

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

A “learning revolution”? Investigating pedagogic practices around interactive whiteboards in British Primary classrooms

Journal Item

How to cite:

Gillen, Julia; Kleine Staarman, Judith; Littleton, Karen; Mercer, Neil and Twiner, Alison (2007). A “learning revolution”? Investigating pedagogic practices around interactive whiteboards in British Primary classrooms. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 32(3) pp. 243–256.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2007 Taylor Francis

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1080/17439880701511099>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

A “learning revolution”? Investigating pedagogic practice around interactive whiteboards in British primary classrooms

Julia Gillen^a, Judith Kleine Staarman^b, Karen Littleton^a, Neil Mercer^b, Alison Twiner^{a*1}

^a *The Open University, UK;* ^b *University of Cambridge, UK*

Interactive whiteboards have been rapidly introduced into all primary schools under UK Government initiatives. These large, touch-sensitive screens, which control a computer connected to a digital projector, seem to be the first type of educational technology particularly suited for whole-class interaction. Strong claims are made for their value by manufacturers and policy makers, but there has been little research on how, if at all, they influence established pedagogic practices, communicative processes and educational goals. This study has been designed to examine this issue, using observations in primary (elementary) school classrooms, and builds on the authors’ previous research on ICT in educational dialogues and collaborative activities.

Keywords: Interactive whiteboards; pedagogy, primary education, multimodality, learning technology

Background

As part of the UK government's plans to embed Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in schools, substantial investment has brought Interactive Whiteboards (IWBs) into the everyday life of the primary (elementary) school classroom (as described by Higgins, Beauchamp and Miller in this issue). The introduction of IWBs is expressly related by policy makers to the goal of raising attainment through improving pedagogic practice; strong claims that the use of IWBs can ‘transform’ teachers’ practice are made by both policy makers and manufacturers. The underlying assumption is that IWBs will have blanket benefits for learning, as former UK Secretary of State for Education Charles Clarke (as quoted by Arnott, 2004) asserted: ‘Every school of the future will have an interactive whiteboard in every classroom, technology has already revolutionised learning’.

However, as has been the case with earlier ICT initiatives, there is a danger that the introduction of this expensive, potentially valuable piece of equipment is ‘technology-led’ (i.e. it is introduced because it is available) rather than ‘education-led’ (i.e. it is introduced because it is known to meet the professional needs of teachers and the educational needs of children better than existing educational tools). Earlier research on

¹ Corresponding author: Alison Twiner, Educational Dialogue Research Unit, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK.
Email: A.J.Twiner@open.ac.uk

the introduction of computers to schools has shown that a technology-led mode of introduction is very likely to create problems, especially regarding teachers’ take-up of the technology as a pedagogic tool (Dawes, 2000).

There is no doubt that IWBs have some interesting affordances that could be of value for classroom teaching (for a full discussion see Higgins, Beauchamp and Miller, this issue). Our research, which draws on work on teacher-pupil communication and on the introduction and use of ICT in educational settings, stems from the conviction that there is a need for a more detached consideration and evaluation of the IWB as a pedagogic tool. By conceptualising the IWB from a socio-cultural perspective as a tool or ‘mediating artefact’ (Wertsch *et al.*, 1993) in primary school classroom practices, we aim to take into account the relationship between the affordances of IWBs, the pedagogical practices of teachers and the communicative repertoires of teachers and pupils.

In a recent study of whole class teaching in primary education, Burns and Myhill (2004) examined the nature of teacher-pupil interaction. In accord with earlier research (as summarised in, for example Mercer, 1995), they found that teachers allowed pupils very little time to initiate responses to questions and did not elicit extended responses from pupils. Pupils generally made only brief responses and took quite a passive role in classroom interactions. Although in some other countries extended contributions from pupils have been observed as more common (Alexander, 2000), this seems to typify life in most British classrooms. There have been recent attempts by both researchers and government agencies in the UK to create a more ‘dialogic’ climate in schools (DfES, 2002; Qualifications and Curriculum Agency (QCA), 2003; Alexander, 2004) and our own research has shown that when teachers encourage the more active discursive involvement of pupils, through drawing them into more extended and thought-provoking question and answer exchanges, this is associated with better learning outcomes (Rojas-Drummond & Mercer, 2004). An interesting facet of IWBs is that they are the only educational ICT tool expressly designed for whole-class interaction. So a key aim is to ascertain whether their use is associated with any changes in the dialogic patterns of whole class interaction, or whether they are simply used to sustain the status quo which has been documented so persistently by classroom researchers over the years.

Aims and objectives

The current study therefore investigates how IWBs actually function as a communicative and pedagogic tool in classroom interactions, how they are used by teachers to pursue their educational goals, and how they are used to build shared frames of reference and ‘common knowledge’ (Edwards & Mercer, 1987) between teachers and pupils. It does so through the analysis of observed and recorded interactions in British classrooms, drawing on the considerable body of research on teacher-pupil communication in classrooms and on the introduction and use of ICT in educational settings (for example, Alexander, 2000; Burns & Myhill, 2004; Wegerif & Dawes, 2004).

More specifically, our data are used to examine:

- a. ways that the IWB functions as a communicative and pedagogic tool in the teacher-pupil interactions of the classroom;
- b. ways in which well-documented features of normal classroom interaction appear to be altered by the use of the IWB;
- c. ways that the use of the IWB appear to encourage or discourage the active participation of children in the process of teaching-and-learning (or in any way to offer them new opportunities for participation);
- d. the distinctive ways in which the IWB is used to build a shared frame of reference between teacher and children or to build common knowledge amongst members of the class;
- e. the extent to which potentially valuable affordances of the IWB are, or are not, used by teachers to pursue their pedagogic goals.

Methods

In the context of this ongoing project, we have collected observation and interview data from four teachers working within urban primary schools in the south of England. These schools were selected on the basis of existing working relations with the project team, and also schools’ expressed interest to be involved in the research. In justification of this sampling method, our aim was not to survey classrooms to describe and offer generalisations of the normal practices with IWBs, nor to evaluate their effectiveness overall (for current evaluations see Smith, Hardman & Higgins, 2006; Moss, 2007). The purpose of this work was to investigate the function and value of IWBs as mediating tools in the communicative process of education through case studies involving microanalysis.

We focussed on Key Stage 2 classes (children aged 7-11 years) at the upper end of primary education. Each teacher was video recorded during two sequences of two lessons, providing 16 lessons overall within which some were on maths and science. All four teachers were also interviewed about their use of IWBs. The interview addressed their perceptions of the potential advantages and disadvantages of the use of the equipment, as well as any ways in which they saw its use enabling or inhibiting their teaching. We also engaged in an amount of supplementary data collection, including video-recording and interviewing other teachers particularly interested in IWBs (who self-referred, owing to interest in the project).

Data focus for this paper

For the purposes of this paper we use, as case studies, data drawn from two lessons in one of the schools. Extracts 1, 2 and 3 are from a Year 3 (ages 7-8 years) English lesson focussing on writing instructional texts. This teacher was fairly new to teaching, with just three years experience, but had had access to an IWB for most of this time. He was one of two teachers at the school in question to receive their first IWBs, which he acquired via an informal ‘bidding’ process within the school. The school has now supplemented these to their current levels of one in each classroom. His enthusiasm has meant that IWBs are now integrated into his classroom environment, with his own comments that he would

certainly struggle if he had to teach without this specific technological tool. Extracts 4, 5 and 6 were taken from a Year 5 (age 9-10 years) science lesson on evaporation. This teacher was the IWB advisor for her Local Authority (LA), and so was very familiar with the technology, but was not the regular class teacher, whereby whilst she was often based at the school, she was less familiar with the pupils. Her confidence with the IWB was apparent in seamless movement through screens, and incorporation of a variety of the IWBs functionalities.

Methodology for analysis of the extracts. The analysis consisted of two main stages. The first involved a preliminary consideration of all recorded data and associated transcriptions. The second consisted of a more detailed examination of video and transcript data to create notes on topic themes, lesson content and non-verbal aspects of interpersonal interaction (including the use of technical equipment and other artefacts). Guided by the research questions, particular sequences were then selected for microanalysis. The process then became one of: (a) tracing ways in which the IWB functioned as a communicative and pedagogic tool in teacher-pupil interactions and (b) describing and distinguishing specific features of the interaction around the IWBs. The findings described are an interpretation based not solely on the extracts presented, but on our immersion in the larger body of material as data and the search for patterns across it. The data extracts included here are therefore illustrative of these larger patterns rather than representing all the data analysed. While recognising the wealth of frameworks concerning the analysis of classroom interactions as alluded to above, for this paper we have found it fruitful to make special use of Mortimer and Scott’s (2003) matrix for distinguishing different types of ‘communicative approach’ in teacher-led talk, as shown in Figure 1 below:

FIGURE 1 HERE

Scott and his colleagues have explained this scheme as follows:

- a. Interactive/dialogic: teacher and students consider a range of ideas. If the level of interanimation is high, they pose genuine questions as they explore and work on different points of view. If the level of interanimation is low, the different ideas are simply made available.
 - b. Non-interactive/dialogic: teacher revisits and summarises different points of view, either simply listing them (low interanimation) or exploring similarities and differences (high interanimation).
 - c. Interactive/authoritative: teacher focuses on one specific point of view and leads students through a question and answer routine with the aim of establishing and consolidating that point of view.
 - d. Non-interactive/authoritative: teacher presents a specific point of view.
- (Scott, Mortimer & Aguiar, 2006, p. 612)

Results

As outlined above, one common claim made by proponents of IWBs is that they enable a learning revolution. Does this mean that there is a profound change of pedagogy as a result of using the technology, or does it merely mean that some procedures or strategies within established teaching styles become easier to enact, or quicker to accomplish and/or involve difficult preparation? In other words, do we see a radical reformulation of how teaching and learning is carried out, or only a significant improvement in the technical support for conventional teaching? We have examined this by studying interactions around the IWB, situating the use of this specific mediating artefact within established procedures, strategies and patterns of interaction employed by the teacher.

Extract 1: Using pictures of previous lesson as resource (4:35 – 5:19)

[Times indicate the interval of the extract into the lesson, and also the duration of the extract.]

Background information: The lesson is a literacy lesson, in which the learning goal is to write a recipe. The children have made pancake batter the previous day and will be baking pancakes today (as it is Pancake Day/Shrove Tuesday). The literacy lesson is linked to this activity, as the students will learn how to write a recipe for making pancakes. The teacher has taken photographs with a digital camera from the cooking lesson the day earlier, and has put four of these photographs on the IWB. The first extract is from the beginning of the lesson (after four minutes) when the teacher asks the pupils to label the pictures, and a bit later, to put the pictures (with the correct labels) in the right order. At this stage of the lesson, the pupils are all seated in front of the IWB, on the carpet.

Teacher	OK, here we go. Here are some pictures of you doing it yesterday (making pancake batter) let's see, first of all, let's see if we can get somebody to come and label, what, some of these up correctly. Who would like to come and label the instructions to the pictures? Eh, Ruben, you come and do the first one? (And let you think) just move the, move the label onto the picture you think it goes with.	<i>Teacher gives whiteboard pen to pupil, who walked up to the IWB. Pupil moves pen to label in order to move it down on the IWB</i>
Teacher	Mmm, yeah: Is that right? (<i>directed to other pupils</i>). That's, why don't you do the one, that's got you on there?	<i>Pupil moves a label to the top right picture</i>
Ruben	OK.	
Teacher	What are you doing there? Right, OK, so move that onto, right, that's it, onto that picture. Very good, right.	<i>Pupil moves label to picture of himself</i>
		<i>Pupil gives pen back to teacher and walks back to the carpet</i>

Transcription conventions

could indicates emphasis

(making) indicates partly unintelligible speech, with most likely speech noted

(...) indicates unintelligible

[indicates overlapping speech

(*intake of breath*) indicates contextual note

The first extract shows an imaginative use of digital photographs from the previous lesson on this topic which, by engaging the children in a fun way, cued common knowledge of past shared experience and thus provided support for the continuity of yesterday’s activity to today’s lesson. Linking the content of lessons can provide some coherence for pupils’ experience of classroom education which, as Crook (1999), Alexander (2000) and other researchers have argued, does not naturally emerge for pupils through participation in classroom activities. It has to be actively pursued by the teacher through appropriate teaching strategies. In addition to this, the use of the actual photographs of the pupils made the current activity (writing a recipe for making pancakes) personal and more authentic. It is hard to imagine how this could be done so well, or so relatively easily in terms of teacher effort, without this digital technology (i.e. camera plus IWB).

Extract 2: Block-reveal: structure and pace (8:45 - 9:41)

Background information: This extract comes from somewhat further in the lesson, when the children are required to think about what they will have to put in the recipe after the instruction of making the batter.

Teacher	Right, OK. This is what we're going to be doing the next part of the recipe, so this is now the part that we haven't done yet. Can anybody think what we might be doing next? What would be the next stage in the, to make the pancake? James?	
James	Put in the pan and let it cook.	
Teacher	Putting the?	
James	Put it inside and let it cook	
Teacher	Alright, putting it in the pan and letting it cook, let's see if you're right with that one. Right, very good, yes. Heat frying pan and pour in the batter. What was the verb there? Which verb did we, what did we use there, which is the, what's the doing word in that case? (Liam)	<i>Moves block that was covering text on IWB slightly down to reveal text: "heat frying pan and pour in batter"</i>
Liam	Heat?	
Teacher	Heat, yes, and again it's coming [up at the front isn't it, it's an instruction	
Pupil	[...] instruction	<i>Some children are talking</i>
Teacher	There's two actions, two verbs in that sentence, the other one...	<i>Looks to pupils, some of whom are still talking</i>

Pupil	You also have to put oil in the pan because it's hard to get it out.	
Teacher	That's quite right, you do normally put a little bit of oil or butter, haven't put that down on there. Right.	

In the second extract we see the teacher use the ‘block-reveal’ facility to give structure and pace to whole class discussion and review of the previous week’s work on writing instructions. The IWB also is shown to be a very useful medium for presenting instructional texts in a way that allows for the order of the items to be varied, and in a way that encourages children to think about the implications for action. One of the instructions was noticed by the children to be missing: ‘put oil in the pan’. However, the teacher did not take the opportunity of an IWB presentation’s provisionality and mutability to revise his original formulation. This may be because at this stage in the lesson, he was very committed to the pre-designed structure of the presentation, and/or because he had expected this part to be based only on ‘authoritative’ discourse.

Extract 3: Provisionality: adding quantities (40:00 – 40:20)

Background information: The last extract for this teacher is from later in the lesson, after the children have been working in groups to write the content of their recipes. The teacher has put a template on the IWB which shows the heading ‘Ingredients’, a bullet list to fill in by the pupils, and some pictures of ingredients. The pupils have to fill in the same template on paper, working together in their groups. The teacher walks around the classroom and talks to pupils.

Pupil	(Do you have to put like) how much to put in?	<i>Pupil walks over to teacher</i>
Teacher	Yes, (<i>directs attention to rest of the class</i>) if you can remember how much, remember it is important. Who can remember how much we used of the different ingredients? Katie?	<i>Pupils raise hands, teacher walks to IWB, where the template of the recipe is still shown</i>
Katie	Erm, 100 grams of flour	
Teacher	Flour, yes, that was 100 grams, good. I'll write that one here. One hundred grams, good. Can anyone remember how much milk we used?	<i>Writes '100g' in the picture of the flour on the IWB</i>

In Extract 3, from later in the lesson, the teacher does utilise the provisionality afforded by the IWB. During the group work, one of the children notices that the amounts of ingredients are not listed. The teacher acknowledges the importance of this, and subsequently adds the quantities to the recipe items on the IWB, while also taking the opportunity to link this issue to scientific understanding. While we are not in a position to explain why the teacher took advantage of this one event and not the other, we certainly can say that the affordances of the IWB were used by this teacher to:

- a. support both authoritative/interactive dialogue and non-authoritative/interactive dialogue (the latter using children’s contributions to modify his formal presentation and hence the task-related information);

- b. relate past shared experience and common knowledge to current tasks;
- c. make a lively and engaging presentation;
- d. maintain a balance between planned lesson structure and spontaneous reactions to contributions and events as they unfolded.

Extract 4: Video: engagement at lesson start (2:56 – 3:30)

Background information: The first extract from this second teacher is from the start of the lesson. After overcoming a few problems in accessing the file, the teacher opens a video clip of herself in her kitchen at home. The extract shows her putting water into a hot frying pan, to demonstrate how the water evaporates. This is presented in the form of a ‘magic trick’.

Teacher (on video)	Hey, this is Mrs Patel. I’m standing in my kitchen and I’m going to do a magic trick. Are you ready? <i>(pause)</i>	<i>Teacher in classroom moves to side of IWB out of the way</i>
Pupils	Yes	
Teacher (on video)	I said are you ready?	<i>Holds hand to ear in listening gesture</i>
Pupils	Yes! <i>(louder)</i>	
Teacher (on video)	You see I’ve got an ordinary frying pan here and an ordinary glass of water. I’m going to take a bit of the water, and I’m going to put it in the frying pan. Watch carefully Now you see it... <i>(pause)</i> Now you don’t	<i>Holds up pan in left hand and runs right hand round it, lowers pan but keeps left hand on it Holds up glass in right hand and puts back on side Takes spoonful of water, and moves above pan Drops water into pan, which sizzles Holds up pan on its side, and no water runs out</i>
Pupil	Whoa!	
Teacher (on video)	Tada!	<i>Looks back at camera keeps holding pan in left hand, and raises right hand to ‘show off’ her display</i>
Pupil	That is a magic trick!	<i>Pupils clap</i>

Extract 4 shows a teacher’s imaginative and effective use of technology (digital camera with video plus IWB) which enables her to demonstrate to the children water evaporation by heat, in a way that clearly engaged the children and avoided the need for staging an event which might create ‘health and safety’ problems. So the children saw something relevant that they would not have been able to see otherwise. Also, presenting

the video file as a ‘magic trick’ provided the lesson with an ‘anchor’, which grasped the attention of the pupils and enabled the building of further understanding (Schwartz, Lin, Brophy, & Bransford, 1999). While the video effectively engaged the pupils via the presentational facility, this in itself was only a starting point for further learning and teaching, in which the IWB was also involved

Extract 5: Pupil involvement: hands up and IRF sequence (Initiation-Response-Feedback) (12:00 – 12.23)

Background information: This extract is taken from part way through a science lesson, during a task of categorising various objects as solid, liquid or gas. Some class members disagree as to whether ice (the particular object they are categorising at that time) can be considered a solid or liquid. The teacher tries to draw the ‘correct’ answer from the pupils, to establish the difference between ice as a solid and water as a liquid.

Teacher	OK, it <u>could</u> be liquid. When is that a liquid?	
Pupils	<i>(intake of breath)</i>	<i>Raise hands energetically</i>
Teacher	When is that a liquid? <i>(pause)</i> Er, Josh.	
Josh	<i>(quietly)</i> When the temperature is very hot	<i>Lowers hand before speaking, and other students then lower their hands</i>
Teacher	When is, sorry, [when	<i>Questioning tone</i>
Josh	[When the temperature is hot	
Teacher	When the temperature is hot, it’s a liquid?	
Another pupil	When it melts	
Josh	<i>(laughs)</i>	<i>Laugh as if he suspects his answer isn’t quite right</i>
Teacher	Does that make sense? Can somebody try to re-word that for me?	<i>Pupils begin to raise hands again (including Josh)</i>
Pupil	When it’s been melted	
Teacher	When it’s been melted and it’s <i>(pause)</i> what?	
Pupil	Er, er water	
Teacher	Water, well done	

Extract 5 illustrates that the structure and content of the classroom talk was very much of traditional IRF (Initiation- Response-Feedback) with closed questions and short responses, and relying on the usual ‘hands up’ competitive volunteer system. The same kind of conventional dialogue structure can be found in Extract 6.

Extract 6: Risk taking and error: exposure or opportunity (15:25 – 16.14)

Background information: This extract is also from the task to categorise various objects as solid, liquid or gas. A girl has been called to the IWB, and selects a picture to categorise (the bottom half shows a desert, and the top half is a blue sky). The girl (Aimee) appears confused about which category it should belong to (solid, liquid or gas), and the teacher questions her and others in the class to work through the confusion.

		<i>Aimee comes up to the IWB. Teacher gives her the IWB pen, and she hovers the pen over a picture</i>
Teacher	What is that a picture of, Aimee?	
Aimee	A desert?	
Teacher	Yep	<i>Aimee starts to drag the picture over to the ‘gases’ column, but then hovers between the ‘gases’ and ‘liquids’ columns</i>
Aimee	(...)	<i>Aimee looks to teacher, but doesn’t let go of the picture</i>
Teacher	You think it’s a gas?	<i>Other pupils mutter</i>
Teacher	<i>(to Aimee)</i> What are we looking at? Which part of the picture are you looking at? <i>(to rest of class)</i> No, she [could	<i>Teacher moves finger to point repeatedly between top and bottom sections of the picture</i>
Aimee	[Oh, oh	<i>Aimee starts to move picture over to ‘solids’ column</i>
Teacher	She could be right. She could put it there, and we’ll talk about why <i>(to Aimee)</i> What part are we looking at? What do you think that picture is talking about?	<i>Aimee moves picture slowly to more central position between the three categories</i>
Aimee	I don’t understand	<i>Releases the IWB pen hold of the picture</i>
Teacher	Which material are we looking at?	<i>Teacher points between the top and bottom sections of the picture. Aimee then points to the top section.</i>
Teacher	<i>(to rest of class)</i> The sky! OK. She’s looking at the sky and she wants to put it in the ‘gases’. Is that correct?	<i>Teacher points from picture to the ‘gases’ column</i>
Pupils	[No [Yes	
Teacher	Oh, put your hands up please, hands up. Do you think she’s right Allan?	<i>Pupils start to put their hands up</i>
Allan	Yes	
Teacher	Yeah. If she’s looking at the sky, and she wants to put it in the ‘gases’ she’s	

	correct. Why?	
Allan	Because erm, well gases like, erm air, you know, and, and, erm, air’s gas.	
Teacher	Good. Well done.	

In Extract 6 there is interesting use of the IWB for getting children involved in constructing the knowledge. The children are asked to come up to the IWB to put images of substances in appropriate frames (i.e. solids, liquids or gases). This activity provides the teacher with an opportunity to establish the children’s understanding about the topic, as well as interactivity on the part of the pupils.

Extract 6 illustrates the power of the IWB to engage pupils, as from the raised hands it seems that they are very eager to be chosen to come up to the IWB for the activity. However, this affordance of the IWB also carries with it the usual risks of public exposure and ridicule for error (a cultural feature of British classrooms: see Alexander, 2000) as in the case of the girl who put the ‘desert’ picture in the ‘gases’ box. In this respect, as with other whole class interactions, the pupils have to balance the risk of public exposure of a possible error with the opportunity of doing an action on the IWB.

We would argue that since in most research the IWB is reported to be highly motivating for pupils, the issue of managing classroom behaviour when mistakes are exposed needs to be important for teachers. This teacher paid considerable attention to recasting the perceived error as a legitimate possibility. Errors and mistakes need to become stepping stones to understanding as opposed to potential sources of ridicule or humiliation (Alexander, 2004), with the IWB resourcing the revision and re-consideration of ideas (see Carter, 2002). Smith (2001) also commented on the difficulties of individual pupil use, where the one-at-a-time nature of this activity means other pupils have to sit and wait their turn, as seen in extract six below. Smith noted that in such activities where pupils are called up to interact with the board, teachers within the study noted a loss of pace, and boredom of more able pupils. Thus the introduction and utilisation of new interaction opportunities, which pupils tend to find motivating and enjoyable when it is their turn raises new issues for classroom management. In this lesson, such potential challenges were managed through changes of pace and variation of activities.

Conclusion

These first results can be examined in the light of Smith *et al*’s (2005) study of IWB use and a distinction made by them between technical interactivity and pedagogical interactivity with the IWB in the classroom. In terms of technical interactivity, the IWB seems to facilitate a speedy, smooth presentation compared with earlier technology (for instance when a teacher would use a video player, then write on a blackboard, then allow children to manipulate pictures on a magnetic screen and then use the video again.) As a mediating artefact, it could be justifiably claimed to have a significant effect on teaching, (as is claimed by other researchers, e.g. Smith, 2001) to the extent that it clearly enabled

teachers to use a combination of innovative styles of presentation and the rapid succession of different kinds of multimodal information.

In terms of pedagogical interactivity the picture is more complex. Teaching from the front can mean that the teacher is better placed to observe and respond to pupils’ comments (as Smith, 2001, suggested) but there is evidence also to support the claim by Hall and Higgins (2005) that the board being at the front may reinforce a traditional style of teaching, although clearly depending upon the teachers’ skills children may be actively involved in the manipulation of information. The shared representation of content on the IWB potentially may be used to encourage more interactive and non-authoritative dialogue (Mortimer & Scott, 2003; Scott, *et al*, 2006) when children use the representation on the IWB to challenge the teacher’s (or other authority’s) claims, and it seems to us that such instances in our data are noteworthy in terms of utilising the IWB’s affordances to contribute to the quality of pedagogic dialogue.

Overall, an effective teacher is likely to engage in a balance of strategies at a number of levels. IWBs enable teachers to produce a very lively, varied, quite complex and interactive lesson more easily than previously possible, which is likely to have an effect on what teachers realistically *can* do in the time available. The most effective use of IWBs seems, from these early results, likely to involve striking a balance between providing a clear structure for a well resourced lesson, and retaining the capacity for more spontaneous or provisional adaptation of the lesson as it proceeds. Otherwise there remains a danger of over-reliance on the conventional IRF structure for dialogue, with its associated closed questioning, (cued) elicitation and one word answers from pupils (Mercer, 1995). Teachers may use the IWB’s technical affordances effectively yet to support an established, conventional style of teaching. This might well be an effective style: but in this sense the use of the IWB cannot be claimed to ‘transform teaching’ in terms of classroom dialogue and underlying pedagogy (as Smith, Hardman & Higgins, 2006, also conclude). Because the use of the IWB can increase the pace of the lesson, for instance through the quick manipulation of images, the opportunities for extended teacher-pupil dialogue may become more limited. In summary, there certainly do exist clear opportunities for identifying ways in which the IWB may be used most effectively in the classroom environment as a mediating artefact, and it is our intention to work with teachers to explore these more precisely.

Acknowledgements

The project team are very grateful to the staff and pupils of Malorees Junior School in Brent, London, whose data are presented in this paper, as well as staff at Brent Local Authority. The project has also collected data from schools in Milton Keynes. The study was made possible by funding from the UK Economic and Social Research Council (grant number: RES-000-22-1269).

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco, in 2006.

Notes on contributors

Julia Gillen lectures in the Centre for Research into Education and Educational Technology at the Open University (from July 2007 taking up post as Senior Lecturer in digital literacies at the Literacy Research Centre, Lancaster University). She has published papers in several international journals focusing on the language of users of technologies new to them, and in making use of digital technologies to investigate learning. Currently, her research interests include the use of virtual worlds in teaching and learning, and using video to investigate the socialisation of two-year-old girls in diverse communities. Her most recent paper is 'Derwent's Doors: Creative Acts' (in press) *Mind, Culture and Activity*.

Judith Kleine Staarman is a Senior Research Associate in the Faculty of Education at Cambridge University. Her research focuses on the role of language in the classroom, both with and without computers. Her publications include: *Connecting discourses: intertextuality in a primary school CSCL practice*. International Journal of Educational Research, 39, 807-816. (2003, with C. Aarnoutse and L. Verhoeven) and *Peer interaction in three collaborative learning environments*. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 40(1), 29-39. (2005, with K. Krol and H. van der Meijden).

Karen Littleton is Professor of Psychology in Education within the Centre for Research in Education and Educational Technology at The Open University, and visiting Professor at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. She has researched children's collaborative learning, often with reference to new technologies and gender, and has published extensively in this area. Her most recent book (with Neil Mercer) is *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking* (Routledge)

Neil Mercer is Professor of Education at the University of Cambridge, and is a psychologist with particular interests in helping children use language effectively as a tool for reasoning. His current work focuses on children's talk in groups, the role of the teacher in guiding the development of children's reasoning, the use of computer-based technology in education and the value of teacher-student dialogue in science teaching. His most recent books are *Words and Minds: how we use language to think together* and (with Karen Littleton) *Dialogue and the Development of Children's Thinking* (both Routledge)

Alison Twiner is a research assistant in the Centre for Research into Education and Educational Technology at the Open University. Her particular research interests focus on the impacts and uses of Information and Communication Technologies in education. Her current work addresses teacher-pupil dialogues around interactive whiteboards in English primary schools.

References

Alexander, R. (2000) *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers).

- Alexander, R. (2004) *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (Cambridge: Dialogos).
- Arnott, S. (2004) Computers to replace blackboards, *Computing*, 9th August. Available online at: <http://www.computing.co.uk/articles/print/2070841> (accessed 8 March 2006).
- British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (Becta) (2006) *Survey of LAN infrastructure and ICT equipment in schools 2005*. Main report. A report by Atkins Management Consultants for Becta (Coventry, Becta). Available online at: http://partners.becta.org.uk/page_documents/survey_of_lan_infrastructure0306.pdf. (accessed 11 May 2006).
- Burns, C. & Myhill, D. (2004) Interactive or inactive? A consideration of the nature of interaction in whole class teaching, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(1), 35-49.
- Carter, A. (2002) *Using interactive whiteboards with deaf children*. Available online at: http://www.bgfl.org/bgfl/custom/resources_frp/client/ftp/teacher/ict/whiteboards/index.htm (accessed 10 January 2006).
- Crook, C. (1999) Computers in the community of classrooms, in: K. Littleton & P. Light (Eds) *Learning with computers: Analysing productive interaction* (London: Routledge) 102-117.
- Dawes, L. (2000) First connections: Teachers and the National Grid for Learning, *Computers and Education*, 33(4), 235–252.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) 2002) *Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Training materials for the foundation subjects* (London: DfES). Available online at: http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/keystage3/respub/fs_trmat (accessed 8 March 2006).
- Edwards, D & Mercer, N. (1987) *Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom* (London: Methuen/Routledge).
- Higgins, S., Beauchamp, G. & Miller, D. (this issue) Reviewing the literature on interactive whiteboards. *Learning, Media and Technology*
- Hall, I. & Higgins, S. (2005) Primary school students' perceptions of interactive whiteboards, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21, 102-117.
- Mercer, N. (1995) *The guided construction of knowledge: Talk amongst teachers and learners* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd).
- Mortimer, E.F. & Scott, P.H. (2003) *Meaning making in secondary science classrooms* (Maidenhead: Open University Press).

- Moss, G., Jewitt, C., Levaic, R., Armstrong, V., Cardini, A. & Castle, F. (2007) *The interactive whiteboards, pedagogy and pupil performance evaluation: An evaluation of the Schools Whiteboard Expansion (SWE) Project: London Challenge* (DfES, London).
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2003) *New perspectives on spoken English in the classroom: Discussion papers* (London: QCA).
- Rojas-Drummond, S. & Mercer, N. (2004) Scaffolding the development of effective collaboration and learning, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39(1-2), 99-111.
- Schwartz, D.L., Lin, X., Brophy, S. & Bransford, J.D. (1999) Toward the development of flexibly adaptive instructional designs, in: C.M. Reigeluth (Ed) *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory, Volume II* (Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers), 183-213.
- Scott, P.H., Mortimer, E.F. & Aguiar, O.G. (2006) The tension between authoritative and dialogic discourse: A fundamental characteristic of meaning making interactions in high school science lessons, *Science Education*, 90, 605-631
- Smith, H. (2001) *Smartboard evaluation: Final report*. Available online at: <http://www.kented.org.uk/ngfl/ict/IWB/whiteboards/report.html#6> (accessed 10 January 2006).
- Smith, F., Hardman, F. & Higgins, S. (2006) The impact of interactive whiteboards on teacher-pupil interaction in the national literacy and numeracy strategies, *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 443-457.
- Smith, H.J., Higgins, S., Wall, K. & Miller, J. (2005) Interactive whiteboards: boon or bandwagon? A critical review of the literature, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21, 91-101.
- Wegerif, R. & Dawes, L. (2004) *Thinking and learning with ICT* (London and New York: Routledge Falmer).
- Wertsch, J.V., Tulviste, P. & Hagstrom, F. (1993) A sociocultural approach to agency, in: E.A. Forman, N. Minick & C.A. Stone (Eds) *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (New York: Oxford University Press), 336-356.

A “learning revolution”?

	<i>INTERACTIVE</i>	<i>NON-INTERACTIVE</i>
<i>DIALOGIC</i>	<i>A. Interactive / Dialogic</i>	<i>B. Non-interactive / Dialogic</i>
<i>AUTHORITATIVE</i>	<i>C. Interactive / Authoritative</i>	<i>D. Non-interactive / Authoritative</i>

Figure 1: Four types of communicative approach (adapted from Mortimer & Scott, 2003, p.35)