this information to my child and I give permission for my child to participate in the study. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Child

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Parent/Guardian

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent/Guardian's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Appendix B.

# IG Artistic Inquiry Letter to Retirees



8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC  
Canada V5A 1S6

FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
Arts Education Program, Simon Fraser University  
Dr. Susan O'Neill  
TEL 778.782.4129  
FAX 778.782.4203  
[@sfu.ca](mailto:susan.o'neill@sfu.ca)  
[www.edu.sfu.ca](http://www.edu.sfu.ca)

Reclaiming the New Westminister Waterfront: education component - 2011sXXXX  
*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*

### INFORMED CONSENT

(for Retirees from ILWU, Local 502, New Westminister)

Our research team is conducting a research project involving an intergenerational (IG) art project into the world of work on the waterfront with children from the New Westminister Home Learners Program. We would like to invite you to participate in this research. The study aims to explore what makes for successful IG artistic inquiry curriculum and what can be done to help build local community knowledge and shared understanding through children's collaboration on an art project with adults who spent their working lives on the waterfront.

Information for this research will be collected during the weekly art classes that you have volunteered to attend for an eight-week period at the New Westminister Home Learners facility. This will involve videotaping your involvement in the IG art project, observing the classes, and photographing interactions between participants during the classes. At the end of the project, you will be invited to be interviewed on topics that may include minimal demographic information such as age, gender, place of birth, highest level of education, heritage language, length of time living in the local community, previous experience with children, previous artistic experience, as well as your views about the direct benefits of the classes, the types of learning exchanges that occur in the classes between the retirees and children, and the opportunities that were provided for learning about the world of work on the waterfront. All research will be conducted during the normal IG art project classes and therefore it will take up no more of your time than you would ordinarily spend at this activity. Retirees who are interviewed may spend from 30-60 minutes of their time depending upon the amount of time they choose to spend in the interview.

The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and the participants' names will not be used. Short segments of the videotapes and/or photographs may be used in the future in any presentation or publication of the research (e.g., scholarly conferences, IG training sessions). They will not be used for commercial use. Individuals will be identifiable to those viewing the images but your name will remain confidential and a different name will be used when referring to you in the videotape or photographic image. All information collected for the study will be kept confidential and will be stored securely in paper format and recorded via digital voice and video recorders for a five-year period, after which time they will be destroyed.

Please be aware that participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time. Those who decide not to participate in the research may still participate in the IG art project classes and will be seated so that they do not appear in the videotapes or photographs. Refusal to participate or

Page 1 of 2

withdrawal from the study will have no adverse effects on your involvement in the art classes. There are no known risks to participating in this study. You may obtain a copy of the results of the research by contacting the Project Director, Dr. Susan O'Neill at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca or the Principle Investigator of the Partnership Research Project *Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront*, Dr. Peter Hall at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca.

If you have any questions or complaints about the conduct of this study you may contact the Director, Hal Weinberg, Office of Research Ethics, Simon Fraser University at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca.

If you have any questions about this research, or any comments to make now or at a later date, please contact Dr. Susan O'Neill at (778) 782-████ or █████@sfu.ca

---

*Please complete **this** portion of the form.*

Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component - 2011sXXXX  
*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*

**CONSENT FORM**  
**(for Retirees from ILWU, Local 502, New Westminster)**

I have read the Letter of Information (above), have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate in the study. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## Appendix C.

### IG Art Project Child Interview Protocol

Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component -  
2011sXXXX  
*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*  
Interview Protocol for Children

Child's Name:

Age:

Gender:

Place of birth:

Heritage language:

Length of time living in the local community:

Previous experience learning with older adults:

#### **PART A – INTERGENERATIONAL ART PROJECT**

1. Describe your art project to me. What is it all about?

---

2. How did you decide on this topic/theme for your project?

---

3. What does your art project tell us about working on the waterfront?

---

4. What did you enjoy about working with your older partner on this art project?

---

5. How did the older person help you with your art project?

---

6. How would you describe the older partner that you worked with?

---

7. Do you think that you have changed your opinion about anything since you have worked with an older person in this art class? In other words do you have any different values, attitudes or beliefs than what you did before working with your partner?

---

8. Do you think that you were encouraged or motivated by your older partner during the art class? Or can you think of a time that you motivated your older partner?

---

9. Do you see yourself as taking chances, or trying something different from what is expected when it comes to art work? Give an example.

---

10. Do you think that you cooperated with your older partner or took turns doing things with your partner? Did you divide up responsibilities? Did you agree together on ways to do things or did you or your partner always seem to do things your own way?

---

11. Did you learn anything about art in this class? Did having an older partner make any difference as to your learning?

---

12. Have you told anyone else about your experiences in this class? Who did you tell and what did you say?

---

13. Would you like to have an older partner again in a class? Please explain.

---

**PART B – LEARNING ABOUT WORK ON THE WATERFRONT**

1. What do you think makes a person want to work on the waterfront?

---

2. What do you think a waterfront worker does in a typical day?

---

3. Can you tell me about the different jobs workers on the waterfront do?

---

4. Can you tell me how different jobs on the waterfront help the community?

---

Anything else you would like to say?

## Appendix D.

### IG Art Project Retiree Interview Protocol

Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component -  
2011sXXXX

*Artistic Explorations of the World of Work on the Waterfront: Past, Present, and Future*  
Interview Protocol for Retirees from ILWU, Local 502, New Westminster

#### Information for Interviewer:

This interview is inductive and involves asking mainly general, open-ended questions designed to elicit stories and descriptions by the respondent. Focus on personal narratives that gain a deeper understanding of the respondent's experiences during the IG art classes and the influence these experiences have on their sense of helping to build local community knowledge and shared understanding through children's collaboration on an art project with adults who spent their working lives on the waterfront.

Using a number of general probes might be helpful. The purpose of probes in interviews is to enable the person being interviewed to provide as much detailed information as possible in their responses. Neutral probes encourage additional information, but do not suggest specific answers. Some examples of probes are "How is that?" or "In what ways?" and so on. You will also be asked at times to provide prompts that move the question around different contexts/situations.

#### Interview Introduction:

- Introduce yourself
- Describe the project and goals (as per the information letter)
- Explain consent form and have respondent sign the consent form (if not already completed)
- Explain that interviews will be audio recorded
- Explain that the respondent may stop at any time or choose not to answer any question
- Ask if the respondent has any questions before you begin, e.g., "Feel free to ask me to clarify any question you don't understand."

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Age:

Gender:

Place of birth:

Highest level of education:

Heritage language:

Length of time living in the local community

Previous experience with children?

#### **PART A – PREVIOUS ARTS EXPERIENCE**

1. What kinds of arts activities did you do earlier in your life?

---

(List all activities - prompts: At school? Church or community choir? At home? (Breadth of arts involvement (what activities), intensity of involvement (how much), Duration of involvement (how long)?

**2. How important were arts activities to you in your earlier life?**

---

*Follow up question: Why do you think it was important/not important?*

**3. Can you tell me a childhood memory that you have of being involved in arts activities?**

---

Think about a key event relating to arts activities from your childhood that stands out to you for some reason. Can you think of a memorable moment involving the arts?  
(Prompts: What happened? What were you doing? When did it happen? Where did it happen? Who was involved? What were you thinking and feeling? Did this event change you in any way? If so, in what way?) [Note: Try to get respondent to focus on a specific event/episode.]

**4. Was there someone important who influenced your involvement in arts activities?**

---

(Prompts: for example, a parent, a teacher, a family member, a friend?) Describe the most important person who had had an impact on your arts involvement. Specify the relationship you had or have with this person and the specific way in which he or she had (or continues to have) an impact on your arts involvement.

**PART B – INTERGENERATIONAL ART PROJECT**

**1. What did you like the most about the art classes with the children?**

---

**2. What do you think is the most important reason for the art classes with the children?**

---

**3. What do you think is the most difficult or challenging part of working with the children?**

---

**4. How do you feel after the classes? (Do you feel any different from before the classes?)**

---

**5. What do you think is the objective/goal of the art classes with the children?**

---

**6. What do you think is the art teacher's role? What are the important things she should do during the classes with you and the children?**

---

7. Can you tell me one of your favorite/most special moments in the class?

---

8. What do you think the children learned from the class?

---

9. Do you think the children learned something from you? Yes-->what? No-->why not?

---

10. In your opinion, why do the other retirees come to the class?

---

11. What do you think the children learned about the world of work on the waterfront from the project?

---

12. Do you feel like during your time in the IG art class you had an opportunity to share attitudes, values and beliefs with your younger partner? If so please give an example.

---

13. Do you recall providing motivation for your partner? Give an example.

---

14. Do you feel like you and your partner cooperated and collaborated with each other during your art making and discussions? Please explain.

---

15. Did you learn anything about art during your time in the IG class? Did having a younger partner have an impact on how and what you learned? Please explain.

---

16. Please tell what you enjoyed about working with a younger partner during the IG class.

---

17. Have you told anyone else about your experiences in this IG class. What did you say?

---

18. Would you be willing to participate in another IG class at some later time? If no please share your reservations.

---

Follow up questions: What do you think would help you to (a) be creative in the future, and (b) make a contribution to educating children? What do you think would stand in your way or make it difficult for you to do it?

Feel free to include any other comments that you feel would help me to provide a better IG learning environment. Thank you for your time!

## **Appendix E.**

### **The World of Work on the Waterfront - Art Project - Student Questionnaire**

What is the Waterfront?

Have you ever been to the Waterfront? If yes, when did you go and with who?

What do you know about the work people do at the Waterfront today?

What do you know about the work people used to do at the Waterfront?

Do you know what a retired worker is?

Are you looking forward to interviewing, gathering information and working with someone who used to work on the waterfront?

Do you know what a researcher does?

Are you interested in learning about the world of work on the waterfront? Is there anything specific you are interested in learning about?

Have you shared with anyone (such as family or friends) that you will be learning about work done on the waterfront?

Are you looking forward to showing what you have learned through an art project?

Did you learn anything about art in the first class that you think will help you with your art project? If yes, what was it?

Draw a picture of what you think the Waterfront looks like and include people working there:

## **Appendix F.**

### **The World of Work on the Waterfront - Student Questionnaire**

Did you enjoy working with the retirees that used to work on the waterfront?

What did you like about working with them?

Did you enjoy visiting the waterfront?

What did you like about it?

Do you know what a researcher does and can you explain?

Did you find it interesting learning about the world of work on the waterfront?

Was there anything specific you found interesting?

Have you shared with anyone (such as family or friends) what you have learned about work done on the waterfront?

Draw a picture of what you think the Waterfront looks like and include people working there:

## **Appendix G.**

### **“The World of Work on the Waterfront” Student ART Project Questionnaire**

Did you enjoy showing what you have learned through an art project?

What did you like about this art project?

What art materials did you choose to work with?

Why did you choose to work with these art materials?

What did you learn about art and the materials you used that helped you with your art project?

Were you able to get enough information about the topic of Work on the Waterfront to put into your art project?

What information about work on the waterfront did you put into your art project?

What do you think someone seeing your art project will learn about work on the Waterfront?

What did you learn from the retirees as they worked with you on your art project?

What do you think you taught the retirees as they worked with you on your art project?

Did you enjoy working with the retirees on your art project, if so what did you like?

## Appendix H.

### Waterfront Program Questions for Teacher:

- 1) What do you think your students learned by being a part of this project?
- 2) What do you think is the most important thing the students have learned from this project?
- 3) Do you think the arts projects were a valuable way for your students to communicate what they learned about the waterfront?
- 4) Do you think all your students were able to fully participate?
- 5) Do you think this type of project works well for students with learning disabilities?
- 6) Do you think this type of project works well for students of all abilities?
- 7) What do you think worked really well?
- 8) What do you think didn't work so well?
- 9) Was there any particular moment that stands out for you during this project?
- 10) Do you think the collaboration and interaction between the retirees and the students worked well?
- 11) Do you think it was a positive experience and beneficial to your students to work with a retiree to learn about the waterfront and to create an art project? If so, how did they benefit?
- 12) Do you think other teachers would be interested in taking on this type of project with their class?
- 13) Do you see any hurdles for a teacher taking this project on by themselves? If so, what?
- 14) Did you enjoy participating in this project with your students?
- 15) Did you learn anything from this project that you think might be useful to you as a teacher?

## **Appendix I.**

### **Approval Letter from School Principal**

Re: "Reclaiming the New Westminster Waterfront: education component" [2011s0810]  
Project conducted in partnership with researchers at Simon Fraser University

Please use this letter as confirmation of acceptance of the S.F.U. research project to be conducted with students and teacher. My understanding is that the study will involve videotaping classes where students and retirees from the International Longshore Workers Union (ILWU) Local 502 will work together on arts projects relating to work on the waterfront. Permission to do the study and the videotaping will be obtained from the children and the parent/guardian of each child that attends the program. Any child who does not want to participate in the study will attend their classes as usual and will be seated so that the camera does not record them. I further understand that interviews will be conducted with the children who attend the classes and who volunteer to participate in the interviews at the end of the project.

Sincerely,

Principal