

HISTORICAL INQUIRY AND EPIPHANY: A BRIDGE FOR ELEMENTARY
EDUCATION MAJORS LEARNING TO DESIGN
ELEMENTARY ART CURRICULUM

by

Kimberly Raie Boehler

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

in

Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May, 2008

@COPYRIGHT

by

Kimberly Raie Boehler

2008

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

of a dissertation submitted by

Kimberly Raie Boehler

This dissertation has been read by each member of the dissertation committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citation, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the Division of Graduate Education.

Dr. Priscilla Lund

Approved for the Department of Education

Dr. Robert Carson

Approved for the Division of Graduate Education

Dr. Carl A. Fox

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this dissertation should be referred to ProQuest Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microform along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Kimberly Raie Boehler

May, 2008

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my Mother, Viola Boehler,
who filled my heart, hands, eyes and ears with art.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am sincerely grateful for the good fortune to have chosen Montana State University for graduate study. It has been a privilege to be a member of the Education Department where I have been surrounded by committed, intelligent, compassionate, and generous individuals. I want to thank my committee in particular; Priscilla Lund, Joyce Herbeck, Judi Franzak, Julia Kellman, Stephanie Standerfer, and Robert Carson for the gift of their guidance, grace, and friendship.

Also, I wish to express my deepest appreciation for the encouragement and influence of my family including: my parents, Viola and Walter Boehler, for being examples of patience, strength and determination, my son and daughter, Theo and Dawn Thompson, who helped me celebrate each step and reminded me to enjoy the journey, and my dearest Philip Olson for his steadfast love and support.

Finally, I want to recognize a small number of the teachers, students, friends, and loved ones who may not know the extent of their inspiration including: Dennis, Barbara, Laura, Trish, Petey, Gloria, and my young friend Adam, who made me a better teacher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Overview	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Statement of the Purpose	5
Research Questions	7
Significance of the Study	7
About the Researcher	11
Definition of Terms	12
Chapter Summary	13
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Chapter Introduction	14
Criteria for Selection of Literature	14
Elementary Education: Who is Teaching Art, What is Being Taught?	15
Comprehensive Art Education	17
Unit Foundations	18
Art Content	21
Instruction	22
Art Assessment	23
Design for Teacher Reflection	25
Cooperative Learning to Support Inquiry	25
Historical/Cultural Inquiry as Experience	28
3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	33
Design of the Study	33
Participant Selection	33
Cooperative Learning Group Selection	34
Site Selection	36
Preparation of Materials	36
Course Topics	37
Teaching Strategies	39
Data Collection/Instrumentation	40
Entry Questionnaire	40
Weekly Group Summary from Individual Inquiry Response	41
Art Unit / Final Assignment	41
Exit Questionnaire	41
Exit Group Interviews	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

Verification and Trustworthiness.....	42
Data Management	43
Data Analysis	43
Chapter Summary	45
 4. RESULTS	 46
Introduction.....	46
Data Analysis	47
Entry Questionnaire: Part A. Art Education	48
Questionnaire Prompt I: I Will/Will Not Teach Art as Part of the General Curriculum in My Classroom	48
Prompt I: Theme 1	48
Prompt I: Theme 2	49
Prompt I: Theme 3	49
Prompt I: Theme 4	49
Questionnaire Prompt II: I Expect to Teach the Following Knowledge and Skills in My PreK-8 Classroom	50
Prompt II: Theme 1	50
Prompt II: Theme 2	50
Prompt II: Theme 3	50
Questionnaire Prompt III: I Have the Following Experience, Knowledge and Skills that Will Help Me Teach Art	51
Prompt III: Theme 1	51
Prompt III: Theme 2	51
Prompt III: Theme 3	51
Questionnaire Prompt IV: My Level of Confidence to Teach Art Can Be Described as	52
Prompt IV: Theme 1	52
Prompt IV: Theme 2	52
Prompt IV: Theme 3	52
Questionnaire Prompt V: My Level of Confidence to Assess Knowledge and Skills in Art Can Be Described as	52
Prompt V: Theme 1	53
Prompt V: Theme 2	53
Prompt V: Theme 3	53
Prompt V: Theme 4	53
Entry Questionnaire: Part B. Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups	53
Questionnaire Prompt VI: My Response to the Above Statement is	54
Prompt VI: Theme 1	54
Prompt VI: Theme 2	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

Questionnaire Prompt VII: An Aspect of In-depth Historical Research that is Enjoyable	54
Prompt VII: Theme 1	54
Prompt VII: Theme 2	55
Questionnaire Prompt VIII: An Aspect of In-depth Historical Research that is Not Enjoyable	55
Prompt VIII: Theme 1	55
Prompt VIII: Theme 2	55
Prompt VIII: Theme 3	55
Questionnaire Prompt IX: Generally, My Experience with Historical Research Has Been	56
Prompt IX: Theme 1	56
Prompt IX: Theme 2	56
Prompt IX: Theme 3	56
Prompt IX: Theme 4	56
Questionnaire Prompt X: An Aspect of Working in Cooperative Groups that is Valuable	56
Prompt X: Theme 1	57
Prompt X: Theme 2	57
Prompt X: Theme 3	57
Questionnaire Prompt XI: An Aspect about Working in Cooperative Groups that I Would Change is	57
Prompt XI: Theme 1	57
Prompt XI: Theme 2	58
Prompt XI: Theme 3	58
Prompt XI: Theme 4	58
Summary of Results for Entry Questionnaire	58
Weekly Summary of Inquiry	59
Summary Report: Week 1	59
Summary Report: Week 2	61
Summary Report: Week 3	61
Summary Report: Week 4	63
Summary of Results for Weekly Summary of Inquiry	64
Final Project/Art Unit	64
Unit Foundations	65
Theme 1: Enduring Ideas	65
Theme 2: Key Concepts	65
Theme 3: Essential Questions	66
Unit Assessment	67
Art History/Culture: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding	67
Art History/Culture: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding	68

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

Art Process: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding	68
Art Process: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding	69
Art Criticism: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding	69
Art Criticism: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding	69
Aesthetics: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding	70
Aesthetics: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding	70
Summary of Results for Final Project/Art Unit	70
Exit Questionnaire: Part A. Art Education	71
Questionnaire Prompt I: I Will/Will Not Teach Art as Part of General Curriculum in My Classroom	72
Prompt I: Theme 1	72
Prompt I: Theme 2	72
Prompt I: Theme 3	72
Prompt I: Theme 4	72
Questionnaire Prompt II: I Expect to Teach the Following Knowledge and Skills in My PreK-8 Classroom	73
Prompt II: Theme 1	73
Prompt II: Theme 2	73
Prompt II: Theme 3	73
Prompt II: Theme 4	74
Questionnaire Prompt III: I Have the Following Experience, Knowledge, and Skills that Will Help Me Teach Art	74
Prompt III: Theme 1	74
Prompt III: Theme 2	74
Prompt III: Theme 3	74
Questionnaire Prompt IV: My Level of Confidence to Teach Art Can Be Described as	75
Prompt IV: Theme 1	75
Prompt IV: Theme 2	75
Prompt IV: Theme 3	75
Questionnaire Prompt V: My Level of Confidence to Assess Knowledge and Skills in Art Can Be Described as	75
Prompt V: Theme 1	75
Prompt V: Theme 2	76
Prompt V: Theme 3	76
Exit Questionnaire: Part B. Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups	76
Questionnaire Prompt VI: My Response to the Above Statement is	76
Prompt VI: Theme 1	76
Prompt VI: Theme 2	77
Questionnaire Prompt VII: One Thing I Want Kim to Know	77
Prompt VII: Theme 1	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

Prompt VII: Theme 2	77
Prompt VII: Theme 3	78
Prompt VII: Theme 4	78
Questionnaire Prompt VIII: This Past Term was My First or Second Block	78
Summary of Results for Exit Questionnaires	79
Exit Interviews of Groups	79
What Can You Say About Designing Art Curriculum?	80
Understanding Begins with Research (Inquiry)	80
Backward Design is Important	81
Understanding Evolves	82
Teaching for Meaning	83
What Are The Limits of Your Understanding?	84
Limited Knowledge or Art Skills	84
How to Find Time for Standards-based Art	85
Curriculum is Untested	85
Summary of Results for Exit Interviews	86
Discussion of the Findings with Literature Reviewed	86
Elementary Education: Who is Teaching Art, What is Being Taught?	87
Comprehensive Art Education	89
Unit Foundations	90
Art Content and Assessment	92
Cooperative Learning to Support Inquiry	95
Historical/Cultural Inquiry as Experience	98
Chapter Summary	102
5. CONCLUSIONS	105
Introduction	105
Overview	105
Statement of the Problem	105
Statement of the Purpose	105
Research Questions	106
Method	106
Data Collection and Verification	107
Data Analysis	107
Results	108
Research Question I	108
Research Question II	109
Recommendations for Course Design and Instruction	110
The Art Prompt and Inquiry	110
Unit Foundations	111

TABLE OF CONTENTS – CONTINUED

TETAC and Comprehensive Art Education	112
Cooperative Learning.....	113
Suggestions for Further Research	115
Chapter Summary	116
REFERENCES CITED.....	117
APPENDICES	121
APPENDIX A: Syllabus For EDEL 332, Inquiry Component.....	122
APPENDIX B: Questionnaires	126
APPENDIX C: Keirse Four-Type Sorter.....	131
APPENDIX D: Learning Group Structure	134
APPENDIX E: Inquiry Response Structure	137
APPENDIX F: Transforming Education Through The Arts	
Foundational Concepts.....	139
APPENDIX G: Art Unit Framework/Template.....	142
APPENDIX H: Art Unit Rubric	146
APPENDIX I: Interview Protocol	149
APPENDIX J: Informed Consent Form	151

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Weekly Summary.....	60

ABSTRACT

Theory and practice for comprehensive art education (K-8) has continued to reflect and influence reform in general education since the 1960s. Yet in spite of development of exemplary programs, art in many classrooms is often limited to experimentation with materials, providing breaks in the day for students or teachers. Teacher educators need to consider what training will enable emerging elementary teachers to become competent developers of relevant and purposeful art curriculum (for learning built on knowledge and skills unique to the arts.)

The purpose of this qualitative study was to guide, observe, and report on the experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) Majors in an Elementary Art Methods course within the Education Department at Montana State University. These students were asked to engage in historical/cultural inquiry as members of a group in order to construct contextual understanding of one artwork or art site. Then students were guided through the process of designing curriculum from their insights of the same art prompt. The unit foundation guidelines used were from the *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC), a five-year project completed in 2001. The framework, which emphasizes art integration, was founded on Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) and Understanding by Design (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) concepts.

The results of this study indicate that emerging teachers have a pre-determined idea about what art is and should be in the classroom. Most EDEL majors say they intend to teach or integrate art but many feel art should be fun activity allowing for free expression. However, when given opportunity to cultivate informed understanding of an artwork, EDEL students were able to design substantive and well-aligned curriculum with meaningful enduring ideas, essential questions, and learning objectives for art skills and knowledge. The findings will encourage educators to approach inquiry in elementary art methods as an information-gathering process appropriate for preparing to teach in any content area. The inquiry process alone did not lead EDEL students to experience epiphany until they began to unpack their ideas according to the structure for unit design. Then one student remarked: "Pow, suddenly it all made sense!"

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Overview

Since the 1960s, theory and framework for comprehensive art education (K-8) has continued to reflect and influence reform in general education. Beginning with the work of Manual Barkan at Ohio State University, the structure for art as a subject of study was eventually described as multifaceted or consisting of four domains; production, criticism, history, and aesthetics (Zahner, 2003). By the 1970's, a framework emerged called Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) established by many, including: Gilbert Clark, Michael Day, W. and Duane Greer (1987) and with support of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. The shift in thinking about art in general education emphasized going beyond art making; art was “being seen anew -- or once -- again as a matter of the mind” (Gardner, 1983, p. 103).

As art education was being re-viewed, there was new influence from reform taking place in general education. Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994) identified nine core subject areas as essential to learning and determined that curricula should be standards-based with framework for teaching and assessment. The act supported inclusion of the arts as core curriculum and the Consortium of National Standards for Arts Education associations drew upon DBAE principles to articulate what “students should know and be able to do in the arts” (Transforming Education Through the Arts

Challenge, Final Project Report, n. d., p. 18). Art educators such as Sydney Walker (2001) at Ohio State University took DBAE a step further by emphasizing “meaning making” as a constructivist approach to art learning. Her ideas advocated for personally relevant and purposeful instruction built around “big ideas” defined as important human issues (p. xiii). Big ideas are similar to enduring ideas used by Wiggins and McTighe in *Understanding by Design* (1998); this framework is used widely in general education for alignment and assessment of content knowledge. UBD was also central to establishing relevant and cohesive curriculum for the *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC), a four-year project initiated in 1996 by the National Arts Education Consortium (NAEC). TETAC will be discussed at length in this study.

In the last fifty years, Art Education has undergone great consideration, organization, and study, yet a large gap exists between actual practice in many classrooms and art programming reaching potential to engage students while teaching knowledge and skills unique to the arts. Unfortunately, it is still common to see art activities taught solely for the purpose of providing breaks in the day for students or teachers. One way of responding to the gap between potential and reality is to reconsider how emerging teachers in elementary education programs are prepared to teach art in their classrooms. As an elementary art methods instructor, it appears from my experience that most elementary education majors have not experienced discipline-based or standards-based programs in their former K-12 experience. Also, since the literature (Chapman, 2005) indicates that a significant number of elementary teachers will teach

art, it is important that they are prepared to distinguish between activity-based and standards-based methods and clearly understand the value of substantive art education.

The objective of this study was to guide elementary education majors in an art methods course through a process of in-depth inquiry of an artwork and its context in order to understand the artwork well before proceeding to develop curriculum from these insights.

Statement of the Problem

When I was studying to become an art teacher, I was in my early 20s and observing in classrooms. At that age I did not know what a substantive art program should look like; I was just hoping that art experience for children could be more than what I was seeing in the schools. Discouraged, I dropped-out of the teacher preparation program that I was enrolled in and explored a parallel path where I discovered Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) through my own research. DBAE offered the promise that there was framework for exploring and teaching a subject to which I was drawn, but still knew little about. Believing in this promise, I returned to school for a teaching degree and soon after became the Art Teacher in a fairly large middle school.

Teaching based on the ideals of DBAE was not easy at first. My art program developed by trial and error; it was very different from the art that children had experienced before and certainly different from what the middle school staff expected of me. Armed with optimism and determination, a strong program emerged in proportion

with my personal growth. It was always clear that art “activity” could engage, but now I saw that aesthetic activity went beyond engaging; it transformed the classroom into a deeply meaningful experience. Most of what I know as an educator came out of this classroom. I vividly remember myself as the young teacher resistant to boundaries for assessing performance (defending the freedom or personal style of the children). And I can also recall the significant shift in my thinking as I tested rubrics and saw how authentic assessment guided development of skill, knowledge, and student awareness of their own growth.

The value of discipline-based art methods to art specialists who intend to teach art can require a shift in what these teachers believe art education is or should be. It is more difficult however to help Elementary Education (EDEL) majors begin to think critically about “instant art” (Chapman, p. xiii) activities, which are often considered something fun to do in-between serious subjects. This scenario is especially true if they feel competent showing children how to do simple art activity and lack confidence teaching art in more depth. Emerging elementary teachers can feel overwhelmed with the prospect of designing comprehensive visual arts curriculum that teaches about understanding artworks based on context, discussing aesthetics, applying art vocabulary and practicing art-making skills. In addition, EDEL majors must know how to plan, sequence, and assess art objectives. Frequently, these pre-service teachers also have beliefs that can undermine their development process. For example, when asked if they will teach art in their future elementary classroom, they respond that art should be a part of general

education because it gives students opportunity to express feelings. But this same group of new teachers will be reluctant to provide guidelines for art making (that may teach skill or technique) because they do not want to limit “freedom of expression” for their students. Viktor Lowenfeld commented on these good intentions in 1947: “The idealistic concept of the child as an innate artist who has simply to get materials and nothing else in order to create has done as much harm to art education as the neglect of the child’s aesthetic impulse” (Cited in Korzenik, 1990, p. 2002).

The challenges are great for emerging educators who must begin to develop content mastery of several subjects while also examining the teaching and learning process itself. This study is based on the belief that the best way to meet the needs of new teachers is to help them understand the structures of a subject as well as the structures for teaching a subject. For example, the structure for Art Education is defined by DBAE (the four domains); the structure for teaching in this case, is the framework from the TETAC project and UBD concepts. At the start, this study asks elementary education majors to engage in historical/cultural inquiry as a part of a group in order to develop contextual understanding of one artwork before unpacking the information to determine enduring ideas, essential questions, learning objectives, alignment, sequence, and a final task.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to observe, report, and interpret experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors, who participated in a required, semester long,

Elementary Art Methods course at Montana State University. The three-credit course was structured so that students worked with me as the researcher for part of the course to conduct historical inquiry in cooperative learning groups. The inquiry prompt was an artwork from a culturally and historically diverse selection of objects and sites from around the world. The class was divided into seven groups and each group had a different art subject to investigate.

The art prompts were chosen based on diversity of subject, culture, and time period as well as having significance to general K-8 curriculum. Inquiry was designed so that each member of a group focused on one of four specific components of the history and culture in order to collectively construct understanding of the creative work from its context. The components were: (1) Ideas: beliefs, religion, politics, and philosophy; (2) The Arts: visual art, architecture, music, and drama; (3) Daily Life: traditions, economy, environment, and technology; as well as (4) Historical Context: geographical and linguistic influences (Carson, 2004).

The role of researcher in this study was to structure the inquiry process, guide inquiry with questions and prompts, and collect group reflection on key ideas, which led to interpretation of meaning for each artwork. Finally EDEL students were introduced to framework and educational theory (Stewart & Walker, 2005) for designing curriculum based on understanding and insights from inquiry. I was specifically interested in evidence of epiphany-like experience throughout the inquiry process, what value these EDEL students placed on their insights, and how the inquiry process would influence development of visual arts curriculum.

Research Questions

The following questions were used to develop framework for the study of Elementary Education majors taking an Art Methods course steeped in historical inquiry of significant works of art:

- I. How does in-depth historical/cultural inquiry, by EDEL majors, lead to epiphany or aesthetic understanding of an artwork and its historical/cultural context?
- II. What will be the evidence of epiphany on EDEL students learning to design art curriculum?

Significance of the Study

The Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) movement introduced elementary classroom teachers to four disciplines or domains of art study including, art history, art criticism, aesthetics and art production (Lanier, 1991; Smith, 2000; Stewart & Walker, 2005; Wilson, 1997; Zahner, 2003). According to Stewart and Walker (2005) DBAE shifted the view of art instruction toward interpretation of art forms, expanded interest for diverse styles of thinking and learning, and methods for teaching that nurtured and guided perceptions and art skills (p. 10). For many, the framework provided a needed structure for development of art programming in individual classrooms as well as entire school districts. It also responded to awareness and concern expressed by E. D. Hirsch, Jr.

(1987) regarding the decline of teaching cultural literacy in America's schools. Harry S. Broudy (1987) emphasized the role of art education and DBAE to develop a child's store of images and understanding of art concepts as a critical part of general education. In light of this it is not enough to expose children to art; we must help them develop skills to help them enter into the work (Greene, 2001). Howard Gardner (1982) states, "We would not expect children to understand computers by having them examine the terminal or a printout. Yet that is the way we expect the young to become sensitive to ballet, theater, and the visual arts" (p. 103). DBAE was theoretically aligned with aesthetic education perspective that advocated, "...performance not for the sake of performance but, rather for the sake of proper perception" (Broudy, 1972, p. 63). It was toward this end that art education was approached as a way of knowing about the world.

The DBAE framework supports goals of historical, cultural, and conceptual literacy with promise that this form of education may also "enlarge capacity for enjoyment" (Broudy, 1972, p. 46). The next evolution of this framework however takes into consideration that learning about the world is enhanced when ideas are relevant and expressing is more purposeful when connected with a child's inner landscape. Walker (2001) has expanded DBAE approach with deeper more reflective view of art production that emphasizes art making as a "meaning making endeavor" (p. 1) based on "big ideas." Big ideas are important human issues that make learning, or in this case artmaking, significant; big ideas are also a tool for linking interdisciplinary curriculum and making learning memorable.

Stewart and Walker (2005), as participants in the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC), have developed framework for teaching the arts and integrating other disciplines in a meaningful way. The TETAC taskforce produced guidelines for developing unit foundations, content, assessment and instruction. The ideas for this project are informed by more than a decade of school reform in art and general education. For example, enduring ideas, as defined by Wiggins and McTighe (1998), become an organizing concept in TETAC curriculum development. According to Stewart and Walker (2005) enduring ideas often lead to relevant content by drawing attention to issues and topics that have interested human beings throughout the ages. When students make authentic connections through these concepts they begin to understand human cultures from the past, as well as themselves, better.

In spite of research and development of exemplary art programs, most elementary education majors will report that they were never offered discipline-based or standards-based instruction in their K-12 educational backgrounds and few have had more than superficial exposure to art study in their university programs (Laura Chapman, 2005). The art experiences that many will remember, Jane Bates (2000) calls “bat projects.” These are the kinds of activities where students are given black construction paper, wing patterns, and Styrofoam balls to make bats, but the term can also refer to any assignment with little regard for learning objectives. She also describes painting courses based on copying pictures from magazines, “bat oriented” (p. xi). As teachers develop from novice to master-level, they should regularly reflect on what is being taught and what students are learning (Bates, 2000; Stewart & Walker, 2005). Novice teachers often express a

sense of nostalgia for “bat projects” because of their childhood memories and the fun associated with these activities. It may be appropriate occasionally to provide children with opportunities to play with materials in this way as long as we are clear this practice is not art education. While these projects may indeed be engaging for children, they are hard to justify in school communities based on professional, informed decision making in order to provide rich and significant educational opportunities for young people. Harry Broudy states, that if art is just nice, it has no place in the general curriculum (1969, 1987). If it is necessary, we must know why.

Elementary education (EDEL) majors who think of art as “bat type projects” can become confused, overwhelmed, and even suspicious at first when introduced to ideas, practices, and rationale for current art education theory and standards-based curriculum. Many of them will have little knowledge, skill, or confidence, which prepares them to teach art to children. However, the attitude of fear is frequently transformed to excitement when these future teachers see the potential for elementary students to learn expressive processes, skills, critical thinking, language, philosophical discourse, and knowledge about a full range of human issues through authentic and personal connection.

EDEL majors, who sincerely appreciate current art theory as practice in an Elementary Art Methods course can still be unsuccessful when designing visual arts curriculum themselves. One common weakness for students with limited art knowledge is to misinterpret meaning of art works drawn from extrinsic information alone. Novice teachers may intend to design discipline-based curriculum and instead create activity with superficial or misinformed connection with artist, artwork, or context. These units are

cause for concern because poorly researched ideas undermine all effort, if what is taught is invented or shallow. The goal of teacher preparation programs should be to guide elementary education students to discover the layers of meaning when we come to know a work of art well through the time and place of its origin. These kinds of experiences can be epiphanies and they transform us. Certainly these insights can change the way we teach art and the reason we teach it.

The historical inquiry planned for elementary education majors in this study was structured (Appendix D.) in order to allow students to research one art form in-depth and to make personally meaningful discoveries in that process. The researcher's role in the inquiry process was to observe, listen, question, and guide. Elementary Education majors worked cooperatively in small groups, focused on various aspects of the artist, artwork, and culture, then shared their findings in order to construct knowledge about the aesthetic object. Finally, from their insights, a unit of instruction was developed with guidance from TETAC curriculum guidelines.

About the Researcher

For over 25 years, I have been an art educator. I have been an artist-in-the-schools, middle school art teacher, Fulbright exchange art teacher, and art methods instructor at Southern Oregon University as well as Montana State University (for a total of seven years). Preparation for teaching included participation in two DBAE institutes, one in Portland, Oregon and the other in Cincinnati, Ohio. I have been a presenter at state and national teacher conferences, affiliated with the National Art Education Association,

speaking on topics of art assessment, aesthetics, and visual literacy. In addition, I was a board member of the Oregon Art Education Association and have worked with the Oregon Department of Education to develop Oregon art content standards.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for clarification regarding meaning related to research in the field of Arts Education and teacher training for elementary majors.

1. Discipline-based Art Education – Art education from the “arts as discipline movement” comprised of four components: art production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics (Stewart and Walker, 2005).
2. Enduring ideas – Similar to themes, they are broad umbrella-like concepts that extend beyond specific disciplines and link subject matter with life-focused issues such as identity, survival, or celebration (Stewart & Walker, 2005).
3. Epiphany – Sudden insight when various pieces of information come together to form meaning (Nilsen, 1984). Can be an aesthetic experience, the opposite of “humdrum” (Dewey, 1934).
4. Essential Questions – Part of unit foundations, developed from enduring ideas and key concepts to bring focus to a unit of study.
5. Historical Inquiry – Research directed and sustained by questions.
6. Standards-Based Art Education – Refers to art curriculum that is designed based on national or state content standards which suggest knowledge and skills for students at various grade levels.

7. TETAC - Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge – A five year Project completed in 2001, funded in part by the Annenberg Foundation and the J. Paul Getty Trust (Stewart & Walker, 2005).

Chapter Summary

This chapter introduces some of the theoretical foundation for comprehensive art education from the last forty years. This prepares the context for the problem identified in this study. There is a significant gap in elementary classroom practice between standards-based art programs that enrich all subjects for all K-8 students and what is actually being taught. However, there are few models to provide rationale and framework for those who will teach art in their classrooms. The purpose of this study was to introduce emerging teachers to in-depth historical/cultural inquiry as an information gathering procedure in an Elementary Art Methods Class. This process was intended to provide EDEL students with contextual understanding as insight to prepare them to develop substantive K-8 visual arts curriculum.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Introduction

Literature selected for this study addresses four areas. The first section is an analysis of research examining elementary art education, the art background of the teachers, and the art knowledge and skills being taught and assessed. Second is an examination of a recent project, *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC) initiated by the National Arts Education Consortium in order to identify exemplary art content and instructional methods within current context of art education theory. The third component discusses structures for cooperative learning as appropriate methodology for Elementary Education majors in an elementary art methods course. Finally, the fourth segment explores historical inquiry as a point of entry for developing contextual understanding of an artwork and how this insight might prepare teachers to develop comprehensive art curriculum.

Criteria for Selection of Literature: Strengths and Weaknesses

Literature for this review was either current or theoretically relevant and selected from scholars well established in each of the specific or related fields of study. The focus of this project was specifically K-8 visual arts education and preparation of elementary teachers to teach art knowledge and skills. I am confident that my choices are well informed and that the literature in all cases is scholarly, built on significant work in each

of the fields relevant to this study. The weakness however should be noted that while I am certain about the quality of the literature, it does not provide broad or contrasting views in most cases.

Elementary Art Education: Who is Teaching Art? What is Being Taught?

Laura Chapman (2005) describes the status of visual arts in elementary education in the United States between 1997 and 2004. The time period is significant because it represents the years following development of national standards in the arts and the beginning of standards-based reform which may have influenced quality of teaching and learning of art in the nation's schools. Chapman's article is based on interpretation of data from a variety of sources including the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

The data from Chapman's article with direct relevance to this research is from a 1999-2000 NCES study of full-time elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms. Of the nation's 903,200 teachers surveyed, 92% reported that they taught art. Of those teachers, Chapman reported, 10% had completed a degree program with a major or minor in art. Further, 56% report that they respond to art outside of school, 13% create art, and less than 10% engage in activities related to art (NCES, 2002, as cited in Chapman). From these figures, Chapman concluded that about 10% of classroom teachers have qualifications similar to art specialists.

The NCES study also reported on professional development activities (PDAs) for classroom teachers within a similar time period. Most teachers had participated in PDAs,

which included, standards-based instruction (90%), assessment (87%), teaching methods (86%), or technology-based instruction (84%). Art related PDAs were experiences for art making (27%), expanding art related knowledge (25%), and integrating art with other subject areas (46%). Chapman added that generally, art specific PDAs for classroom teachers were less adequate than reported for art specialists. Only 13% to 14% found the studio experiences or art knowledge valuable to their teaching with an increase to 26% for art integration. According to Chapman (2005), “We may also conclude that classroom teachers are on the receiving end of many PDAs and that art-specific PDAs are judged less helpful than those on more general topics” (p. 130).

Considering the number of teachers who report that art is taught in their classroom and the significant participation in PDAs, some inconsistencies are notable. For example, while 90% of teachers report PDAs dealing with standards-based instruction, 71% say their art teaching is not aligned with state or national standards (NCES, 2002, as cited in Chapman). Also, most teachers report that art is integrated with other subjects but Chapman believes, “both the quality and art-centered character of ‘integrated’ instruction is seriously cast in doubt” (p. 131). Only 28% of teachers said they emphasized theme-based units and 27% say they emphasize the visual arts. Further, 49% reported they never use art texts or resources. Finally, although assessment of student learning ranks high among PDAs in general education, 44% of classroom teachers “do not engage in any form of assessment of art learning” (NCES, 2002, as cited, p. 131). Chapman concludes:

If it is true that classroom teachers are well-poised to illuminate connections between the arts and other subjects, there can be no doubt that most classroom teachers lack the knowledge, skill, and compensatory support necessary to ensure that art learning is sound in content, standards-based, and systematically assessed. (p. 131).

These statistics are cause for concern because they indicate that a large number of art programs in many elementary schools may be failing to teach knowledge and skills and continue to exist without regard for art standards.

Comprehensive Art Education

The history of education is dynamic with each age bringing new values and conceptions of teaching and learning. Those of us currently engaged with theory and teaching practice in art education as well as general education have been influenced significantly from research and reform of the last two decades. From this rich stream of information and insight, the National Arts Education Consortium organized an initiative called, the *Transforming Education Through The Arts Challenge* (TETAC). The purpose was to assist elementary, middle, and high school teachers to develop curricula in the arts that also linked with other subjects. TETAC was a five-year project (1996-2001) involving six regional organizations in six states. From each state, representatives were selected as a task force and these members met several times over a period of two years to develop curriculum guidelines for the project. The state representatives became mentors for the TETAC teachers in participating schools and all efforts were combined to design “substantive, comprehensive arts-based curricula in their schools” (Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. v).

Two members of TETAC, Marilyn G. Stewart and Sydney R. Walker (2005), report on the strength of the project in *Rethinking Curriculum in Art*. At the heart of TETAC is reflective practice that asks “what is important for students to learn and how this can best be accomplished” (p. 2). A process for creating art curricula emerged “in response to more than a decade of school reform efforts in education regarding teaching for understanding, accountability, (and) student relevance...” (p. 2). In addition, the project promoted collaborative efforts for teachers. Following is a discussion of five key components outlined by the TETAC task force for curriculum development: Unit Foundations, Content, Instruction, Assessment, and Design.

Unit Foundations

As the name implies curriculum development begins here. One of the most important components of curriculum design comes from the work of Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe (1998). The TETAC framework emphasizes the importance of careful choice of enduring ideas as a foundation around which alignment of all other lessons, activities, and assessment as well as integration will be built. Enduring ideas are ideas of interest and relevance to human beings throughout history and they will be the notions students will remember long after the classroom experience is forgotten. Not only do enduring ideas guide understanding, they help students make meaningful and often personal connections with the content and concepts of the learning activities. Stewart and Walker (2005) describe enduring ideas as “umbrella-like ideas that guide students in understanding what it means to be human, to live alongside others and in the natural

world” (p. 25). Some examples suggested are, identity, social power, relationships, conflict, ritual, and survival.

Enduring ideas are a guiding light for teachers in the curriculum planning process. The ideas can come from (and should connect with) content standards or they can come from the artworks or contexts that teachers choose for art instruction. From the enduring ideas, come key concepts, and essential questions, all of which tie a unit of study (or several units) together. These concepts can be challenging for experienced as well as novice teachers because they are required to reflect very carefully on what they are doing in their classrooms. However, the value of this orientation for curriculum design is that it goes beyond discipline knowledge into contextual understandings as well as other ways of knowing. According to Sydney Walker and Michael Parson (2000), “focusing art curriculum around human issues...is an opportunity to capitalize on exactly what makes the arts powerful and significant, their ability to convey the complexity and ambiguity of human beliefs, interpretations about life” (as cited in Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 30).

A single teacher, a team, or an entire school can select an enduring idea. Regardless, the decision should be based on criteria to determine if an idea is important, appropriate, and relevant to students and their culture. Also, the way the idea is represented in the arts should be considered. When criteria for an enduring idea have been explored, a brief rationale should be written to initiate thinking about significance and direction of the instruction. The next step is to “unpack” enduring ideas to find key concepts and then the essential questions (Stewart and Walker, 2005).

Key concepts are the bridge between enduring ideas and essential questions. They are developed by brainstorming to generate a list of 10-20 related phrases. For example, I'll explore the enduring idea, "Relationship." Key concepts might be: Relationship requires patience, Relationship can change, Relationship is necessary for survival, Relationship can be defined different ways, and Relationship can be misunderstood. These key concepts begin to reveal the complexity of ideas such as relationship. When the list is complete, the teacher will select and prioritize 3-5 of the most important key concepts to emphasize in the unit. The key concepts are also necessary for writing essential questions and eventually for identifying objectives.

Essential questions are developed next; they bring focus to a unit and synthesize key concepts. For example, from the list of key concepts for relationship, essential questions might include: What counts as a relationship? Why is relationship important? Why is relationship occasionally difficult? These essential questions should be limited to 2-4, since their purpose is to develop focus. They also will become a factor in assessment. When writing essential questions, teachers should be thinking about ways to motivate as well as broaden student thinking (Stewart and Walker, 2005).

In the final stage of creating unit foundations, after developing the enduring idea, key concepts, and essential questions, unit objectives will identify what students will know and be able to do at the end of the unit. Stewart and Walker (2005) explain that unit objectives are more wide-ranging than lesson objectives, they "are a restatement, in a general way, of the enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential questions you've identified" (p. 36). Based on previous examples for relationship the unit objectives

following are very similar to the essential questions: Students will understand what counts as relationship, Students will understand why relationship is important to human life, and Students will understand why relationships can be difficult. After unit foundations are defined, they should guide every other decision for the unit. This procedure ensures that all components are meaningfully related or aligned.

Art Content

Since the 1980s art educators have used the four art domains or disciplines (art production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics) of Discipline-based Art Education (DBAE) to determine art learning objectives. According to Stewart and Walker, DBAE shifted art instruction toward thorough understanding of art forms, more range of interest for diverse styles of thinking and learning, and teaching methods that nurtured and guided arts skills and perceptions. DBAE also provides framework for emerging teachers with limited art experience when learning to design art curriculum.

In addition to the four domains of DBAE to guide art teaching, five key art understandings (Appendix F) were identified in the final TETAC report. The key understandings are broad ideas about art that must be learned from repeated exposure in multiple contexts or as Stewart and Walker (2005) explain, “they represent issues requiring life long learning” (p. 42). Arthur Efland describes the complex nature of learning, characteristic of the arts, as “lattice-like” (Efland, 1995, p. 151). That is to say, art encompasses distinctly different disciplines and ways of knowing that when woven together, form a meaningful whole. When it comes to making decisions about content, there is no right or wrong place to start. The best advice for guiding content decision

making is for teachers to decide what is important for students to understand about art. From that view, instruction should be based on inquiry informed by a central idea with objectives for knowledge and skills identified from the four core disciplines.

Instruction

After making decisions about unit foundations from enduring ideas, key art understandings and specific lesson objectives, then teachers must decide how to help children learn. The TETAC art unit often begins with an artwork and a teacher leading student discussion in order to stimulate observation and engagement with the work. Stewart and Walker describe the process of talking about the art that leads to inquiry about the artist and the influence of the place where it was made. How the inquiry unfolds depends on the scope of the unit; however one thing is clear, the object of inquiry and the exploration of enduring ideas through various activities must be relevant to students and their lives. When planning instruction, teachers must determine what students know before they can begin to make decisions about how to construct new knowledge.

The instructional strategies from the TETAC project promote constructivist and inquiry-based practices from well-established strategies for instruction. For this study, the strategies of “how” to use inquiry may not be as important as “why”. The purpose of formalized inquiry in any context including teacher preparation is to establish a practice for learning or rather “learning how to learn” (Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 71). Another instructional component from the TETAC project relevant to preparing Elementary Education (EDEL) majors to teach art is making the distinction between learning process

and products as a result of learning activities. The TETAC teachers used products to help students reflect on their own learning and emphasized: “that the products are the indicators of the process, not the primary purpose of the learning experience” (2005, p. 71).

For example, as a drawing instructor, I remember when my teaching would have emphasized application of drawing techniques and making informed decisions regarding composition. I saw the product, the drawing, as the important result of the learning. However, from reflective practice came the realization that the process of making a drawing became less important than what I was learning about observing and seeing. When discussing a drawing with a student now I focus less on the product itself; instead, the drawing becomes the medium for discussing what was observed, and what was learned. From this example we see how instruction and assessment can be authentically related.

Art Assessment

Once teachers identify what is important for students to know, activities can be created to assess this learning. The TETAC guidelines for assessment as a key component in curriculum development are comprehensive. Since EDEL majors participating in this study are already familiar with assessment rationale and strategies, I will highlight just a few points.

Many curriculum writers for the TETAC project made use of “backward design” strategies of Wiggins and McTighe (1998). This method begins by identifying enduring

ideas, key concepts, and essential questions followed by articulating what students will know and be able to do at the end of a unit. Only then are learning activities and instructional strategies decided. This is not as revolutionary as it sounds; in fact, it is just good teaching. It is especially important in art to organize assessment this way to ensure alignment of all components with unit foundations (enduring ideas and so on) as well as knowledge and skills from the four art disciplines that comprise a standards-based curriculum.

The idea of assessing art can be disturbing to many emerging teachers. This perception is especially true if they believe that assessment means judging student art with no guide for quality. In fact, instead of arbitrarily judging, assessment should make objectives clear with thoughtful use of criteria. “By attending to criteria, students tend to focus on what’s important, and accordingly their learning is enhanced” (Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 95). Used in this way, criteria can be organized as rubrics to identify degrees such as exemplary, essential, or partial achievement.

Finally, evidence of understanding from comprehensive art education can be demonstrated through a variety of skills. TETAC faculty at Ohio State University have created an extensive list to consider, including: “Organizes knowledge, analyzes processes, constructs interpretations, makes connections, makes comparisons, translates knowledge into symbolic form, finds examples, experiments, tests...” and so on (Ohio State University unpublished notes, as cited in Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 97).

Design for Teacher Reflection

The final component of the curriculum development process identified by TETAC (See Appendix F) is critical review of the unit of instruction to assess alignment, coherence, and sequencing of lessons. The team determined criteria for reflection on the projects based on high expectations for students to construct knowledge, pursue understanding, engage in developing contextualized meaning, and develop self-awareness as learners. Also the project expectations included integrated learning, group planning, utilization of technology, writing across the curriculum, collaboration, and commitment to global and local topics. Finally, TETAC criteria stated that assessment would be authentic and ask students to examine problems or life issues, consider various perspectives and solutions, employ ideas, utilize writing to demonstrate understanding, and demonstrate understanding for an audience beyond the classroom (National Arts Education Consortium, 1999, as cited in Stewart & Walker).

Providing EDEL students with clearly defined framework for arts education is vital. TETAC not only proposes purposeful learning experiences for children but defines the steps for moving toward comprehensive art education.

Cooperative Learning to Support Inquiry

Cooperative learning, a highly structured subset of collaborative learning, was chosen as a methodology to support Elementary Education majors in the process of conducting research in an Elementary Art Methods course. This particular approach was chosen because several attributes of cooperative learning correspond with the nature of this research project. This literature focus was selected because it explains rationale for

cooperative methods, explanation of the active/constructive process, structure for moving from theory to practice, and the value of community relationship to learning experience.

Millis and Cottell (1998) emphasize two characteristics of cooperative learning. The first is the ability of cooperative group process to build interdependent communities. Second, deep learning is promoted through activities that help students to internalize information (p. x). Some of the most compelling endorsements of cooperative learning in higher education come from Astin (1993) who determined that two environmental factors in particular influence academic achievement, personal development, and satisfaction with college. These are student-student interaction and student-faculty interaction. Because of this influence he concludes that “how” students are taught is far more important than curricular content and structure (as cited in Millis and Cottell). Further, Astin specifically endorses cooperative learning:

Under what we have come to call cooperative-learning methods, where students work together in small groups, students basically teach each other, and our pedagogical resources are multiplied. Classroom research has consistently shown that cooperative-learning approaches produce outcomes that are superior to those obtained through traditional competitive approaches, and it may well be that our findings concerning the power of the peer group offer a possible explanation: cooperative learning may be more potent than traditional methods of pedagogy because it motivates students to become more active and more involved participants in the learning process (Cited p. 10).

According to Millis and Cottell (1998), cooperative and collaborative learning is based on the “belief that learning is an active, constructive process” and that learning should be “produced, not reproduced” (p. 5-6). Myers and Jones (1993) explain that both approaches promote talking, listening, reading, writing, and reflecting in the progression of gathering and applying information (as cited in Millis and Cottell). Matthews, Cooper,

Davidson, & Hawks (1995) share the assumption that teachers should be facilitators able to balance lecture with activity and share the teaching and learning experience with students. They concluded that students benefit from small group participation through exposure to diverse thinking as well as enhanced reflection and increased articulation. Further, students were more likely to accept responsibility for their personal learning.

The advantage of cooperative learning over collaborative learning is that the former has a strong theoretical base but is operationally better defined. Millis and Cottell (1998) refer to specific implementation tools as “structures,” which make implementation more prescriptive and reliable. These structures can be used to organize nearly every component of the cooperative learning process including sequencing of tasks and constructing expectations. Management strategies are also well defined with guidelines for selecting groups, team building, assigning roles, decision-making, and accounting for tasks. Millis (2002) states key components for successful cooperative learning: students have a common and well-structured task, learning is in small groups, group roles are interdependent, and there is individual accountability with mutual rewards.

Cooperative learning is built on respect for students of all backgrounds and their potential to succeed. Culturally and academically diverse classrooms in this context are valued. Sapon-Shevin, Ayres, and Duncan (1994) state:

“Cooperative learning...builds upon heterogeneity and formalizes and encourage peer support and connection.... All students need to learn and work in environments where their individual strengths are recognized and individual needs are addressed. All students need to learn within a supportive community in order to feel safe enough to take risks” (as cited in Millis and Cottell, 1998, p. 5).

Cooperative learning does indeed have potential to expand the pedagogical resources for teaching students (Austin, 1993). However it cannot be ignored that cooperative learning also adds to skills that must be taught by the instructor. In this study, group structure is expected to enhance engagement of EDEL majors in the inquiry process and engage critical thinking while also reflecting the social nature of the arts in our culture.

Historical/Cultural Inquiry as Experience

From Discipline-Based Art Education of the 1980s, many art educators moved toward standards-based art practice with objectives in all four domains considered critical in comprehensive art education. Elliott Eisner (1998) describes his vision of the outcomes tied to those four domains and I've chosen the first of these as entry point for this study: "Arts Education should enable students to understand that there is a connection between the content and form that the arts take and the culture and time in which the work was created" (p. 97). As educator in teacher preparation, I am interested in the relevance of this understanding to Elementary Education majors who are learning to develop visual art curriculum. The views of many are helpful in this discussion beginning with statement from Maxine Greene describing the essence of aesthetic education. This is followed by Suzanne Langer and Harry Broudy, who I've referenced, to illustrate the difficulty in accessing works of art and reaching understanding of meaning. Harry Broudy and John Dewey are introduced also in this chapter to discuss qualitative differences in knowledge

or experience. Finally Robert Carson's theory of "foundational perspectives" is presented as a structured form of historical inquiry to enrich teaching and learning (Appendix D).

What is the importance of understanding the connection between an artwork's "content" and the cultural historical context of the work? A reason for teaching the connection between art and context might be to educate an arts literate community. However, a more direct benefit to the individual is that authentic connection changes perception and increases enjoyment or appreciation. Maxine Green (2001) stresses the importance of "developing a more active sensibility and awareness in our students" (p. 8) in order to initiate them "into what it feels like to live in music, move over and about in a painting, travel round and in between the masses of a sculpture, dwell in a poem" (Reid, 1969, as cited in Greene, p. 8). Greene is also concerned with preparation of teachers who are able to guide others in this process. She states, "We are hardly in a position to develop heightened sensitivity in others if we ourselves do not know what it is like to live inside, to move around within the range of art forms" (p. 8). This is where my study begins, with the significance of this experience to children and the value of developing this awareness in emerging teachers who will teach art.

The resources teachers need to enter into the world of an artwork are found in the total cultural heritage of the work. "Everything in that heritage – science, religion, technology, art, philosophy – is, in one sense or another, relevant to wisdom" (Broudy, 1972, p. 59). It is no wonder that the visual arts appear mysterious when understanding of multiple cultural and historical viewpoints is uncommon. Susanne Langer (1951) explains, "[G]reat art is not a direct sensuous pleasure. If it were, it would appeal – like

cake or cocktails – to the untutored as well as to the cultured taste” (p. 175). The challenge to connecting with art is also expressed by Harry Broudy (1972):

Complex works of art and even our natural environment do not impinge upon us so simply and directly. Their impact on us is more like hearing a foreign tongue for the first time: everything seems to have been run together, we cannot detect any pattern or phrasing, and so it makes no sense, even if we have some familiarity with the written language. But we know that the speaker makes sense to his compatriots, and we know that these compatriots do not translate word for word but, rather, apprehend patterns of meaning in the flow of discourse. Similarly, aesthetic experience can be confusing until we catch on to it’s “phrasing,” so to speak (p. 73).

What does a person need in order to make sense of art, to enter and move about in a painting? To expand Greene’s (2001) reference, we could say we need similar experience with context, to “dwell” in the place and time of the art work in order to understand how to perceive it. That is to say, it is not enough to acquire knowledge about art when attempting to enter into its meaning. Broudy (1972) helps illustrate this point when he states: “*knowledge about* is no substitute for the *perception of*, as the standard appreciation courses so often are taken to be” (p. 65). He makes the difference clear:

The most serious consequence of substituting *knowledge about* for *experience of* art is that one’s standards tend to become conventional. One feels obliged to say that Beethoven is great because authorities cited in the course said so. The Fifth Symphony is a masterpiece because Beethoven wrote it and Beethoven was a great composer because he wrote the Fifth Symphony.... Enlightened cherishing means not only liking X or Y or Z but also being able to point to those features of X, Y, and Z by virtue of which one can defend the judgment that X, Y, and Z deserve to be liked (p. 65).

The question remains, if we must understand context in order to understand form and content of art works, then how do we prepare emerging teachers to enter into an information gathering process that is potentially richer than having knowledge about a

subject from limited resources? The approach used for this study was influenced by the work of Robert Carson (2004). Carson calls the components for deciphering cultural and historical understanding, “foundational perspectives” and suggests that they frame and enrich teaching of any subject. “Foundational perspectives are those derived from bringing to bear upon the study of any subject area the disciplines of history, philosophy, sociology, anthropology, and psychology...” (p. 797). The purpose for developing curriculum around foundational perspectives is to construct historical narrative embedded with important information and deliver it in a natural and coherent form that students are able to hear (p. 800). Carson states:

It would be quite wonderful if somehow we could transport the learner back in time and take her to the exact time and place where each culturally significant event was unfolding, to experience for herself the problem and its context, as well as the humans who worked through the problem (p. 800).

Without the option of time travel, Carson has developed framework to direct cooperative learning groups in the process of conducting historical inquiry of intellectual culture (p. 802). Carson’s organizational structure, which promotes investigation from multiple perspectives, has been adapted for this study (Appendix D). Historical inquiry conducted in this way has potential to stimulate rich dialog and prepare learning groups to construct informed understandings and perceptions in order to bring context to life.

When inquiry is aimed at bringing art or context to life, it becomes a search for significance and can become a constructed experience following an “aesthetic route” (Broudy, 1972). This view of inquiry might also be considered *an experience* from Dewey’s (1934) point of view. He makes the distinction between experience and *an*

experience and states: “It is possible to be efficient in action and yet not have a conscious experience. The activity is too automatic to permit a sense of what it is about and where it is going” (p. 38). In order for a series of events and responses to become an experience, Dewey tells us, they must be “cumulative in their impact. The second phase augments and builds on the first, the third on the first and second, and so on” (as cited in Broudy, 1972, p. 33-34). Broudy describes the overall effect:

The original is now seen in the light of what has happened subsequently. An experience, we may say, is characterized by a quality that pervades it and thereby distinguishes it from other experiences. But the pervasive quality is vivid, somewhat in the way that flavor becomes vivid in concentrates (Broudy, p. 33-34).

The process of historical inquiry for this study is an information gathering strategy, however as the literature implies, it is also much more. It is a way of preparing emerging elementary teachers to construct understanding for an art object or site based on the premise that form and content are necessarily connected to the culture and time from which it came. It also has the potential, when constructed from various facets of culture and history, to begin to paint a picture that the learner may be allowed to enter. To “...travel round and in between the masses” (Reid 1969, as cited in Greene, 2001) can become an experience that enlarges capacity for understanding as well as appreciating works of art (Broudy, 1972).

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to observe and interpret experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors who participated in a required, semester long, Elementary Art Methods course at Montana State University. The three-credit course was structured so that EDEL students spent half of their course work conducting inquiry on one art prompt for the purpose of learning to design comprehensive art curriculum. Individuals worked in cooperative groups and individuals focused on one component of the inquiry based on learning group structure (Appendix D). For this project, I selected art works I knew were relevant to general K-8 curriculum and that were culturally and historically diverse. When the information gathering process was complete, participants used unit foundations from Transforming Education Through The Art Challenge (TETAC) to design an art unit from their inquiry insights.

Participant Selection

Participants for the study were Elementary Education (EDEL) majors enrolled in an Elementary Art Teaching Methods (EDEL 332) course for three credits (sixteen weeks) at Montana State University, Bozeman. The Elementary Art Methods course was part of a cohort, which all Elementary Education majors are required to take before student teaching. The class normally meets twice a week for two hours each day.

During fall term 2007, there were two sections of Elementary Art Methods taught in two different cohorts and one professor of Art Education at MSU was instructor of record for both sections. Beginning this term, the course included an inquiry component in both sections; however, only one section of 27 students was invited to participate in this research study. The professor of record (not the researcher) was responsible for general content of the course including: text selection, course syllabus, and final grades. The professor met with students one day a week for two hours. On the alternate day of each week, I worked with students to introduce the inquiry task, assigned cooperative learning groups, guided the process of historical and cultural inquiry, and finally instructed how to prepare curricula for an art unit outline from their finding. Although I did not assign grades, I provided ongoing feedback and accounted for all assignments.

Cooperative Learning Group Selection

Group selection was informed by the literature especially *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty* (Millis and Cottell, 1998). According to Millis and Cottell, students must always feel respected and valued. Also, learning group theorists advocate for heterogeneous groups selected by the instructor as most productive (1998). Selection process began with note cards submitted from participants with name, art experience, and first, second, or third choice of art prompt as their subject for inquiry. Also, as suggested by Millis and Cottell, students were invited to include on their note card, the names of one or two others they would like to work with if given a choice. In addition, students completed a self-assessment questionnaire called the *Keirsey Four Types Sorter*

(Appendix C). According to Francis, Robbins, and Craig (2007) The Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS), similar to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), is an instrument for identifying personality traits of individuals. I used this informally to determine individual preferences and differences. The information was all considered to select groups that were balanced as much as possible.

The participants for the inquiry component of Elementary Art Methods were assigned to seven groups of four or five individuals. Each member was given two roles for participation in their group. The purpose of the roles was first, to organize the group process and second, to identify separate inquiry focus for each individual. Rotating roles work best to organize the group and regulate balance of power as well as work load among members. The rotating roles include: (1) Group manager: to clarify, record, report; (2) Facilitator: to steer, monitor reports and discussion; (3) Notebook accountant: account for tasks, materials, copies, collection; and (4) Timekeeper: responsible for time management (Millis and Cottell, 1998).

The second role for each participant will determine individual focus for the group task. After groups are formed to work with a chosen art prompt, each member will choose to become an “expert” on one aspect of the art work and its context. These individual topics related to historical and cultural context for an artwork are: (1) Ideas: beliefs, religion, politics, and philosophy; (2) The Arts: visual art, architecture, music, and drama; (3) Daily Life: traditions, economy, environment, and technology; and (4) Historical Context: geographical and linguistic characteristics (Carson, 2004).

Site Selection

The Department of Education and the Elementary Education (EDEL) program at Montana State University, Bozeman, is located in Reid Hall. Elementary Art Teaching Methods was taught in Reid 124 as regularly scheduled each semester. This was a lecture room with “Smart” podium, several large tables with chairs, one sink, and cupboards with art supplies for studio activities. Elementary education majors were familiar with this room because several of their classes were offered in the same space.

Each class meeting began and ended in the Reid Hall classroom. However, for the group inquiry process, students were allowed to work in various computer labs on campus or in one of two libraries. Students were given a choice to work in the Renne Library or the Creative Arts Library located in Cheever Hall. Another research location for students was the Teachers’ Resource Center located in room 222 of Reid Hall.

Preparation of Materials

Before proceeding with this study, materials were prepared for the Human Subjects Committee including *Request for Designation of Research as Exempt from the Requirement of Human Subjects*. This document included information such as, name of investigator, title of project, and brief description of research methods. Subjects for this study were defined with a statement ensuring no risk or inconvenience to EDEL students including confidentiality of their identities. Student identities were masked by coding documents with a group number and an assigned letter for each participant.

Materials sent to the committee included: Informed Consent Form, Certificate for Human Participant Protection Education, and an example of the questionnaire that was used for the study. The questionnaire asked students to respond very generally to determine their art knowledge and previous experience in art (as student or teacher) at the start of the course as well as their view and experience of participating in inquiry with learning groups. The institutional review board responded with a document stating the research was exempt from review. This was based on determination that the research was conducted in an established educational setting involving normal educational practices.

Course Topics

Elementary Education Majors as participants were introduced to the inquiry component of the course and rationale for an in-depth historical and cultural inquiry project as a basis for art curriculum development. The project responded to the gap between current art education theory and the “art as novelty” kinds of experiences that many Elementary Education majors had when they were children. According to Efland (2002), from a Vygotskian perspective, laissez-faire art experiences leave students “at the stage of their ‘actual’ development” (p. 37). As a result only those students with “talent” or pre-existing disposition for art making will be successful in unguided and unfocused learning environments. However, a current view of Art Education plans instruction for all children based on clearly articulated and sequential learning objectives that are built around meaningful and purposeful art experience.

Literature and research from the last twenty years has overwhelmingly advocated for the inclusion of the four art disciplines as curriculum components: art history and culture, art criticism, art production and aesthetics. The identification of these components is also associated with development of discipline-based art education (DBAE) and they continue to guide curriculum content decision-making in standards-based programs today. Stewart and Walker make strong recommendations for these four core areas in *Rethinking Curriculum in Art* (2005) and in addition they illustrate an expanded view of art curriculum development based on the five-year project, Transforming of Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC), completed in 2001. Participants of the inquiry component of Elementary Art Methods will become familiar with the TETAC project as theoretical framework for historical inquiry and to inform their preparation of an art unit outline at the end of the term.

Why would Elementary Education Majors spend so much of their course time and effort conducting historical and cultural inquiry based on the context of one work of art? In-depth study is what interested people do; it is how good teachers expand their own knowledge base and enrich the courses they teach. Anyone who has ever followed a question to the heart of a subject understands the sudden insight or epiphany associated when a context reveals meaning or the essence of a subject. The “meaning” that is found by anyone interested enough to follow the thread is the insight we discover about a person, a glass of wine, an art object, a literary work, and so on. The connection or path to an epiphany described here is the intention behind this research proposal. I am interested in the historical/cultural inquiry component of this course to see what

responses students will develop as they seek in-depth understanding of an artwork and its context. Of the observed participants, who will experience an epiphany? For those who express or demonstrate new insight, will this be observable in the curricula they design?

Teaching Strategies

As researcher, I chose cooperative learning groups to sustain and support engagement in the inquiry process. My role was to prompt, guide, and account for the participant responses. The first step in the project was to identify individual focus (See Appendix D) and begin inquiry into beliefs, daily life, the arts, as well as historical and geographical context of one artwork (Carson, 2004). As group members followed inquiry prompts they recorded key points as well as personal responses (Appendix E). Think-Pair-Share was a strategy for group processing of information; participants reflected alone first, then discussed in pairs, before finally bringing an idea to the group discussion and summary (Millis and Cottell, 1998). All materials produced by individuals and the group, were collected in one notebook as record of the group process. It provided an accounting for individual participation on a weekly basis. From the collective work, groups were expected to construct understanding of the artist and or culture of their investigation at the end of the first stage.

The in-class inquiry process was organized to include time for me to introduce ideas related to the group process or to discuss foundational concepts in art that support art education in general and demonstrate the TETAC structure specifically. Participant groups were also given time during class to visit campus libraries or computer lab

together. The rationale was to create “space” or time, in order to promote deep rather than superficial learning as well as encourage critical thinking (Millis, 2002). Also, it allowed me opportunity to listen to group interaction and prompt with questions or offer feedback as necessary. However, the researcher’s goal should be to encourage group interdependence. Millis and Cottell suggested using guidelines such as the, “three before me” rule where “students are required to consult three other sources before consulting with the instructor” (p. 58). The final portion of the daily organization was for all groups to return to the classroom in order to process and summarize progress or new questions. In addition the expectations for the next class session were reviewed.

The participant/group process evolved from inquiry to construction of understanding until finally ideas were translated into foundational components for art curriculum design based on TETAC framework.

Data Collection/Instrumentation

Data for this study was collected from five instruments including: (1) entry questionnaire from the beginning of study; (2) weekly summary report from individual responses; (3) art unit/final assignment; (4) exit questionnaire; and exit group interviews.

Entry Questionnaire (Appendix B)

The questionnaire at the beginning of the study assessed Elementary Education major’s views of art education, why they would or would not include instruction as a part of their general curriculum as well as what skills and knowledge they believe can and

should be taught in art. The questionnaire also invited student comments about doing inquiry on an artwork and regarding working in cooperative learning groups.

Weekly Group Summary from Individual Inquiry Response (Appendix E)

The inquiry project was prompted by the learning group structure and with questions generated from within groups and from myself. Individuals reported and reflected on weekly inquiry findings based on key ideas and personal response. At the end of the week, groups summarized their inquiry as a group and sent an electronic report to me. Individual responses were accounted for and collected in a group notebook.

Art Unit / Final Assignment (Appendix H)

This document represented the final project for the Elementary Art Methods course, which was development of an art unit based on inquiry of the group art object or site. EDEL students had the option to turn in one document for the group or to develop individual unit plans.

Exit Questionnaire (Appendix B)

At the end of the course, after the final project (art unit) was submitted, participants were asked to respond again to the exit questionnaire. Part A of this instrument was the same as the entry questionnaire, part B repeated the main prompt and then asked two questions for general information.

Exit Group Interviews (Appendix J)

The last source of data was an interview session with groups. The interview protocol (Appendix J) consisted of four open-ended questions; each interview lasted fifteen minutes and was recorded. Following, the recording was transcribed in preparation for analysis.

Verification/Trustworthiness

Research is trustworthy to the extent that investigation and reporting is ethically sound and results are valid and reliable. “Assessing validity and reliability of a qualitative study involves examining its component parts” (Merriam, 1998, p. 199). According to Merriam, a qualitative researcher can use six strategies to enhance validity:

1. Triangulation – Data for this study came from primarily document sources; however, the documents were distinctly different in nature and represented various components and viewpoints. This provided a diverse set of data and opportunity for constant comparative method.
2. Long-term observation –By design, the study took place once a week for thirteen weeks (one academic semester). My role was participant observer.
3. Peer-examination –Three individuals on the dissertation committee were consulted on a weekly basis. Comments and suggestions were invited.
4. Participatory or collaborative modes of research –Again, the dissertation committee was valuable here as was the collaborative arrangement for teaching the art methods course during this study.

5. Researcher's biases –A necessary component in qualitative research was to clarify my biases and assumptions as researcher.

Data Management

Data were organized by type, by group, and by date and stored in three ring binders. The weekly inquiry response was collected in each group's folder and stored there as a valuable record for the group reflection process. Since I had permission to access individual responses, these were photocopied and stored by date. In addition, during each class meeting, groups had opportunity to process and summarize key points. These summaries were sent to me electronically by a group manager, saved to electronic file and printed. All art units for the final project were also copied and stored. Finally, the group interview was recorded, saved electronically, then transcribed and filed by group.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was on going and began with collection, review, and written reflection. The first data were from a questionnaire; I was looking at these responses to determine where EDEL students were at the beginning of the course based on prompts about teaching art and their experience. The questionnaire was used again at the end of the course to reflect changes that had taken place. Analysis of questionnaires and the interview transcriptions was a similar process. The procedure began with review of individual statements and proceeded to identification of patterns of similar responses or significant differences. Several themes emerged from the questionnaire, and often two or

three themes appeared in one response. As a result, the numbers reported for this instrument represented frequency of the themes instead of numbers for individuals.

The other type of data was from course assignments and the statements that resulted naturally aligned with assignment guidelines. In other words, themes were used that reflected components of the assignment and data analysis was through reporting of the similarities or differences.

The first example of data from course structure was from weekly summary of inquiry. This set of data was individual and group notation of key concepts from inquiry and response. This data was directly related to Research Question I: How does in-depth historical/cultural inquiry, by EDEL majors, lead to epiphany or aesthetic understanding of an artwork and its historical/cultural context? Data analysis looked for signs of knowledge accumulation and language that suggested value response to key points or the discovery process. Member checking for accurate interpretation of the information from individuals or student groups occurred naturally as part of the instructional process and took place in person or through e-mail communication. Finally, references to the inquiry process or the group experience were also crosschecked with related prompts on the questionnaire.

The next example of data from the assignments was from the second half of the course when the process of historical cultural inquiry gradually became the inquiry process for developing comprehensive art curriculum. The turning point was reflected in the weekly summary as EDEL students shifted focus and statements began to align with Research Question II: What will be the evidence of epiphany on EDEL students learning

to design art curriculum? The art unit was the final document source of data relevant to the second research question. EDEL group performance with this final project was reviewed in light of the exit questionnaire and the exit group interviews.

Field notes from observation and reflection throughout the semester were maintained to consider with other findings. This recorded my description of the course setting, interactions, non-verbal communication, as well as what was and was not happening during the Elementary Art Methods class. The final stage of data analyses was interpretation of the findings as related to the literature.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter the design of the study has been presented. Participants were Elementary Education (EDEL) majors at Montana State University who were enrolled in an Elementary Arts Methods course. The study took place over the period of one semester. The purpose was to observe participants in the process of conducting in-depth historical and cultural inquiry based on one artwork. From this experience, participants followed well-established guidelines for developing comprehensive K-8 art curriculum.

The chapter also presented data verification, management, and analysis of the study. Data were collected from five instruments including: entry and exit questionnaire, weekly summary of group inquiry, the final art unit document, and exit interviews of groups. Analysis began with review of EDEL student statements and proceeded until patterns appeared. These themes were first reported, then interpreted and compared with the literature.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to observe, describe, and interpret the experiences of 28 Elementary Education (EDEL) students enrolled in an Elementary Art Methods course. There were 30 students in class; however, one graduate student became teaching assistant for the course and one EDEL student chose not to participate. Data from that individual was excluded from this report. For the first half of the course, students worked in cooperative learning groups on an inquiry assignment based on one art object or art site. After student groups developed insight about their art prompt, they were led through a process of designing an elementary art unit based on the same prompt. The curriculum development process was guided by framework (See Appendix F) from the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC) project.

This chapter will look at the study's results, identify themes, and report on the findings based on five sources of data and finally compare the data with a discussion of the literature. Data exists largely in the form of documents: beginning and exit questionnaires from individuals, weekly group summary reports from inquiry, the Art Unit for K-8 art curriculum from each of the groups, as well as transcription of recorded exit interviews with seven groups. Throughout the term, I also maintained a field journal with notes from weekly observations of in-class group work and discussion to support information provided by the documents.

The following questions framed this study:

- I. How does in-depth historical/cultural inquiry, by EDEL majors, lead to epiphany or aesthetic understanding of an artwork and its historical/cultural context?
- II. What will be the evidence of epiphany on EDEL students learning to design art curriculum?

Data Analysis

Analysis for a naturalistic study is both inductive and deductive (Patton, 2002).

The inductive stage of data analysis was to observe, collect, and review. There were five instruments for data collection: an entry questionnaire from individuals, weekly summary of inquiry from seven groups, the art unit document submitted and presented by groups, exit questionnaire (individuals), and finally an exit interview conducted in groups. The fifteen-minute interview was recorded, transcribed and then the transcription and recording were carefully compared for accuracy.

The next step of analysis was recognition of patterns or themes from general statements. With instruments such as questionnaires and the interview, themes emerged from similar responses to prompts from the EDEL students or when other interesting dimensions emerged. Specifically with the entry and exit questionnaires, several themes of interest appeared and occasionally two or three themes were present in an individual response. As a result, with this instrument alone, the number reported represents theme frequency rather than individual EDEL students.

The other two instruments, weekly group summary and the final art units, were both assignments, which produced data with different characteristics. Since assignments guide responses to some degree, the themes for these instruments consequently reflected performance level of the seven groups.

Entry Questionnaire: Part A. Art Education

The first instrument for gathering data for this study was a questionnaire (See Appendix B) that 26 out of 28 EDEL students responded to at the beginning of the Elementary Art Methods course. These eleven questions were used to collect student responses coming into the program regarding: (Part A) Art Education and (Part B) Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups.

Questionnaire Prompt I:

I Will/Will Not Teach Art as Part of the General Curriculum in My Classroom:

Student responses were overwhelmingly affirmative with all 26 students saying they would teach art. The affirmative responses can be described by four themes: (1) Intent to integrate art with content areas; (2) value placed on art to provide enjoyment, freedom, or a break from academics; (3) value placed on art as opportunity to express, create, imagine and (4) affirmative response with reservations.

Prompt I: Theme 1: Intent to integrate art with content areas (12 responses).

Twelve of the EDEL majors said they would integrate art. Statements such as, “I think art is very important to integrate throughout all the content areas” were common or in one case, “I plan to use art to supplement activities.”

Prompt I: Theme 2: Value placed on art for enjoyment, freedom, or a break from academics (6). Six EDEL students expressed interest in teaching art because it was enjoyable for children or because of their own feelings about art. For example one student wrote: “I love to doodle, color, play with clay, and paint. I feel free when I do something artistic.... I want students to explore and also be free when doing art. I want it to be fun.” Two students also expressed the belief that art should be a break in the school day: “I believe (art projects) are a great escape from the ‘usual’ curriculum...”

Prompt I: Theme 3: Value placed on art as opportunity to express, create, or imagine (9). Nine of the questionnaire responses emphasized art as expressive and creative opportunity for children such as, “(Art) encourages creativity and imagination” or “Art...is time for free uninterrupted self-expression.”

Prompt I: Theme 4: Affirmative response with reservations (3). Three participants who said they would teach art, expressed reservation such as, “I’m not good at (it), but would teach if my job requires me to.” Another said: “I don’t feel like I could teach art as in how to paint, draw, etc. but I could teach the history of art and artists and show examples of technique & let my students just try even if I couldn’t assist them very much.” The third EDEL student wrote: “I will integrate it into other curriculum areas as much as possible. With all the other demands for high stakes testing there are other requirements that are rated higher than art.”

Questionnaire Prompt II:
I Expect to Teach the Following Knowledge and Skills in My PreK-8 Classroom:

EDEL student statements regarding knowledge and skills they would teach were broad in range, from two questionnaires with no answers and one that said, “Honestly I have no idea” to a variety of more specific responses including one individual who wrote: “I want to teach how to analyze art and what to look for when evaluating art.” From the 26 participants, three themes emerged: (1) emphasis on materials, tools, or techniques; (2) color, line, or other elements and (3) art history.

Prompt II: Theme 1: Emphasis on materials, tools, or techniques (14). Fourteen statements referred to teaching about art materials or creative processes but only four of those individuals limited the answer to include only materials, tools and/or techniques: “Depending on specific age level, I will teach beginning to advanced drawing, painting, sculpting, abstract art, and creations.” The rest of the responses extended the answer to include reference to technique such as, “Stipple, shading, blending, weaving, knowledge that art should be fun.”

Prompt II: Theme 2: Color, line, and other elements (5). Five EDEL students made reference in their answer to art elements, saying they would teach, “Line, shape, value, contrast, tone, color wheel.”

Prompt II: Theme 3: Art history (6). Six individuals indicated through a variety of language they would teach about artists and/or art history such as, “...history of arts development, history of artists and famous paintings.”

Questionnaire Prompt III:

I Have the Following Experience, Knowledge, and Skills that Will Help Me Teach Art:

Out of 26 student responses, nineteen said they had experience from elementary to high school art classes or general experience with materials. Three themes appeared in response to experience, knowledge, and skills that EDEL students had for teaching art:

(1) Some experience elementary through high school, some college; (2) Some experience, but not much and (3) expressed interest or love of art.

Prompt III: Theme 1: Some experience, elementary through high school (19).

Nineteen EDEL students reported some experience from personal interest in a variety of processes including, drawing, painting, photography, sewing or scrap booking. Others said they had art in their K-12 school experience and two individuals reported taking art classes at the college level. There are three EDEL students with an art minor in this class but none made reference to their minor in response to this prompt.

Prompt III: Theme 2: Some experience, but not much (7). Seven of the 19 individuals that reported some experience qualified their answer with expressions similar to: “but not much.”

Prompt III: Theme 3: Expressed interest or love of art (8). Eight of the responses for experience, knowledge or skills that prepared individuals to teach art were statements such as, “I have a big interest in exploring art” or “Love!”

Questionnaire Prompt IV:

My Level of Confidence to Teach Art Can Be Described as:

Regarding confidence, the themes were: (1) confident; (2) partially confident and (3) not confident.

Prompt IV: Theme 1: Confident (5). Five EDEL students described themselves as confident even though 3 of these qualified their answer: “Very confident and excited, even though I do not have a lot of experience, I am very willing to learn and experience my own art class.”

Prompt IV: Theme 2: Partially confident (14). Fourteen of the statements indicated EDEL majors were partially confident with answers similar to: “Medium” or “Average.” In this category was also, “Moderate, art is something you do, there are steps in the process but I don’t feel it’s something you learn. You do it and practice. I can’t teach someone how to draw a face or a tree, it is practice.”

Prompt IV: Theme 3: Not confident (7). Finally, seven participants indicated they were not confident with statements such as, “Minimal” or by explanation, “Very low. I never took any art classes because I was afraid of it & had not experienced success with it at all.

Questionnaire Prompt V:

My Level of Confidence to Assess Knowledge and Skills in Art Can Be Described as:

This prompt asks EDEL students to describe their level of confidence to assess art and four themes appeared: (1) confident; (2) partially confident; (3) not confident and (4) reluctant to grade art.

Prompt V: Theme 1: Confident (2). Two students said they were confident about assessing art and elaborated with explanation, “I feel good about portfolio assessments and rubrics for grading artwork.”

Prompt V: Theme 2: Partially confident (13). Thirteen responses described personal confidence level with words such as “Average” or “Medium” or confidence was qualified such as, “I am confident I will survive but still need a few pointers for how to pick my subjects and to know what valuable knowledge kids need to know.”

Prompt V: Theme 3: Not confident (11). Eleven students reported confidence to assess art as, “Minimal” or said: “Not confident at all.”

Prompt V: Theme 4: Reluctant to grade art (5). Five EDEL students, who rated confidence level from low to moderate, expressed reluctance similar to this individual: “I don’t want to grade art. It’s supposed to be free, unique and fun. I don’t care what it looks like as long as they tried and they had a fun experience.”

Entry Questionnaire: Part B. Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups

This section of the questionnaire is introduced with the following statement: “Historical inquiry or research of an artwork’s context (time and place) may shed light on key ideas for developing art curriculum.”

Questionnaire Prompt VI:

My Response to the Above Statement is:

Participants said they agreed with the statement in 24 out of 26 responses while the remaining two individuals replied, “I don’t know.” Out of the affirmative answers there were two themes: (1) agree, with elaboration and (2) agree, with reservation.

Prompt VI: Theme 1: Agree, with elaboration (12). Twelve EDEL students agreed with the statement and elaborated, for example, “I agree - context and times determine what people paint and why they paint it.”

Prompt VI: Theme 2: Agree, with reservation (7). Seven of the participants who agreed with the statement also expressed some reservation similar to this response: “While this statement is true it is overwhelming” and another wrote, “I agree, but for some people it will have no impact on how they see the piece. It would even ruin how they see it. It might not be as beautiful if they know it was created because of war or violence.”

Questionnaire Prompt VII:

An Aspect of In-depth Historical Research that is Enjoyable:

There were two clear themes with this prompt: (1) felt interest or enjoy learning and (2) no interest.

Prompt VII: Theme 1: Felt interest or enjoy learning (17). Seventeen participants had similar responses, saying that an enjoyable aspect of historical research is, “Discovery, finding out interesting information.”

Prompt VII: Theme 2: No interest (4). From the remaining general and varied responses, four statements indicated no enjoyment from historical research, “None, I feel its busy work.”

Questionnaire Prompt VIII:
An Aspect of In-depth Historical Research that is Not Enjoyable:

EDEL student responses were mixed, with three themes emerging: (1) Topic was not relevant or interesting; (2) amount of time was a concern; and (3) felt frustration with sources.

Prompt VIII: Theme 1: Topic was not relevant or interesting (6). Six participants had similar responses regarding an aspect of in-depth historical research that was not enjoyable such as, “Researching a piece of artwork that you are not interested in” or “When you have no idea why you are doing it and the purpose it gives you in the future.”

Prompt VIII: Theme 2: Amount of time was a concern (5). Five students said that historical research was “time consuming” and that made the task not enjoyable. “It requires amounts of time and resources that can be a burden for us.”

Prompt VIII: Theme 3: Felt frustration with sources (5). Five students reported frustration as the factor that made historical research not enjoyable such as, “Reading so much! Finding sources that aren’t good.”

Questionnaire Prompt IX:

Generally, My Experience with Historical Research Has Been:

This prompt generated responses about quantity of research done previously by EDEL students as well as quality or how they felt about historical research in general. There were four themes: (1) some experience; (2) limited experience; (3) positive response to experience and (4) negative response to experience.

Prompt IX: Theme 1: Some experience (7). Seven EDEL majors said they had some experience with historical research and four of these said their experience was from a social studies methods course.

Prompt IX: Theme 2: Limited experience (5). Five participants described their own experience as limited.

Prompt IX: Theme 3: Positive response to experience (7). Seven students said their experience generally was “Positive” or “Somewhat enjoyable but I find it tedious at times.”

Prompt IX: Theme 4: Negative response to experience (6). Six individuals used the word “boring” to describe their response to historical research or they qualified their answer such as, “It is a good way to teach but I find research boring.”

Questionnaire Prompt X:

An Aspect about Working in Cooperative Groups that is Valuable:

When EDEL majors described what was valuable about working in cooperative groups, they often had multiple comments. These comments can be described with three

themes: (1) exposure to a variety of ideas; (2) share the work of a task; and (3) enjoyable, occasionally make friends.

Prompt X: Theme 1: Exposure to a variety of ideas (19). Nineteen participants indicated that they valued, “Different perspective” or “Differences of opinion, discussing ideas with others that are interested in the subject.”

Prompt X: Theme 2: Share the work of a task (12). Twelve comments from individuals said, “You share the workload. . .” or “The work doesn’t feel so overwhelming.”

Prompt X: Theme 3: Enjoyable, occasionally make friends (6). Finally, six EDEL students said, “I find it fun” or “I like working together – motivation for each other, it’s good to have interaction with people!”

Questionnaire Prompt XI:

An Aspect about Working in Cooperative Groups I Would Change is:

A variety of responses followed this prompt; four themes appeared: (1) imbalance of work or power; (2) issues with communication; (3) issues with roles assigned by instructor; and (4) no suggestions for change.

Prompt XI: Theme 1: Imbalance of work or power (5). Five individuals made statements about distribution of work or power. For example one student wrote: “Sometimes the control being placed on one person can be overwhelming. Dictating

feeling, I don't like it." Another individual indicated they would like, "The same amount of work being done by everyone."

Prompt XI: Theme 2: Issues with communication (4). Four participants suggested that communication could be improved, for example: "Members need to communicate more so that everyone can understand other's researching progress."

Prompt XI: Theme 3: Issues with roles assigned by instructor (7). Seven responses made reference to group roles assigned by the instructor (researcher) (See Appendix D). Students said, "We don't need jobs assigned to us, we work well together and know how to delegate."

Prompt XI: Theme 4: No suggestion for change (8). When asked about an aspect they would change about working in cooperative groups, eight participants said, "None" or "I really get along with my group so I wouldn't."

Summary of Results for Entry Questionnaire

Overall, the entry questionnaire responses indicated that EDEL students at the beginning of the art methods course said they intend to teach or at least integrate art. Over half of these emerging teachers expressed beliefs that art should be enjoyable, a break from academics, or opportunity to imagine and create. Also, over half mentioned materials, processes or techniques as the knowledge and skills they will teach. EDEL students were also prompted to describe their own knowledge and skills preparing them

to teach art and the majority said they had experience from elementary to high school art or personal interest in drawing, photography, or other processes. Finally, half of these individuals expressed partial confidence to teach and assess art while half also reported they were either not confident to assess or did not want to grade art at all.

The results from the second half of the questionnaire demonstrated that almost half of the EDEL students agreed that inquiry into the historical context of an artwork could shed light on key ideas for developing art curriculum. The majority of answers said that historical inquiry was interesting and that working in cooperative groups was valuable to them.

Weekly Summary of Inquiry

This source of data was a weekly summary of group inquiry for information about an artwork or art site over a period of four weeks (See table 1). This summary was compiled from individual inquiry response (Appendix E) based on individual focus/roles (ideas, daily life, the arts, historical context) from the learning group structure (Appendix D). After two weeks of historical inquiry, groups were asked to identify enduring ideas and rationale for the curriculum development process (Appendix F) from their findings.

Summary Report: Week 1:

- Reporting facts and questions (What, Where, When) (7).

All groups in the first week began by reporting a wide variety of facts and information that reflected the assigned inquiry structure of reporting key ideas and personal response (comments, connections, or questions). All summaries

reported findings related to what the art objects was, where it was, as well as the cultural and the historical context.

- Reporting the relationship of who and why (5).

Five of the seven groups reported that they investigated, who the creator(s) of the artwork was as well as meaning or purpose of the piece or site. For example one group wrote: “(We) found a description about the daily life of a monk, which will help. . .(piece) together this aspect of the study.”

Table 1. Cooperative Learning Groups and Themes for Weekly Summary Report.

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7
Week 1	Facts: What: Bayeux Tapestry Who:? Where: France When: 1070s	Facts: What: Bronze Plaque Who:? Where: Benin When: 1500s	Facts: What: Painting Who: Kandinsky Where: Russia When: 1913	Facts: What: Mural Who: Rivera Where: Detroit When: 1932	Facts: What: Ink Painting Who: Sesshu Where: Japan When: 1400s	Facts: What: Shah Mosque Who:? Where: Iran When: 1600	Facts: What: Sculpture Who: Wodiczko Where: New York When: 1988
Week 2	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context	Ideas, Daily Life, The Arts, Historical Context
Week 3	Enduring Idea: Story Telling Rationale: none provided	Enduring Idea: Several listed Rationale: specific	Enduring Idea: Color Rationale: none provided	Enduring Idea: Humanity Rationale: broad	Enduring Idea: Religion Rationale: broad - specific	Enduring Idea: Several listed Rationale: broad	Enduring Idea: None listed Rationale: specific
Week 4	Focus Narrows: Ancient folk poems	Focus Narrows: Power is the big idea	Focus Narrows: Seeing the vision	Focus Narrows: Welfare common people	Focus Narrows: Simplicity is not ordinary	Focus Narrows: Beauty they bring the world	Focus Narrows: Art...as if world mattered

Summary Report: Week 2

- Multi-faceted report (6).

Information submitted this week, in six out of seven cases, clearly reflected the focus roles (ideas, daily life, the arts, historical context) from the inquiry group structure. The six groups had common factors: the art subject was from a foreign culture and all artists or historical contexts were before 1960. One summary concludes with: “Our goal for this coming week is to bring our artist to life.”

- Limited report (1).

One group summary was distinctly different from the others. This group was investigating a contemporary artist from a foreign country who is currently working in America. This group reported, “We had difficulty accessing online journals and articles relevant to (the artist) so we spent the majority of our time discussing our own opinions of the (artwork) and interpreting the information we have.” The group reported questions they had developed for further inquiry.

Summary Report: Week 3:

To prepare for the third week summary, EDEL students were introduced to the concept of enduring ideas defined by Stewart and Walker (2005) as umbrella-like concepts that connect subject matter with significant human issues. Enduring ideas were identified to direct development of the art unit assignment. In addition, groups were asked to write brief rationale for teaching the artwork and the specific enduring idea in a K-8 classroom. These are the two themes for this week:

- Developing enduring ideas (6).

Six out of seven groups had enduring ideas to report in this summary. Two of the groups had enduring ideas such as “Storytelling” that met criteria for this concept. For example: “We discussed how to possibly teach how storytelling was important to these people and how the tapestry itself is a story in itself.”

The other four ideas reported were very broad such as, “We decided that our enduring idea for our unit will be color” other groups were considering ideas such as “religion” or “symmetry and symbolism.”

- Developing rationale (5).

Five out of seven groups reported a rationale at this stage of the inquiry process.

Of these five groups, two groups were subject specific with their rationale,

“Students (will) understand the culture of Benin kings and people, the bronze/brass art works produced by these people, the values of everyday life and the hardships of culture.” One group rationale began broad and became specific,

“All art is a result of the artist’s beliefs, whether they are famous or a little child drawing about their life. This is a common theme that unites all people through art across all time periods. Sesshu’s art in particular embodied all aspects of his religion, which he used in an attempt to call his generation back to traditional

Japanese ideals. Through studying his drawings, students will be able to

understand Asian culture while recognizing that Sesshu created his art under the same motivation that drives them in their own works of art. The remaining two

groups reported a broad or general rationale, “Our rationale states that it is

important for students to know how culture and beliefs affect art and how these can be expressed through art.”

Summary Report: Week 4

One theme emerged for all groups: Narrowing of focus (7).

- Group 1: Group summary included a favorite quote, “...and they loved to recite their ancient folk poems by heart, violent and blood thirsty sagas of wild beasts and warriors. . .”
- Group 2: “Power with these people is the big idea.”
- Group 3: “Last week our group really started seeing the vision of this project.”
- Group 4: “We are still focusing...on his promotion of the welfare of the common people.”
- Group 5: One student in the group was quoted as saying, “Simplicity does not mean ordinary.” The rest of the group thought this was brilliant and made it the enduring idea.
- Group 6: “We want our students to see how intricate these ‘wall coverings,’ if you will, are and how much beauty they bring to the world. These designs were not just chosen at random, but each one has its own meaning.”
- Group 7: This group made reference to a chapter from *The Reenchantment of Art* (Suzi Gablik, 1992), titled: *Teaching Art as if the World Mattered*. “This chapter is going to help us incorporate The Homeless Vehicle Project into a classroom and give meaning to it.”

Summary of Results for Weekly Summary of Inquiry

The data from the weekly summary from groups represented information and individual response to four weeks of structured inquiry on the art prompt. The data demonstrates similar progress reported for the seven groups with some variation among groups just as there were differences in the art prompts. Groups began by reporting general facts then narrowed their focus into a multi-faceted view based on place and time of the art (beliefs, daily life, the arts, and historical context). Finally, EDEL students translated understanding of the findings into an enduring idea and rationale for integrating this content into K-8 curriculum.

Final Project/Art Unit

The Art Unit followed culmination of inquiry as a basis for developing K-8 visual art curriculum. After four weeks of inquiry, EDEL students began the work of designing the art unit using unit foundations as framework from Transforming Education Through The Arts Challenge (TETAC) (See Appendix H).

The final art unit was submitted as a group project unless individuals chose to finish the assignment on their own. In response to this option, four groups submitted one document as required, while three groups submitted more than one document indicating that at least one individual chose to complete the final work alone. Before reporting the data for this instrument, I compared similarities and differences of documents submitted from within groups. In all but one case, the final documents were very similar with differences characterized by language choice or degree of development

of the various sections. Only one group submitted two documents with marked differences; to adjust for this I will be reporting themes from eight possible documents.

Unit Foundations

The structure of the art unit depends on development of unit foundations to direct and guide the teaching and learning toward finding and making meaning from art. As implied by the title, these components form the foundation of the art unit and are the three themes for this section: (1) enduring ideas; (2) key concepts and (3) essential questions.

Theme 1: Enduring Ideas: Enduring ideas, or themes of relevant human interest, guide understanding of learning experiences by clarifying the connection between learning activities and content.

- *Bayeux Tapestry*: Storytelling, What is Your Story?
- *Kandinsky, Sea Battle* (painting): From Experience to Expression
- *Rivera, Detroit Industry* (mural): Unity, United We Stand
- *Sesshu, Autumn Landscape* (ink painting): Simplicity
- *Shah Mosque* (architecture): Pattern Has Meaning, Pattern as Form of Expression.
- *Wodiczko, Homeless Vehicle* (sculpture): Recognition, Recognition through Art.

Theme 2: Key Concepts: Key concepts begin to reveal the complexity of enduring ideas and should correspond with essential questions.

- *Bayeux Tapestry*: Storytelling can be fact, storytelling can be fiction, and storytelling can be seen in art.
- *Kandinsky, Sea Battle*: Expression, abstraction, human beings as unique filters of experiences.
- *Rivera, Detroit Industry*: Unity is working together, unity is diverse, and unity shares a common goal.
- *Sesshu, Autumn Landscape*: Simplicity does not mean ordinary; simplicity can create perspective on life and simplicity can be beautiful.
- *Shah Mosque*: Pattern in Islamic Art has important meaning to Islamic people and the same pattern/symbol can be used to represent many different ideas.
- *Wodiczko, Homeless Vehicle*: Art can be vital to drawing attention to and promoting understanding of social issues.

Theme 3: Essential Questions: Essential questions develop focus for the unit; they should engage and motivate.

- *Bayeux Tapestry*: Does all art tell a story; can stories be accurately depicted; what is the purpose of storytelling?
- *Kandinsky, Sea Battle*: Is realistic or abstract painting better; what is expression; how do you express yourself; what is art to Kandinsky and what is art to you?
- *Rivera, Detroit Industry*: How is unity represented through art; how does Rivera view unity; how does my community demonstrate unity?

- *Sesshu, Autumn Landscape*: What is simplicity; how do you create simplicity and why should/shouldn't simplicity be incorporated into our everyday lives?
- *Shah Mosque*: How can color, shape, and pattern communicate an idea; what kinds of patterns/symbols mean different things to different people?
- *Wodiczko, Homeless Vehicle*: How does the homeless vehicle show recognition; are there other issues that affect us that we can shed light on through art?

Unit Assessment

Unit development from Understanding by Design begins by identifying a final task in order to design learning activities for attaining that goal. In order to meet standards for comprehensive art education the unit must also have measurable learning objectives for all four domains (art history/culture, art process, art criticism, and aesthetics) explaining what K-8 students should know or be able to do in each area. Assessment in each of the four domains therefore, should be based on specific knowledge and skills for that art component. A review of the assessment for the art unit developed by seven groups showed that all final documents made reference to the four domains but the development and demonstrated understanding for each component varied. For each of the four types of objectives, there were two themes identified: (1) demonstrated understanding or (2) demonstrated partial understanding.

Art History/Culture: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding: Six (6) groups demonstrated understanding of this objective in their unit by including significant facts or connections with the history and culture of the art and artist of group focus. For example,

“Students learn...historical facts about the Bayeux Tapestry and various aspects of the middle ages.” Within the body of the unit this group included specific information such as theory for creation of the tapestry, components of the tapestry as a method of story telling, key ideas from the battle of Hastings, as well as related information from the medieval life.

Art History/Culture: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding: One (1)

group developed their unit for a contemporary piece and stated: “This class will research and construct reasoning on why (this artist) made (this artwork). What was the state of social, political, or cultural issues at that time in our country, as well as around the world? Students will then discover issues that may need to be addressed in their own community.” The body of this unit however, did not include significant facts about the artist or the context of the work.

Art Process: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding: Two (2) groups identified

specific objectives for art process. EDEL students were asked to plan the art unit with consideration for sequence and practice in order to develop skills and understanding for the final task. Assessment of the unit’s final task should be based on specific criteria to guide student understanding of the expectations for the assignment. For example, one unit described how their students would be instructed to choose or create symbols and further, how the symbols would be used in the final task. The rubric showed guidelines for use of color, explanation for controlled use of line, number of symbols to be used and the

requirement of a key to define symbolic meaning. The unit also provided opportunity for development of ideas and practice with materials before the final task.

Art Process: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding: Five (5) groups demonstrated partial understanding for this objective. All groups suggested approaches for developing ideas such as brainstorming or description of materials to be used. However in all cases, these groups reported process objectives without description of the skill that was being taught such as: “Students will construct a ‘person’ out of recyclable materials,” “Students will know the (painting style) and create paintings,” “Students will create a mural...” In all cases, a rubric was provided for the final task including objectives for process such as, “Drawings are recognizable, original, done with some skill,” “Work is clean, neat,” “Student shows practice,” in one case the art work (no criteria) was to be mounted “carefully” to display.

Art Criticism: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding: Four (4) groups demonstrated understanding by identifying specific art language or other relevant vocabulary including art elements, principles, or art concepts. Examples were: “pattern, color, shape, and symbolism,” “unity, balance, line, movement,” “background, middle ground, foreground, 2-D, 3-D, and space,” or “the importance of line and asymmetrical balance.”

Art Criticism: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding: Three (3) groups demonstrated partial understanding with general statements for this objective such as,

“Students will be required to first describe, analyze, and interpret...,” “...discuss art by (these) people,” or “...critique paintings of peer, artists, themselves...” Broad statements such as these must be supported by introducing specific language students would use to meet this objective.

Aesthetics: Theme 1: Demonstrated Understanding: Five (5) groups demonstrated understanding with objectives built around questions such as, “How can abstract ideas (unity) be represented through art?” or “Discuss why it (the art object) is or is not art.” Aesthetics within the context of K-8 visual art curriculum refers to open-end discussion or exploration of philosophical issues or concepts about art. Occasionally aesthetic topics can come out of key concepts or essential questions. These are the ideas that stimulate critical thinking and should be investigated to expose the richness of a subject.

Aesthetics: Theme 2: Demonstrated Partial Understanding: Two (2) groups demonstrated partial understanding of this objective with general statements, for example: “Students learn the importance of (the art),” or “...symbolism.”

Summary of Results for Final Project/Art Unit

Development of comprehensive art education requires that art content is built from a foundation of understanding a work of art from its context. The purpose of unit foundations is to connect historical/cultural context with current human experience for the purpose of providing relevant connection with the subject content. The data in this section was a report of enduring ideas selected by groups to reflect understanding of art, artist, and culture. Also, students were able to unpack the ideas to develop key concepts

and essential questions. This process is the foundation that must be in place in order to identify content objectives and a final task for developing relevant and meaningful K-8 visual art curriculum.

Unit assessment was another source of data from the art unit. Objectives based on standards should identify what K-8 students will know or be able to do in four art domains or art content components by the end of the unit. In this study, the majority of groups demonstrated understanding of objectives for three areas: art history, art criticism, and aesthetics. However, the majority of the seven groups demonstrated only partial understanding for writing objectives with specific criteria in order to teach skills and knowledge related to the art process.

Exit Questionnaire: Part A. Art Education

The next instrument for data collection was the exit questionnaire (See Appendix B). EDEL students were asked to respond to the prompts in class after submitting the final project (Unit Outline); 27 out of 28 questionnaires were turned in. The group exit interviews were conducted the same day. Part A. of the Exit Questionnaire is the same as the entry format. Part B. however, has only the same statement/response prompt at the beginning. The other two prompts were either checking for general comments about this component of the course or determining length of time (first or second block) the student was in the Elementary Education Program.

Questionnaire Prompt I:

I Will/Will Not Teach Art as Part of General Curriculum in My Classroom:

The responses can be described by four themes: (1) intent to integrate; (2) value placed on art for enjoyment or a break from academics; (3) value placed on art as opportunity for children to express themselves and (4) expressed reservations.

Prompt I: Theme 1: Intent to integrate (15 responses). Fifteen EDEL students reported they intend to integrate art in their future classrooms. This was expressed in various ways from: “I feel so many things can be taught through art” to “Art is such a great way for students to express themselves and enhance knowledge about various content areas. I not only want to integrate art, but teach art itself as well.”

Prompt I: Theme 2: Value placed on art for enjoyment or a break from academics (5). Five EDEL students said they would teach art because these EDEL students personally enjoy art or because they believe it is enjoyable or a break for children. “Art is fun and it not only provides a break but it is very informative.” Another said, “I enjoy art and think it is a great value for children.”

Prompt I: Theme 3: Value placed on art as opportunity for children to express themselves (4). Nine responses used the phrase: “Art is a great way for kids to express themselves” or similar.

Prompt I: Theme 4: Expressed reservations (4). Four EDEL students expressed reservations similar to: “I will not be the art teacher because I am not confident enough in

my own art skills. But I will teach art in my classroom as integrated lessons.” Also, another said they would teach art, “If the district allows it.”

Questionnaire Prompt II:

I Expect to Teach the Following Knowledge and Skills in My PreK-8 Classroom:

Four themes were noted: (1) emphasis on materials or process; (2) reference to art history or appreciation; (3) reference to art criticism or talking about art and (4) reference to art and meaning.

Prompt II: Theme 1: Emphasis on materials or process (5). Five responses describing knowledge and skills they would teach, emphasized materials and process, for example: “Drawing, painting, cutting, gluing, sculpting, use of all art supplies and any fun art concept that is appealing.”

Prompt II: Theme 2: Reference to art history or appreciation (9). Nine EDEL students said they would teach art history or similar to: “How to talk about art, how to appreciate art, how to do simple art.”

Prompt II: Theme 3: Reference to art criticism or talking about art (9). Nine responses included art criticism or talking about art with other knowledge and skills for example: “I plan to teach about the different styles, techniques, mediums, criticism, ideas, forms, & expression.”

Prompt II: Theme 4: Reference to art and meaning (4). Four individuals (three in one group) made reference to “meaningful activities” or said they would teach knowledge and skills, “To understand that art can have many meanings.”

Questionnaire Prompt III:

I Have the Following Experience, Knowledge, and Skills that Will Help Me Teach Art:

There were three themes: (1) reference to elementary art methods; (2) limited experience, but have resources and (3) interest in art or hobbies at home.

Prompt III: Theme 1: Reference to elementary art methods (15). Out of 27 questionnaires, fifteen EDEL students either made single reference to “elementary art (class)”, “inquiry/research”, or included reference with other experiences such as, “I have experience with drawing, painting, ceramics, and jewelry classes in high school and feel more prepared after the art methods class.”

Prompt III: Theme 2: Limited experience, but have resources (5). Five responses to the prompt said experience or knowledge was limited but suggested they had resources, for example: “Very little, but I have the resources to find out.” Another said, “I will have to learn as I go. I have a foundation in art history and the basic understanding of drawing techniques.”

Prompt III: Theme 3: Interest in art or hobbies at home (6). Six individuals included their own interest in art or hobbies at home such as, “I am a hard-core scrap-booker. I spent years doing embroidery and ceramics. I am very crafty.”

Questionnaire Prompt IV:

My Level of Confidence to Teach Art Can Be Described as:

Three themes resulted from this prompt: (1) confident; (2) partially and (3) not confident.

Prompt IV: Theme 1: Confident (5). Five individuals reported confidence level as “High,” “Very good,” or similar.

Prompt IV: Theme 2: Partially confident (17). Seventeen EDEL students described confidence level as “Medium” or “Slightly improved. I feel okay, but not stable.”

Prompt IV: Theme 3: Not confident (4). Four responses said that these EDEL students were “Not confident at all”. Of these students one stated, “Iffy, but only because I don’t feel that I am a good artist” and another, “Although this is a methods class, I don’t know the content to teach.”

Questionnaire Prompt V:

My Level of Confidence to Assess Knowledge and Skills in Art Can Be Described as:

Three themes emerged: (1) confident; (2) partially confident and (3) not confident.

Prompt V: Theme 1: Confident (5). Five EDEL students said they were confident in their ability to assess art. One individual wrote: “I now understand the assessable aspects of art and how to assess the skills, not the art piece/expression as a whole.”

Prompt V: Theme 2: Partially confident (17). Seventeen students said they had “Medium” confidence or were, “Fairly good – I can establish non-biased criteria.”

Prompt V: Theme 3: Not confident (3). Three students described confidence to assess as “Weak” or “Very scared.” One of these students said, “My assessment is not confident in art; it will mostly be completion of assignment.”

Exit Questionnaire Part B. Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups

EDEL students were asked to respond to the following: “Historical inquiry or research of an artwork’s context (time and place) may shed light on key ideas for developing art curriculum.”

Questionnaire Prompt VI:
My Response to the Above Statement is:

Two themes describe student answers: (1) agree with explanation of importance and (2) expressed objections.

Prompt VI: Theme 1: Agree, with explanation of importance (19). Almost all nineteen responses in agreement also elaborated on their view such as, “Art is more than what many people think it is. There is always going to be a historical concept behind a piece of artwork.”

Prompt VI: Theme 2: Expressed objections (7). Seven individuals stated objections about being assigned to groups, assigned the art prompt for inquiry, or amount of time spent on inquiry (more related data will be reported with prompt 7.) Another interpretation of the inquiry process was expressed as, “I don’t believe an art curriculum should be based on historical inquiry or research of an artwork’s context. Possibly key ideas, but for younger students art curriculum should focus on skills, motor skills, and technique.”

Questionnaire Prompt VII:
One Thing I Want Kim to Know:

Four themes were noted in response: (1) positive remarks; (2) comments on group or group-work; (3) too much time spent doing inquiry and (4) more guidance was needed.

Prompt VII: Theme 1: Positive remarks (12). Twelve students had positive things to say about the course or the instructor.

Prompt VII: Theme 2: Comments on group or group-work (4). Four individuals reported personal experience in groups for example, one said, “Working in groups on such a big unit was very stressful.” However, two others stated that the project went well because their group worked “really well together.” Finally, another explained, “Our group worked really well until the end. One really strong personality started running the show...”

Prompt VII: Theme 3: Too much time spent doing inquiry (6). Six EDEL students said that the inquiry process should have taken less time and more time should have been spent “writing the unit plan.”

Prompt VII: Theme 4: More guidance was needed (6). Six individuals stated that more guidance was needed during the inquiry process. Three of these students said they needed more direct instruction or direction. One individual summed it up: “This is a very good class to help us learn how to develop a curriculum, but sometimes the coverage of a topic is so rich and comprehensive maybe students have difficulty to digest all the information...”

Questionnaire Prompt VIII:
This Past Term was My First or Second Block:

This prompt had no themes, just choice of two answers to determine stage of the program these Elementary Education students were in. Students were asked if they were in their first or second semester or “block.” Out of 27 questionnaires submitted, there were 26 responses. Nine students said they were in the first block and seventeen were in the second block. Review of the data indicated that there was no distinction in the final performance (unit design) between EDEL students with previous experience and those who were in the Elementary Education blocks for the first time.

Summary of Results for Exit Questionnaire

EDEL student responses to the exit questionnaire indicated that over half intend to integrate art. When asked about knowledge and skills they will teach, a third of the responses said they would teach art history or art appreciation, a third said they would teach art criticism and/or “talking about art” (as it was described in this course), and only a small number of individuals emphasized materials and/or art processes in their answer. Overall, the majority said they were partially confident about teaching art and the same number also stated they were partially confident about assessing art. Finally, Two thirds of EDEL students said they agreed with the statement that historical inquiry of context could shed light on key ideas for developing K-8 art curriculum.

Exit Interviews of Groups

The last source of data was a recorded interview with each of the seven groups, which was transcribed for analysis. Each group interview was scheduled to last fifteen minutes and consisted of discussion prompted by the interview protocol of four questions (See Appendix J). The first three questions were closely related and served as prompts to sustain the conversation about art curriculum. They were: (1) What can you say with confidence about designing curriculum in art; (2) What do you want me to know from reading your unit outline; and (3) How do you know you understand components for designing art curriculum? Because of the similarity of the questions, the themes appeared throughout discussion of all three prompts. As a result I have combined the data under a

new heading, “What can you say about designing art curriculum?” This portion of the data had four themes. The last interview question was: (4) what are the limits of your understanding? This section did provoke three distinctly different themes.

What Can You Say About Designing Art Curriculum?

EDEL student responses to the three questions about art curriculum continued to reflect previous themes from prior sources of data collection. During five group interviews for example, participants in this study repeated that art could be integrated to enrich other subject areas and three groups said they valued the open-ended nature of art. However, the following four themes were the most developed: (1) understanding begins with research; (2) “backward design” is important; (3) understanding evolves; and (4) teaching for meaning.

Understanding Begins with Research (Inquiry). Five (5) groups discussed their learning from the inquiry or research process, for example:

- Group 2: “I think curriculum in art is a lot easier once you do a little bit of research, just like everything else. So you need to have a background in what you’re doing.”
- Group 3: “...It’s funny because you are starting from the very beginning not knowing anything about this painting so you have to build up knowledge and then you start working backward.”

- Group 5: “Well I think that now having done it and spent so much time on it that if you were to hand me a painting and ask me to design curriculum I think I could do it without being like, Oh no. Where do I start?”
- Group 6: “I think if you don’t know why a piece is significant to that culture or to that time period or something you can’t really understand it.... there is no way to really present it if you don’t know those things.”
- Group 7: “There needs to be quite a bit of research involved to understand history behind artwork.”
- Group 7 (continued): “And I think it is good for the kids to discover things on their own too. To research and find, not just give them the answers and tell them what the art means but have them use their own critical thinking to discover their own meaning.”

Backward Design is Important. Four (4) groups indicated their understanding of backward design or Understanding by Design (UBD) was valuable to their process of designing visual art curriculum:

- Group 2: (Individual comment on the purpose of research or inquiry.)
“Backward Design...I guess...knowing where you are going before you start.”
- Group 3: “The idea of backwards design was huge...just huge. It changed everything really.”
- Group 3 (continued): “And we really got excited after she had a big idea for the last assessment. Booing! And that’s when everything was like, Pow! We’re

- going now! And then once we had that big idea in mind, then we were able to work backwards.”
- Group 5: “It’s really good because we have the (enduring) idea in our curriculum and we can actually teach something beyond the art itself (that is) really meaningful to people.... You can go beyond art...you can relate it to real life.”
- Group 6: “It is good to know that your plans are going to evolve as you gain knowledge of the content you are teaching. You may have one idea in the beginning, but most likely it will change. And just to focus on the big picture and not get tied down. Focus on the enduring ideas that you find.”

Understanding Evolves. Three (3) groups described how their understanding for designing the unit evolved:

- Group 3: “...I don’t have a lot of experience, especially with formally looking at art.... But now...I understand all those quotes and readings and words that came directly out of him and paintings. It’s very much in depth. And in order to design curriculum, I think that is an intricate part of it and I didn’t realize that before.”
- Group 5: “When we first started.... our whole focus was on the art and making art rather than the components of art. We just focused on the process rather than on the aesthetics or the history or any of those. I think one thing we developed through building our unit is especially the (historical) focus. Art isn’t just about painting or drawing or making.”

- Group 6: “It’s good to know that your plans are going to evolve as you gain knowledge of the content you are teaching.”
- Group 6 (continued): “It evolves.... it starts as (dialog about) Islamic pattern and turns into a discussion about pattern in their everyday lives. So something that’s so broad and culture specific to something...that affects...daily life.”

Teaching for Meaning. Five (5) groups explained their understanding of teaching art experience with meaning:

- Group 2: “It relates our unit to a personal level from what they learn about the personal lives of the Oba (Benin) to having reason to create their own now.”
- Group 3: “This was the most useful piece of this course...especially for opening the curriculum across.... Ours is more of an art unit...about expression and individuality and those types of things. But it could easily go into history. It could easily go into culture. And you could do that with almost anything. For somebody who’s going to have a self-contained classroom, I keep saying that, it’s absolutely huge. And this was incredible.”
- Group 5: “It’s about more than having kids color on a piece of paper or look at a painting and try copying it. It’s getting beyond that - about what the painting actually means and the history behind it.”
- Group 6: “I think just the ability to not just throw an art project in and make it something fun but that it has meaning.... Something I’ve seen a lot in the schools

is that they just do these art projects and they're not really focused on art. They're just: make a turkey."

- Group 7: "...Growing up...(for) Thanksgiving you made turkey, for Christmas you made...now you can integrate (art) into anything."
- Group 7 (continued): "And it has meaning too. Like the coloring books, making the turkey...who learns from doing that? It's, fun but you're not really thinking. You're not using higher level thinking at all."

What Are the Limits of Your Understanding?

Responses to this question can be described by three themes: (1) limited knowledge or art skills; (2) how to find time for standards-based art; and (3) curriculum is untested.

Limited Knowledge or Art Skills. Four (4) individuals in groups expressed personal view of limitations:

- Group 1: "I can't draw. I can draw a stick figure, so how am I supposed to teach art?"
- Group 4: "I did a lot of artwork over my years but I don't really remember why we did it or what it connected to..."
- Group 4 (continued): "It is probably going to be interesting when we teach. When we get the chance to teach art, I'll probably end up starting out the way I was taught...just doing arts and crafts and then based on this class...or depending on the age group...I don't know really."

- Group 5: “I think it would be easier.... having a lot of background in art or any at all...I have a lot in music, but absolutely none in art.”
- Group 6: “...I don’t see myself as very artistic so I think that is my main limit.”

How to Find Time for Standards-based Art. Two (2) individuals expressed limits to understanding as not knowing how to make preparation and activity fit into time constraints of teaching:

- Group 6: “I think for me it’s the limit of I never got access to a lot of art when I was younger. For me it’s going to be hard to take the time to research it if I want to use it so I fully understand what the picture says, what it’s meaning (is), what the artist’s intention of was...”
- Group 6 (continued): “I think I see why they do the turkey. The turkey takes five minutes. They trace and they color and they glue and they are done.”

Curriculum is Untested. Two (2) groups discussed awareness that effectiveness in the classroom had not been tested:

- Group 4: “You know what you want to happen based on your lesson and it doesn’t always work that way.”
- Group 4 (continued): “I think it is kind of hard telling until you actually teach it. You’re not going to know anything because...some things you put on paper aren’t going to work in front of thirty little people.”
- Group 5: “Never having used the curriculum we designed. We think it’s wonderful but it might not be so wonderful when we put it in a classroom.”

Summary of Results for Exit Interviews of Groups

Group interviews were the final stage of data collection for the Elementary Art Methods course. The fifteen-minute interviews, based on four questions, were intended to prompt conversation about designing curriculum in art. Over half of the groups discussed the purpose of inquiry or research to teaching art. Also, the majority saw the value for using Understanding by Design (UBD) or backward design concepts in that process. Three of the groups reflected on how their understanding evolved in the unit design process and the majority of the groups could recognize meaningful or purposeful art experience for children. When participants were asked about the limits of their understanding (about teaching art), less than half said they had limited skills and knowledge and a small number said they were unsure how to find time to develop and teach art. Finally, two groups were also aware that they had limited understanding about how successful their units would be in an actual classroom.

Discussion of the Findings with Literature Reviewed

Literature reviewed for this study looked at current status of elementary art education, explanation and framework for comprehensive art education for teacher training, cooperative learning in higher education, and historical inquiry for contextual understanding. In this section I will review the data and compare findings with the literature.

Elementary Education: Who is Teaching Art, What is Being Taught?

The central purpose for educational reform is to ensure that educators are informed and purposeful in their teaching with objectives well articulated and rationales for what is taught. In the arts, there should be the same expectation. However, Laura Chapman's 2005 report on the state of elementary art education illustrates several deficiencies. The article was based on interpretation of data from a variety of sources including the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). According to Chapman, from a 1999-2000 NCES survey of the nation's 903,200 full-time classroom teachers, 92% say they teach art (NCES, 2002, as cited in Chapman, p. 129). However, the same survey indicated that most were without knowledge, skills and support for developing standards-based art instruction and assessment. In addition, the majority of these teachers reported that art teaching was not based on a local or district guide or aligned with state or national standards. Half said they never used art texts or other resources and again, nearly half never use any form of assessment for art learning (Chapman, 2005).

Chapman's findings were reflected in entry-level responses by Elementary Education (EDEL) majors to a questionnaire for this study. The majority of participants, who expect to be classroom teachers, said they intend to teach or at least integrate art. Also, responses to the questionnaire indicated that most of these emerging teachers had limited qualifications for teaching art. When prompted to explain art knowledge and skills they would teach in their classroom, EDEL students most often responded with reference to art processes and materials, or "expressing." Also, based on responses

related to assessment, the majority of these participants reported they were not confident about assessing art and several stated they were reluctant to assess art at all.

At the end of the Elementary Art Methods course and this research study, EDEL student responses to the exit questionnaire continued to indicate they intended to teach or integrate art. However, the knowledge and skills they said they would teach were more aligned with art standards with references to art history (art appreciation) and art criticism, in addition to art process and materials. Also, in response to their confidence to assess art, the majority said they were moderately confident and one explained, “I can establish non-biased criteria” and another, “I now understand the assessable aspects of art and how to assess the skills, not the art piece/expression as a whole.”

Chapman’s article reported that most classroom teachers surveyed for the NCES study had participated in professional development activities (PDAs) for both standards-based instruction and assessment (2005). While Chapman’s findings are based on experienced teachers, I do not believe that EDEL students would have been able to determine the four domains or content areas from Montana art content standards without specific instruction. Similarly, by the end of this study, it was clear that while participants were able to identify the four content domains, (history/culture, art process, art criticism, and aesthetics), ability to determine learning objectives in each area varied. The majority of participants demonstrated understanding when writing objectives in three of the four content areas, but objectives for teaching skill or understanding for art process were noticeably undeveloped and broad.

Chapman's article was important because it demonstrates a gap between common practice in many K-8 classrooms and programs reaching potential for comprehensive visual art education. The deficiency of classroom art experience may be the result of preconceived ideas about the role of art in the schools. Until recently, few models have existed for exemplary visual art programs. However, this study reveals how specific frameworks can support emerging teachers in the process of developing art curriculum. It also shines light on some complexities about art teaching and learning that art educators in teacher preparation programs need to address in art methods course content.

Comprehensive Art Education

Comprehensive art education takes into consideration recent educational theory and research, as well as current development of art education content, purpose and potential. A review of the literature led to framework from *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC), a significant nationwide project also concerned with development and implementation of substantive K-8 visual arts curriculum. Prompted by the TETAC project, Stewart and Walker (2005) produced *Rethinking Curriculum in Art* to inform art teaching practice with framework for Comprehensive Art Education. The TETAC curriculum task force determined five guidelines for classroom teachers including: unit foundations, content, instruction, assessment, and design (for teacher reflection). It should be noted that TETAC participants were in-service teachers compared with pre-service teachers in this study. The EDEL majors were learning how to develop comprehensive K-8 art curriculum in addition to completing other Elementary Art Methods coursework. Because of this, it became necessary to adjust TETAC

framework and expectations in order to adequately focus on three of the five components: unit foundations, content, and assessment. The other two guidelines were addressed but not explicitly taught.

Unit Foundations: Stewart and Walker (2005) indicated that the concepts from Unit Foundations were a critical component for curriculum design for the *Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge* (TETAC) project. Especially important were enduring ideas as over arching themes that connect learning across the curriculum with issues of timeless human interest. They are “broad, umbrella-like ideas that guide students in understanding what it means to be human, to live alongside others in the natural world” (p. 25). In this study, seven groups of EDEL majors developed enduring ideas while in the process of conducting historical and cultural inquiry based on their art prompt. At the end of the term, when students reflected on their process, one individual emphasized focusing on the big picture and not getting tied down, “You might have one idea in the beginning but most likely it will change.”

The enduring ideas did evolve over the duration of the course (see Table 1) and especially during the inquiry process. EDEL students were ready to shift their attention to development of curriculum when their themes were well established, for example: *Kandinsky’s Sea Battle: From Experience to Expression*, *Rivera’s Detroit Industry Mural: United We Stand*, and *Sesshu’s Autumn Landscape: Simplicity*.

The next step in unit foundations was development of a rationale. This component plays a vital supporting role in the process because it should articulate relevance of the art unit, not just to art content or a related field, but to K-8 students based on developmental

levels as well as interests and concerns (Stewart and Walker, 2005). EDEL students struggled with this at first, writing statements that were either very broad or failed to explain the K-8 student connection. For example, too broad was: “All art is the result of the artist’s perspective” which later became more developed: “This will appeal to students because it will teach them about the values of others (Sesshu) as well as how to reflect on their own values.” Another example, “Students will understand the culture of Benin kings and people, the bronze/brass art works...the values...the symbolic representation.” While this suggests rich and interesting things, the rationale does not articulate why K-8 students might connect or be interested.

After determining an enduring idea and writing rationale, the next step in curriculum design is “unpacking” key concepts and essential questions. Brainstorming what is implied by the enduring idea develops key concepts. According to TETAC guidelines, a list of about 10 to 20 key concepts should be generated at first and then concepts should be collapsed or reduced to a shorter, more meaningful list. This is a critical step for understanding the enduring idea in depth. Stewart and Walker (2005) caution, “...it is a mistake to skip over developing key concepts” (p. 33) and from the study I observed this was true. In one case, a group did proceed to develop “essential questions” before listing key concepts and the lack of richness was noticeable until the sequence was repeated. Another suggestion from Stewart and Walker confirmed by the study was to phrase all key ideas the same by beginning each sentence with the enduring idea. “Repetition of a single sentence stem for the key concepts organizes your thinking, allowing you more easily to compare and contrast the concepts” (p. 35). An example of

this is from the group working with the *Bayeux Tapestry*: “Storytelling can be fact, storytelling can be fiction, storytelling can be seen in art.”

Key concepts develop the broad focus of enduring ideas and then lead to essential questions, which provide the unit with coherence and direction. Essential questions are useful for students as well as teachers; they should be engaging, open-ended and limited to no more than three (2005). While essential questions are not the same as objectives, objectives can be developed from these later in the unit development process. For example, content knowledge and skills for K-8 art curriculum should reflect all four domains of discipline-based art (art history, art criticism, art production, and aesthetics). Traditionally, the aesthetic component is challenging for emerging teachers to develop. However, during this study it became apparent that rich aesthetic questions frequently occurred naturally out of the essential questions. For example, essential questions for the unit based on *Kandinsky’s Sea Battle*, also met criteria for aesthetic questions: “Is realistic or abstract painting better; what is expression; how do you express yourself; what is art to Kandinsky and what is art to you?”

Art Content and Assessment: According to *Understanding by Design* (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) or “backward design,” after enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential questions are in place, the final performance task is decided. Participants in this study quickly decided on final products for their units: *Bayeux Tapestry*: a paper scroll/mural, *Benin*: a cast plaque, *Kandinsky*: a painting, *Rivera*: a mural, *Sesshu*: an ink painting, *Shah Mosque*: ceramic tiles, and finally *Wodiczko*: sculpture from recycled

materials. With a final product in mind, the rest of the unit was designed “backward” by developing learning activities around knowledge and skills for preparing K-8 students to perform the final task successfully and to also meet standards in each of the four art content areas.

Throughout this study, I have made reference to discipline-based art education (DBAE) and the four domains. The TETAC task force considered this multi-domain approach central to the project (Final project report, n. d.). DBAE is organizational framework that assists in examining state standards for determining art content in all four areas that make-up comprehensive art education. Stewart and Walker (2005) explained a conceptual framework for each of these. Art history “...is about time, chronology, classification, ...artworks, aesthetics, style, intellectual ideas, interpretation, analysis, evaluation, iconography, social and cultural context, and change” (p. 45). Art criticism asks students questions about what they see; it also asks them to describe, interpret meanings, and evaluate or judge. Art process or art making is taught to develop technical skill, knowledge about design, and personal expression. It is also “...a means for exploring the world, self, and others” (p. 51). Finally, Aesthetics represents the big questions, “These are the questions related to purpose, value, meaning, and the nature of art” (p. 54).

To prepare EDEL students to design sequential learning activities, it was first necessary for them to write objectives reflecting all the four domains of art content. To begin this process, I asked participants in this study to consider what was significant

about their art prompt in each area; specifically what was most important about the artist, the history and culture; what language or concepts were most important for describing or interpreting; what art making skills and techniques needed to be introduced and practiced and in what sequence would the knowledge and skills be taught? Finally, how would K-8 student learning be assessed? To support EDEL student understanding of objectives, I explained and demonstrated various types of learning activities in each domain area, provided feedback on early drafts of units, and also planned for a studio test day as a hands-on opportunity to examine objectives for the art process. In view of this preparation, data from the EDEL group unit assessment is revealing. All seven units included reference to objectives and assessment in four content areas; with content areas coded as AH/C, AP, AC, and AE. Six out of seven groups demonstrated understanding for writing specific objectives for historical and cultural knowledge (AH/C) and determining outcomes; five out of seven groups were able to develop open-ended aesthetic or philosophical questions (AE); and four out of seven groups were able to identifying specific art vocabulary and language (AC) with activities for practicing and assessing development. When it came to writing clearly defined objectives for art process, however, five of the EDEL student groups demonstrated only partial understanding. The data showed that participants did not fully understand what K-8 students needed to know in order to design and paint a mural, construct a sculpture from recyclable material, or how to paint in a particular style.

The data indicated various levels of understanding for developing objectives in all four domains. Some of the differences can be explained by variations in the nature of the

seven art prompts, individual group differences, or areas I need to address in my teaching strategy. However, the difficulty in articulating objectives for art making raised questions for me. Is teaching an art process challenging because these students are pre-service rather than in-service teachers or is it because this was their initial attempt to design comprehensive K-8 art curriculum? I reviewed the TETAC final report (n. d.) for data that would address my concern.

The TETAC project was evaluated on several levels and one set of data did provide insight related to the level of understanding demonstrated by EDEL majors when determining content and assessment for their art units. The TETAC report showed ratings of curriculum units by schools involved in the project over a period of three years. The rating was done on a scale of 0 to 4 based on criteria such as “adequacy, depth, and logical coherence” (p. 59). The purpose of the rating was to determine quality performance for five TETAC guidelines: (1) foundations; (2) content; (3) instruction; (4) assessment; and (4) design (or reflection). The data indicated growth in all five areas over a period of three years with an overall rating from 1.9 in 1999 to 3.5 in 2001. Also, other data from the report suggested several factors related to positive response or improved performance in TETAC schools including: training, support, teacher collaboration and collaborative reflection.

Cooperative Learning to Support Inquiry.

At the philosophical base of the TETAC project is collaborative planning for teachers as well as inquiry-based, active, constructive process for instruction (Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 20). This collaborative strategy was rationale for cooperative learning as

methodology for this study, and there was a practical purpose as well. Designing standards-based K-8 curriculum is complex and learning groups offered a sound strategy for “expanding pedagogical resources” (Astin, 1993, as cited in Millis and Cottell, p. 10). Cooperative groups in this study provided structure for a learning process and at the same time it supported my ability as instructor to be fully informed of the various stages of development and provide feedback. While, Millis and Cottell (1998) emphasized the role of instructor as a guide, EDEL majors needed frequent support through questions or suggestions. In other words, it was more efficient to be informed and responsive with seven groups rather than thirty individuals.

Many other factors made cooperative learning compelling for this study including the value students place on having opportunity to interact with other students (Astin cited in Millis and Cottell). The data from the entry questionnaire for this study showed that the majority of EDEL students reported cooperative groups were valuable to them because of diverse view points, shared course work, and it was often enjoyable. However, from the entry questionnaire, participants reported on aspects of working in groups that they would like to change (from previous experience), and those were the challenges that did appear over the course of this study. Specifically the issues I observed or that appeared from the data, were imbalance of power, imbalance of workload, or lack of communication. For example one individual reported, “Our group worked really well until the end. One really strong personality began running the show,” another said “Working in groups on such a big unit was very stressful.” This person’s comment was

very general, but I was aware of problems the group had experienced with power (a strong negative voice) and work imbalance.

The literature acknowledges the kinds of issues that groups were experiencing in this study. According to Millis and Cottell (1998), many problems can be prevented with adequate structure for the group to develop interdependence based on rotating roles. Also structure for team building and monitoring of group behavior was suggested. Team building was certainly valuable, yet it was after people were at ease, that the issues began to appear. Regarding rotating roles, the learning group structure (Appendix D), was useful in the beginning. However, by the end of the course (the exit questionnaire), seven individuals from well-functioning groups implied that not only were assigned roles unnecessary but possibly insulting: “We don’t need jobs assigned to us, we work well together and know how to delegate.” Another management suggestion from Millis (2002) was for students and the instructor to monitor group behaviors. It would include teaching social skills, using various strategies for providing feedback, and group problem solving (while also working on a very complicated task for the course). I am certain that my experience as instructor of this class and that of the EDEL students was fairly common and I am also fairly certain that negotiations suggested by Millis (2002) would have made group members very uncomfortable. In one case I did respond when I knew a student was frustrated: “I am aware how difficult working in this group is” and the student replied, “I feel better just hearing you say that.”

In spite of the complexity of managing cooperative learning groups, the value of building interdependent communities of learners is unquestionable. Interdependent

learners are more likely to be engaged in critical thinking, communicating, explaining, or interpreting, which lead to “deep” rather than superficial understanding (2002). Certainly from this study it was clear that EDEL students interacted to teach each other. According to Millis and Cottell (1998), interdependent communities generally help individuals to “...internalize information, linking it in personal ways to what they already know” (p. x). Generally, I agree with this statement based on the growth I observed over the course of this study. I think it is also important to note an alternative view from this study. One EDEL student explained, as a member of the only group of five, it was occasionally difficult to have her voice heard, and when that happened: “...it is easy to sit back because you can’t...(be heard). We were talking about this. We’re a group...all of us leaders and so we really struggled with that. And so someone eventually is going to have to back off. And then I don’t think you get as much out of it, whereas the leaders get more out of it.”

My response to data from the study in light of the literature is that cooperative learning by nature will always be complex. As an instructor of emerging teachers I believe the value of group process outweighs the challenge, and that it is a beneficial experience for EDEL students having great relevance to both their learning and future teaching.

Historical/Cultural Inquiry as Experience.

At the heart of this study lies the assumption expressed by Eisner (1998) that one outcome of a comprehensive arts education is awareness of the connection between the content and form of an artwork and the context from which it was created. Historical and cultural inquiry was the entry point for this study as I anticipated EDEL students

uncovering significance for artworks that would lead them to an experience of epiphany. The data revealed a willingness of students to participate in the inquiry process and generally they agreed that it could shed light on art curriculum they would develop just as it would help them prepare to teach any subject. However, some students expressed reservations about conducting inquiry in an art methods class either because they were unclear about the purpose or they thought it would be overwhelming. Also, one student expressed the belief that understanding the context of the art might in fact ruin the viewer's experience, "It might not be as beautiful if they know it was created because of war and violence."

That single comment seems worth considering because it may be a more common belief than the data indicated. This viewpoint can be considered in two ways. The first may be a resistance to the notion that works of art are always about something. Regarding interpretation of an artwork, Terry Barrett (2000) explains that individual response or feeling does not have to match the artist's intent but that good interpretations should have "coherence, correspondence, and inclusiveness" (as cited in Stewart and Walker, 2005, p. 44). An alternative viewpoint that the student may be expressing might be similar to the difference Broudy (1972) describes between *knowledge about* and *experience of* a work of art (p. 65). I do not believe that Broudy's view disregards knowledge about; rather he is stating that it should not replace or become more important than entering into the experience.

Maxine Greene (2001) makes a case for arts education and developing heightened sensitivity in children that will allow them to enter into the experience of a work of art.

She reminds educators that in order to lead others we must have that ability ourselves. The purpose of this study was to assist EDEL students to enter into the historical and cultural context to prepare them to construct informed understanding of a single art subject. Robert Carson's (2004) model for teaching cultural history from a multi-faceted perspective was adapted to organize cooperative learning group inquiry. The data indicated that groups began the investigation by reporting a very broad range of facts and information. During the start-up period, groups needed to be reminded to keep the art object or artist as the reference point. The multiple perspectives from Carson's model provided richness in the types of information that was reported. Meanwhile, it seemed necessary to restate that the purpose for various components of inquiry was to bring the art, artist, and context to life. In the end, the majority of most participants were in agreement with Eisner's concept, that the form an artwork takes and its context are connected. This was simply stated by one EDEL student: "Art is more than what many people think it is. There is always going to be a historical concept behind the piece of work."

Weekly summary of group inquiry gradually developed from very broad facts to ideas with more connected understanding. Meanwhile, the work in the Elementary Art Methods class was focusing on guidelines for developing art curricula. This process began with introduction to unit foundations and an emphasis on *enduring ideas*. Stewart and Walker (2005) described these ideas as timeless human concerns "that serve as the focus around which inquiry in the arts and other disciplines can be meaningfully integrated" (p. v). When EDEL students began to approach their inquiry with intention of

finding connection with something of relevant human interest, the bridge or the epiphany appeared. The data showed students used the following phrases interchangeably: understanding by design, backward design, unit foundations, enduring ideas and big ideas. It is in reference to these concepts that students reported their “Aha!” experience. They said, “The idea of backward design was huge...just huge. It changed everything really” while another explained the excitement over finding a big idea and said, “...that’s when everything was like, Pow! We’re going now!”

For some students, however, the epiphany never came. The difference in experience can be explained in a variety of ways. While some students reported that understanding from inquiry sparks interest in them, others said they need to be interested in the subject first, and if they were not interested in the beginning they would not become engaged later. This finding makes me think of Langer’s (1951) view that great art is not always easy to access. If we perceive there is nothing worth understanding, the pursuit might feel like a waste of time. For those participants who entered into the inquiry process without being motivated by preference or taste, the epiphany may have been the reward for their leap of faith. Without having a pre-judgment of the art object the epiphany might have been the surprise at discovering something worthwhile or significant at the end of the investigation.

There can be many influences, which can interfere with epiphany including serious factors such as fear, pain, or stress. University students as well as in-service teachers might find it difficult to invest time in anything other than the practical matters demanding their attention. For some, the mysterious or the sublime may be perceived as

irrelevant or less important than teaching the core curriculum. But then, that is the potential that the arts suggest, to transform education into interesting and relevant as well as sublime experience. Emerging teachers who can be excited about discovering meaningful connections with art from historical and cultural context will be better prepared to lead their students into meaningful life-long learning experiences.

Chapter Summary

Laura Chapman's (2005) article reported on a study by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 1999-2000) that reflected the status of elementary art education in many of the nation's schools. The data from this study of elementary education (EDEL) majors showed a relationship with the classroom teachers from the NCES study. The majority of participants in this research stated they intended to teach or integrate art in spite of limited art background or knowledge and the data also suggest that these emerging teachers may have preconceived ideas about the role of art in the classroom and what teaching art content consists of. The purpose of this study was to introduce EDEL students in an Elementary Art Methods course to comprehensive art education practices. Their experience began with in-depth historical and cultural inquiry as a basis for designing K-8 visual art curriculum with guidelines from the Transforming Education Through The Arts Challenge (TETAC). TETAC was a large-scale project conducted in over thirty schools over a period of four years and intended to "link the arts with whole school reform" (TETAC, Final Project Report, n.d., p. 29).

Before EDEL students in this study began to design K-8 visual art curriculum, they first conducted in-depth historical and cultural inquiry in cooperative learning groups. The inquiry was based on one art prompt (an object or site) that would become the starting point for developing an art unit. The purpose was to gather information and resources from multiple perspectives of the art context in order to bring it to life as suggested by Robert Carson (2004). I was interested in how the contextual understanding would lead to heightened experience of the art subject as described by Maxine Greene and Harry Broudy. I was also interested in what the evidence might be for epiphany or insight from the art units or other data.

After the historical, cultural inquiry process was established for EDEL students, they began the work of examining their findings to construct unit foundations (enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential questions) from the TETAC curriculum framework. It was during the process of translating information from inquiry into unit foundations that students reported their “aha moment.” The next steps required in the curriculum design process were development of rationale, determination of a final task, and articulation of objectives and assessment for knowledge and skills from all four art content domains.

Both observation of participants and data confirmed that the art units developed by EDEL majors in this study were exemplary final projects. As would be expected, the data indicated different levels of understanding across groups for the various curriculum components. However, even the weakest unit would have provided meaningful and purposeful experience for K-8 students. This finding was likely the result of the connection or relevance provided by enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential

questions. The most challenging aspect of curriculum design for participants was articulation of objectives and assessment from the four art domains. Also, the weakest of the four, where most groups demonstrated only partial understanding, was determining criteria to guide and assess art production.

Cooperative groups were chosen as a learning structure for this study because it reflected the collaborative approach of the TETAC project. EDEL students reported that working in learning groups overall was beneficial and enjoyable and as instructor, the cooperation facilitated communication throughout the course. The literature provided a good foundation for developing structure needed to organize and manage this learning process. While cooperative learning introduces some complex issues and questions to the learning experience, the advantages clearly outweigh the challenges.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the purpose, procedures, and findings of this study. Conclusions will be discussed as well as suggestions for further research.

Overview

Statement of the Problem

There is widespread misconception about the role of art education in the K-8 classroom, unrealized potential for teaching skills and knowledge unique to the arts, and very few models available to guide emerging teachers in the process of learning to design comprehensive K-8 visual art curriculum.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this naturalistic study was to observe, report, and interpret experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors in an Elementary Art Methods course at Montana State University. The research component of this three-credit course consisted of cooperative learning groups engaging in historical and cultural inquiry as preparation to design comprehensive art curriculum from well-established guidelines.

Research Questions

The following questions were used to develop a framework for a study of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors in an Elementary Art Methods course structured around in-depth historical inquiry:

- I. How does in-depth historical/cultural inquiry, by EDEL majors, lead to epiphany or aesthetic understanding of an artwork and its historical/cultural context?
- II. What will be the evidence of epiphany on EDEL students learning to design art curriculum?

Method

This was a naturalistic inquiry method based on observation and interpretation of experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors in a required Elementary Art Methods course at Montana State University-Bozeman. There were thirty students in the class and 28 participants in the study including 25 women and 3 men. One graduate student became teacher assistant and one individual chose the option of having related data excluded.

Two sections of this course were taught using the same approach; only one section was the study group. Both Elementary Art Methods sections were team-taught. One class each week focused on the core content of the course and was taught by the professor of record. I was instructor on the alternate days where the emphasis was on inquiry and preparation to develop comprehensive art curriculum. The EDEL students in my portion of the class completed these tasks as members of cooperative learning groups.

Data Collection and Verification

Data were collected using five instruments: an entry questionnaire, weekly group summary of inquiry, the art unit developed by cooperative learning groups, an exit questionnaire, and an exit interview of EDEL student groups. From these data and field notes from a semester of observation, I proceeded to review, reflect, and then verify findings. I verified the data through triangulation, peer examination of the findings and collaboration with the instructor of record in teaching the course that was the central to this study.

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data began with review as it was collected. The entry questionnaire was the first document source. Participant statements were sorted by prompt, identities were masked, and analysis proceeded by identifying themes as they emerged and these were coded. This process demonstrated that individual responses contained two or more relevant themes. As a result, I reported frequency of themes rather than numbers for EDEL student responses for each prompt. This approach was used for both the entry and exit questionnaire.

The next data were collected as a weekly group summary of individual inquiry. This was collected over a period of four weeks and themes corresponded with the inquiry structure and course assignment. Reporting in this case reflected cooperative group response to the assignment instrument and provided evidence of growth toward understanding from inquiry. Similarly the art unit was a document from coursework and it represented the culmination of learning in the Elementary Art Methods class. The data

reflected group response to guidelines in two categories. The patterns that resulted in this case corresponded to demonstrated levels of understanding for specific components of the final project.

Finally, the last data source was provided by exit interviews of EDEL student groups. The recorded interviews lasted fifteen minutes and consisted of an interview protocol of four questions. The interviews were transcribed and reviewed with the recording to ensure accuracy. After reading and reflecting on the transcription, patterns were recognized, coded and reported.

Results

Research Question I

How does in-depth historical/cultural inquiry, by EDEL majors, lead to epiphany or aesthetic understanding of an artwork and its historical/cultural context? Elementary Education majors in this Elementary Art Methods course were assigned the name of an art object, a painting, sculpture, or architectural example. They did not know about the artwork in advance. It was explained they would develop K-8 curriculum based on this subject, but first they would need to conduct an inquiry in cooperative learning groups. There were two significant structures to support the inquiry process. The first structure illustrated that the inquiry should consist of multiple cultural perspectives, including: ideas, daily life, the arts, and historical context. The second structure explained the form of information collection, which consisted of a list of key points and a column for personal response, connection, or further questions.

Most students began the inquiry enthusiastically, one said the process was “sticky gooey” because questions led to more questions. In the beginning inquiry led EDEL students into broader fields of diverse information. At times, I felt these pre-service teachers needed to be reminded to maintain a connection with the art prompt. This process lasted approximately four weeks with individuals reporting key points and responses on a weekly basis in groups. This segment was followed by group summary.

In this study, course work related to unit foundations in preparation to develop comprehensive K-8 curriculum began two weeks after groups initiated their inquiry. The first step was to explore the meaning and purpose of enduring ideas as overarching ideas for a unit of study. Students looked at examples of these “themes” and discussed possibilities for their K-8 art unit. Enduring ideas are timeless issues of human interest and concern (Stewart and Walker, 2005). Therefore the act of processing life from another time and place through this filter, transformed foreign and distant knowledge into ideas that were currently relevant and meaningful. It was during this process that EDEL students said they had their “Aha” experience. The evidence of the epiphany was evident in the K-8 art units that these emerging teachers created.

Research Question II

What will be the evidence of epiphany on EDEL students learning to design art curriculum? Evidence for epiphany had many forms. It was demonstrated by the final unit document and peer presentations of comprehensive art curriculum. Most significantly, insight was revealed by the richness of the unit foundations, (enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential questions) that EDEL student groups developed in

relationship with the assigned art subject. The evidence here was carried through with relevant rationale for teaching the unit to K-8 students. Finally, epiphany was reflected in statements by participants. Some knew the moment “the light came on” while others demonstrated an informed shift in thinking about art in the classroom. Even when emerging teachers expressed lack of confidence or interest in teaching art they were distinguishing the difference between “bat projects” without learning objectives and teaching art with regard for meaning as well as skills and knowledge.

Recommendations for Course Design and Instruction

The following recommendations emerged from the results of the study, and may guide similar instructional models in the future. These recommendations fall into four categories: (1) the art prompt and inquiry, (2) unit foundations, (3) Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC) and comprehensive art education, and (4) cooperative learning.

The Art Prompt and Inquiry

EDEL students said that having choice about the art prompt was important to their sustained interest. To accommodate this response, I would recommend instructors pre-select a variety of art subjects for EDEL students to choose from to ensure art subject relevance and significance for the K-8 populations. As for the organizational structure for the inquiry, this framework was very valuable for the EDEL student groups. Individual focus roles for historical and cultural inquiry (Appendix D) provided rich and diverse reporting from multiple perspectives. Also, the key point and response format from the

inquiry response structure (Appendix E) resulted in collection of significant facts with corresponding personal connections or further questions.

One advantage of the Montana State University site was availability of a portable computer cart with laptop computers. This resource made in-class group inquiry very productive at various stages of this project and convenient for me to answer questions or prompt the groups further. Instructor supervision can ensure critical selection of resources and guide the investigation so that it remains connected to the art or artist.

Unit Foundations

The ideal situation for teacher preparation programs would be teaching Understanding by Design (UBD) concepts, relevant to all content areas, in the context of an assessment course. The concepts, while they are not difficult, require considerable time to teach in depth. If UBD were a pre-requisite, that would ease the amount of content that had to be covered for a similar Elementary Art Methods course. If that is not possible, I would recommend introducing unit foundations (enduring ideas, key concepts, and essential questions) before or at the start of the historical inquiry because they provide valuable framework for constructing contextual understanding.

Specific recommendations for unit foundations include advising emerging teachers to allow enduring ideas evolve. The best enduring ideas steadily moved closer to the essence of the unit's meaning. Also, articulating a rationale is a critical second step for emerging teachers because it clearly connects the idea for the unit with what is relevant and purposeful for K-8 students. Finally, the art methods instructor might emphasize the dual role of essential questions. These open-ended questions determine

direction for a unit. At the same time essential questions can lead naturally into aesthetic questions. This connection with aesthetic inquiry responds to one of the four domains of comprehensive art content (art history/culture, art criticism, art process, and aesthetics).

Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC) and Comprehensive Art Education

Discussion of “bat projects” or other examples for what comprehensive art education is not has been insightful for emerging teachers because they are all familiar with that form of art experience. My position did not dismiss these experiences, as “bad.” Having fun with materials, for example to decorate a classroom, can be worthwhile. Instead, I advocated for knowing the difference between substantive art learning for K-8 students and other art material based activity. Similarly, TETAC guidelines, besides being arts-based, also emphasize art integration with other content areas. Emerging teacher’s need guidance in understanding what standards-based art integration is and is not. One “rule of thumb” I suggest is that art integration is standards-based (teaching art knowledge and skills) and authentically connected.

It is critical that studio experiences in art methods courses model the framework for comprehensive art curriculum that EDEL students are expected to know. This strategy makes it possible to demonstrate where the four domains of art content appear in the unit and the skills or knowledge that objectives in each address. In addition, provide emerging teachers with opportunities to examine and develop appropriate assessment for each domain. Pay particular attention to illustrating the assessable components of art process

and how to determine criteria for guiding a successful experience while also allowing for personal connection and response.

Why use the four domains of discipline-based art when there are state and national standards? The domains describe art content and organize thinking about curriculum and it is easy to remember to connect art learning to the four components. I suggest coding state standards (AH/C, AC, AP, AE) to identify the domains in order to make them more useful for curriculum planning.

The template from *Rethinking Curriculum in Art* (Appendix H) was a valuable guide for EDEL majors learning how to design K-8 art curriculum. I also showed them a completed template for a sample unit that I taught. When the first draft of the unit was complete, it was worthwhile for groups to devote an entire two-hour class to experimenting with art materials and testing ideas related to the final task. This was opportunity to discuss the reality of a classroom and the types of guidelines that K-8 students need.

Cooperative Learning

EDEL students favored self-selection of groups (especially for the length and size of this project). Also some of them resisted the idea of having rotating roles for group management. The function of the roles (Appendix D) can be discussed and made optional.

Millis (2002) emphasized the importance of “positive interdependence and individual accountability.” I would recommend accounting for individual responses and

group summary for a limited period of time over a period of two weeks or four class meetings. Then the inquiry can continue, but more informally. Developing the unit as a group, cultivates interdependence. However, I would suggest an alternative to the “one art unit submitted for the group” standard. Some individuals fully participated in the group process but chose to produce separate final documents. This option allowed adjustment for grade level or other individual differences.

Toward the end of the unit development process, groups were divided and reassigned for peer review of first drafts. This activity strengthened final products and allowed for transfer of learning through evaluation of others. Finally, at the end of the course, group presentations of the art unit (main ideas and activities) were engaging and beneficial for the audience of peers.

There were many benefits to cooperative learning as method. Students liked sharing the work and most often found it enjoyable. I recommend it especially as an asset for communication. I was able to stay well informed about group progress and could efficiently provide feedback. There were also challenges that can be with managed with class structure, holding people accountable and large group problem solving. It is advisable to monitor pre-service teachers and encourage acceptance of disagreement and negotiation.

Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this study prompted questions for further or related investigation.

1. A qualitative study could be conducted to investigate how learning cultures change when TETAC forms of art integration are implemented throughout a school.
2. Qualitative and quantitative methods could be used to determine the difference between step-by-step art curriculum planning and learning to use art framework as a guide to curriculum development.
3. Qualitative or quantitative analysis could show differences between elementary pre-service teachers and K-12 specialists when learning to design comprehensive art curriculum.
4. Comparative analysis could be conducted to recognize differences between pre-service teacher and in-service teachers learning to design art curriculum.
5. If TETAC models of visual art integration could be taught consistently, then impact on learning in other K-8 curriculum areas could also be investigated.
6. Qualitative and/or quantitative methods could be used to investigate how *Understanding by Design* (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) connects with the TETAC model in a teacher education program.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to observe and interpret experiences of Elementary Education (EDEL) majors in a required Elementary Art Methods course at Montana State University-Bozeman. EDEL students worked in cooperative groups, conducted historical and cultural inquiry based on a work of art and used guidelines to design comprehensive art curriculum from that art prompt. This study may be of interest to educators who teach elementary education pre-service teachers, but the findings will also be relevant for those who prepare K-12 pre-service art specialists.

This chapter presented an overview of the study with problem, purpose, and method as well as explanation of data collection, verification, and analysis. Then the results were discussed in response to the research questions. Also, results and field notes were used to summarize recommendations for teaching a similar instructional model. Finally, considerations for further and related research were suggested.

REFERENCES CITED

- Barrett, T. (2000) *Interpreting Art, Criticizing Art: Understanding the Contemporary*. 2nd ed. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishers.
- Bates, Jane. (2000). *Becoming An Art Teacher*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Broudy, H.S. (1994, First Edition for Kappa Delta Pi, 1972), *Enlightened Cherishing*. Urbana and Chicago: Illini Books University of Illinois Press.
- Broudy, H. (1987). *The Role of Imagery in Learning*. Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Carson, R.N. (2004). Teaching cultural history from primary events. *Science & Education*, 13, 797-809.
- Chapman, L.H. (1982). *Instant Art, Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chapman, L.H. (2005). Status of elementary art education: 1997-2004. *Studies in Art Education*, 46(2), 118-137.
- Dewey, J. (1980, First Edition 1934). *Art as Experience*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Eisner, E.W. (1998). *The Kind of Schools We Need, Personal Essays*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Efland, A.D. (2002). *Art and Cognition: Integrating the Visual Arts in The Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press and Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Efland, A.D. (1995). The spiral and the lattice: Changes in cognitive learning theory with implications for art education. *Studies in Art Education*. 36(3), 134-153.
- Francis, L.J., Robbins, M., Craig, C.L. (2007). Two different operationalisations of psychological type: Comparing the Myers-Briggs type indicator and the Keirsey temperament sorter. In L.S. Boyar (Ed.), *New psychological tests and testing research*, 121-140. Abstract retrieved March 8, 2008, from PsychINFO database.
- Gardner, H. (with Winner, E.). (1982). *Art, Mind, and Brain, A Cognitive Approach to Creativity*. U.S.: Basic Books.

- Gardner, H. (1983). The cognitive view of the arts. In M.D. Dobbs, H. Feinstein & R.N. MacGregor (Eds.), *Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating*, 102-109. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Geahigan, G. (1999). Teaching pre-service art education majors "The world of the work". *Art Education*, The Journal of the National Education Association, 52(5), 12-17.
- Greene, M. (2001). *Variations on a Blue Guitar, The Lincoln Center Institute Lectures on Aesthetic Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural Literacy, What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Langer, S.L. (1951). *Philosophy in a New Key*. New York: Mentor Book.
- Lanier, V. (1991). *The World of Art Education According to Lanier*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millis, B.J. (2002). Enhancing learning and more through cooperative learning, *Idea Paper #38*. Retrieved June 20, 2007 from The IDEA Center Web site: <http://www.idea.ksu.edu/consulting/millis.html>
- Millis, B.J. and Cottell, P.G. (1998). *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education Press and The Oryx Press.
- National Arts Education Consortium. (n.d.). *Transforming Education Through The Arts Challenge, Final Project Report*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Department of Art Education.
- Nilsen, D. (1984). Epiphany: The language of sudden insight. *Exercise Exchange: a journal for teachers of English in high school and colleges*, 30(1), 13-16.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Smith, R.A. (Ed.). (2000). *Readings in Discipline-Based Art Education, A Literature of Educational Reform*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Soucy, D. and Stankiewicz, M.A. (Eds.), (1990). *Framing the Past: Essays on Art Education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Stewart, M.G. and Walker, S.R. (2005). *Rethinking Curriculum in Art*. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications, Inc.

Walker, S. (2001). *Teaching Meaning Through Artmaking*. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

Wiggins, G. and McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zahner, M. (2003). *Barkan*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

SYLLABUS FOR EDEL 332/INQUIRY COMPONENT

Elementary Art Methods 332, Inquiry Component

Fall 2007

Wednesday, Reid 124

Kim Boehler

Office: Reid Hall 234 G

Phone: 406 994 5037 or 406 579 7151 (Cell)

E-mail: kimberly.boehler@montana.edu

Description of Research Component:

The goal at the heart of this segment of the course is to provide elementary education majors with opportunity to design authentic and meaningful art curriculum based on personal experience of conducting in-depth historical inquiry. Students will work in cooperative groups to investigate one artwork and its context (time, place, and culture). This will begin the decision-making process of designing curriculum for the final task based on current art education theory and framework from the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC) project. The National Arts Education Consortium initiated the TETAC project (completed 2001) for the purpose of developing substantive, comprehensive art based curriculum. (For more information on this project and curriculum development read, *Rethinking Curriculum in Art* by Marilyn Stewart and Sydney Walker, 2005.)

Overview:

Historical Inquiry/Research:

All students will participate in historical inquiry based on “a work of art”.

Historical inquiry will be done in cooperative learning groups of four persons who will construct understanding for the context (time and place) of the artwork. Individuals will each have a specific focus as their part of the group’s research.

Inquiry will be based on questions generated by the group and weekly prompts from the instructor/guide. Weekly reporting and reflection within groups should include rich and detailed explanations with evidence and examples as needed (saved in the group folder).

Final Tasks:

Individuals will create a unit outline that corresponds with art curriculum development framework and unit foundations (alignment of enduring ideas, content, instruction, and assessment).

Group presentation

Grading:

Weekly Individual Report/Reflection:

These materials will be accounted for and described as $\sqrt{+}$, $\sqrt{/}$, or $\sqrt{-}$ according to agreed upon criteria.

Weekly Group Summary:

These materials will be submitted electronically to the research guide by one group member each week and will be accounted for and described as $\sqrt{+}$, $\sqrt{/}$, or $\sqrt{-}$ according to agreed upon criteria.

Final: Individual Unit Outline and Group Presentation:

This assignment will be completed by each individual according to unit rubric and may have some variation from other group members depending on individual teacher preferences including choice of grade level. Grades will be determined by Dr. Lund based on the rubric for unit outline.

Objectives:

Work toward a common goal as a member of a cooperative group.

Engage in community building in class and in groups; demonstrate trust, respect, and suspended judgment. Be willing to ask for, and offer, assistance.

Pursue a personally meaningful path toward historical/cultural inquiry.

Collect, question, document, report, and reflect on a variety of sources of information.

Listen patiently and deeply when reading and/or discussing with others.

Have general understanding and be able to explain standards-based art education theory.

Demonstrate significant and in-depth understanding of one work of art based on cultural and historical context.

Design art curriculum (unit outline) for teaching art skills and knowledge that is created from a relevant enduring idea with key concepts, and essential questions.

Present art curriculum to peers in order to inspire and inform exemplary practice.

Expectations:

Attend All Classes:

The majority of the work for this component of the course will be done in groups and individual participation is critical. Also, attendance should be prompt unless previous arrangement is made.

Participate:

Please come to class and groups willing to participate thoughtfully and enthusiastically. All individuals contribute to the learning community by expressing ideas, thoughts, questions, feelings, and resources freely. Try to contribute and listen with an open mind.

Be Prepared:

Assignments must be completed on time. Individuals will bring weekly documentation and reflection on inquiry each Wednesday. These assignments will be collected and summarized in groups and submitted via e-mail no later than the following Sunday by the group manager for that week. Rather than grading research/response, it will be accounted for on a regular basis using a check system.

First draft of unit outline will be due November 14. Final draft will be submitted with group presentation at the end of the term.

APPENDIX B:
QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaire for Elementary Art Methods and Historical Inquiry Project

Name_____

(Please respond to the following prompts using the space provided.)

Part A. *Art Education*

1. I will/will not (circle one) teach art as part of general curriculum in my classroom:
(Please explain)

2. I expect to teach the following knowledge and skills in my PreK-8 classroom:

3. I have the following experience, knowledge, and skills that will help me teach art:

4. My level of confidence (up to this point) to teach art can be described as:

5. My level of confidence to assess knowledge and skills in art can be described as:

Part B. *Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups*

(Please respond to the following prompts using the space provided.)

“Historical inquiry or research of an artwork’s context (time and place) may shed light on key ideas for developing art curriculum.”

My response to the above statement is:

An aspect of in-depth historical research that is enjoyable is:

An aspect of in-depth historical research that is not enjoyable is:

Generally, my experience with historical research has been:

An aspect about working in cooperative groups that is valuable is:

An aspect about working in cooperative groups I would change is:

Exit Questionnaire for Elementary Art Methods and Historical Inquiry Project

Name _____

(Please respond to the following prompts using the space provided.)

Part A. *Art Education*

1. I will/will not (circle one) teach art as part of general curriculum in my classroom:
(Please explain)

2. I expect to teach the following knowledge and skills in my PreK-8 classroom:

3. I have the following experience, knowledge, and skills that will help me teach art:

4. My level of confidence (up to this point) to teach art can be described as:

5. My level of confidence to assess knowledge and skills in art can be described as:

Part B. *Historical Inquiry and Cooperative Learning Groups*

(Please respond to the following prompts using the space provided.)

“Historical inquiry or research of an artwork’s context (time and place) may shed light on key ideas for developing art curriculum.”

My response to the above statement is:

One thing I want Kim to know:

This past term was my first _____ second _____ block.

APPENDIX C:

KEIRSEY FOUR-TYPE SORTER

The Keirsey Four Types Sorter

For each item, rank-order the four choices. Mark the response most like you as #1; less like you, #2, still less like you, #3, & least like you, #4. Put your numbers next to the corresponding letters.

1. I'd rather study

- ___ (a) arts & crafts
- ___ (b) literature & humanities
- ___ (c) business & finance
- ___ (d) science & engineering

2. I feel best about myself when

- ___ (a) I'm graceful in action
- ___ (b) I'm *en rapport* with someone
- ___ (c) I'm rock solid dependable
- ___ (d) I exercise my ingenuity

3. In mood I'm more often

- ___ (a) excited & stimulated
- ___ (b) enthusiastic & inspired
- ___ (c) cautious & prudent
- ___ (d) calm & detached

4. I keep coming back to

- ___ (a) perfecting my craft
- ___ (b) helping others affirm themselves
- ___ (c) helping others do right
- ___ (d) figuring out how things work

5. Coming right down to it I tend to be

- ___ (a) practical and opportunistic
- ___ (b) compassionate & altruistic
- ___ (c) dutiful & diligent
- ___ (d) efficient & pragmatic

6. I respect myself more for

- ___ (a) being bold and adventurous
- ___ (b) being kind-hearted & of good will
- ___ (c) doing good deeds
- ___ (d) being autonomous & independent

7. I'm more inclined to trust

- ___ (a) impulses & whims
- ___ (b) intuitions & intimations
- ___ (c) customs & traditions
- ___ (d) pure reason & formal logic

8. I'm sometimes eager to

- ___ (a) make an impression & have impact
- ___ (b) lose myself in romantic dreams
- ___ (c) be a valued & legitimate member
- ___ (d) make a scientific breakthrough

9. I'm in a life-long search for more

- ___ (a) thrills & adventures
- ___ (b) self-understanding
- ___ (c) safety & security
- ___ (d) efficient methods of operation

10. In facing the future

- ___ (a) I bet something lucky will turn up
- ___ (b) I believe in people's innate goodness
- ___ (c) you just can't be too careful
- ___ (d) it's best to keep a wary eye

11. If it were possible I'd like to become

- ___ (a) an artistic virtuoso
- ___ (b) a wise prophet
- ___ (c) a chief executive
- ___ (d) a technological genius

12. I'd do best in a job working with

- ___ (a) tools & equipment
- ___ (b) human resources development
- ___ (c) material & services
- ___ (d) systems & structures

13. As guide to action I look primarily at

- ___ (a) immediate advantages
- ___ (b) future possibilities
- ___ (c) past experience
- ___ (d) necessary & sufficient conditions

14. I'm most self-confident when I'm

- ___ (a) adaptable & flexible
- ___ (b) genuine & authentic
- ___ (c) honorable & respectable
- ___ (d) strong-willed & resolute

15. I appreciate it when others

- ___ (a) surprise me with generosity
- ___ (b) recognize my true self
- ___ (c) express their gratitude
- ___ (d) ask me for my rationale

16. When thinking about misfortune

- ___ (a) I usually laugh it off
- ___ (b) I often wonder why
- ___ (c) I try to make the best of it
- ___ (d) I view it from a wide perspective

The Keirsey Four Type Sorter Scoring Directions:

First, in the numbered columns below, record your rankings (1 to 4) for each of the 16 items.

Second, add the numbers across each of the four rows (a, b, c, d) & place the sums in the boxes at the far right. **Third**, circle the letter (A, I, G, or R) beside the lowest sum. **Fourth**, A stands for Artisan (SP), I for Idealist (NF), G for Guardian (SJ), and R for Rational (NT).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
a																
b																
c																
d																

	A
	I
	G
	R

APPENDIX D:

LEARNING GROUP STRUCTURE

Historical Inquiry Group Structure

Group/Name: _____

Object/Prompt: _____

Focus/Roles

Ideas: _____

Daily Life: _____

The Arts: _____

Historical Context: _____

Rotating Roles:

Group Manager (Clarify/Record/Report)

Facilitator (Steer and monitor individual reports, group discussion)

Notebook Accountant (Account for tasks, materials, copies, collection)

Time Keeper (Time management)

Group Inquiry Process:

Making Curriculum Choices/Tasks:

Choose the Enduring Idea

Write a Rationale

Unpack the Enduring Idea for Key Concepts

Form Essential Questions

Identify Unit Objectives for Skills / Knowledge

Aligning the Unit

Organizational structure for historical, cultural inquiry in learning groups

ARTWORK/ ARTIST/or CULTURE Focus:	Bayeux Tapestry 1070s	Sesshu Painting 1400s	Benin Plaque 1500s	Shah Mosque 1600s	Kandinsky Painting 1913	Rivera Mural 1932	Wodiczko Sculpture 1988
Ideas: Beliefs Religion Politics & Philosophy							
The Arts: Visual Art Architecture Music & Drama							
Daily Life: Traditions Economy Environment &Technology							
Historical Context: Geographical Linguistic							

Adapted from Carson, R. (2004), *Teaching Cultural History from Primary Events*.

APPENDIX E:

INQUIRY RESPONSE STRUCTURE

General Research/Response

Name _____

APA-style reference: _____

KEY POINTS	RESPONSES
ANNOTATED SUMMARY:	
PAIRED ANNOTATION:	

APPENDIX F:

TRANSFORMING EDUCATION THROUGH THE ARTS (TETAC)

FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS

Key Understandings About Art

These are foundational ideas about art taken directly from the final report of the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge (TETAC).

Art is a purposeful human endeavor.
 Art attains value, purpose, and meaning from the personal, social, and cultural dimensions of life.
 Art raises philosophical issues and questions.
 Artworks are objects for interpretation.
 Change is fundamental to art.

(TETAC final project report, cited in Stewart & Walker, p. 42)

Because of the complex nature of art, this list represents well-grounded assumptions that form a basis of understanding from which all teaching and learning in art can be built. Curriculum should be designed based on the question, what knowledge and skills do I want my students to retain and understand long after they have left my classroom? (p. 42).

National and State Standards are helpful in making curriculum content choices and in art, embedded in the standards are the art four disciplines which suggest content considerations for current (expanded) art education theory. The four components, also associated with Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) are: Art Criticism, Aesthetics, Art History, and Art Production.

The Four Content Components:

Art Production is the experience of purposeful (personally connected) making of art. This component in curriculum plans for sequential development of skills through practice with materials, tools, and techniques as well as related vocabulary.

Art Criticism develops student ability to describe, analyze, and interpret artworks. Art Criticism is talk about art, practice with vocabulary, and becoming more engaged and responsive to the visual world.

Art History and Culture is the context of time and place for a work of art and the artist. The meaning of an artwork can never be interpreted separate from the ideas and values of its time or place of origin. Because of this, art interpretation without this insight is a very limited experience.

Aesthetics is the philosophical component of art, which reminds us to consider some of the large and most compelling questions of the field.

Components of the Curriculum Development Process

Unit Foundations:

Enduring ideas, key concepts, essential questions, and unit objectives are the foundation of unit design with all other curriculum components in alignment.

Content:

Knowledge and skills to be introduced or developed should be aligned with art content standards and include the four domains: art history, aesthetics, criticism, and art production.

Instruction:

Learning strategies are student-centered, inquiry-based, and constructivist approaches.

Assessment:

Demonstrate learning of content through assessment activities with acceptable evidence of student understanding.

Design:

Criteria used for reviewing quality of a whole unit to assess alignment, coherence, and sequence of curriculum components.

Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge: Goals and Expectations

TETAC project held high expectations for students, including that they:

- Actively construct knowledge, rather than passively receive knowledge
- Pursue understanding, not simply memorize and reproduce knowledge
- Engage in developing contextualized meanings, not learn isolated facts
- Develop self-awareness as learners

TETAC project expected that curriculum would include:

- Integrated/interdisciplinary learning
- Group planning
- Utilization of technology
- Writing through the curriculum
- Collaboration learning
- Representation of global and local topics/issues

TETAC project expected authentic assessment with assessment tasks that ask students to:

- Construct rather than reproduce knowledge
- Consider alternative solutions, strategies, and perspectives
- Employ ideas and theories central to academic or professional disciplines
- Utilize writing to demonstrate understanding
- Examine problems or issues found in life beyond the classroom
- Demonstrate understanding for an audience beyond teacher, classroom, or school

Source: The National Arts Education Consortium, "Goals and Expectations for the Transforming Education Through the Arts Challenge," February 26, 1999. (*Rethinking Curriculum in Art*, p. 20).

APPENDIX G:

ART UNIT FRAMEWORK/TEMPLATE

Unit Overview

Unit Title:

Enduring Idea:

Rationale:

Key Concepts about the Enduring Idea:

Key Concepts about Art/Visual Culture:

Essential Questions:

Unit Objectives:

National or State Standards:

Assessment

Evidence:

Levels and Criteria:

Exemplary:

Essential:

Partial:

Overview of Lessons

Lesson 1:

What will students do?

What will students learn from this?

Lesson 2:

What will students do?

What will students learn from this?

Lesson 3:

What will students do?

What will students learn from this?

Lesson 4:

What will students do?

What will students learn from this?

Lesson 5:

What will students do?

What will students learn from this?

Planning For Artmaking

Artmaking Problem How will students explore/question the Enduring Idea/Topic? Conceptual Strategy What conceptual strategy will help students question, explore, or problematize the enduring idea? How can you help students develop new perspectives/viewpoints about the Enduring Idea/Topic?	Personal Connections
Artmaking Boundaries What limits will you place on students' artmaking? (Media, subject matter, visual form, scale, techniques, context)	Technical Knowledge

Artworks, Artists, Artifacts

Key Artwork/artist/artifact:

Reason for including:

Significant Facts about Artworks, Artists, Artifacts

Artwork/artist/artifact:

Significant facts:

(Stewart & Walker. (2005). *Rethinking Curriculum in Art*, p. 144-147).

APPENDIX H:

ART UNIT RUBRIC

Art Unit Due: November 28, 2007

Name _____

Total Score _____

Art Unit Outline Rubric

The criteria:	√-	√	√+	The standard for each area:
Enduring Idea, Key Concepts, and Essential Questions				Important ideas and concepts clearly define meaningful foundation for unit alignment.
Rationale				Explanation is carefully thought out and states the importance and relevance of enduring ideas to students' lives.
Grade Appropriate				Unit outline demonstrates regard and alignment with a selected grade "range" (i.e. Grades 7/8).
Objectives for Skills and Knowledge (Content)				In alignment with standards-based art content with specific skills and knowledge (vocabulary) identified
Standards-based content includes four domains				Objectives are authentically aligned. They include historical / cultural connections, art criticism, aesthetics, and meaning-making process.
Instruction and Methods including Sequence				Well-planned sequence toward objectives with purposeful student centered learning activities.
Assessment Formative and Summative				Clear alignment with objectives for knowledge, skills, and concepts including vocabulary.
Unit Outline – Mechanics and Conventions				Unit outline is formatted to clearly identify all components of the curriculum development process, is typed, and free from spelling or other errors.
References				A variety of forms of reference including; book, film, internet, interview, etc. Ten documented sources or in-depth reading of fewer sources (APA format).
Support Materials				Materials make ideas and concepts visible; include ideas for charts or handouts as well as example of rubric for final performance task.

Group Presentations (20 minutes, 5 minute discussions): December 3rd and 5th

Names _____

Total Score _____

Art Unit, Group Presentation Rubric

The criteria:	√-	√	√+	The standard for each area:
Unit Foundations				Enduring idea is clear unifying concept, essential questions and key concepts develop unit focus and depth.
Unit Plan				Standards-based objectives for knowledge / skills are explained or demonstrated as well as alignment, sequence, and assessment.
Teacher Presence				Presenters are confident, energetic, knowledgeable and engaging.
Teaching Method	Overuse of PowerPoint			Presenters demonstrate best practice in teaching methods. Thoughtful regard for use of time.
Relevance K-12				Unit content and objectives are clear, purposeful and relevant.
Curriculum Quality & Depth				Unit is an inspiring example relevant and meaningful curriculum.

Comments:

APPENDIX I:

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol:

What can you say with confidence about designing curriculum in art?

What do you want me to know from reading your unit outline?

How do you know you understand components for designing art curriculum?

What are the limits of your understanding?

APPENDIX J:

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent Form
Montana State University

Historical Inquiry and Art Curriculum Development

Kim Boehler
234 (G) Reid Hall
406 994 5037

The study in which you will be participating is a collection and analysis of data based on student experience of in-depth historical inquiry as a component of the Elementary Art Methods Course at Montana State University. The purpose of this process is to help teachers develop insight about key concepts in Art Education in order to develop substantive and comprehensive standards-based art curriculum.

Participant responses to questionnaires, prompts, and assignments for the historical inquiry component of the course will be collected and eventually analyzed as data for this study. Data will be coded and stored in locked cabinet in the office of Kim Boehler, 234-G Reid Hall. When results are reported, be assured that no student identities will be recognizable.

(Please note that the professor of record and not the researcher will assign grades for EDEL 332 course work.)

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You may ask me about research procedures and I will answer questions to the best of my ability. Also, you are free to stop participating in the research at any time. Withdrawal from the study means that any documents or responses from you will be excluded from the data analysis and that your decision will be confidential. *Participation in no way will affect your grade for this course or your class standing.*

Your participation in this research is confidential. For data collection purposes, I will identify information about you using a code number. Dr. Priscilla Lund (my instructor) and I are the only people who will have access to the key linking your name with a code number. Results of this study will be reported using pseudonyms. If I believe that any information from this study could result in recognition of your identity, I will decline to disclose this information.

I agree to participate in a study of elementary education majors conducting historical inquiry in order to gain insight about development of standard-based art curriculum. I understand the information given to me, and I have received answers to any questions I have had about the research procedures. I understand and agree to the conditions of this study as described.

I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary and that I may withdraw from this study at any time by notifying Kim Boehler.

Anyone with questions regarding research with human subjects may contact: Mark Quinn 406 994 5721.

Participant Signature

Date