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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The child bravely consulted me;
He spoke of feeling car crashes
In his head because he felt
His picture did not turn out right;
He held his crown and tears
And spoke of wanting to please,
Questioning his talent, his goodness;
I listened and felt the enormity
Of his predicament. (W.T.M.)

The purpose of this study is to explore how youngsters make meaning of their experiences in an elementary art program. Such a study cannot ignore the influence of instructional intent and practices of teachers; the immediate and peripheral contexts in which children and teachers interact, negotiating and individually constructing art knowledge; or the state of the field of art education and what it envisions as its goals.

Who Cares About Art, Anyway?

Most children will tell you they care about art. Their reasons are varied and numerous beyond "it's fun" when one probes the nature of "fun" with students. In Goodlad's (1984) recent study that involved over 17,163 students in 38 schools, for example, the arts were the most liked school subject at all three levels of students questioned—upper elementary, junior high, and secondary. The arts also were perceived by
students to be the least important or difficult of subjects. We can surmise why students may feel the arts are least important due to the little importance given to the arts by adults in day-to-day school encounters over 12-14 years. At this point, however, we cannot surmise what makes a subject "difficult" or "easy" from the viewpoint of students.

Many parents will tell you they care about their youngsters having art. The Harris Arts Survey (1980) reported 93% of the public felt that it was important for children who are in school to be exposed to the arts. These results are higher than the 1975 survey of 91%. Hardiman and Johnson (1983) point out a contrast to this strong endorsement for art in the schools. "State guidelines, mandates, or standards for art education tend to reflect the broader perspective seen in the Harris surveys rather than the frequently more limited local perspective" (pp.23-24). Disappointingly, Hardiman and Johnson (1983) do not explore why art ranks much lower on a long list of subject areas and activities in only one location, nor do they critique the reliability of the Harris survey findings.

Some classroom teachers and principals will tell you they care about art, although there is less time in the curriculum to explore the arts in the mire of mastering the "basics." Unfortunately, art for many elementary classrooms may be mundane, retaining the status of 30 pumpkins just alike or coloring dittos during "free" time (Goodlad, 1984). Much of the nature of classroom art may depend upon the teacher's training in art, comfort with it, time for it, and his/her beliefs about learners and what they need.
Obviously, art teachers or art specialists will tell you they care about art, and they care in a variety of ways. However, the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (1978-79) points an accusing finger at art specialists. Student achievement and attitudes toward art were assessed by testing 9, 13, and 17 year olds, using five categories: art education and art experiences, valuing art, knowledge about art history, responding to art (perceiving, describing, analyzing, and judging), and design or drawing skills. "On only a few occasions did 17 year olds with four to six art classes perform differently than others their own age" (Zimmerman, 1984). As a result, Zimmerman (p.14) reports:

NAEP has suggested that art teachers move away from free expression and imitative art activities toward the development of art making skills and include more instruction about perceiving, responding to, and evaluating aesthetic aspects of art works if students are to become artistically literate. There is little evidence that such instruction is taking place, presently, in our nation's schools.

Art educators and those responsible for developing system or statewide curriculum will tell you they care about art. They manifest care in a variety of ways. For example, some endorse the "artist-in-the-schools" movement or solicit parent volunteers to teach art in difficult budgetary times. Yet, the current conservative and functional-literal temperament in education does not leave the arts unscathed. The "back-to-basics" movement paradoxically is a climate in which art educators can legitimize the arts in the total curriculum by narrowing the focus of the arts. They can do this by adopting the kind of "technocratic mindedness" that is evident in American approaches to the "basics" and rationalistic curricula that are incrementally
systematized, organized, taught, and tested in reading and math, for example. This kind of technocratic rationality distorts or confines communication and emancipation interests by "reducing moral, aesthetic, educational, and political issues to technical problems: why and what are reduced to how" (Bullough & Goldstein, 1984, p.144).

Bullough and Goldstein's (1984) recent study of the Art Is Elementary program in Utah revealed that the failure of curriculum developers to recognize the tension between wanting to preserve the expressive potential of the arts (maintaining the arts' traditional value in schools) and wanting to build a program consistent with popular curriculum practice is "at the heart of the conceptual and instructional problems in AIE, blinding its creators to the resulting emaciation of arts education for the young" (p.147). Thus, by adopting a technocratic form to legitimize and ensure the existence of art in a crowded, back-to-basics curriculum, they may very well undermine their own enterprise in the long-run. They could find themselves digging up their own stakes because they unwittingly planted them in the wrong "technocratic" soil in the first place.

Much of the public and many educators still may conceive of art as a frill in the curriculum—a respite from the humdrum, a ditto to color on Friday afternoons, a Mother's Day card, or mere childish but healthy "expression" and production, rather than engagement in a discipline that has aesthetic, critical, and social/cultural qualities and dimensions. For example, Engel (1981, p.24) posits what art is and is not:

Art is rational, systematic, based upon the intellect, meaningful. Learning in the arts is slow, painstaking, very hard work, frequently boring and routine, requires much practice. The arts are not fun, a substitute for
recess, extracurricular, entertainment, enriching and supplemental, pure emotion, only intuitive and irrational, from the guts rather than the mind, whatever a child puts on paper.

Interestingly, less and less is mentioned of creativity and self-expression in art education research and popular literature, with the exception of accusing practitioners for their "expressive mindlessness" and indulgence. The NAEP report states that many art teachers "cling to the myth that if they teach art systematically or in a structured way they will destroy natural creativity" (p.11). The message is that when most specialists teach art, it is without structure or meaning, even though we have lost ground in the allotted time for art in the curriculum, there is less local public acceptance of the arts since the 60s' era of personal expression, and school contexts may militate against the fuller and richer discipline of art envisioned by art educators embedded in university settings.

Apparently, many art educators are not aware of the Utah program that Bullough and Goldstein described (above), and if they are, one must wonder if they are pleased with the quality of this curricular enterprise. The rationale for most art educators today who are elbowing for space and legitimacy in the curriculum do so on the grounds that art is a structured discipline...as legitimate and serious a subject as any other, which can be taught as seriously as the basics. For example, Smith (1984, p.278), who is keenly interested in the aesthetic dimensions of art rather than mere production argues:

(A)rt...is comparatively nonutilitarian and is to be cherished in its own right, not as a means to something else... (A)rt is a distinctive school subject with distinctive outcomes that has the potential to enrich human life in ways nothing else can.
Madeja (1984) supports more structure in the art curriculum with an eye toward scope and sequence, "just as do mathematics and science" (p.286).

A brief glance at art education in the United States over the last two-hundred years might help us see where we have been and where we are going.

**The Nature of Art Education Over the Last 200 Years**

Hamblen (1984) presents a chronology of art education from the 18th century to the present. The 18th and 19th centuries are best described as a dependence on European models of instruction and academic aesthetic standards, in particular of the mimetic, pragmatic, and idealistic kind. For example, art education in the 19th century emphasized morality, citizenship, and vocational skills. Art also was correlated with other subjects e.g., drawing related to writing and language skills. In the late 1800s, industrial/geometric drawing and pictorial drawing were predominant. Drawing was emphasized as construction, representation, and decoration rendered with a uniform penciled outline. Geometric abstraction and accuracy of the product were emphasized, and instruction began from geometric simplification to the complexity observed in nature, using adult organization of knowledge and standards of evaluation.

In the early 20th century, art education emphasized child studies, multi-media, art appreciation, the nonvocational, a balance between disciplined study and freedom of expression, and a balance between idealized art and practical application. This encompassed an early aesthetic movement with advocate Henry Turner Bailey, the progressive education era (1920-40), social consciousness and responsibility, and
art as therapy. The "Age of Art Education Heroes" occurred between the 40s and 60s with Lowenfeld, D'Amico, Read, Cole, and Schaeffer-Simmern at the forefront. Focus then was on the child and creative expression with an orientation toward existentialism and pragmatism.

From the 60s to present there developed a range of proposed theories and programs with multiple perspectives. In practice there was a continuation of the studio model for instruction with rationales for creativity or self-expression, understanding design, and manipulative skill development. This era included concerns such as visual literacy, environmental design, the exploration of newer media for instruction and expression (film, television), artists-in-schools, and the study of popular arts. Further, "the content of many research studies and a concern for more effective curricular objectives in art education appear to have strengthened together from the mid-sixties to the present" (Logan, 1975).

From 1975 to present, the major perspectives seem to focus on visual literacy, creativity, and aesthetic education, according to Hamblen (1984). I would suggest that there is less emphasis on creativity, particularly when some middle school and secondary level art teachers have adopted as their "teacher's guide," Edwards' *Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain* (1979). It is perceptual or mimetic training, based upon realistic representation and embraced because of its 'pseudo-scientific' reference to brain hemisphericity. I also would suggest that other contextual phenomena influence what is taught in art classes, such as the back-to-basics movement, mastery learning in reading and math, testing, teacher accountability, and public criticism
of education and national reports by "blue ribbon" panels.

The "structure of the disciplines" movement, once led by Jerome Bruner in the area of science, is now a concern of art education. Thus, a range of perspectives are represented in art education rhetoric today, particularly with regard to the intense concerns about teaching the social, cultural, and critical dimensions of art rather than only studio production. What is pronounced by art educators and what is actually practiced by art teachers, however, may jut out in opposite directions.

Hamblen (1984) suggests that there is a definite time lag of about 20 years between theory and practice. "Despite the extensive theoretical literature, state curriculum guidelines, and the endorsement of major art educators, aesthetic education has yet to be widely implemented" (p.116). Certain decades seem to have contained stronger art programs and more singularly focused ones than others. These seem to follow closely on the heels of a major war. Hamblen notes that "there is the possibility that in addition to the increase in population and industrial achievements that follow a war, the aftermath of devastation may call forth an affirmation of human values" (p.116).

Chapman (1978) attributes the cyclical nature of certain kinds of programs to responses to similar social needs in time. Hamblen (1984; p.117) summarizes our state of affairs:

...(A)rt study in public schooling has usually entailed some form of material manipulation and manual skill development... With few exceptions, the study of art has been given instrumental justifications that have included such diverse rationales as the fostering of world peace, perceptual literacy, consumer awareness, and the acquisition of math skills... Art has rarely been treated as an academic subject, and, concomitantly, has often been dismissed from the general educational program as a dispensable frill.
With the above diversity of opinion and historical background in mind, let us address the parameters of this study.

**The Boundaries of This Inquiry and a Rationale**

This study is an exploration into what is out there—in a few places at least—and what sense a particular group of individuals make of their experiences in art class. It is not to prove that one curriculum form exists beyond another, that only one approach is better than another, or that all art classes are like these. Rather, it is to find out what happens in particular art classes with particular people, the processes that occur there, the meanings students make of these experiences, what might influence the meanings they can make, and the potential outcomes of these interactions which then can be assessed as to their value.

We now move from a brief taste of the debate among educators themselves as to what art is or why it is important to what we know about research in the visual arts that approaches this interest in real settings and people I have posed. At both the elementary and secondary levels, visual art is given a kind of "token basic-ness." It is token in the ways that time, attention, understanding, staffing, and budgeting are given to it within the total curricular experience of youngsters (Chapman, 1982; Eisner, 1979; Goodlad, 1984). Given that only about 18% of our nation's elementary schools employ art specialists (Chapman, 1982, p.52), what is the character of instruction and art knowledge that is both available and constructed in such settings? What do students learn in only 4% of an academic week?
Chapman suggests that "research offers little insight into the way the art teacher's beliefs and preferences may influence what students study, or the character of interactions in the classroom, or what students learn" (1982, p.107). We have even less knowledge about how student preferences and beliefs affect their own learning and the curriculum. And in comparison to other areas of educational research, observational research in art education is not abundant (Davis, 1977). The literature is dominated by a developmental, if not physiological concern, more recently under the guise of cognition and information processing. Studies that demonstrate the effect of art instruction on artistic growth and the processes within the context of an art class are "less numerous than reports of typical stages of development" (Chapman, 1982, p.106).

The poem at the beginning of this chapter is indicative of the phenomena one may encounter in an educational setting if one asks a student a question beyond his literal complaint of a "headache." We know little about the meanings students make of their educational experiences or the metaphorical ways they may use to convey their messages, particularly in the arts. We, therefore, know even less about what this implies for curriculum or instruction. We frequently fail to listen, to see, to ask, or even to ponder the phenomena we encounter or perhaps miss in a sea of students. Most of us find it difficult to recognize the poignant, sophisticated, and well-articulated messages and images children express because we are too constrained with time and numbers to allow these to occur or to investigate when they do. Once we bump into these messages serendipitously, we may not know quite how to
assess what students mean, or how to interpret these meanings in terms of what to do at the practical level. The tendency frequently is to suppress or dismiss student talk or action at a superficial level in order to cope, rather than learn from these accounts.

Sarason (1971) reminds us that teachers are in the unfortunate position of having to give more than they get. "One of the consequences of a marked disparity between giving and getting is development of a routine that can reduce the demand for giving" (p.168). Routine or rationalization reduces the guilt associated with not meeting the external or internal demands to give, according to Sarason. Thus, a child's headache can be passed off without further clarification and without the teacher getting rich information about this particular student or the conflict he is having between the demands of a task and his own psyche. The teacher also misses the more individual, empathetic dimensions of interaction.

Cumulatively, without such knowledge we are hard pressed to reflect upon on our practice or to improve it. Without knowing the quality of life in art classes and what individuals experience there, we are much like ships without sails, rudders, or a compass...weathering waves, storms, unknown currents, or the deluding calm of that which is taken for granted. We are unaware of any landscape below the surface or on the horizon where we might anchor for a while and assess where and who we are.

Such a lost image cannot be maintained if we want to justify the arts in the curriculum, create experiences that are meaningful for both teachers and students, or better identify and understand the principles
and structures that may undermine or enrich the quality of the teaching and learning of art in schools. This study focuses on art; however, I would argue that this investigation could help build understanding about the teaching-learning process in other subject areas, for it is in the context of schooling where this study takes place, under similar conditions of other subject areas, and in the situation of teaching and learning where people construct their own meanings, individually and collectively.

According to Husserl, individuals shape their consciousness, create selves, and form a symbolic world in which their actions make sense. They act in the lifeworld. An orientation or a structure of knowledge is created or constituted in consciousness as we carry on the activity of living (Husserl, 1970, p.338). And while the lifeworld is structured personally by symbolizing experience and meaning, "the lifeworld is not a private one; it is there for everyone" (Johnson, 1981, p.56). With this phenomenological interest, we live in a shared, intersubjective world, particularly in the social arrangement found in schools and in our sometimes acute sense of isolation among the many.

Perhaps we can move forward in some way—not merely describe what is there and what life means to participants in a setting. Dewey suggests, "Every experience is a moving force. Its value can be judged only on the ground of what it moves toward and into" (1938, p.38). It would seem that in our practical enterprise, we are obliged to seek and question the direction we might take (or have taken) and explore the value of this direction for real people in real places.
Some Definitions

In this study, "curriculum" is defined as the dynamic, communicative interaction between a teacher, students, and subject matter within a particular educational setting. It is the active negotiation and construction of knowledge through individual and group efforts. It is not anything and everything that occurs in a school, for curriculum defined in this way has no subject matter attached to it—something publicly recognized as that which is taught and learned, intended or spontaneously, in that particular setting. Traditionally, curriculum has been viewed as a set of objectives attached to subject matter with the intended outcome of testable knowledge acquisition. In my definition, it is not merely a set of objectives, a curriculum guide, a lesson or unit plan, a course of study, or a discipline some call "subject matter." Curriculum spoken of in this way will be called the "explicit" curriculum in this study.

Because the interaction described above is embedded within in a particular context, the curriculum will differ in different places with different individuals, even if the same subject matter is explored, the same textbooks are used, or similar groups of persons (SES, age level, ability level, etc.) engage in this material. There may be some similarities among different settings, however, the distinctions will be there as well because of the differences in people. The dimensions of this process-oriented view have been captured by other writers with terms such as the "implicit," "hidden," "enacted," "curriculum-in-use," or the "sociology of curriculum." These curricular issues will be discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters.
"Meaning" in this study is defined in two ways: (1) **Literal or descriptive meaning** is in terms of what participants report they think, believe, or feel about themselves as artists, the artistic process, artistic products, and how they interpret and make accounts of activities or classroom interactions. For example, a student says, "I don't like these paints." Descriptive meaning also is defined as the actions and behaviors participants express verbally and nonverbally in the natural setting for the astute observer to witness, record, and clarify with those participants. For example, the researcher asks, "Why don't you like the paints?" The student responds, "They keep running."

(2) **Analytic/interpretive meaning** is inferred by the researcher from the arrangement of time, space, physical objects, artifacts, symbols, metaphors, subject matter content, or persons in the setting with which participants, including the researcher, interact. This inferred kind of meaning elaborates the first kind and is viewed in relation to larger conceptual issues found in the literature or in the researcher's own experiences so that interpretations can be made. For example, students may report their dislike for a particular art lesson because they say they had little control over the media to be used. This may have little to do with students' desire for a successful product outcome or their developmental level, as some research would suggest. In fact, students at a particular age level may desire more media exploration or manipulation than previous research has reported. Perhaps the task requested by the teacher did not fit well with the medium used, the subject matter to be portrayed, or the students' history, frequency, or quality of experiences with the medium. Thus,
after further clarification, interpretation is required.

By "self expression" in this study, I refer to a student's ability to visually and verbally synthesize and create ideas and feelings from personal experience and stimuli in the environment. Visual qualities of stimuli can be noted and expressed, and the use of media can be used to convey personal, expressive intent. Incorporated in this expression is the student's active interpretation of meanings and decision-making about the significance of his/her experiences. This definition implies that a student exercises choices to fulfill his/her vision and expressive intent.

The Organization of This Presentation

The presentation of this study has been organized as follows:

Chapter I presents the purpose of the study, background information related to art education in general, the boundaries of this inquiry, and a rationale for conducting the study.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature. This literature is clustered into three areas germane to this study: (a) theoretical and curriculum orientations to art education; (b) studies in art education; and (c) naturalistic or qualitative inquiry as a research orientation.

Chapter III describes the design of this study and the methodological strategies used. This information will be provided in detail so the reader may assess the trustworthiness of this study and be able to critique the methodology, as well as the analyses and interpretations that follow.

Chapter IV begins the description and analysis of the findings in this study. Explored is the programmatic context of this study and its
potential constraints on art teachers and youngsters. An analysis of the "explicit" curriculum is provided. This document analysis of the explicit or paper curriculum (curriculum guide and teacher lesson plans) reveals the theoretical thrust of art knowledge intended for instruction and interpreted by art teachers in their initial planning.

Chapter V presents the "enacted" curriculum, or the nature of what actually occurred in the art classes studied. Illustrated are the contexts of each art class and school, the lessons presented, and some of the teaching-learning processes or active construction of art knowledge that occurred in these contexts, which may have influenced what meaning students might make of their experiences.

Chapter VI presents an analysis of what students said they learned and an interpretation of the teaching-learning processes observed. The thrust of this enacted curriculum will be assessed in relation to Efland's (1983) theoretical orientations to art curriculum and the goals espoused in the program's explicit curriculum or paper documents.

Chapter VII summarizes the findings and addresses the implications for the curriculum and education in general. The hidden curriculum of art in schools will be explored, and finally recommendations will be made on the basis of the significance of this study and its findings for the field of education.

And finally, the Afterword deals with some of the primary ethical issues encountered in the conduct of this study. This chapter is provided for those conducting or critiquing naturalistic inquiry, particularly in school settings.
Chapter II
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It would hardly be fish who discovered the existence of water.
(Kluckkohn, 1949, p.16)

Reviewing the literature required exploring new territory like a fish out of water—and the re-tracing of familiar waters, as well. The new territories helped me see the familiar ones in surprisingly new ways.

The purpose of the literature review was twofold: (1) to determine the nature of research in art education and the extent to which research has explored student perceptions and experiences in their art class or the natural setting; and (2) to provide a framework from the areas of art education, curriculum, and qualitative inquiry so that the broad interests in this study could be conceptualized in a comprehensive manner. The Mechanized Information Center at The Ohio State University Library provided several ERIC retrospective searches related to the above topics and numerous subtopics. Although research was examined that provided a conceptual framework to begin this study, several searches were conducted throughout the investigation as new questions emerged.
The literature review is presented in three clusters: (1) theoretical and curriculum orientations to art education; (2) studies in art education germane to this inquiry; and (3) the nature of naturalistic or qualitative inquiry as a research orientation that provides the conceptual and methodological framework of this study.

Theoretical and Curriculum Orientations to Art Education

The curricular content for this study is art and, as such, brings with it certain aesthetic positions and valued frames of reference that can be aligned with sociological, psychological, and educational theory. Four major alignments or positions were posed by Efland (1983; 1979), and this conceptual framework helped me interpret the data in this study. His presentation assisted me in understanding participant perceptions and curriculum goals and objectives within families of viewpoints.

Efland (1979) argued that certain philosophies of art are reflected in the ways the arts get taught. He suggested that aesthetics are a point of entry in inquiring about art education, but pushed his notion further by noting alliances of theoretical positions across major fields or disciplines. Efland drew upon Abrams' work (1953), where four elements or orientations are presented:

1. the work of art itself
2. the artist as the work's creator
3. the audience to whom the work is addressed
4. the universe represented in the work e.g., what the work is about
Efland (1983) utilized these four major viewpoints to discuss how these might be manifested in a curriculum situation.

The Mimetic-Behaviorist Model

The mimetic-behaviorist position manifested in art curriculum has a theme of imitation, according to Efland (1983). Learning is a process of imitation, while "good" art is a faithful imitation of nature. Other common themes in this position are control (of behavior or media, for example), modeling, and proposed value-neutrality due to its positivistic bend. Content is stated in terms of observable behavioral objectives, which might include skills of representation, copying, perspective, and procedural information in the use of media.

Goals are not determined by the subject or the method since both are presumed to be value free. Efland suggested that "social control seems to be implied by the nature of the method" (1983, p.28). With such an approach, one can readily see that this might imply a primary teaching behavior (modeling) and form of evaluation (precise measurement of changes of behavior).

A technical-rationalistic approach to the enterprise of curriculum can best be described as positivistic in orientation, evident in the current state of affairs of most American schools. Gay (1980, p.131) called this a technical model. The discussion in Chapter I mentioned the contemporary emphasis on the basics, mastery learning, programmed learning, testing, and accountability. The thrust of this orientation has a long history in curriculum, going back to representatives such as Bobbitt (1924) and Charters (1922), and it is implied in much of the work of Tyler (1949), Popham (1969), Gagne (1967), and Beauchamp (1982).
This perspective most often is conveyed in labels such as "means-ends," "factory," "input-output," "objectives-first," or "behavioristic" models of curriculum.

The post-war mood in America in the 40s and 50s and the launch of Sputnick encouraged yet another curriculum revolt due to an increase in world competitiveness. An alliance emerged between the military/industrial establishments and schools with the development of a kind of "cold-war" teacher-proof curriculum, particularly in math and science. The social upheavals in the 60s further promoted a top-down dissemination model of curriculum. Quality control was in order, and thus, transmission or diffusion was planned tediously to bring about educational reform.

In the technical-rationalistic model, curriculum is a thing, in and of itself, excised from the more dynamic and complex nature of teaching and learning. The attention to behavioral objectives and incremental skills in lock-step fashion tends to allow bit-by-bit management and systematicity to become ends in themselves. Often, one will witness the separation of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values into behavioral objective forms, implying that these areas exist in different portions of the learner's brain or in a teacher's repertoire as separate entities.

Curriculum development from this perspective is best described as defining ends and constructing measurable behavioral objectives to attain such ends. Development is not in the realm of teachers, as the role of the teacher essentially is to manage, implement, and test the objectives or knowledge to be dispensed. Evaluation is in terms of
standardized measurement (the normal curve), which tests the objectives and student performance in relation to other students.

**The Pragmatic-Interactive Model**

The pragmatic-interactive position proposed by Eland (1983) has themes of social adaptation or reconstruction, problem-solving, experiencing, or facilitating a unified collective life. Content is encountered in life-like situations; it has immediate relevance; and it takes place in an appropriate context that provides situations to be generated and solved. Goals emerge through transactions between teachers and students, and both participants might arrive with differing problems, but they would negotiate areas of agreement or mutual interests which establishes the agenda. The teacher's role is that of a resource person; s/he would not impose adult expertise upon students until they perceive relevance or a problem. Evaluation is process and product-oriented, descriptive of what happened, and an assessment of relevance to the students and their learning experiences.

Gay (1980) proposed a model in curriculum that she labeled pragmatic, although this model relates more to curriculum development. She stated:

> The allocation of values and the power negotiations among special interest groups occur with great regularity in curriculum decision making, thereby making it a political process. (p.136)

Persons oriented to this view would perceive instructional planning as a "particularistic, localized process that is specific to the sociopolitical milieu of the school context in which it occurs" (Gay, 1980, p.137). Walker (1971) described this approach as a "naturalistic
model;" Verduin (1967) called it "cooperative curriculum change;" and Unruh (1975) labeled it "responsive curriculum development." This model relates more to the implementation process in curriculum than it does to a design or model for curriculum.

In the practical world of the classroom, one might ask students to concern themselves with art in society or participate in group decision-making. The artist from this perspective works in socially-based art forms, such as architecture, city planning, or interior design. Such inquiry entails consultation with clients, thus, an artistic solution is reached through negotiation and consensus (Efland, 1983).

**The Person-Centered or Expressive Model**

The person-centered or expressive-psychoanalytic model posed by Efland (1983) has themes of art as products of the imagination of the artist, person-centered education, mind as self-activity, universal expression of emotion, personality, originality, spontaneity, or creativity. Content is from within the learner and not imposed by the teacher. Subject matter is different for each student because such emerges from personal experience, thus, it is student-determined.

Goals are stated in terms of personal goals or growth (self-concept, personal fulfillment, or therapeutic benefits). The teacher's role is to nurture and facilitate this "unfolding" of creative activity, perhaps reflecting "back to the student his own attitudes and values so that he can encounter these more fully" (Efland, 1983, p.40).

A phenomenological orientation to curriculum matters is best exemplified in this model. Where the technical-rationalistic position identifies more with product (outcome, achievement), the
phenomenological position is oriented more toward process and the
person. Curriculum from this frame of reference is person-centered, and
we might label it as experiential (Gay 1980). Persons working in this
vein are concerned with the lifeworld of persons and how they make sense
of their world in a social setting. Gay (1980, p.125) explicated this
perspective:

It emphasizes child-centeredness, interpersonal
relations...the existential order of the individuals
involved in learning activities, and the primacy of
affective content in instruction.

Some representatives from this perspective are: Dewey (1973); Greene
(1978); Lieberman and Miller (1984); MacDonald, (1974); Polanyi (1958),
van Manen (1979); and Willis (1981). Activity and experience create the
primary contexts for the realization of social, interpersonal, and
intellectual process skill development" (Gay, p.129).

The teacher has a great deal of autonomy in structuring what is to
be taught and how, based upon his/her understanding of a discipline,
process, and individual students' needs and interests. The learner is
perceived as an active and vital agent in deciding and building the
curriculum content.

Curriculum development from this perspective is "bottom-up" or
individualized, implementation is process-oriented, and students
participate in the evaluation of their own learning. The experiential
model is "subjective, personalistic (and) heuristic" (Gay, 1980, p.125).
Popular labels associated with this perspective are "humanistic,
"experiential," "inquiry-oriented," "person-centered," or
"individualized" in the sense that content actually emerges from
students and is not defined by individualized pacing through identical
packaged material intended for all students (eventually).

**The Objective-Cognitive Model**

The *objective-cognitive* or *information processing* position proposed by Efland (1983) has themes of structural autonomy, concepts, symbols, and developing or exhibiting expertise. Content is perceived as parts of a structured discipline, and it is stated in terms of concepts to be attained, and goals are stated in terms of the acquisition of such concepts. Methodology facilitates student inquiry by discovery and experiment, and it facilitates concept attainment through experience or situations which provide for hypothesizing unknowns. Evaluation refers to the content of the subject and student understanding of these major concepts. Students’ inquiry methods are of interest to the teacher to see how students process information.

This model best aligns with Gay's (1980) presentation of the *academic* orientation to curriculum. This model of curriculum relies on several data bases: learner, society, subject matter disciplines, philosophy, and the psychology of learning. Persons from this perspective rely on generic intellectual skills that are assumed to be enduring and transferable in any learning context. The most familiar popular label given to this orientation is the disciplined-based approach or separate-subject design. The discipline of art, for example, would be seen as a separate subject with its own inherent structures and ways of knowing and doing.

In the practical world of the classroom, we might see the study of design elements and principles or the study of art criticism and our cultural heritage. This orientation lends itself well to the study
approaches of the critic in "observation and description of the aesthetic object (and) in terms of concepts which can be used to characterize the structure of such objects" (Efland, 1983, p.57).

All four of the above models or perspectives are valuable approaches to inquiring about art curriculum matters. Each perspective presents a different view of similar phenomena, providing different levels of interpretation and values. According to Stenhouse (1975, p.107):

The object of curriculum study is to establish a congruence of contingencies, that is to bring anticipated and observed contingencies into agreement by achieving that blend of logical and empirical which is grounded theory.

Orientations to curriculum hold a variety of labels. Reynolds and Skilbeck (1976) presented an anthropological approach to the study of curriculum, noting people's conceptions or expectations are shaped by culture, yet people can and do shape culture. Further, they suggest that no teacher can "transmit" culture effectively without interpreting and responding to the consciousness of his/her students, or without understanding their culture (p.16). This is phenomenological in orientation.

Schwab (1971) addressed what he called the four "commonplaces" of curriculum: subject matter, learner, teacher, and milieu, each of which is equally important. Commonplaces help us map a field and compare rival theories in one discipline to see how a specific subject matter is treated. As an eclectic, Schwab was much like Efland (1983) in examining alignments of ideas and ways to select, synthesize, and proceed in practical ways.
In the more traditional presentations, like Tyler's Rationale (1949), the three sources of information for considering curriculum matters are the learner, society, and subject matter...leaving out the teacher. Perhaps this is a clue to the role the teacher is to assume in curriculum matters. Eisner and Valance's (1974) orientations to curriculum are: curriculum as technology, personal relevance, academic rationalism, cognitive processes, and social adaptation/social reconstruction. However, it is problematic to see the separation of social adaptation/reconstruction from the other four orientations.

Classifying and labeling is a worthwhile activity if ones conceives of continua of positions within each category or overlappings. In classifying, one risks oversimplifying. Life in classrooms and the practical matters of curriculum are much more complex. Eggleston (1977, p.53) reminded us:

No philosopher, psychologist, sociologist or perspective has a monopoly on objectivity, interpretation or truth. There is no "right" theory that will explain the dynamic nature of the curricula or of knowledge itself.

Efland would be the first to admit that each of these positions cannot be found in the purest sense in real-life situations, nor should they be. His ideas present an eclectic view. "To select one model as true...belies the nature of art and would result in curriculum that is nonrepresentative of the true state of affairs in art, that...there are rival views concerning the nature of art" (Efland, 1993, p.51). This also is true of the curriculum field in general.

Moving from rival theories into actual practice, we are reminded that practice exists in alternative forms to satisfy numerous
educational goals—from teaching students skills or concepts to helping them achieve personal growth or meaningful problem-solving. "Practice does not exist to prove the truth of theory but to help students achieve the state of being educated" (Efland, 1984, p.54). We also must attend to the personal theories, tacit knowledge, and thinking of teachers in the practical world and the contexts in which they must work.

What Efland provided is a way to conceive of participants' beliefs, preferences, and actions in a particular subject area—art. By exploring what participants perceive to be of value, worth knowing, or experiencing regarding art, we can better understand how such expectations might influence the intended, articulated, and negotiated nature of a particular curriculum context. No doubt, other disciplines hold rival theoretical views that influence what is taught and learned and in what ways. Such a conceptual framework can help characterize findings so these can be assessed, and what is assessed can suggest alternatives and directions for both theory-building and practice.

**Studies in Art Education**

Many of the studies conducted in art education have been descriptive studies that used questionnaires or surveys. In recent years, the bulk of the research in art education has been experimental in orientation, primarily related to perception and information processing in the physiological sense and in relation to student responses to artistic forms, student skill, or representational development. Experimental studies are meaningful in informing both theory and practice; however, they may not approach the qualities of lived life in classrooms and natural settings as do naturalistic studies.
conducted over a sustained period of time. In fact, research of any kind in art education is a relatively recent development.

The first publication of *Studies in Art Education* by the National Art Education Association in 1959 marked the beginning of the present era, "one in which the research effort has gained increasing respectability" (Day & DiBlasio, 1983). Some educators doubt that this increased activity has made significant impact in the field. For example, Rush and Lovano-Kerr (1982, p.11) commented:

There is a small body of research on art learning and even less on art teaching. There is little agreement between researcher and teacher on the relative values of basic and applied research.

In a discussion about the potential contributions of research in art education, Day and DiBlasio (1983) recommended that research can foster or stimulate awareness of what occurs in classrooms and the teaching-learning process. Kinds of research that may have raised our awareness or alerted us to perceive such processes are the works of Gardner, Winner, and Kircher (1975) that relate to the conceptual development of various age groups. The researchers recorded comments made by youngsters about art objects that were shown to them. The responses revealed that children have "minimal understanding" about where art comes from, what artists are, how long it takes to make art, how one becomes an artist, how works come to be shown in galleries, or how they are judged. For fifteen years Harvard's Project Zero, headed by Howard Gardner, has explored the development of artistic growth with emphasis on the importance of symbol use in general cognition and the artistic process. The purpose of the above emphasis in the long run is to gain new insights into aesthetic education. Long-term research
projects, like Project Zero, contribute to the construction of theory. (See Rush and Lovano-Kerr for an excellent overview of Project Zero's contributions to research and practice, 1982.)

Piaget (1972) and Piaget and Inhelder (1969) described how the symbolic functioning of children is creative and replete with intellectual activity. Children at every age re-invent meanings for familiar objects; however, children "who are asked to interpret the inventions of an artist's imagination are presented with a more complex task" (O’Onofrio & Hodine, 1971, p.23). Thus, a child's response will take a form that reflects his capacity to entertain plausible, abstract relationships between style and representation. Older children used increasingly abstract justifications for their preferences in paintings and were able to take the point of view of the artist (1931, p.18).

Regarding artistic development, Wilson and Wilson (1950) believed that it was "not nature alone that counts, but an interaction of nature and nurture, of innate and cultural factors" that contribute to children's development in art. After about the age of six, children throughout the world are not the same artistically and/or developmentally because of age level. Likewise, Gross (1933) suggested the development of talent or confidence for the many (or the few) in art is social/cultural.

Conceptual analyses are helpful in assessing where we are, where we might want to go, and the value of the methodology and findings for the kinds of questions that persist. Concepts such as "creativity," "child art," "school art," "aesthetic education," or "cognition" have been explored through conceptual analysis and numerous empirical studies.
(Efland, 1976; Eisner, 1966; DiBlasio, 1930). The difficult issue of depth versus breadth in the practical matters of art curriculum and instruction was explored by Beitel, Wartil, Burgart, Burkhart, Kincaid and Stewart (1962) and Davis (1959).

Lovano-Kerr (1982) investigated the theories of Piaget, Feldman, and Witkin by examining the relationship of perception and cognition to drawings in boys grades two to six. Children's art seemed more related to transaction processes affecting a child's direction and rate of growth than to chronological age. In earlier work (1970), and like Wilson and Wilson (1981), Lovano-Kerr suggested that there is a wider range of individual differences in student development within each grade level than between grade levels. The higher the grade, the greater the diversity.

Gerhart (1982) found that the threat of grades and peer comparisons seems detrimental to continuing motivation of students. Fourth graders who self-evaluated their performance were the most willing to continue their efforts in art and creative problem-solving tasks. Tilton (1983) compared the attitudes of fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade students toward the arts. She found that fifth-grade students had more positive attitudes toward the arts than fourth or sixth-grade students, and that most of this positive attitude seemed related to the duration of instruction (at the end of two years). Furthermore, girls had more positive attitudes toward the arts than boys.

Gaarder's experimental study (1973) explored peer influence in figure drawing as related to age, sex, artistic prestige, and social prestige. He discovered that pairs of elementary-level boys were more
likely to be influenced by each other in the performance of a task than were pairs of girls. Opposite sex pairs were less influenced by each other than same sex pairs. And subjects with high artistic prestige exerted more peer influence during art activities than subjects who were not so rated by their peers. Subjects with high social prestige were not significantly influential during the same art activity.

Representational awareness in drawing activities can be facilitated socially, according to Cocking and Copple (1987). The researchers taped preschoolers' talk during art activities and discovered that such talk related to the naming of objects they drew, descriptions of these objects, evaluative talk (of their own work and of peers), planning talk, and reaction talk to others' evaluations. Planning and evaluation talk was more common among the older students (about five years old). Girls were more evaluative than boys, and all students seemed aware of the discrepancy between likenesses and the real objects they depicted in their drawing. Interestingly, many art teachers and educators alike may believe that youngsters this age are too egocentric to have any capacity for judgment or evaluation of their work or others.

Smith (1983) discovered that children's drawings from observation (rather than memory) included greater detail, overlapping, unconventional orientations, and complexly contoured shapes. In a presentation of longitudinal studies of six children, Paine (1981) cautioned us to assess the value of youngsters' artistic representations in relation to their ongoing work. There seems to be more evidence than one might expect for the individual's awareness of his/her own drawings as parts of a sequence of development, a development of themes. "The
motives for making drawings and what they signify require as much consideration as how they are made" (Paine, 1981, p.3).

Selje's (1977) longitudinal study of one autistic girl, Nadia, documented the phenomenal representational ability of a youngster from age 3 to 11, provoking us to re-think artistic development and the nature of autism. Goodnow (1977) deftly illustrated how children's drawings "tell us something not only about children but also about the nature of thought and problem-solving among both children and adults" (p.2). She regarded children's drawings as "equivalents" that contain only some properties of the original, where convention frequently determines which properties should be included and in what way (p.16-17). Goodnow (1977, pp.16-17) concluded:

"...We emerge from looking at equivalents with a healthy respect for the sheer quantity of learning required of children, both in becoming able to read the variety of visual equivalents a culture uses and also in learning to produce the equivalents regarded as "good" or "acceptable."

In both art and language, metaphor insists we look beyond the literal, that we generate associations and tap new, different, deeper levels of meaning. Langer (1957) believed that metaphor was not only essential to thought, but also that art was a developed product of thought or metaphor. "Out of signs and symbols, we weave our tissue of reality" (Langer, 1976, p.280). She would suggest that to understand our experience requires that we first mentally transform it into a symbol. To convey that experience to others requires that we re-transform it into some language or other symbol system.

Meaning is comprehended, constructed, and conveyed through symbolic transformations. Literal meaning communicates by way of denotation;
non-literal meaning evokes by way of connotation. In order to evoke, "some agreed-upon (literal) referents must be present" (Feinstein, 1992, p.47). Nonliteral meaning is exemplified in metaphor.

Ortony (1975) reflected the position espoused by many phenomenologists who believe in the primacy and continuity of experience. Metaphor compactly represents the subset features of concepts or percepts, allowing large chunks of information to be converted or transferred economically from vehicle to topic. The filling in of details is left to the perceiver to select and emphasize, based upon his or her individual experience. Thus, the percipient constructs meaning. Feinstein (1982) insisted that metaphor is closer to perceived experience because it is not mediated by the verbosity of literal language. Thus, we can conceive of children's artistic representations as metaphors or a symbol system that express meaning, just as we can conceive of their language, actions, and interactions as symbols, metaphors, or expressions of meaning. What do we know about the potential influence of art teachers on student meaning-making?

Pariser (1979) developed two instructional methods of teaching drawing and examined the results presented by students in their work. Day (1976) discovered that the shaping of high school's students general aesthetic taste is a lengthy process, but effective. Rush, Neckesser and Sabers (1960) compared two instructional methods for teaching contour drawing to children, discovering that hands-on demonstration may not be the best procedure and that there may be more effective ways of introducing material (modeling procedures). The required skills of the teacher and the structuring of the presentation in complex ways remain
unclear. Zurmuehlen (1977) found that teachers seem to prefer realistic representation and detail in children's work. Teachers tend to compare students' work with nature or realism as the standard for evaluating student art.

In a survey of art teachers, Allen (1975) concluded that teacher emphasis placed on students' art products increased from elementary to secondary level; conversely, teacher emphasis on process decreased from secondary to elementary level. In another survey, Gray (1983) found that art teachers felt a need for more knowledge related to the following areas: working with exceptional children (and methods); working with other art forms, such as dance and film; research in the field; influences of art on cultures; and contemporary art. The only significant background factor seemed to have been graduate degree training.

Frattallone (1974) compared 108 public and 46 private colleges in midwestern undergraduate art teacher training programs, discovering deficiencies in: observation and evaluation of teaching theories; participation at all levels; structuring the art learning experience; and classroom organization. Both art administrators and educational administrators reported they felt preparation programs in art education lacked emphasis on aesthetics, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology of education. Prater (1983) found few radical differences existed among art programs in Ohio, where the primary curricular emphasis was on teaching art production skills. Decreases in the number of art students coincided with general enrollment decreases; funding for programs was unequal; and population shifts and economic conditions were reflected in
the state of art programs. The state minimum standards in Ohio guaranteed art's existence in the general curriculum; however, Prater stated that their "indefinite nature" indicated Ohio's low priority for art education.

The work of Sevigny (1978) and Johnson (1981; 1982; 1985) best represent the orientation of inquiry that will be addressed in this study. Both represent an ethnographic orientation, and others have begun to inquire into the actual art class and what meanings are constructed there. For example, Sevigny's (1978) study analyzed teacher appraisal behavior from more than one perspective—as student participant and as observer-ethnographer. Johnson has explored aesthetic socialization during school tours in an art museum (1981), children's meanings about art (1982), and the construction of art knowledge in an eighth-grade art class (1985). Probing questions related to student responses seemingly were not used in her inquiry or reports.

In the study of what art means to students (1982), Johnson discovered that in the elementary grades students defined art as a time, place, act, or specific content. Furthermore, at the upper elementary grade levels she found students adopted the view that art is personally determined and a subjective event. "Art is viewed as a narcissistic act devoid of social consequences and import" (p.65). Students strikingly portrayed the world view dominant within our society—that "individuals are exalted as beings who are in full command of their environment and destiny" (p.65), when, in fact, few individuals may have the power to direct their own actions, particularly in the context of schools. Thus,
Johnson suggests that students have adopted (or have been enculturated) into a kind of false consciousness.

Likewise, in Johnson's latest study (1985), eighth-grade students held a variety of views about art that were formalistic, expressionistic, and nihilistic, to name a few. With regard to evaluating art, students held a relativistic and personal view, an idea that Johnson claimed is pervasive in our society and legitimated by the Modern Art movement. "The art knowledge built up during the course was historically grounded and consisted of a multitude of metaphors and perspectives which reflected issues and problems that concerned our predecessors" (pp.22-23). Johnson also discovered that students did not have an opportunity to be reflective about their art experiences or view and criticize art work. She felt this was due to time constraints and a public conception of art that denies it any cognitive status.

In Sevigny's study (1978), the setting was a university art class. He analyzed teacher appraisal behavior and the meanings that classroom participants fashioned in order to make sense of the aesthetic judgments they communicated to teach other. He also combined methods used in a category system of observation (with subscripting) to complement his ethnographic strategies as a student and as an participant observer taking fieldnotes.

Other than the work of Sevigny and Johnson, most of the research conducted in this vein has been at Pennsylvania State University. For example Zaccari (1974) explored an anthropological approach to inquiry at the university level, examining teacher, student, and peer influences and those influences working with material and from beyond the
classroom. Folsom (1975) assumed the role of researcher-teacher in order to examine the interactive influences of teacher and student that enhanced student self-fulfillment in art activities. Paleologos (1976) inquired into the working process of a mature artist-teacher in much the same way studies conducted recently explore the writing process in adult writers. Using participant observation, Wilson (1977) examined the anti-structural dimensions in a high school art class, focusing on eight students; she suggested anti-structural dimensions in schooling contribute in a positive rather than a negative way to students' enculturation into the arts.

Other studies have adopted a naturalistic framework to explore participants' meanings. For example: Smith's (1977) study of "Mrs. Kaye's drawing class;" Degge's (1976) investigation of the teaching practices in a junior high art class and a study presenting a case for art teachers to become inquirers/researchers (1982); Hawke's (1980) study of the lifeworld of the beginning art teacher; Janesick's (1982) case study of a professor of architectural design; Jones' (1976) descriptive study of elderly art students; Laing's (1977) interest in the quality of the verbal art critique; May's (1984) case study of an art class conducted on a university campus where views held by youngsters, the pre-service teacher, and parents conflicted; Òru's (1973) work, like Sevigny's, that combined an observation instrument (category system) with ethnographic methods to describe an artist-in-schools program; Praisner's (1931) "sketch" of an art teaching experience; Perlin's (1979) study of teaching strategies; Szekely's (1982a; 1982b) studies of prison art and student talk in art classes in
fifth-seventh grades; and Vena's (1977) investigation of art programs in three alternative high schools.

But for the studies listed above, there are few naturalistically oriented studies in the field of art education. As the reader can ascertain, these few represent several grade and age levels, a wide range in number of participants involved—from one, to eight, to a classroom, to an entire educational program, and a variety of settings. Thus, it is difficult to build a host of conclusions from this research that might inform this study.

What is pronounced in these studies is the reciprocal or interactive dimension found in natural settings and the researchers' recognition of the active interplay between individuals, individuals and their environment, and their active construction of meaning, individually and collectively, within particular contexts. Most of the above researchers acknowledge that through such interaction and construction, a context-specific reality is shared, even though participants may hold individualistic views, perceptions, and meanings. Furthermore, the studies that stretch beyond the descriptive and investigate findings in relation to sociocultural and historical dimensions seem to render more significant and pervasive themes to ponder. The reader perhaps is more capable of generalizing the studies to similar known contexts, or awareness is raised concerning that which the reader has taken for granted.

The discussion of approaches to curriculum and studies in art education leads us to the examination of an orientation to inquiry. Discussed were naturalistic kinds of studies conducted in the field of
art education. We now explore the conceptual framework of naturalistic inquiry, although much of this will be provided in Chapter III.

**A Naturalistic Approach to Inquiry and the Construction of Meaning**

Phenomenology addresses the question of meaning participants make of their experiences in a setting. In particular, symbolic interactionism views experience as an interpretive process (Blumer, 1969; Garfinkel, 1964; Manis & Maltzer, 1972; Mead, 1934; Thomas, 1923). Phenomenology focuses on understanding the inner lifeworld of individuals and their intentionality (Husserl, 1946), as well the meaning of human action within a social context. What people do depends on the meanings they give to their everyday life situations and the events which occur there (Schutz, 1957). Using ethnographic strategies to investigate these meanings facilitates the description of practice in real settings and the development of grounded theory (Bloor, 1975; Denzin, 1970; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; and Phenix, 1964). Rather than entering the field setting with a theory to "test it out," one enters the field to collect "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of the beliefs, actions, or accounts of persons, and it is from these data that new theories can be developed. Thus, this theory is "grounded" in the data.

In the early 70s, sources for learning about participant observation and the conduct of ethnographic inquiry were difficult to obtain or find in the field of art education. Several articles and books now exist within a paradigm of research called naturalistic or qualitative inquiry, as more disciplines are coming to see its potential in increasing our understanding of persons and processes in real situations (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Burgess, 1984; Dobbert, 1982; Guha &

The ethnographic approach emerged from anthropology; however, sections of other fields now utilize this more participatory, sustained, and in situ kind of research: sociology, ethnomethodology, medicine, psychology, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and education (particularly in the field of curriculum). Furthermore, there are several dimensions within this orientation, from the anthropological/cultural (which seems pronounced among American researchers) to the sociological (which seems pronounced in Great Britain). Contemporary sociolinguistic and ethnomethodological studies seem more American-bred than British.

Naturalistic or qualitative inquiry also has been used increasingly in the evaluation of curriculum and educational programs (Bersson, 1978; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Eisner, 1985; Fraser, 1980); Guba, 1978; Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Patton, 1980; Popkewitz & Tabachnick, 1981; Rogers, 1985; Rubin, 1982; Stake, 1975; and Willis, 1978).

Another dimension of this approach to research is educational criticism, a research style proposed by Elliot Eisner (1985; 1979). For example, the work of Barone, Donmoyer, and McCutcheon are presented in the 1979 edition of Eisner's The Educational Imagination. The 1985 edition contains new examples, Barone's of which is particularly notable and rich. The researcher, as participant observer, paints a verbal picture of the setting and action in much the same way that an art critic provides insight into an art object. The critic and/or educational connoisseur helps us to see and perceive the qualities

Methodological approaches to the practical enterprise of naturalistic inquiry are as follows: data are collected in the field over a prolonged period of time, and observations are contextualized (in situ). Guiding questions help focus the study initially, but more informed questions are expected to emerge while the study is in progress and the context and its actors are better understood. Thus, there is a reflexive process embedded in the conduct of such inquiry, as the researcher assumes the reflexive stance of participant observer. These methodological strategies and numerous others are presented in detail in the next chapter.

Chapter III presents the conceptual framework, design, and methodological strategies used in this study. The methodology reflects a naturalistic approach to inquiry, detailing the ethnographic and complementary methods and instruments developed and used to analyze and interpret the data. The chapter is presented in detail so that the trustworthiness of this study can be assessed by the reader.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Orientation

The purpose of this study was to investigate what art means to a group of third and fourth grade students within the context of a system-wide art program and its curriculum. This focus on meaning required the exploration of phenomena from a particular conceptual framework or perspective.

The constructivist or phenomenological perspective suggests that students and teachers construct their own realities and create their own individual meanings. An interactionist perspective suggests that at another level, a "common" reality is created, shared, and understood intersubjectively through social interaction within a particular context. And finally, this perspective implies a reciprocal relationship between members and a context: first, members of a group create meaning in a context, and as such contribute to the construction of a context; and, secondly, through the opportunities and constraints provided by the structures of a context, the context influences the meanings persons might make. This conceptual framework is shared by many other ethnographers in education, sociology, anthropology, and psychology (Becker, Geer, Hughes & Strauss, 1951; Berger & Luckmann,

**Design**

The design of this study is naturalistic or qualitative in orientation, and, as such, rests on a set of assumptions. Although a conceptual framework is utilized to create guiding questions related to the phenomena of interest, new questions emerge as a study proceeds in a setting selected for observation. Thus, the boundaries of this framework are influenced by an increased understanding of a particular field setting and its members. This growing knowledge and experience helps define and redefine the boundaries of the conceptual framework.

Such a study is conducted in the natural setting. The researcher assumes a participant observer stance in the setting, where observations and interactions are contextualized (field-based) and sustained. Through methodological strategies such as participant observation, taking fieldnotes, interviewing, audiotaping, making member checks, and triangulation (to be discussed later), the primary purpose of the researcher is to come to understand a setting and its participants as much as possible, in all its complexity (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Dobbert, 1982; Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Informal conversations and in-depth interviews are conducted frequently to promote the unfolding of the participants' personal and cultural knowledge in its more natural form. A major part of the ethnographic task is to understand what sociocultural knowledge participants bring to and generate in the social setting being studied. All cultures feature common as well as distinguishing features (Spindler, 1982).
Inquiry and observation is as unobtrusive as possible, even though technical devices may be used (cameras, audiotaping, or videotaping) to enable the collection of data that can be reviewed and analyzed in detail. Descriptive observations can be shared with participants, therefore clarified and refined and made more reflective of the meanings participants assign to events or situations. Semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, observation instruments, or other such instruments may be developed or used to complement data collected as a participant observer, particularly when analysis within and across groups also is desired. The reverse is possible; data gathered through fieldnotes and observations can illuminate the more limited and sometimes glossed findings obtained through more traditional instruments. And no matter the multiple strategic devices used or "thick" description obtained through the interplay of detailed description and layers of interpretation (Geertz, 1973), the researcher knows that not everything in a setting can be attended to or captured.

The Framing of Questions

Questions guiding this inquiry related not only to student perceptions of art and their art experiences, but also to the nature of an art curriculum. Issues regarding the flexible and negotiable nature of curriculum-in-action were explored, based upon the definition of curriculum presented earlier in Chapter I. Curriculum was viewed not merely as a paper document or "subject," but as a dynamic interaction of intentions and spontaneous happenings between a teacher, students, and subject matter or materials within a particular context. With this definition in mind, Table 1 presents the major guiding questions, data
sources, and analytical strategies that guided this study. This format of presentation is a revision of a model by McCutcheon (1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Analytical Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the nature of the explicit curriculum, system-level documents, and the assumptions inherent in these? How might these more formal structures influence what is negotiated as curriculum in practice?</td>
<td>Curriculum documents, substitute teacher packets, teacher lesson plans; art teacher context check, semi-structured interviews with art supervisor and staff; weekly observations and field-notes of art staff meetings and classes.</td>
<td>Content analysis; analytic description; comparative and contrastive analysis across data sources; analysis of program structures at system level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are participants' perceptions regarding art, art processes, art products and the self? How might such beliefs influence what is negotiated in the curriculum and in what is actually taught and learned?</td>
<td>Weekly observations of art classes and art activities in regular classrooms using field notes; audiotaped transcripts of each art lesson; semi-structured and informal interviews with students and teachers; photos of art class activities, settings, and student art products.</td>
<td>Content analysis; analytic description; comparative and contrastive analysis across groups; analysis of program structures, individual school level; triangulation of different accounts, same events; triangulation across data sources; simulated recall from photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Questions</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Analytical Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What do students experience in the curriculum? What kinds of teaching-learning behaviors are manifested in the art class, and what are the implications of these for the curriculum?</td>
<td>Participant observation in scheduled art classes; field notes, audiotaped transcripts of art lessons; semi-structured and informal interviews with students and art teachers; photos of art class settings, activities, and student art products.</td>
<td>Content analysis; analytic description; comparative and contrastive analysis across groups; application of art theory; simulated recall using photos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do students' views about art relate to those of their parents, classroom teachers, and art teachers? How might these beliefs interact and influence the curriculum? What are the implications for art curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation? What might be some implications for the field of curriculum in general?</td>
<td>Questionnaires for parents, classroom teachers, and art teachers (open-ended, Likert scale, and parallel items); semi-structured interviews with art teachers and students; field notes, audiotaped transcripts of interviews and art lessons; photographs; curriculum documents.</td>
<td>Content analysis of open-ended questionnaire responses; comparative and contrastive analysis across groups reported in frequencies and percentages; comparative and contrastive analysis across groups and paper documents; analysis of evaluation models for curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inquiry Time Line

This study covers a two-year period of field work, which is broken into distinctive phases geared to the structure of the typical academic school year in public schools. Figure 3.1 illustrates simultaneous activities across this time line, constructed as the inquiry progressed.

In Phase I, groundwork was laid for the research. This occurred in the fall semester of 1983 and included obtaining Human Subjects and Research Review Committee clearance, observations of weekly art staff meetings, and selecting and gaining entry to the field settings.

During Phase II, the spring semester of 1984, third grade art instruction began. I observed three groups of students (N = 83), in three art classes, taught by three art teachers, in three different schools. I also observed intermittently in subsites within these schools and in the regular classrooms of these students. I continued to attend weekly art staff meetings during this semester. When formal art instruction ended (before the semester had otherwise ended for students), I conducted semi-structured interviews with 63 students (76% of this student population).

The summer of 1984 was a major analysis period. Content analyses of curriculum documents were reviewed, and all interview data, taped transcripts of art classes, and questionnaire responses from parents, the regular classroom teachers, and the art teachers were analyzed. I spent the latter part of the summer tracing students to their new schools and gaining entry to two new schools.

Phase III involved gaining access to two new schools and selecting target students who would have fourth-grade art instruction. The "east"
Figure 3.1. Inquiry time line depicting simultaneous activities
group of students (from School C) could not be followed in this phase because of a change of schedule in art instruction to the spring semester. Thus, I followed up 17 target students from two of the three original student groups, observing these students and their classmates as fourth graders ($N = 61$). One of the art teachers from Phase II (School B) taught in another "north" school; a new art teacher was observed in the "south" school (School A students). In Phase III, I discontinued observation of art staff meetings in order to spend more time in the schools with students, and again, I observed intermittently in the students' regular classrooms and in subsites within these two new schools. Phase III ended with semi-structured interviews of fourth-grade students, which included 44 or 72% of the total fourth-grade population ($N = 61$) and the target students ($n = 17$).

Phase IV of the inquiry cycle included intermittent attendance in art staff meetings to report findings and receive feedback from the art staff. The early part of Phase IV also included analysis of new interview and art class transcripts from the fourth-grade observations. The middle and latter parts of Phase IV were spent reviewing all data sources and documents, synthesizing, and writing up the findings.

**Selection and Sampling**

A primary methodological issue in research is selection and sampling. This issue relates to decisions made regarding which field sites, situations, events, and people will be studied. The researcher must address why some things or people are studied and why others are rejected as objects or dimensions of study. Tightly entwined with sampling and selection is the issue of gaining entry or access to
settings and people where information can best be obtained. Thus, selectivity works in complex ways—the researcher is selective, those who grant access to and information in the field setting are selective, and circumstances force an unforeseen kind of selectivity.

Many sampling decisions were made prior to entering the field, guided by preliminary research questions and a developing conceptual framework. However, other decisions were influenced by persons in the field or by those who held access to the setting; decisions were influenced by the constraints of my time, energy, and finances as researcher; and more importantly, decisions were influenced by my growing understanding of the context under study and its members. Thus, all sampling and selection decisions were not made in static points in time, a priori to observation and data gathering in the field site. Sampling decisions were embedded in the on-going process of inquiry.

Field Site Selection—Program Context

I chose a "formal" art program as a setting for this research because, as was evidenced in the literature, we know little about the art experiences of elementary students in such settings. Research in the art education field has focused primarily on the stages of children's artistic development. While this has been helpful, we know little about what occurs in the natural setting of art classes or what sense students make of these experiences.

The context of this inquiry was an elementary art program in a large, midwestern public school system. This program was intended to serve only the third and fourth-grade student population, approximately 6,000 students. At each of these two grade levels, students received
one semester of formal art instruction with one or two of the ten
assigned art specialists. Art at the elementary level in this school
system can be illustrated as follows:

First grade - Classroom teacher
Second grade - Classroom teacher
Third grade - Art specialist; second semester only
Fourth grade - Art specialist; first semester only
Fifth grade - Classroom teacher; three art-related
field experiences conducted by art specialists
Sixth grade - Art specialist; unified arts

The program was organized so that third graders usually had art
instruction the second semester of their third-grade year, and fourth
graders had art instruction their first semester. According to state
guidelines, art was to occur at least 80 minutes a week at the
elementary level.

The ten third and fourth-grade art specialists were assigned to
three to five schools per semester, thus, they traveled from school to
school, serving approximately 100-120 students per day and 1000-1200
students per year (Context Check and interviews, 1983).

Selection in this study represented both non-probability judgment
sampling and opportunistic sampling (Burgess, 1984; Honigmann, 1982;
Parten, 1950). Each of these kinds of sampling represents degrees of
deliberateness exercised in choosing informants, subjects, situations,
or behavioral events. Honigmann (1982) illustrates:

The ethnographer uses his prior knowledge of the
universe to draw representatives from it who possess
distinctive qualifications. He may, for example,
select informants or subjects according to class strata,
occupational status, sex, age, or length of residence
in a community. (p.80)

I used judgmental sampling in selecting a system-wide art program. I
approached the art supervisor and described the kind of research I
wished to conduct. Based upon her interest in the study, I asked that she recommend three school sites which she felt would be representative of the third and fourth grade schools in the system, as I was unfamiliar with the system. I suggested that three different geographic locations and varying economic backgrounds or social strata might be a starting point. I wanted to conduct research in "typical" schools in the program—not in schools in other systems that had no formal art program.

In Phase II, I wanted to explore the teaching-learning process in art across at least three different art teachers and groups of students because studying more than one school context or group meant that eventually I could make comparative analyses of the perceptions of at least three different student groups, parent groups, and art teachers. I believed that three settings would be all that one person could schedule and spend enough time in to become familiar with them and their members. Such information also would help me see programmatic and institutional phenomena e.g., the art curriculum being taught, negotiated, and learned in different settings with potential commonalities and distinctions. I hoped such data would help me develop an analysis beyond the immediate contexts toward structural and institutional interpretations. Common or distinctive phenomena might enhance, impinge upon, or at least influence the meaning different children in different settings gave to their art experiences.

In Phase III, bounding the study was still problematic. To give myself more time and to enhance this study, I decided to follow up some of the students as fourth graders, investigating curriculum issues such as continuity, sequence, scope, and balance. A follow-up also suggested
the potential for examining student changes in perceptions of art because of changes in school settings or art teachers. New sampling of field sites and subjects was opportunistic in nature. Modifications occurred due to the availability and willingness of a variety of people to cooperate and/or participate in this study. Site selection depended upon not just an initial informal interest and agreement on behalf of the art supervisor; it depended upon her superiors' review and approval of the research proposal, the consent of individual art teachers, building principals, classroom teachers, and parents (for their youngsters), and the logistics of scheduling inquiry at five different field settings. For example, because of the change of one art teacher's schedule to teach fourth grade art from fall to spring, I lost a third of the original student group. That schedule conflicted with mine.

**The Selection of Subsites**

The selection of the field sites stimulated the need to select subsites within these contexts. This meant observing in the regular classrooms, on playgrounds, having lunch with students, experiencing fire drills and assemblies, as well as observing in art classes. From these observations, I could enrich my understanding of each setting and the nature of schools in general. Selecting subsites allowed me to explore and analyze student actions in different school settings, with different teachers, and in different situations and events. Such information seemed pertinent to a better understanding of the students in this inquiry.
The Selection of Art Teachers and Students

Access was further complicated by the juggling and scheduling of systematic observation over two academic years, in three geographic locations in the city, in five schools and their subsites, in weekly scheduled art classes, and in weekly scheduled art staff meetings.

The primary subjects in this study were 83 third-grade students and 61 fourth-grade students, 17 of whom were target students observed over a two-year period. Four of the 17 art teachers were observed, one of them over a two-year period. The five schools represented three geographic locations and three social strata in the public school system—north, east, and south; lower-middle, middle, and lower SES, respectively. According to an analysis of public demographic and academic information, these students were representative of the system in heterogeneous groupings (lower to middle SES, gender, ethnicity, and academic ability). The student groups and art teachers are represented in this study as such:

School A-1  South, third grade  Teacher A-1
School A-2  South, fourth grade  Teacher A-2
School B-1  North, third grade  Teacher B-1
School B-2  North, fourth grade  (Same "B") B-2
School C  East, third grade  Teacher C

The Selection of Target Students

Two groups of third graders were "followed" to their respective fourth-grade schools as fourth graders. Seventeen (17) target students were selected from the original groups, based upon the highest number of original subjects located within a given fourth-grade classroom. Because students were bused to feeder schools in the fourth grade, they were dispersed among several fourth-grade classrooms into different
configurations than they were in the third grade. At the beginning of the fourth-grade year, I examined the class rosters and chose each "new art class" by the highest number of former third graders represented in a given classroom. Then I examined this choice to see how representative the smaller group was of the original student "types."

Both fourth-grade classes were representative in range of student types and abilities, as in the three third-grade classes. ("Types" will be discussed in detail, later). Classroom teacher interviews confirmed this representativeness when I shared the lists of target students and inquired about the students' abilities and performance in the regular classroom. There were eight target students from School A and nine target students from School B. Thus, in the latter phases of this study, I narrowed my focus of study to the target students I already knew, paying particular attention to them in my observations and fieldnotes.

Although the selection of target students in the fourth grade was a judgmental sampling decision, the decision remained opportunistic in relation to the availability of the highest number of former students in a given class. There also was some implied "leverage" in gaining access to the fourth-grade schools. Because I had been conducting the research for a year and stated that I was "following up" a group of students, access seemed easier and less problematic at the fourth-grade schools and with the fourth-grade art teachers, who by then were familiar with the study.
The Selection of Informants

In naturalistic inquiry, informants usually are considered to be the participants who are "more willing (than others) to talk, have a greater experience in the setting, or are especially insightful about what goes on" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.63). According to Mead (1953), the selection of informants demands that the researcher have some knowledge of the situation or context that is to be studied in order to evaluate the informant's position in a particular setting and their knowledge of that setting. To avoid partial accounts, however, I selected a wide range of informants based upon categories or "types" of students. This sample can be referred to as a purposeful, non-random or non-probabilistic sample.

The types and range of "typifications" of students evolved from my own observations of teacher-student interactions and student behaviors, as well as from "labels" or typifications expressed by the members themselves. For example, from an art teacher: "This is my 'specials' class," meaning "learning disabled" students; or from a classroom teacher, "She's the brightest student in this class—very bright...my best reader." And from students themselves, "Lee is the best artist in class. He can draw anything." Or, "Maggie's always in trouble! This morning she was sent to the principal's office...again."

I did not converse only with those students who seemed to be bright, articulate chatterboxes overflowing with information. I sought shy students who said little in class and seemed isolated from their peers. I sought students who seemed to get into trouble often. I sought the "brighter," the "slower," the "in-betweens," the
"talkatives," the "reticents," the "artistically or academically gifted," and those less so. Such sampling was possible not only through my own observations over time in different settings or through participants' typifications of themselves, but through the examination of school and classroom documents and records, publicly displayed student work that indicated achievement levels and teacher evaluations, and student assignments to reading groups, special teachers, or particular materials.

The Nature of Consent

I prepared a cover letter and a description of the study for principals, classroom teachers, art teachers, and parents to help them make a judgment about participating in this study. This description may have alleviated potential concerns, questions, or misunderstandings, as I was as specific as possible about what was expected of different persons and what kinds of things I would be doing as a researcher. Anonymity was ensured through the use of pseudonyms for persons and locations.

Consent from teachers was requested by two Review Committees—the school system and Human Subjects at the University. Although most of the art teachers signed a consent form, there was no initial, apparent enthusiasm for participating in this project. Because the art supervisor granted initial permission to conduct this study and "presented" me to her staff, many of the art teachers complied by signing consent forms, but may not have wanted to participate or have fully understood the consequences of such an agreement. (See Afterword, ethical issues). The art teachers with whom I eventually worked shared
their apprehension in a variety of ways and admitted such on questionnaires and in interviews. For example:

Beginning...apprehensive. At end--accepting and interested!!! (Questionnaire, 5/84)

I didn't mind--especially at first--as I became more tired or had bad days I felt a little uncomfortable--that perhaps a bad situation was truly identified. (Questionnaire, 5/94)

I look so stupid--like a bumbling idiot! (Reference to teacher's first reading of lesson transcript; interview, 10/84)

I had hoped that written and spoken explanations regarding the nature of the study would help orient teachers to the nature of my research. But there was no way for the participants—or me, for that matter—to fully anticipate and understand the implications of such an agreement until the study was in progress. Burgess (1934) suggests that access is not negotiated on a single occasion, but is re-negotiated in different phases of the research with the same or different members of the setting.

In the initial phases of the research process, gaining access was critical, stubbornly cautious, and couched in suspicion, no matter how polite interactions seemed to have been on the surface. Further along, there may have been "discrepancies between the phases," and I may not have been "in the same phase with all those who (were) researched simultaneously..." (Burgess, 1934, p.85). This "out-of-phase" phenomenon was particularly noticeable to me in Phase III when target students were being followed up among students new to me. Once, I caught myself wondering why a student seemed so apprehensive about me assisting her in art class, and then I realized we were "new" to each
other. She had not known me in the third grade, and her apprehension obviously was warranted. Feeling "out-of-phase" was noticeable on the first occasions when I shared taped transcripts of art classes with the art teachers, even after waiting to share these with some teachers for nine or ten weeks, thinking trust and rapport had been developed. There was simply no way to prepare teachers for the shock of the concreteness of taped transcripts and their words, despite my having tried to prepare them, or having tried to write as descriptively and uncritically as possible. Being "out-of-phase" with participants may be a methodological phenomenon that occurs because individuals do not experience the same things in the same way, nor do they experience identical phenomena simultaneously, even though it appears they participate as a group in the same situation within the same time frame.

Parent consent forms for youngsters to participate in this study were waived at my request by both Review Committees, since there seemed to be little risk involved in this kind of research. However, two principals requested these. I had hoped that an explanation of the research would have been sufficient communication. Nevertheless, I never did receive a 100% return, and the principals and teachers did not help me pursue this after I was in the field for several weeks. I never did resolve this issue, and as yet have realized the implications of also conveniently giving up as time went on. (See Afterword, for further discussion.)

The more critical consent needed from parents was permission to take photos of their children in art activities and to use these in a variety of ways during research and in the presentation of findings.
With the same dilemma of "few returns," I decided to use these photos as a resource for drawings, where I could artistically alter identities with a deft hand, if necessary, and still capture an illustrative point for future use. Where I had permission from those pictured, I would be able to use photos. Given the option to deny interviews or photographs, only three parents denied permission.

The Selection of Time

Rhythms in schools are distinctive from other institutional contexts. There are differences in observing in the fall semester and in the spring. In the fall, routines and expectations are being established and negotiated between teachers and students; in the spring, routine is well established within the social network of individual classrooms, although routines are sometimes re-negotiated. Days of the week, beginnings and endings of semesters, grading periods, mornings and afternoons, class periods, and school bells mark and make the natural rhythms of schools. These natural rhythms influenced the selection of time and events to be observed and the participants' receptivity to my needs as a researcher. As a former teacher, I tried to be sensitive to the needs and pressures of the participants.

The rhythms of school are important in understanding decisions regarding the sampling of time in this study. For example, I decided to focus on recurrent time by attending most art staff meetings and every scheduled art class in the selected schools for two semesters out of the inquiry, which was the natural duration of formal art instruction for the youngsters in this study over a two-year period.
I focused as well on continuous time by observing during the entire school day beyond the art class, noting how daily activities were constructed and how they flowed from morning to afternoon on different days.

Over two academic years—observing students as both third graders and fourth graders—allowed me to note changes in students' artistic development, interests, and interactions and to study curricular issues. This continuous sampling decision originally was an opportunistic one. Due to delays and difficulties gaining access to the field sites and my inability to conceptualize and narrow the focus of my study so early without preliminary observations and knowledge of the field sites, I decided to extend my inquiry from one year to two.

I did intermittent time samplings, as well. This meant that I did not choose to observe the regular classrooms on the same days of the week or at the same time of day. I observed in the mornings, in the afternoons, for short periods and long periods, and within structured and unstructured activities e.g., reading period and recess. I was in each school one to three times a week.

I also paid attention to the irregularities in the rhythm of school time e.g., unexpected events such as class changes because of building repairs, fire alarms, or student fights which disrupted routines. Events were routine with students doing tasks, lining up to go to the restroom, teachers doing directed teaching, students doing independent work (workbooks, ditto sheets, spelling tests), etc. Events were special when there were holiday celebrations, concerts, guest speakers, balloon launches, or "Book Fair Week".
By utilizing several school sites where the same students attended over a two-year period, I could explore the programmatic nature of art instruction and curricular phenomena such as scope, sequence, balance, repetition, omission, media used and content, concepts, and skill expectations presented. Such extended time in the field allowed careful and detailed analyses of the goals expressed in curriculum documents and those expressed and negotiated by teachers and students in natural settings. I examined how different art teachers presented the same art concepts and skills, how different groups of students responded to similar tasks, and how programmatic and structural constraints influenced the teaching and learning of art in different settings.

The Selectivity of Those Who Grant Access

The research proposal had to meet with the approval of several persons in the school system's hierarchy and the Human Subjects Committee on campus. To my surprise, both Committees requested potential interview or questionnaire items in advance of work in the field sites. Having to develop and present potential questions for yet-to-be-constructed questionnaires and semi-structured interviews prior to having set foot in the field settings was no small feat. Nor did it feel "right" to my code of conduct as a naturalistic inquirer. I had to compromise and generate possible questions from a larger, generic pool. Even though many of these questions had proved informative in two pilot studies, I remained uncomfortable. Furthermore, my desire to observe in regular classrooms and to take fieldnotes was criticized by one school system member because "this had little to do with art," and, "there were objective classroom climate instruments one could use" to obtain such
information. Finally, I was told that what I wanted to do was "really not research."

In the school system review committee, one person seemed to have been appointed "judge" of the appropriateness of questions that researchers could ask teachers, students, or parents. Some of these questions were censored, and any "emerging questions" were to be approved before I could ask them in the field.

This kind of censorship apparently was meant to protect teachers and the school system image. "The public accessibility of data on schools and classrooms appears...to give...greater power to teachers than to pupils, regardless of the safeguards provided by researchers" (Burgess, 1984, p.23). But the negotiating process can reveal much to the researcher about the pattern of social relationships at a research site—in this instance, a hierarchical relationship and the protection of teachers through unionized, if not idiosyncratic censorship. That the University's Human Subjects Committee requested questions in advance also suggested that some of the canons of naturalistic inquiry were either unknown or unappreciated in the university research sector. It could have been that the terms "semi-structured" interviews or "questionnaires" were red flags, as fellow researchers were not requested to submit questions in advance of their study. These terms have traditional definitions. (See Afterword for further discussion of censorship.)

Through patience and in a posture of good faith to "follow the rules" in a highly systematic and well-documented study, I hoped others would come to better understand, appreciate, and trust this kind of
inquiry. Previous experience had taught me that desired information often emerges serendipitously, without the asking. The ethical dilemma would be withholding both positive and negative findings in final reports where agreements had been made prior to data collection.

**Selecting a Role as Researcher**

"...Researchers have turned to observation and participant observation in order to get access to the meanings which participants assign to social situations" (Becker, 1958, p.652). Role-taking in naturalistic inquiry flows and sputters; it is not as clear-cut as it would seem. One may choose to adopt a certain stance, but several roles may be developed and negotiated throughout an investigation.

The term participant observation refers to a multitude of roles and activities in field research. Hughes (1960) offers a definition:

The unending dialectic between the role of member (participant) and stranger (observer and reporter) is essential to the very concept of field work, and this all participant-observers have in common: they must develop a dialectic relationship between being researchers and being participants. (p.xi)

Likewise, McCall and Simmons (1969) describe participant observation as "a very complex tactical blend of a number of data-collection techniques" (p.77). Further, they suggest that the overall structure of such a study is "almost undefinable, with research design, data collection, data analysis, and write-up activities all proceeding more or less simultaneously" (p.77).

Had I chosen a participant-only role (surrogate teacher, adult volunteer and/or assistant, an obviously large third-grader), no doubt, I would have had different guiding questions, different perceptions and
methodological puzzles in the field, different insights through full participation, and probably different interpretations than those expressed in this study. However, I walked in children's shoes as best I could and found this posture more liberating than tight-fitting. I did this by trying to be particularly attentive and sensitive to students' expressed concerns and actions--more so than to those of teachers. I reflected often upon my experiences as a nine and ten-year-old and those of former students I had taught.

I chose two primary roles in this study: (1) observer, and (2) participant observer. I was an observer when acclimating myself to settings and people new to me, and I to them. Never was a setting and its occupants so "new" to me than when, indeed, I was a stranger--an outsider poised patiently in silence, waiting to get in and feel "inside." Gaining entry and establishing the observer role was "psyching-out" time. Trust and rapport had to be established; routines for each "group" had to be learned and understood. I, like the students in art class for the first time with a new teacher, needed to figure out how to get along in this new social situation among strangers and potential friends.

When I only observed, I obtained less of the kind of information that I sought--students' meanings and understanding as expressed by them. Building trust and rapport takes two people at least. If there was little or no interaction with students, then trust and rapport—as well as information and understanding—would be long in coming. Brief, informal interactions helped build mutual understanding. As I became more comfortable with the setting and its members and they became more
accustomed to my presence, we began negotiating the participant observer role.

I do not quite know how to explain how one "knows" or senses when it is appropriate to instigate or enter conversation for the first time, or to sit next to children for short periods as they work and not make them feel uncomfortable, or to "get lost" and move on to another location when one realizes—too late—that one has anticipated too much too soon. The researcher's sensitivities possibly are more heightened than those of children, for the researcher pretty much knows why s/he is there and what is at stake. (At least this was my case.) Yet, it works the other way, too. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983, p.77) remark:

Like gatekeepers and sponsors, people in the field will also seek to place and locate the ethnographer within their experience. This is necessary, of course, for them to know how to deal with him or her.

I began moving around the room after the teacher's instruction for an activity. I would leave the tape recorder on the window sill and move quietly about the room, observing what students were making. Student requests for more information regarding specific tasks still were referred to the art teacher as "expert." Requests for evaluation or praise were mirrored back to students with a smile and comments such as, "What do you think?" or "How do you like it?" When students extended or clarified their needs or ideas aloud, this provided much information about their perceptions of tasks and teacher expectations, and it also deferred my role as surrogate teacher. As familiarity settled in, I began sitting with and assisting students (more than assisting the teacher, as in passing out papers). I tried to be "true" to the task at hand by repeating the teacher's directions or specific
art vocabulary verbatim to the students, however, in some instances assistance was problematic.

When I truly did not understand the task or procedures myself and was asked by students for clarification, I honestly had to shrug and say, "I don't know," "I'm not clear myself," or "I'm confused." This honest response seemed to defer the surrogate teacher role and initiated student talk regarding their perceptions of art tasks and teacher expectations. Student recognition that an adult may not have understood a teacher's directions may have helped legitimate their confusion or lack of information. This kind of honesty opened many doors to student talk, expression of their ideas and feelings, and conversation.

Reactivity sometimes occurred with regard to the above, particularly if the teacher overheard my "not knowing how to do x either" statement to a student. A teacher usually was quick to come to the aid of the student and clarify the task, or she would publicly clarify the task to the whole class. At first, this seemed to embarrass some teachers, as in "leaving out some step or something important," as one teacher told me. It may have been embarrassing that another adult could not decipher her directions.

Sometimes I quietly requested clarification from the teacher during a lesson so that I could assist students, but I avoided this for several reasons. The teacher could have perceived my request for clarification as criticism. Secondly, asking for clarification could have been perceived by the teacher as yet another "student" kind of demand on her valuable time and attention. Third, asking for frequent clarification could have encouraged more teacher dependency on my willing assistance.
and allowed a surrogate teacher role to develop. And most importantly, if I were to come to understand student perceptions and understanding, I had to be willing to remain mute and confused as many students did, or patient in the hopes that further clarification from her would be forthcoming. As an adult, I could always clarify teacher expectations after an art class or the following week in shared tape transcripts. I did this more often as the study progressed, feeling trust had been established. A teacher's clarification or elaboration was more often spontaneous and unsolicited after this trust had been established and when the teacher could read the art lesson in transcript form.

Another issue related to the participant observer role presented a moral dilemma. What if I disliked and disagreed with an activity on the grounds that I felt it was unfair, too confusing, or too frustrating to students? Sometimes, I agreed with individuals who complained or were having a difficult time "that x was difficult," or that "I would find x hard to do, too." Sometimes I withdrew into the observer role, snapping pictures or taking time-out on the periphery to record fieldnotes. (See Afterword for further discussion.)

**Role Metamorphosis, Illustrated by Comments and Conversations**

As can be seen from the illustrations above, it is one thing for the researcher to make decisions about his or her role, and it is yet another to resist or negotiate the demands placed upon the researcher by the participants in a study. The researcher's role is no static thing. As I reflected on my own role throughout my methodological diary and fieldnotes, I could tease out changes in participant perceptions of me and my role by examining their comments over time. Figure 3.2
illustrates sample student comments over time, as recorded in fieldnotes and informal interviews.

The use of multiple strategies in collecting data (to be discussed later) instigated student comments that changed over time and revealed a growing familiarity with and acceptance of the research process and my role. My primary methods for collecting data in art classes were recording fieldnotes during scheduled art classes, audiotaping each session from start to finish, and taking photos without flash. Stages of comments regarding fieldnotes ranged from suspicion, to curiosity, to acceptance. Stages related to taking photos can best be described as suspicion, embarrassment for some students (whether these photos were of them working or their work in progress), curiosity, acceptance, and elaboration through stimulated recall while viewing the photos at a later date. (See Appendix B.) Stages related to audiotaping included suspicion, curiosity, clarification of the method, and acceptance. (See Figure 3.3.)

Thus, one can see from these examples that the nature of student comments and questions changed over the course of time—usually from suspicion and curiosity to acceptance of the methodological strategies and me, as researcher. The nature of my responses changed as well, from yielding brief facts to offering more extended and playful responses. Embedded in both student and researcher comments were subtle cues that I had transformed from stranger to friend. Some comments, with accompanying nonverbal expressions, afforded me information and a certain degree of disclosure that often was not given a teacher. Therefore, I felt that I had successfully avoided the surrogate teacher
Beginning Phase---Are you a teacher? (I used to be; now, I'm a student again. I go to OSU.)
What are we going to do today? (I don't know.)
Are you her boss? (No.)
Are you learning how to be a teacher?
(I'm learning about what kids do in art.)

Middle Phase-----Where were you last week? (I was sick).
Oh, who took care of you? (My husband. He made me a lot of chicken soup.)
What does she (teacher) want me to do? (I'm not sure. Why don't you ask her, and she'll help you.)
You draw good. (I like to draw.)
This is my favorite stuff to use. (How come?)
I think this part I did looks neat. (I do, too. Why do you like that part?)
(One student to a new transfer student):
That's just Wanda. We talk to her and she takes pictures.

Later Phase------I don't like doing this; this is stupid! (How come?)
It doesn't make sense. (What doesn't make sense?)
I hate doing people; I can't draw. (They're difficult to draw. What do you like to draw better?)
I can't draw popcorn, but I can sure eat it. (I giggle, and we each pop a kernel in our mouths).
She (teacher) always makes me start over! (Why did she ask you to start over?)
If I do what she (teacher) tells me to do, it'll be wrong, and then she'll make me start over. Why doesn't she tell me to do it right the first time? (What did she tell you to do the first time? Maybe she's confused.)

Figure 3.2. Student and researcher comments over time related to the researcher and her role
Suspicion--------Are you taping us? (Yes, matter-of-factly. Or, the teacher...I have to get down all the teacher's words in the whole art class time.) Why are you taping us? (Said teasingly, as in "Are you playing tricks on us and/or being sneaky?" I shrug, resigned. I have to—it's my homework.)

What's that? (A tape recorder. It hears and remembers better than I do sometimes). [Some students had not seen a tape recorder this size or ever recorded their own voices.]

Curiosity--------Why do you have to use the tape recorder? (I have to remember all the teacher's words when she teaches art; it's part of my homework at OSU.)

Hello-o-o. Whish-h-h. My name is Michael Jackson. [When I sometimes carried the recorder and left it on a table among us as I sat, some students would say "hello" or blow into it. I called this "monkeying around" and asked that students not do that so that the tape could still hear the teacher, wherever she was in the room. They always complied.]

Play it back. (I can't because then it can't hear the teacher. It can't play and hear at the same time). [I did play back parts of student interviews when these were private, but not during class time where such behavior would have disrupted class.]

Clarification----Tell me why you tape again. (I go home and listen to the whole tape. Then I type every word I hear. When I'm finished, the art lesson is like a story that I can read and study, again and again. I learn a lot from it.)

Acceptance------That (transcribing) must be hard to do. (Yes, it is. I have to start and stop, start and stop. I just can't type as fast as people talk.)

That must take forever; I'm glad I don't have your homework. (I'm glad I don't have your homework. That takes time, too, I bet.)

That'd be neat to read. (When I've finished studying this year, I'll give you a little book that will tell you what I've learned.)

Figure 3.3. The stages of student comments regarding audiotaping
role and negotiated access to the students' in this study and their accounts and meanings.

Growing familiarity and development of trust in relationships was similarly true for the art teachers. For example, when I had to attend an out-of-town conference once and miss an art class, the following week the teacher remarked with a big smile, "I missed you last week--I'm getting used to you being around here!" as if she herself were surprised at the familiarity that had unwittingly crept into our relationship. Teachers' expressions changed over time...from that of orienting me to the setting and "their ways," to justifying their actions in the classroom, to that of reflecting on their own practice. Figure 3.4 illustrates examples of these stages, gleaned from fieldnotes and interview transcripts.

Data Collection

The primary method of collecting data in this study was participant observation. The role of the researcher has been discussed previously as a "complex tactical blend of a number of data-collection techniques" (McCall & Simmons, 1969). Others have suggested that participant observation is the "researcher as instrument," particularly when viewed from a more phenomenological framework. And in naturalistic inquiry, data are both the evidence and the clues. "Gathered carefully, they serve as the stubborn facts that save the writing you will do from unfounded speculation" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.73). Following, are data collection strategies and sources of "facts."
Orientation-----The paints didn't come, and I ordered them last summer. So, we're going to be using these today.
I don't let just anyone and everyone get out of their seats to get water—it's just too confusing, and accidents can happen. I get whatever they need.
Would you mind helping punch the holes?
I don't know if you're going to be here this afternoon, but they're going to be doing bicycles and hot wheels, and things like that. I don't know if that would interest you.
There's so much preparation to do for painting.

Justification-----I hope you don't think I'm a tyrant. I firmly believe that you don't just do art.
This is not one of my better lessons.
I don't think it hurts kids to be challenged.
More cut-and-paste today (said sheepishly).

Reflection------I don't know why that was difficult for them. I must have left something out.
I wish I could observe the other art teachers...just to see how they do things.
Sometimes I feel like I'm telling them too much. I don't know, they need guidance sometimes, but...
When I run into problems, I go home and think about what it was—usually I pitch it—pitch the idea if it's been terribly frustrating for a class and say, 'We won't do that again.'

Figure 3.4. Teachers' expressions over time
Fieldnotes

Fieldnotes are written descriptions of people, objects, places, events, activities, and conversations. They also may include the recorded ideas, strategies, reflections, and hunches of a researcher and noted patterns that emerge in the data. Fieldnotes are the "written account of what the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.74).

Data in this study were gather primarily through three kinds of fieldnotes: descriptive, reflective, and summary. Making descriptive fieldnotes meant writing what I observed as objectively as possible, and in as much detail as time would allow. I recorded the passage of time (usually every three to five minutes), attempted to capture dialogue with direct quotes, and tried to be as unevaluative and descriptively concrete as possible. An example follows:

10:50

"This young man's doing a super job with drawing the body shapes. (T holds up John's picture.) He has a leg—they're bigger on the top, and the legs go with the size of the body, and the head—the proportions are good. Now he needs a nice foreground and background." (John seems pleased, smiles.)

[Five children are copying the teacher's rabbit example on the board.]

(T approaches me.) "Mrs.--- had about a hundred National Geographics that they've been looking through before they came here." (T moves away toward another plaintive student hand.)

Tricia still is not drawing. (It's ten minutes into the activity.) As I talk with her, I discover that she wants to draw an elephant, but does not "know what one looks like."
(I approaches Tricia and me.) "Do you have an elephant to look at?" I ask her. Tricia nods "no." I then sends Tina to the library to find a book with an elephant in it.

10:53

[Lionel is having difficulty today with a broken right arm--his "drawing hand," he tells me. Tears well up a bit, and he seems very discouraged.]

The above excerpt of an art lesson illustrates description of events, the time frame in which these took place, a restructuring of dialogue, and other observations. The bracketed statements were for the teacher to clarify at some later time. For example, I wanted to know if the teacher was concerned about students copying her example on the board, rather than finding photos or using their own ideas. (Copying became an issue that I later pursued in depth.) I also wanted to know if the teacher was aware of Lionel's problem and how an art teacher handles such a situation. Bracketed statements were held to a minimum; too many of these shared with a teacher at any given time could have been perceived as evaluative and put her on the defensive.

Reflective fieldnotes were recorded in a methodological diary. In this diary I wrote reflections regarding methodology, potential themes and patterns which seemed to be emerging from the observations, directions for analysis, my frame of mind at the time of an observation, ethical dilemmas, and areas to seek clarification from particular members. An example of reflective fieldnotes, while trying to gain entry into a state conference:

There was something else going on politically. Apparently, the university people who were presenting were planning on "crashing" the affair...they had let their membership slip or plain refused to pay. This was no dice for the organization, and there was much whispering among Ms. North
and a few others about what they would do "when the university contingent arrived." As soon as I got wind of this, I disassociated myself from the University and forged a new name tag for the next day. The "contingent" did show and present, but I don't know that anything happened. It certainly was a "we-they" kind of thing. (FN)

Complementing both descriptive and reflective fieldnotes were summary notes. After each observation, I had quite a distance to drive. During this time, I taped summary statements and reactions to the events of each particular observation, transcribing these when I transcribed audiotapes of the art lessons. I also made notes immediately following each observation to capture any other events or ideas while these were still vivid. I spent many pensive moments writing summary notes in the university parking ramp before re-entering my "own world" and its distracting demands.

Audiotaping

A small, uncoconcealed tape recorder was used to make a record of each art lesson. Such a record was useful for detailed analysis of teacher-student interaction, informal interviews with students, and art content presented. I placed this tape recorder on a window sill near the center of the length of the room, turning it on as soon as the children arrived (or the art teacher), and leaving it on for as long as the tape would run (60 minutes). Because of the 50-60 minute length of art classes, this worked well in capturing teacher directions and clean-up time, as well as the running account of each art lesson as it unfolded. After presentation of the lesson, I often took the tape recorder with me as I sat with various students at different tables and desks. And I used a tape recorder for all semi-structured interviews.
Tapes were transcribed verbatim and woven together with the fieldnotes. I used the fieldnotes to record observations not captured on tape (participant actions, nonverbal behavior, names, numbers of persons when applicable, time, room arrangement, displays, etc.). I used the tapes to record the passage of time, detailed language, stress, and intonation so that these could be played and replayed for detailed analysis. Combined, I obtained a rich, detailed account and description of each art class session—usually 15-30 single-spaced, typewritten pages. This length usually depended upon how long an art teacher dominated class time in her presentation. Thus, I transcribed fieldnotes and tapes simultaneously, translating and weaving raw data into a form that could be used and analyzed in a variety of ways.

Documents

Documents such as the state art curriculum objectives, the local curriculum guides, other local curriculum documents, and the art teachers' lesson plans were a data source. The art teacher substitute packet contained prescribed lesson plans and was used as a data source, as were the evaluation forms used for the assessment of art teachers. Any sources and notices handed out in art staff meetings to art teachers were also given to me. Data related to demographics and achievement levels were obtained from the various classrooms, schools, and the school system.

Photography

A record of art class settings, activities, expressions, and student products was made with 35mm photographs. Film was chosen that
would not require flash (ASA 100 or 400, F-2.2). Because I wanted to record natural events and everyday situations in art classes and not just end products of student work, the non-flash method seemed least obtrusive. "Photographs taken by researchers in the field provide images for later intense inspection about clues to relationships and activities" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.108). I was able to capture teacher examples, classroom displays, room arrangements, the progression of student work from start to finish, degrees of student attentiveness while teachers presented lessons, routines, deviations and disruptions in routines, and students' artistic expressions and interpretations. Because art was the subject-area vehicle in this study and the primary focus related to how students make meaning of their art experiences, the capturing of many kinds of expressions other than verbal—artistic, nonverbal, etc.—seemed not only possible with photos, but desirable.

This photographic record was shared on an intermittent basis with the regular classrooms so students could see the results of such an effort. When semi-structured interviews were conducted with students, these photos were used for stimulated recall related to art activities and classroom events. Through some projective techniques e.g., "What's happening here?" students could refer to these photos, elaborate on the images, and provide insight as to how they viewed their world.

**Informal Interviews**

Informal or unstructured interviews with students and teachers were utilized throughout the inquiry period. Such interviews can best be described as non-directive in that participants initiated conversations or took discussions in whatever directions they preferred (Gouldner,
This approach was used most often with students during the activity portion of their art classes when they were making art or in more relaxed, non-instructional settings (recess, lunch, getting ready to leave class, etc.). With most art teachers, informal times also were utilized for such conversation, for example, immediately preceding or following an art class, over lunch, or in staff meetings. Informal conversations were conducted with classroom teachers, as well.

Such interviews involved the kind of conversation that is developed through a sustained relationship between the participant and the researcher. Thus, as the inquiry progressed over time, conversations became more numerous, frequent, and relaxed. Cottle (1978) remarks, "Without allowing people to speak freely we will never know what their real intentions are, and what the true meaning of their words might be" (p.12). Such conversations were recorded in fieldnotes (descriptive, reflective, or summary notes) or on audiotape, if the recorder was near enough to capture such. An example follows:

[I am helping Lucretta "pick out" her stitching that is terribly tangled. She heaves a big sigh.]

"I hate sewing," she says. "I sew, and she (teacher) makes me take it out. (Pause) She's so nervous."

"What do you mean 'nervous'?"

"Oh, her hands shake and she talks too loud."

"Yeah, she sure is," Ladonna pipes up. "She mean."

"You think so?" I explore, trying to be non-chalant, picking away at the knotted yarn.

"Yeah, she make you stand in the corner and
stuff. I told my Mama 'bout that, and she didn't like it."

"She made you stand in the corner?"

"Yeah, don't you remember? (Pause) Anyhow, she mean. I don't even like sewing. I want to be a secretary when I grow up—not a artist." (Lucretta and Denise giggle, as Ladonna shoves her stitchery away from her on her desk and throws her head onto her propped hands in seeming disgust.) (FN)

Semi-Structured Interviews with Students

When more was understood about the contexts and participants in this study, I presented particular issues and questions in the form of semi-structured interviews. Many open-ended and Likert-type questions were developed from my observations of students and activities in the field. These interviews were a way to obtain triangulation through member checks (to be discussed later) regarding some of my budding analyses and interpretations. For example, at the end of each of the two semesters of art instruction I conducted semi-structured interviews. Students were asked to choose their favorite, least favorite, easiest, and most difficult art lessons from graphic representations and summaries of these lessons. The open-ended questions of "Why?" or "How's That?" were attached to all questions. The interview guide was prepared initially as a questionnaire, but I believed that I would get more information serendipitously from interviews and would enjoy the continued verbal interchange with students in the process. Thus, I used a paper instrument to allow students to record some of their responses (checking Likert-scale type items), but I audiotaped these interviews so that lengthy responses did not have to be written by students. I then transcribed these interviews verbatim. (See Appendix C.)
In the third grade, 76% (63/83) of the students were interviewed. School representation was as follows: School A-1, 63% (17/27); School B-1, 78% (21/27); and School C, 86% (25/29). In the fourth grade, 72% (44/61) of the students were interviewed. School representation was as follows: School A-2, 71% (22/31); and School B-2, 73% (22/30). All target students were interviewed.

The above interviews, requiring about a half-hour per student, were conducted in empty library and nursing offices, during recess periods, the afternoons (with the classroom teacher's sanction), or over brown-bag lunches with students. The classroom teachers were most accommodating to this enterprise and interested in the findings, and because there was so much student enthusiasm I never sat idle for volunteers e.g., "When is it going to be my turn?" Most of the students were remarkably relaxed and talkative, particularly after the initial questions; a few students were extremely shy, and I tried to allow for ample wait time for responses before rewording questions or moving on to others.

The Card Game

Some questions (sentence completions) were typed in a large typeface on ten 3 x 5 index cards with colorful stickers or pictures on the backs. I had developed this strategy in a pilot study, and it worked particularly well with shy students or for conversations early in the research cycle. The only introduction needed during an art activity was, "You wanna pick a card?" as I fanned out the cards. Invariably, students responded with enthusiasm, picking a card, reading the question, and responding to it. I never asked a student to address more
than two or three questions at a time and would move on to another student. I did this only the first semester. (See Appendix C for examples and Afterword related to ethical issues.)

**Semi-Structured Interviews with Adults**

Aside from the numerous informal encounters with the art teachers, three semi-structured interviews were conducted with three of the four art teachers; one could not seem to "find the time" to do this. Time was set aside during lunch, planning periods, or over a glass of wine after school. These interviews were audiotaped. The nature of the questions related to teacher goals, planning, curriculum documents, background, past experience, perceptions of the particular art class and students in the study, and particularly discussion of shared fieldnotes and audiotaped transcripts.

Three semi-structured interviews were conducted with the art supervisor. The first was to gather information regarding the program and staff; the second, to gain information regarding the supervisor's role and to clarify patterns and themes constructed midway through the inquiry; and the third, to help clarify and interpret my findings as they had evolved. For example, during one luncheon with the art supervisor, I presented a half-page outline of a "typical" staff meeting, noting the topics usually covered, by whom, and for what length of time. She confirmed this amalgamated picture as a "typical" art staff meeting.
Paper Instruments for Data Gathering

Paper instruments were developed not only to gather data, but to clarify my observations and interpretations. Likewise, these instruments provided data that could be analyzed across groups and individual data sources.

Student Pre-Check

"Poor Zork" was an instrument administered by the classroom teachers to their students before formal art instruction began (see Appendix D). Zork was an imaginary creature from outerspace who knew nothing about art. It was hoped that these preliminary questions would enlighten me as to student perceptions, interests, and understanding entering formal art instruction, as such perceptions or preconceptions might influence their experiences in formal art instruction. The one-page instrument included seven open-ended items, such as, "What is art? Zork just heard that word, and he doesn't know what it means," or, "What is your favorite thing to draw or paint? Why?" The last was a 5-point Likert item in the form of facial expressions requesting student evaluation of themselves as artists, from "Terrible!" to "Terrific!"

Most of the items were repeated in the semi-structured interviews, following formal art instruction. Despite all the potential intervening variables for change or sameness in responses over time (before art instruction and following a semester of art instruction), a description was sought of these changes, both individually and by groups.
Art Teacher Context Check

After several weeks of observation in art staff meetings during Phase I, a true-false instrument was developed related to the program context, as viewed by the art staff. This was structured true-false, with room for comments to obtain a certain "factual" account regarding the program and to require less time of busy art teachers to complete. Some of the items were purposefully loaded to provoke a response or commentary. This was a "member check" instrument to clarify observations and information; it was given to all 10 art teachers and their supervisor to take home and complete. (See Appendix E). There were 30 statements, such as, "I work with about 100 students a day," or, "My school-related work is from 8:30 to 3:30 only, unlike other teachers who must grade papers, attend faculty or PTA meetings, etc." Space was left for comments related to each item, and Item #31 asked respondents to create and answer their own question if they wished. Most respondents chose to comment on each item, clarifying the statements where they felt necessary. The true-false responses were calculated in percentages, and all comments were analyzed for patterns and themes. Nine persons (90%) responded to this instrument, one of whom was the art supervisor.

Questionnaires

The questionnaire for students already has been discussed under the semi-structured interview section. Questionnaires were developed for art teachers, classroom teachers, and parents of the students in this study after the third-grade semester of art instruction. Several parallel items were included among these data sources for analysis.
within and across groups, and these will be presented in the findings.

The art teacher questionnaire was developed to obtain information beyond the four teachers participating in this study. Responses on this instrument would help me see commonalities and distinctions related to all the art teachers and the program as a whole. This questionnaire requested personal information e.g., background, university degrees, inservice, participation in arts-related activities beyond the school system context, etc. It contained 20 items (primarily 5-point Likert scale items), ranking items for curriculum goals, media they thought third graders preferred, and open-ended items, such as, "In teaching art to third graders, what comes easiest for you? Why?" This questionnaire was submitted to the art teachers by mail in the summer of 1984. Seven of the ten teachers (70%) responded. (See Appendix F.)

The parent and classroom teacher questionnaires followed much the same format as the art teacher questionnaire, above. (See Appendix F). Information from the third-graders' parents was sought to help me understand the students in this study, what was available to them, and what they might experience related to art beyond the school context. Parent attitudes and home-community art resources could potentially influence the nature of student art experiences beyond and within the school setting. (I piloted a very similar instrument in an earlier study.)

There was a very low response rate to this questionnaire, 36% or 30/83. Responses related to schools were as follows: School A-1, 25% or 7/27; School B-1, 37% or 10/27; and School C, 45% or 13/29. One clue to the low response is the length of the questionnaire, even though it
looked longer than I felt it would actually take to complete. One student brought back her parents' empty questionnaire and said, "My mamma said this was too long." The poorer the school population, the lower the response, although the success of this could have been improved considerably had the classroom teachers assisted more with the follow-up. But I felt I could not ask teachers to do this in their busy schedule, and I could not afford a second mailing. I did send many extra questionnaires home with students, to little avail.

The classroom teacher questionnaires could yield information regarding particular students, what kinds of art activities took place beyond the scope of this study in the regular classroom, and teachers' perceptions and beliefs that might influence students' experiences in art—in both the art class context and the regular classroom context. I gave these only to the three third-grade teachers. Learning from experience, I got much more information through informal and frequent discussions with busy teachers.

Feedback Instruments

Findings reported to students, parents, teachers, and the art staff were organized in such a way that responses to these could be used for extended data collection and triangulation. For example, I wrote and illustrated three booklets, designed primarily for students and their parents. These contained major descriptive findings for each of the three groups of students. (See Appendix G.) All three descriptive booklets were given to the art staff toward the end of this study. In a staff meeting, the art staff contributed their feedback and observations of commonalities and distinctions among the three booklets. The three
primary questions asked of the art staff regarding the three booklets were: (1) What seems common among these three art classes? (2) What appears to be distinctive? And, (3) after such an analysis, what do you think art meant to these particular students?

Based upon the above exercise, summary reports were distributed to the art staff. Clarification and elaboration of the findings were requested of the art staff, thus, even during feedback strategies, data continued to be collected and interpretations extended or refined.

**Data Analysis**

As has been suggested previously, analysis in naturalistic inquiry does not happen entirely post facto of all data gathering strategies. Indeed, analysis has a character of simultaneity and continuity with other methodological issues and strategies and is self-corrective and cumulative in nature (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). However, as indicated earlier in the Inquiry Time Line (p.43), there were major analytical periods in this research.

**Coding and Indexing**

Multiple strategies were used for gathering data in this study, thus multiple tools and levels of analysis were necessary, as well. Three levels of analysis were utilized: (1) coding by themes or patterns contained within and constructed from individual data sources; (2) coding by themes or patterns across data sources in search of commonalities and distinctions within and among groups; and (3) conceptual analysis which guided the inquiry and contributed to theoretical analysis and interpretation of data.
(1) Coding and Indexing within Individual Data Sources. Data sources were fieldnotes; taped transcripts of art lesson sessions; taped transcripts of all semi-structured and many informal interviews; responses to closed and open items on questionnaires; photos of student and teacher activity in art classes and their products or artifacts; and documents, such as teacher lesson plans, the art curriculum guide, and the art substitute packet. Schatzman and Strauss (1973) refer to this "within-source" level of analysis as "analytic description." An organizational scheme is developed from "discovered classes and linkages suggested or mandated by the data" (p.110).

An example of analytic description from this study is the construction of labels for art class routine from the information provided by students in the third-grade interviews. Teacher "explanation" was a label for a category of student descriptions such as, "She tells us what to do," "She tells us how to do it," or "She explains it to us." This category differed from "demonstrating," where students said, "She shows us how to do it," "she makes one," or "she makes us an example." Thus, the categories and/or labels were constructed from a recurrence of descriptors that the students themselves used; the categories were not constructed prior to the gathering of interview data. Therefore, the raw data and recurrence of particular descriptors dictated certain categories and their boundaries, for which I then created appropriate labels.

(2) Coding by themes or patterns across data sources in search of commonalities and distinctions. This coding probed new themes or patterns which could be constructed by comparative-contrastive analysis.
For example, student responses in semi-structured interviews were compared across three student groups to ascertain in what ways these groups were alike or different. Another example was an analysis of responses to parallel items on questionnaires from parents, classroom teachers, art teachers, and student interviews in relation to the goals presented in the art curriculum guide. Thus, several data sources were used to construct categories that were common or distinctive across groups or across multiple data sources. This is also known as "triangulation," and it is a means of testing the internal or construct validity of data.

(3) A conceptual analysis guided the inquiry and interpretations of the findings. The primary conceptual framework in this study has been described as interactionist or constructivist in nature. This perspective, along with the phenomena I encountered in the field, guided the investigation, the nature of my questions and observations, and the direction of my analyses and interpretations. Subsequent discoveries made throughout the study influenced the ways in which I would construct and interpret findings. For example, toward the middle of this study, I kept asking myself, 'Why aren't there more distinctions among these art classes and instructional approaches than there seem to be?' I asked myself toward the end of the study, as the feedback of my findings grew imminent, the following question: Once the art staff and supervisor read these findings, will anything change? The answer that persisted was, 'Perhaps there would be only minimal change, if any.' This potential answer troubled me deeply. Findings which illustrated a preponderance of routine and control through teachers' expectations for
realistic student representations suggested I might re-examine program constraints through structural analysis (Gibson, 1984). It also seemed appropriate to review critical theory to explore notions of control, larger social structures, or educational exchange.

Thus, the conceptual framework was tentative and amorphous in the beginning of this study. Because of difficulties gaining access to schools in the beginning of this study and my personal resistance to narrowing the focus so early on, I focused on the professional staff, program structures, and curriculum documents where I did have access. When I finally could enter schools, my focus shifted to the lifeworld of students and teachers in the school context. And when finally in the art classes, I focused on the instruction and learning that took place there, continuously relating it to the regular classroom. Once in the art classes, I focused more and more on individual students, the meanings they made of these experiences, what they brought to the art class with their own beliefs and out-of-school activities. And once I had a reasonable grasp of these meanings, I turned back to the larger structures of the program, the official curriculum, and the enterprise of schooling itself. Thus, the shape of this conceptual framework narrowed and widened continuously in a reflexive process throughout this inquiry.

The Mechanics of Coding and Indexing

The data were analyzed in an on-going process by the way in which they were recorded and organized. For example, I kept a methodological diary where I recorded my reflections as a researcher and the dimensions of my role in field work. This diary helped me examine the issues of
reactivity and my developing relationships in the field with children and teachers. It also allowed me to go back, in retrospect, and examine the potential stimuli and consequences of my sampling decisions.

By bracketing tentative questions in transcripts of fieldnotes, art lessons, and interviews, I could establish a record of theoretical notions to be pursued. For example, I could go back through transcripts to see what issues I raised (and when), and what kinds of data seemed to influence these as "issues" in my mind. I also made several copies of transcripts—one for the art teacher and several for me—where I could jot down ideas in the margins, raise further questions, and eventually resort to a cut-and-paste method of analysis with the use of "thesis cards."

As with official paper documents (the art curriculum or teacher's lesson plans), I did content analyses of these "texts" and transcripts, highlighting and coding patterns from the data. Content analysis is any technique for making inferences by systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages (Holsti, 1969, p.25). Sometimes the unit of analysis was as small as a particular part of speech (a certain noun, verb, or phrase) that kept cropping up e.g., "There's only so much time!" (in teacher interviews and questionnaires). Sometimes the unit of analysis was based upon a major idea or category, such as analyzing the messages of the local curriculum documents in relation to the three major categorical messages of the state objectives or Efland's four theoretical orientations to art education, each of which carries certain descriptors.
I continued to refer back to these transcripts as new patterns or categories and their parameters were constructed from the data, keeping my initial guiding questions in mind. Negative examples and evidence were sought at all levels of analysis to exhaust category parameters, to create new categories, to illustrate commonalities and distinctions among individuals or groups, and to avoid the pitfall of speculating or generalizing beyond the scope of the data.

I color-coded photocopies of transcripts (a color per category), once I had constructed categories that emerged from and were supported by the data. This meant that different excerpts might have had only one category assigned to them, and some may have had several colors or "category fits." I continued to classify and reclassify by cross-referencing and expanding or delimiting categories. This method of analysis is described as the "constant-comparative" method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Once the color-coding had been accomplished, I used a punched card system (Indecks) that allowed a great deal of flexibility for analysis. Each card had the same numbered holes around the edges. After gluing on each unit of data, the appropriate hole and/or holes were punched (with its adjacent edge cut off as well). These cut-off places represented categories. A needle inserted into a category in the stack of cards allowed all cards pertaining to this category to fall off. Thus, data could be organized, retrieved, and analyzed in many different thematic ways, although it was time-consuming initially to transfer copy to cards.
Analysis of Questionnaires and Instruments

Open-ended items on questionnaires and in semi-structured interviews were coded by themes and patterns through content analysis. When appropriate, frequencies and percentages were calculated on open-ended items that had been categorized through content analysis. For example, in relation to the question, "What do you find difficult to do in art?" most of the third-grade students made references to particular media or control of media (49%); while twenty-seven percent (27%) noted particular subject matter that was difficult to draw.

Where Likert scale items were used, point values were assigned to each statement, ranging from 1-5, negative to positive attitude, respectively. The results of these were calculated so that these could be reported in percentages within individual groups or across groups. For example, twenty-eight percent (28%) of all the fourth-grade students interviewed (n = 43) felt they were "terrific" artists; in Schools A-2 and B-2 the responses were 23% (5/22) and 33% (7/21), respectively.

In summary, the presentation of questionnaire results within this document account for the response rate for each item given, as well as the total sample size and the overall percentage of returns and/or responses, since all respondents may not have answered all questions. Where appropriate, relationships between different variables and across parallel items were investigated. Such findings were used to generate hypotheses—not to test them, as direct cause-effect relationships were not sought in this inquiry. It would have been inappropriate to treat ordinal data any differently without using more sophisticated statistical strategies. I also wanted to use descriptive statistics so
that practitioners could understand the numerical findings.

**Triangulation**

*Triangulation* is a term borrowed from psychological reports (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) to refer to situations when "a hypothesis can survive the confrontation of a series of complementary methods of testing" (Webb et al., 1966, p.174). Triangulation also can refer to comparing a number of data sources (as mentioned earlier) or comparing a number of accounts of the same events (Burgess, 1984, p.144). For example, when I shared fieldnotes and taped transcripts of art lessons with the art teachers, this was triangulation. Their responses to these recorded events and my observations either corroborated or clarified my observations and interpretations. Although fieldnotes and transcripts, per se, were not shared with students, I shared observations with them through probing questions. For example, during an interview with a student who had persistently complained about art tasks and "given up" in almost every lesson over the term:

"Juan, how much did you like art class this year?" I inquire.

"I loved it," Juan quips, matter-of-factly.

"You didn't ever get discouraged?" (Sensing an anomaly, I probe with a leading question).

"About two or three times."

Later in the interview, I asked Juan what he had learned in art that he did not know before. He replied:

"If you don't try to draw, then nothing that you do might never come out right."
"So, you gotta try—is that what you learned?"

"Hm-hm."

What Juan said that he learned surprised both the art teacher and me because his "negative" attitude persisted, even into the fourth-grade semester. The art teacher described Juan as "belligerent." His behavior seemed to have supported her interpretation, no matter how consistently supportive the art teacher was of Juan, or how varied the art tasks were in degree of difficulty for most students. Juan never seemed confident about any upcoming art task or pleased with the way any of his work turned out. In relation to the other students, he requested a lot of teacher attention, he pouted, cried, complained, and often was reprimanded gently for being disruptive or not paying attention.

So, what does one do when confronted with such an anomaly of "facts?" Shaffir, Stebbins and Turowetz (1980, p.215) share some ideas regarding the candidness of participants:

Triangulation is a method that seeks ancillary data to corroborate statements made by the focus population... Triangulating methods enable the researcher to check the candidness of respondents' replies, illuminate various perceptions of events, and offer competing interpretations of respondents' worlds.

In the case of Juan, it was not that I doubted his sincerity, rather, I felt that he merely parroted what he felt he "should" have said or what someone wanted to hear that he "had learned" in the more formal interview setting. His behavior during art classes over two semesters did not corroborate his statement, nor did his "about two or three times" illustrate his chronic discouragement that was apparent to me, the art teacher, his peers, and his regular classroom teacher. With
regard to triangulation then, credibility and structural corroboration were sought by pursuing "hunches" through various data sources and accounts (observing a student over an extended period of time, questioning the student in an interview, and discussing this student with the art teacher and classroom teacher, for example).

In another example, art teacher responses were sought to clarify my observations of their "program context." This was triangulated in that I presented the results of this open-ended paper instrument to the teachers for further clarification and discussion. When these observations were corroborated, I felt that I could represent the "facts" of their situation fairly and honestly. I triangulated data when comparing information related to students' home or community art activity obtained through parent questionnaires to that provided by student interviews.

Triangulation was accomplished through different member accounts of the same events (teachers, students, researcher), which frequently is called "member checks" in the literature. Triangulation through member checks can help the researcher define and refine the boundaries of categories. For example, Guba and Lincoln (1981, p.316) suggest that:

The 'member-check' sample can serve a useful purpose in addition to that of commenting on data already collected; it can help...to confirm the existence of categories implied by the original data set but that had not yet emerged and to flesh out those incomplete categories of information already identified. (p.316)

Thus, under the category of "student frustration" which had emerged in this study, Juan became both an example and a non-example of this category. In one regard, he was a representative example of
"frustration" because his actions appeared to be that of a frustrated person. Yet, Juan was not representative of the kind of frustration that was exhibited on occasion by the other members in this study. Their frustration was acute and occasional, but Juan's frustration was chronic.

The above point is critical in that it illustrates the need to use multiple research strategies over extended time in the field. Had I only observed Juan in the classroom, I would have made one interpretation: Juan seemed to be a frustrated and disruptive child during art class. Had I only interviewed Juan (without classroom observations), I would have formed a totally different interpretation: Juan was a seemingly confident and polite little boy who probably tried very hard to do art tasks; he seemed to have a rather mature attitude about his abilities. And certainly, informal conversations with Juan's teachers further illuminated my interpretations. Recognizing differences in evidence was not to dismiss Juan's account, but to put his account into perspective and to treat it and his actions as distinctive in some ways from those of the other students. As Guba and Lincoln (1981, p.107) state:

> Obviously, the naturalistic investigator cannot place very much confidence in single observations or deductions. Each will contain its modicum of error, perhaps sufficient to cause suspension of belief if no other evidence is available. But when various bits of evidence all tend in one direction, that direction assumes far greater credibility.

**Peer Debriefing**

In the first year of this study, I met twice a month with three other members of a research group. This group was composed of other.
doctoral students involved in naturalistic inquiry. Our fieldnotes, budding interpretations, preliminary analyses, and methodological and/or reflective notes were distributed, prior to our meetings. Our discussions helped monitor preliminary analyses, particularly with regard to the development of category systems. For example, I shared raw data from two sets of responses on the "student pre-check," administered to students prior to their formal art instruction. I requested the group members construct categories related to the data provided, while I, myself, had done so (but not shared these with the members). At the next meeting, our category constructions were shared. The high degree of similarity and number of categories created among the group members using the same raw data functioned as a kind of "interrater reliability."

Through discussions during such meetings, potential researcher bias and multiple interpretations related to each person's study were addressed. Aside from the positive technical, systematic, and instructional aspects of forming such a group, the emotional support was invaluable. Like minds experienced the highs and lows of doing such inquiry, rarely in synchrony and often vicariously.

Summary

This chapter has described the conceptual orientation of this study, its inherent design, the inquiry cycle, and the methodological strategies employed. Also discussed were methodological issues that I encountered during the course of my research e.g., gaining access, selectivity and sampling, and role dimensions of the researcher. The more technical aspects of data recording, organization, retrieval, and
analysis were presented so that the reader might judge the extent to which the study was trustworthy and systematic.

The methodological approach to this study was an attempt to examine the complexity of a situation and its members in more ways than one. I sought out the richness and distinctiveness of individuals, groups, and contexts within a larger programmatic setting where constraining or liberating influences could be explored. One limitation in this study may have been this extended interest. Some readers may strain for more idiosyncracy and detail, say in only one classroom, while others may be tempted to overgeneralize because it isn't about one classroom. Some may believe I have little focus and "a lot of little interesting studies here," while others may believe I could not have addressed the problem I did without looking at all of the areas I explored. Because of the broader scope of this case study, however, I believe the findings illustrate how the teaching-learning process is nested in layers of particular contexts, each of which might influence the kinds of understandings students can make.

Some readers may not benefit much from the statistical findings, charts, and graphs, perhaps sensing that the "true grit" and richness of qualitative research has been underestimated or downplayed in this presentation. Others may find the descriptive sections and dialogue distracting, not wanting to wade through the nuances and detail of conversation and classroom talk. Perhaps the two approaches will complement each other, and each kind of "language" can convey what the other cannot.
Some readers may struggle with wanting to know what students "really" learned in terms of how they might perform as young developing artists. The students could have been asked to draw a table top in perspective or match art vocabulary with definitions, but I chose to use the photographic record of student work, their own accounts, those of their teachers and parents, and mine as sufficient evidence of learning. If I believed learning art could only be evidenced in drawing skills or word recognition, I might have chosen to design a pretest and post test of this sort.

Another concern of the readers may relate to how I selected particular quotations as evidence to illustrate certain points. The strength of patterns and themes was established through the noted frequency and pervasiveness of certain comments or participant actions, as well as through triangulation (discussed earlier). In such cases, I chose a representative verbal example from this category, and in several cases, I presented more than one quote. By the same token, I tried to present non-examples, negative evidence, or variations to balance my interpretations and presentation. Negative evidence was used not only to support an argument for the positive evidence, but to illustrate the distinctions inherent within a group. Not to have presented negative evidence or a range of comments when possible would have been naive on my part. Although a group may share many beliefs, a group still is made up of individual perceptions and multiple realities.

By the title of this inquiry and subsequent explorations and interpretations, it will become apparent to the reader that a potential positive bias exists toward youngsters. I identified strongly with
students and hereby acknowledge this possibility.

The presentation of the findings of this study begins in the next chapter. Chapter IV provides a description of the art program context, along with the potential social structures that might have influenced what was to be presented to students. The explicit and/or "official" curriculum documents are analyzed in detail. From this presentation, it is hoped that the reader will better understand the programmatic expectations of art teachers and students.
Chapter IV

THE PROGRAM CONTEXT AND EXPLICIT CURRICULUM

The Program Context

This chapter will present the findings related to the context of the third and fourth-grade art program and the explicit or "official" curriculum. Following, is my introduction to this program, as reflected in my first on-site fieldnotes.

This morning is to be my first contact with the art teachers and their supervisor. It's raining, depressingly so, and has been for days. The morning is foggy, the trees zipping by my car window especially brilliant in the autumn bog. Traffic on the expressway is painfully erratic, and I am worried that I won't find the place or arrive on time.

My destination is Fort Armand, a revitalized armory building that now houses spacious galleries and work areas for the public school system. This is the home base of the third and fourth-grade art teachers and their supervisor, where art in-service for regular faculty frequently is conducted, where art resources and materials are housed, where fifth graders attend a few special field trips, where enrolled secondary students spend some of their school week in the visual and performing arts.

Inside is a stairwell leading up to something like a clock tower, I think, because of the round windows atop it. Wooden beams cross at the top. The stairs seem new, protruding slightly with glass and polished rails away from the original brick that encloses the huge vertical entry. I discover later that this entry area was the "drop" tower. A naturally fed spring flowed through the bottom of this tower, and hot lead was hauled up once-existing stairs that hugged the brick interior. This molten lead was dropped several feet below into the cool spring water to make ammunition pellets.
I climb up to the third floor, and it opens into a wide warehouse effect with an old polished wooden floor that strains slightly as I creep across it. Windows align the north and south walls, and brick, chimney-like supports thrust up to the tall ceiling. Nevertheless, it is so cavernous a place and so dismal beyond the windows in the rain that it seems rather dark.

Beyond the elevator on the right, which ends precariously before the high ceiling, I spot Mrs. North wrestling with immense rolls of white paper stretched across several tables that have been pushed together. This is the art supervisor. As we introduce ourselves early this Monday morning, I am told that she is planning on painting 500 placemats for an upcoming state art conference. The art teachers will help paint, and the long sheets will be cut into placemats. She wants a design with "beads, colorful, black, to match the poster theme" she shows me. The posters will be rolled up as a center piece for each table at the banquet, and there will be "votive candles here and there."

"We don't start until 8:30, so just make yourself at home," she says, as she continues to happily spread out long rolls of white paper. I am struck by the resources at the teachers' fingertips. Numerous slide kits, seemingly developed by teachers or the supervisor herself, as they are not commercial kits. These relate to pattern, the circus, lines, American art, etc. Things are well-organized in boxes with labels. Carousel slide trays can be checked out, along with projectors, laminated prints of famous art, photos of interesting elements and designs.

I pour over the shelves, noting tin cans, egg cartons, two deep double sinks, three large looms, a classroom sitting area with chalkboard and individual adult-sized desk-chairs, work tables with chairs around them. There are large wooden cabinets which appear to be the individual art teachers' "lockers." Mrs. North has a small desk and phone near the cluster of work tables that have been pushed together with white paper on them. This is only her "part-time" office; half of her time is spent in another location called a resource center, where her secretary is located.

Several of the art teachers begin to slowly drift in. Their weekly staff meeting is to last from 8:30 to 9:30, and then the teachers will drive off to the schools assigned to them. Mrs. North introduces me and announces that I will be "presenting something in a few minutes." I am not aware of this presentation, and my mind races. (FN, 10/24/83)*

* FN = Fieldnotes
CC = Context Check (1/84)
Q = Questionnaire (7/84)
I = Interview
The fieldnotes above portray the character and quality of the programmatic setting for this art program. If one enjoys the arts, vicariously or otherwise, one cannot help but feel his/her blood race a little when entering this refurbished building that is busy with the sights and sounds of the visual arts. The place does not "feel" like a school or district-building setting because it isn't. Student and adult art works are aesthetically displayed in the spacious first-floor gallery. The internal spaces of this building are expansive and airy. Classes of fifth-graders march through the guided tour of the gallery, the hallway that has glassed in the secondary students perched on stools at their drafting tables, into the photo lab and dark room where secondary students are experimenting, through a maze of displays related to our popular culture, under the canopy of a large parachute, and into the world of art—led by an art specialist.

This seemingly vital and sanctified world of art, however, is not really a part of the world of the art teachers in this program, but for the brief, Monday morning staff meetings or an occasional visit during the week to gather more supplies or visuals. This rich image possibly fades quickly from the minds of the third and fourth-grade art specialists. Their world is the world of schools—ancient or new, crowded or sparse, with or without art room space to conduct art classes, and most commonly without. They must create and re-create a world of art in real school settings.

**Serving a Vast Population**

As was mentioned in Chapter III, the third and fourth-grade art program served approximately 6,000 youngsters in this large, midwestern
public school system. Each of the ten art specialists were assigned to about 120 students a day, 3-5 schools per semester, and about 1200 youngsters a year, teaching both third and fourth-grade levels. According to state guidelines, elementary students are to have at least 80 minutes per week for art. Third graders received art instruction for about 50-60 minutes, once a week with an art specialist their second semester only; fourth graders, likewise, their first semester only. Other art experiences were to be provided by the classroom teacher.

The third and fourth-grade arrangement of this program was complicated somewhat by busing. Third graders attended different feeder schools as fourth graders, usually within the same vicinity of the primary schools. Thus, students were reconfigured into new groups and classrooms, with only a small cluster of an original third grade group remaining intact in each (about 5-8 students). Aside from this reconfiguration, the art teachers who taught third grade art were not assigned necessarily to the feeder schools of these same students. Thus, the art teachers worked with some of the same youngsters they had in the third grades, as well as with youngsters new to them. Nothing is wrong, superficially, with this reorganization or assignment of persons; however, with regard to curriculum matters, this may prove problematic (to be discussed later).

The Art Supervisor

Mrs. North worked with 87 teachers in the system, and only ten of these were the elementary art specialists in this program. Her "typical" day included working directly out in the field with students or teachers, in the community, and "somehow on a broad kind of
curriculum and instructional development or revision, or whatever it may be." She illuminated her community responsibilities:

Part of each day (is spent) on some kind of civicly-involved project intended to make visible what's happening in (Local) Public Schools—sometimes that's not about art. But because art and music and a couple of other areas are involved with the community a whole lot, more than say a language arts or social studies-geography areas, we are the natural liaison... (Interview)

One glance at Mrs. North's calendar, each square packed with places to be and things to do, and it was not difficult to see how demanding her position was in a variety of ways. She provided in-service for school faculties after school; worked closely with a few marginal middle school art teachers by demonstrating a lesson, assisting them with their lesson, and checking on the third lesson of the day. She observed and evaluated those teachers who were up for evaluation; worked with other area supervisors, coordinators, and teachers in curriculum and instructional matters; worked with personnel, screening substitute art teachers; and attended meetings with community organizations where student art often was requested of her. She seemed very careful about screening requests so that student art for peripheral decorative causes was kept to a minimum and did not interfere with the regular art program or take advantage of students. The art program itself included at least two major, highly visible art exhibits a year; other exhibits or contests were held to a minimum, and these were voluntary on the part of the art teachers. On the whole, Mrs. North seemed very responsive to the particular needs of school faculties, principals, teachers, and the community, somehow juggling all of these responsibilities and remaining pleasant, supportive, and in good spirits at the same time.
Monday Morning Staff Meetings

Every Monday morning at 8:30, the ten art teachers and Mrs. North had a staff meeting. This time of the week had been selected because some principals complained that Monday morning was too crucial a time of day and week to start off with art activities, according to some of the art teachers' reports (1). Although special activities may have occurred during staff meetings, such as the supervisor's request of art teachers to volunteer painting placemats for a convention or their own need to matt student work for an arts festival, most often there was a fairly typical pattern to these meetings. Figure 4.1 illustrates a composite of a typical 8:30-9:30 staff meeting.

Staff meetings rarely began at 8:30, as some teachers arrived late, and others scurried about gathering materials needed for the week or returning materials and/or resources from the previous week. The teachers appeared to be rather self-contained and quiet, with little talk or chatter among themselves, each going his or her own direction, a few sitting and waiting around the cluster of work tables near the supervisor's desk.

Mrs. North seemed very organized for staff meetings, spending about twenty minutes making announcements and passing out materials and forms. Much of the manpower needed for constructing display panels and delivering materials was supplied by a gentleman working with Mrs. North. However, it seemed that the teachers did most of the matting of student work in their spare time, usually in the evenings or on weekends.
Time | Substance or Content
--- | ---
8:30 | Staff meetings usually 10-15 minutes late starting, as some teachers arrive late and others are scurrying about gathering materials and resources for the week or returning materials.

8:45 | Announcements from Supervisor (usually 20-25 minutes)
Passing out materials, copies of warehouse catalogue, School Arts Magazine, travel vouchers, mileage forms, medical forms, advertising fliers, university course offerings, etc.
Announcements related to an up-coming arts festival, exhibit, or special event where student work is needed; how much is needed, how it will be displayed, labeled. Requests and direction for teacher participation in hanging exhibits, manning a booth, doing an activity at an affair.
Announcements related to status of supply orders or new materials on market; ordering supplies; discussion of condition of kilns; availability of supplies and resources.

9:10 | Designated, scheduled art teacher to "present" (about 5 minutes).
One teacher on calendar presents student work/activity a group has done; shows student samples, explains procedures; relates interest of students or success of activity.
A question or two from one of the teachers listening about the procedures or the media.

9:15 | Meeting begins to break up; a teacher usually asks the supervisor a question about availability of supplies, how to work with a particular principal or school staff, or question about upcoming exhibit and procedures.
Brief clarification.

9:17 | Some teachers organizing to leave the premises; some leave, some linger to gather materials; some request individual information from the supervisor (FN & I)

Figure 4.1. The "Typical" Staff Meeting
The art teachers then had about five to ten minutes allotted for one of them scheduled to "present." "Presenting" meant the designated art teacher brought in samples of student work from a particular project and shared these in the meeting. S/he explained the procedures and usually addressed how well the students liked the activity or worked with the materials or concepts. Although teacher interest seemed high, there was usually little time left to ask questions or have a discussion. Mrs. North did not always attend to this "presentation," as she sometimes was busy getting other materials organized for a faculty in-service or working with the gentleman (above) who made deliveries.

The staff meeting usually ended fifteen minutes short of the hour designated, whereupon teachers readied for the week by gathering needed visuals or resources. Some chose to do this, but most hurried off to their "Monday" schools to start their week.

A couple of times, Mrs. North or a teacher brought in fresh fruit or juice for the staff, but rarely was the staff meeting a social occasion with coffee, donuts, or discussion while announcements were made. Although relatively pleasant, almost everyone but the supervisor seemed rather withdrawn, preoccupied, and pressed to get on with their week. Thus, the flavor of these meetings was business-like and silent, but for the primary speaker of the moment and any pressing practical concerns. When time was left for practical discussion, the teachers appeared more animated and contributed potential solutions to shared problems:

The teacher "presenting" today mentions her difficulty with the custodial staff at one school who has complained about ceramic clay dust all over the floor. She asks how to handle this.
"I hate to have a custodial staff dictate my curriculum," she inserts.

There is a brief discussion about different types of table cloths (oil cloth vs. plastic sheets). Mrs. North says the plastic "slips and slides, but not if you tape it to the floor." Another suggests that she has to work with individual student desks and uses chip board that she takes up at the end of each period. Newspapers are a problem because "students never remember to bring it in from one week to the next." The teacher "presenting" throws up her hands in exasperation, seeing no real solution.

Another teacher says she "pays" students for newspaper, and thus gets it. "For every clean, refolded newspaper a student brings in, he or she receives three sheets of 12 x 18 white drawing paper." Apparently, she does not have a newspaper problem, and white drawing paper is a coveted commodity among youngsters. The issue doesn't seem resolved for the teacher with the immediate problem, as the rest disperse for the day. (FN)

Discussions like that above were rare in staff meetings. Most often, staff meetings were made up of announcements e.g., "We need to get student labels ready for the exhibit, so don't forget to give me a list to give to the secretary to type up" (FN). In informal interviews, teachers stated that "presenting" was one of the most beneficial aspects of staff meetings. They wanted more dialogue to "share ideas," to "see how other teachers do things," to address practical concerns. Ears seemed to perk, and eyes riveted in attention to the "presenter" of the week. Thus, these art professionals did not seem to have what many professionals may have in school settings (faculty lounges, common break times, or halls) that might encourage brief and informal, but professional discussion about practical matters.

Some of the art teachers tended to cluster into particular duets beyond school hours, call each other in the evenings, or go a few places together. Some had a colleague they felt free to call, and some felt
terribly alone (I). Most (78%) said they felt somewhat isolated professionally when working in various schools (CC & I). But such a sense of isolation is not unusual for most classroom teachers (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Some school staffs made the art specialists feel welcome and a vital part of a school, and others did not. For example, "Some schools are friendly and include support personnel in everything! I love those schools" (CC).

Teaching from the Trunk of Your Car

Teachers were assigned to schools, based upon their preferences as to geographic location, when possible. For veteran teachers, assignments also were based upon an established working relationship with particular principals and faculties. Each teacher seemed to have an equal share of "problem" schools where student populations were particularly challenging. Each art teacher was responsible for organizing and scheduling individual class times with each classroom teacher of each of his/her schools per semester. And each teacher provided visuals, resources—in one case, "hot wheels" and a bicycle for drawing—at the various schools, thus, teachers tended to transport a great deal of found objects and material in their cars, traveling from school to school.

The most obvious contraint for these art teachers was the student-teacher ratio. Each of the teachers were assigned to as many as 1200 youngsters a year. In this third and fourth-grade art program, teachers also added on second and fifth-grade levels when their schedules permitted (CC & FN). And all taught special student populations (learning, physically, emotionally disabled), usually mainstreamed into
the art class, increasing class size to 30-40 youngsters. A few art teachers found themselves teaching a whole class of disabled youngsters without assistance from an aide or classroom teacher (Q). Most art teachers seemed to receive assistance from such persons when this scheduling and/or grouping occurred.

The equitable and democratic ideal found in general education of educating all persons is to be admired and cherished in this program. However, many of the teachers felt ill-prepared to deal with special populations of students: "Mainstreaming students with emotional and physical disabilities can be trying because we have not been trained to work with such problems," remarked one of the teachers (CC). Of the few practical concerns discussed in the staff meetings, several dealt with questions about adapting curriculum or strategies and exploring "reasonable" expectations with respect to special student populations. Though admitting such students offered a challenge, some of the teachers seemed to have worked through their own initial fears and public labels assigned to students by trial-and-error teaching. These teachers seemingly discovered interesting strategies, student potential, cooperation, and pleasing product outcomes. One teacher who happened to enjoy working with such youngsters expressed, "This was my 'specials' class, and I had them work cooperatively on these murals. I couldn't believe how well they worked together. They loved it!" (FN).

Most (78%) of the assigned schools had no art room or facilities, per se (CC & FN). However, even when space was available, this often was used by other personnel or activities in the school, thus leaving student work, art materials, and displays to chance. There were
logistical problems in acquiring, organizing, and maintaining adequate space for storage, student work, or supplies for each school. Ordered supplies sometimes would "disappear" from the art teachers' boxes or cabinets, orders would not come in on time, or a teacher could not "get into the custodian's area to use the kiln because the area was under lock and key." Over half of the teachers (56%) felt that keeping up with supplies was no small task. "Supplies are not easy to get, and they are not kept in a place (in a school) that is only mine. Supplies are quite often 'missing'," stated one teacher. Others felt that with foresight and planning, however, supplies were not a problem (CC).

I observed two art teachers using the regular classroom for art instruction, hauling in pails of water for painting or pounds of clay. Most often, however, they used drawing and cut-and-paste media in the regular classroom. With the exception of one teacher, art teachers who used a room designated for art tended to use more and "messier" media with youngsters and incorporate projects over the semester that took several sessions to complete. (See Chapter V.)

Classroom control or maintaining discipline was a factor cited often by the art teachers as a constraint. The teachers stated that children think of art as "play time, having so few art activities in the regular classroom," and thus the specialist continually did battle with the ghost of fun, whether real or imagined (I). One teacher elected to teach in the regular classrooms rather than an available art room to maintain classroom control. "Just the traveling from their own classroom to the art room can get them hyped up," said another who, like a few of the other art teachers, assigned seats in art class (CC).
Sometimes this was done to learn student names (often futile), but most often it was to maintain classroom order. Another teacher commented, "I had some wonderful, enthusiastic classes. But some schools have very poor discipline and no classroom teacher help." One suggested, "Present day students are often hard to motivate" (O).

Another teacher stated that the first few art lessons should require students to draw realistically so that classroom control could be established from the beginning and students would get the message that art was "hard work, just like reading or math, and not play time" (I). She suggested the curriculum guide was sequenced this way for this purpose, although it was not organized as such, nor did it stress realistic representation. This was a matter of folk wisdom shared between a veteran and an art teacher new to the program.

Many of the art teachers insisted that student behavior was linked to behavior expectations in the regular classroom. For example, "Students who are behavior problems in the regular classroom have less control sometimes because of the freedom of the art class" (CC). "Freedom" in the art class should not be misconstrued here, as in all the art classes I observed, I never witnessed chaos and rarely even loud talking or students out of their seats. Another teacher suggested, "Students have a hard time understanding art as a 'class' experience. They see it as an activity like recess or gym" (CC). Other art teachers assumed more responsibility for student behavior in the art class, rather than blaming students' lack of control or the classroom teacher's lack of discipline. For example, "(Students) are well-behaved because the art teacher insists on it" (CC).
Although feeling somewhat isolated, the art teachers felt that classroom teachers supported their efforts (89%) for a variety of reasons (CC). One reason for this support, according to art teachers, was because classroom teachers "get an hour break" or "only want free time—not because they like, agree with, or know what goes on (in art class)." Another reason given for classroom teachers supporting the art program was because "they (classroom teachers) themselves feel inept in teaching art." For example, "they always prefer a specialist teach it."

Another art teacher perceived support in the following way:

They support the time off (and need it). As the year progresses, they support the program for the fringe benefits—room decorations, bulletin boards, skills in cutting, and behavior with scissors, etc., that the children learn (CC).

Most of the art teachers (75%) stated that the classroom teachers did not stay in the room while art was being taught (CC), although the art supervisor suggested that this was an expectation from the program of classroom teachers (I). The art teachers reminded me that the art period may be the only planning period classroom teachers had, and that most of the teachers graded student work during this time (CC). As an observer, I perceived this range of attitudes suggested by the art teachers. However, one classroom teacher said she stayed away because she felt she made the art teacher nervous and self-conscious (I).

Indeed, the interactions between art teachers and classroom teachers ranged from mutual support and interest to avoidance or tolerance (FN & I). Much of this interaction seemed to depend on the art teacher's outgoing nature, rather than the reverse. Obviously, there was little time in either teachers' schedule to develop a more collegial and
and cooperative kind of relationship and an understanding of what each other was about.

Regarding planning, art teachers (like many teachers) said they must do their planning in the evenings and on weekends, "preparing examples and gathering resources for the week." Another stated, "Matting, writing certificates, mailing art work, cutting yarn, cardboard, getting visuals ready is on home time." Thus, all of the art teachers stated that their work day was not from 8:30-3:30 (CC). Most of their planning during the school day was only a snatch of 5 or 10 minutes here and there, and never to be counted on. "There are no free periods in my day. There is so much preparation for each class!" stated one teacher. Another suggested:

Classroom teachers can use class time to evaluate or have students self-check papers. I do not have that luxury. My 'free time' is spent getting set up and cleaning up between classes. Very seldom (do I) sit in a lounge to (eat lunch) or 'visit' (CC & I).

Two of the teachers felt planning came easy. For example, "I love the planning phase and the excitement of trying new ideas and media. I like to experiment and gear lessons to the students' ability" (Q). Three, however, struggled with planning, particularly with regard to rationalizing the value of selected activities to others, selecting "out of a myriad of ideas what should be taught," and considering their desired plans in relation to the constraints of facilities. For example, "It is difficult to do the kind of multi-media projects that I like involving a lot of materials and mess when you have so many schools and sometimes no art room or even adequate storage space" (Q).
Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the art teachers had taught other subject areas, and all of the teachers had taught in other grade levels before teaching in this program (CC). Almost three-fourths claimed to be practicing artists or craftspersons, and two had degrees in the fine arts. In a year's time, almost all of the teachers had been to an exhibit or art museum, had read some interesting research or articles in professional arts journals, and had taken in-service related to the arts in this school system. Over half had taken a university or community arts course to enhance their artistic skills or knowledge, and over half had made a monetary contribution to a local arts group (Q).

Only one teacher had attended a local or regional arts education conference in a year's time (Q). In fact, the art teachers did not seem too clear about the number of professional development days allotted to them per year, the nature of such for their own development, and the procedures for requesting such (CC). None of the art teachers attended the state-wide art education conference when it was held in the city—the event for which most painted placemats during two staff meetings. They told me they could not get release time (FN & I).

Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the teachers felt they taught other subjects or subject-area skills while teaching art. For example, "Reading, vocabulary, language...creative thinking and writing, social studies, geometry, science, ecology, careers, etc. Whatever pertinent." Another, "Vocabulary skills, motor skills, and sometimes related subjects or themes" (CC).

None of the art teachers felt teaching art was easy. For example: (The) public does not put as much emphasis on art. It is not scrutinized as closely as other subject teaching.
However, physical motor skills, thinking and sequencing skills, technical skills, interpreting visuals, etc. are difficult to teach at times (CC).

On the initial sharing of transcribed fieldnotes and audiotaped art lessons, one teacher remarked, "I showed my husband this and said, "That's why I'm tired at night! Now you know what my day is like!" Another commented, "Now my boyfriend knows teaching art is not easy. I showed him this" (FN & I).

Over half of the teachers were neither totally satisfied nor totally dissatisfied with their present positions. Almost a third felt they were "quite the artist" themselves, but many did not feel strongly about their own artistic talent. They tended to rate themselves higher as consumers or viewers of art than as artists (72% and 43%, respectively, each of 100% on separate ranked items). (Q)

What seemed to stand out in the teachers' comments most was a genuine love for art as subject matter and an enjoyment working with youngsters. For example, motivation came easy to most of the art teachers. "Getting the children excited about art because I'm so enthusiast [sic] about art," and "to excite them about mixing colors and using color because color excites me" were comments in reference to what comes easy to art teachers (Q). It seemed they downplayed the many constraints or conditions in their situation with care, perserverance, and sacrifice. There were few complaints, open or otherwise, about the conditions in which they worked. There was little absenteeism, even with available substitute art teachers.

To improve the program, the art teachers suggested that it needed to be expanded so that youngsters "worked with them an entire year at a
time." They also wanted to see the program expanded to fifth grade. "We need much more time with students...and with all students," one teacher commented (CC). Thus, in improving the program, the teachers' focus was not on themselves and decreasing their incredible loads; it was on students and increasing the amount and quality of their art experiences. One teacher suggested s/he would like to have "more inservice training by artists and art educators to broaden my horizons, and make teaching more interesting and stimulating to myself and the students" (Q). Another desired "time off for art teachers to attend art-related conventions (or a planned) group trip to (the) art museum—half day off" (Q).

We might consider the findings presented in this section of the chapter as programmatic or social structures that illustrate the organizational arrangement of time, space, materials, and persons. Gibson (1934) says that to speak of "the classroom, "the school," "the program," or "the teacher" is to acknowledge the presence and force of social structures. These are both constrainers and enablers, shapers and resources for action (p.48). The following are such social structures presented in the previous section that may potentially influence the nature of the enacted curriculum.

Assignments of people to places: busing, which reconfigured students between third and fourth grades; teacher assignments to schools; the supervisor's assignments or duties
Organization of time: the once-a-week nature of formal art instruction over a period of one semester, meaning about 14 sessions of art on the average: 50-60 minute classes
The nature, substance, or scheduling of staff meetings
A large student-teacher ratio
Teacher background, training, and expertise
Concerns about classroom management
Teaching students with special needs
Teacher planning
Encountering different social-political entities of different schools and their acceptance of the arts and thus, acceptance of the art specialist and his/her contribution to general education

Individual, interpersonal relations between art specialists and classroom teachers or principals

A sense of professional isolation, even within the specialist group

Logistical problems with space and supplies

Making the arts visible to the community in order to legitimize, maintain, or expand a place in the general curriculum with limited energy and resources

We can see how some of the above findings could relate to each other by diagraming one issue: assignment of students and art teachers to places (see Figure 4.2). From this diagram, there are potentially positive and negative consequences in the arrangement or assignment of persons to schools. The curriculum effects could be positive. For example, continuity of student experiences could be better ensured if the same students had the same art teacher the second semester; and if not, if art teachers shared their "enacted" curriculum, personal theories, and their knowledge of the same students. Continuity could be better ensured if the different schools shared the same degree of support (a strong one) for the arts. Continuity might be better ensured if the art teachers organized the third and fourth-grade curriculum in such a way that the issues of breadth, depth, scope, and balance were addressed. All of this, of course, assumes that one believes continuity is an important dimension in student learning and that the actors within a setting share the same definition of continuity. One person may perceive continuity as the opportunity to practice, and another may perceive continuity as the "growthful, ever-expanding, and restructuring" of experience.
Figure 4.2. How social structures might relate to the enacted curriculum.
The next section of this chapter will analyze the explicit or "official" curriculum documents. This is provided so that eventually we may explore how these documents, the interpretation of them, and the given social structures may have influenced the enacted curriculum.

The Explicit or "Official" Curriculum

According to Eisner (1985), the "explicit" curriculum is the knowledge in schools that is known by or offered to the community, much like an "educational menu." A school or system "advertises what it is prepared to provide" (p.88). In the culture called schooling, "there are certain publicly explicit goals: teaching children to read and write, to figure, and to learn something about the history of the country," for example (p.87). These goals appear in school district curriculum guides and course-planning materials, and the public knows that these courses are offered and that students will have an opportunity to achieve these aims to some degree.

The State Curriculum Document

As in most states, the State Department of Education and a consortium of notables in this midwestern state developed and provided a curriculum document related to the visual arts (1970). The 36 objectives were not grade-specific, but related to three primary areas: (1) personal fulfillment in art; (2) awareness of art in society; and (3) awareness of the artistic heritage. Underneath each of these three areas were two subdivisions of objectives, expression and response, with a cluster of six objectives within each:
Personal Fulfillment Through Art
  Personal expression (6 objectives)
  Personal response (6 objectives)

Awareness of Art in Society
  Understanding how societies use art expression (6 objectives)
  Understanding how societies respond to art (6 objectives)

Awareness of the Artistic Heritage
  Understanding how artists achieve expression (6 objectives)
  Understanding how critics and historians respond to art (6 objectives)

The above tripartite framework was traced to Chapman's text, *Approaches to Art in Education* (1978), albeit several art educators, supervisors, and teachers throughout the state helped develop the state curriculum guide (1970) as it currently exists. This framework will be explicated with examples, as the local graded course of study and curriculum objectives appear to relate directly to this framework.

Personal Fulfillment

In order to achieve personal fulfillment through creating or expressing in art, Chapman (p.119) states:

Children need sensitive adult guidance in mastering the following pivotal moves in the artistic process: the creation of ideas for personal expression, the discovery of visual qualities to express ideas and feelings, and the use of media to convey an expressive intent.

Furthermore, responding to visual forms can be just as active and creative an experience as the expression of creation of an art object (Chapman, 1978, pp.119-120):

Perceptual awareness can become a mode of response to life that is personally fulfilling to children if they have guidance in perceiving obvious and subtle sensory qualitites, in interpreting the meanings of perceptual experiences, and in deciding on the significance of these experiences.
It is at this personal-fulfillment level that Mrs. North suggested the third and fourth-grade program focused, as we examined the 36 state objectives (I). In the rationale of the graded course of study, to which the teachers were "obligated" (I), this orientation was fairly explicit. For example:

Art is essential to education because the art process constitutes fundamental ways of knowing and being—seeing, feeling, responding, expressing, producing... (School System) provides the climate and experiences for enjoyable, wholesome growth in personal expression and response... Enjoyable developmental experiences characterize the program of studies in visual art in kindergarten through grade five... The overall elementary experience seeks to emphasize the personal satisfactions possible through visual expression... (Grades 5-3) provides a needed transition from the enjoyable and developmental experiences of the elementary level (K-5) ...An attitude of personal enjoyment and satisfaction should predominate.*

*(Underscoring author's emphasis)

The personal-expression emphasis pervaded the art teachers' comments and responses, as well. For example, the primary curriculum goal desired by the teachers was "self-expression, creativity, exploring personal feelings, ways of communicating this with others." A close second was, "learning the basic elements of design—line, shape, pattern, color, etc." (Q). Some of the teachers strongly believed that as a result of their teaching, their students had learned that "there are different ways to use mediums [sic]—and none are incorrect;" "it's okay to experiment with different techniques and mediums [sic];" "there's no 'right' way when creating—all ideas are great!" or "in art you can really do your own thing...copying is not art." Only two teachers felt that students learned "to enjoy looking at art," that
"artists (have) different styles—from life's backgrounds," or students had become "more sensitive to color" (Q).

Most of the above comments fit into the personal fulfillment category espoused in the state guidelines, even though the teachers' comments appeared more vague and free-spirited than the state objectives. Chapman (1978, pp.118-119) warns against experimentation for experimentation's sake:

Children enjoy manipulating art materials, and even without guidance they may produce works that have expressive power. Nevertheless, mere activity and chance successes are poor measures of learning. If, as the saying goes, "one picture is worth a thousand words," one truly creative experience in art is worth a thousand aimless experiments with art media.

Though not highly prescriptive, the objectives stated in the curriculum document seemed to lean toward what Chapman expressed. Implied in the objectives was a high degree of student intentionality and active decision-making, something beyond mere production, and something illustrative of different views of the artistic process, as researchers have come to understand this process. Sample objectives of personal expression in the state objectives read:

To help children:
Use their inner feelings, beliefs, and personal concerns about the past, present, and future as sources of subjects and themes;

Compare planned and improvised ways of working as means for helping ideas unfold;

Explore various qualities of media to make appropriate selections for expressing ideas.

Sample objectives of personal response read:

To help children:
Develop their powers of perception by taking note of visual qualities in works of art and the environment;
Voice descriptions of the qualities they see in works of art and the environment;

Judge and explain the personal significance of works of art in their own lives.

Although there seemed to be a strong match of intended (official) and preferred (teacher) goals in reference to personal expression and response, there was a subtle difference. This subtlety will be explored in more detail in Chapters V and VI.

Awareness of Art in Society

A society or culture is partly identified by the visual forms it creates. Goals for expression from this component of art education relate to "learning how art forms originate in a society, how visual qualities express social values, and how media are used to express social values" (Chapman, 1973, p.121). Related to response, Chapman suggests that unconsciously or otherwise, "we are constantly responding to visual forms in our environment" (p.121). Children need guidance in learning how they and other people perceive visual forms in their environment, interpret visual forms, and make judgments about these in society. Perceptually illiterate persons risk being unaware of the ways in which visual forms might affect them, and thus, they are susceptible to control by forces they do not understand, cannot judge, or change.

This social emphasis does not pervade art teachers' comments. For example, when teachers were asked to rank four primary goals for art education (based upon Efland's theoretical framework), "social/cultural heritage; popular images; and criticism" was on the bottom of the list (Q). One teacher perceived a "well-grounded knowledge of art history" as one of his/her strengths, however. Another felt that one of his/her
strengths was correlating lessons with other classroom subject areas. The nature of this correlation was vague. In one staff meeting, I observed a teacher present activities where students had made posters from a popular trade book and individual "books" for language arts. In her presentation, this teacher did not discuss the social dimensions she may have presented to students within these lessons (FN). Another teacher had students design posters for a visiting magician, however, there was little discussion about symbols, advertising, or communication in our popular culture. The exercise focused more on learning how to make and cut out block letters (FN). Others claimed to occasionally correlate art lessons with other classroom subjects (Q).

The reasons that teachers and the supervisor gave for the little focus on art in society related to lack of time, lack of personal knowledge about such matters, or a perceived lack of interest or ability on the part of third and fourth-grade students to deal with such matters (Q & I). For example, "(Third graders) don't perceive exploring feelings or cultural heritage the way fourth and fifth graders do. Their [sic] interested in a product and how realistic is my product" (Q).

Sample objectives from the state curriculum guide seemed to be a possible enterprise with third and fourth graders, however. With regard to expression, for example, teachers could help children:

Understand how societies communicate beliefs by developing visual symbols in their art forms;

Compare and contrast styles of art produced by people in different cultures;

Study the different ways men have planned their environment.
Related to **response**, some objectives were to help children:

- Study different systems of visual communication developed by various societies;

- Understand that people in a social group will often interpret the same symbol in different ways;

- Understand that a person's choice of a particular product may result from the design of a given package.

Without teacher preferences for goals related to art in society, and with the belief that this art knowledge cannot or really should not be delivered, there was little way to compare the official document with teacher planning at this point, but we will return to this issue later. There was some evidence of the presentation of social symbols in the making of arts festival posters and holiday art e.g., symbols for the arts to convey an arts festival, like theater masks, ballet slippers, music notes, and paint brushes; Christmas symbols, like candy canes and Christmas trees; and Easter symbols, like a woven paper Easter basket with felt-tip-colored paper eggs. However, there was no critical discussion of the social dimension of symbols in the classrooms observed (FN).

**Awareness of the Artistic Heritage**

Understanding the artistic heritage includes knowledge about the work of artists, architects, designers, and craftspeople of the past and present. Chapman (1973, p.120) also suggests that this area of art knowledge relates to the contributions of persons who "preserve and interpret works of art—collectors, curators, scholars, and teachers." In order for such knowledge to be meaningful to youngsters, however, it must connect to their own lives. Thus, Chapman states that this area of
knowledge parallels the goals for personal expression: "learning how artists create ideas for their work, how they use visual qualities for expression, and how they use media" (p.120). Furthermore, this area of knowledge relates to response:

Children can...study the artistic heritage from the viewpoint of people who have developed special skills in responding to art... Educational goals are learning how experts perceive and describe art, how they examine works of art, and how they judge (them).

These experts give us insight into the process of perceiving, interpreting meanings, and judging the significance of works.

Only one teacher commented about art history or cultural heritage as a body of worthwhile art knowledge, particularly as a strength in his/her own knowledge of art history. The emphasis in this art program was said to be on media exploration and personal expression.

Some sample objectives from the state curriculum document with regard to expression in the artistic heritage area were to help children:

Understand the different sources that artists draw upon for their ideas;

Understand that artists interpret their ideas by developing different ways of presenting them in visual form;

For response, objectives were to help children:

Understand that art critics and historians help people to perceive qualities in works of art;

Understand that critics and historians judge and explain works of art, making use of various criteria;

Compare the differences in judgments that result when different criteria are employed.

Regarding art in our society and art in teacher preparation programs, our artistic heritage is not seen to be particularly
important; it is likewise with regard to third and fourth graders. Studio courses still weigh heavily in the certification standards for art teachers, and colleges and universities still tend to develop the prospective teacher's identity as an artist. With this assumption, the primary mission of the teacher is "to engage children and youth in the process of creating art and handcrafted objects to the virtual exclusion of teaching youngsters about forms of art that cannot be made 'by hand' (Chapman, 1982, pp.89-90). Hastie (1984) shares this claim about the preponderance of studio activities in teacher preparation programs, stating, "prospective teachers are given few opportunities to become involved with inquiry and questions about how and why works of art are the way they are" (p.11).

In summary of this section, Chapman (1978, p.113) suggests that the three major functions of general education are "to develop each child's ability to find personal fulfillment in life, to transmit the cultural heritage, and to extend the social consciousness of children and youth." Likewise, a child's encounter with art education "should be personally meaningful, authentic as 'art,' and relevant to life" (p.113). We now turn to a local curriculum document, the graded course of study.

**The Graded Course of Study**

Discussed earlier was the rationale of the local graded course of study, which stressed personal fulfillment. It further illustrates the teacher's role in "providing sufficient space, time, and encouragement" to enable students to do the following:

Develop skills in communication; make intelligent visual choices; practice problem-solving; value spontaneity and intuitive decision-making; grow in self-direction and in
art in our present society and cultural heritage; and be aware of the career potentials in art.

Perceptual, Conceptual, and Motor Skills

Delineations are made between perceptual, conceptual, and motor skills and grade levels in this document (see Figure 4.3). In this document, "perceptual" and "conceptual" are not defined, thus distinctions between these notions are difficult. On first glance, a definition for "motor skills" seems self-evident until one wonders if "decorating finished clay products" does not require conceptual skills. Is "sensitivity to the plasticity of clay" a conceptual or motor skill? How could one know or use one skill without the other? The qualities and limitations of media can be realized through both perceptual and motor skills. Conceptual skills require that we be able to choose or judge media that seem appropriate to the expression of certain ideas and intentions. Learning to control media is both a motor and perceptual skill that enhances the probable success of expressing conceptual skills. Thus, separating skills seems somewhat arbitrary. It implicitly dismisses the complexity of the artistic process and the interplay or simultaneity of a variety of skills required in expressing and responding to art. Thus, the "cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains" familiar in educational literature seem to parallel our three categories here: perceptual-affective; conceptual-cognitive; and motor-psychomotor.

In this document, there is an unequal weighting of motor skills over the other two kinds of skills. For example, at the third grade level, 47% of the skills are motor, 27% perceptual, and 27% conceptual.
Figure 4.3. Delineation of skills in the third and fourth grades as presented in the graded course of study.

**GRADE 3**

**Perceptual Skills**
- Gives verbal expression to aesthetic judgments made in response to visual qualities in works of art and the environment
- Develops an awareness of the art of other cultures
- Reinforces independent decision-making to build self-confidence and pride
- Begins to think critically and analyze own work and that of others

**Conceptual Skills**
- Uses primary colors and practices mixing them to achieve secondary colors
- Gains in sensitivity to the plasticity of clay
- Incorporates proportion and depth in drawing with an emphasis upon quality (variety) of line
- Recognizes movement in design

**Motor Skills**
- Constructs upon an armature
- Combines wet and dry media on same page
- Decorates finished clay products
- Draws into a surface and makes a print
- Cuts away to produce pieces of sculpture
- Weaves and stitches
- Practices proper use of materials and tools with emphasis on care and safety

**GRADE 4**

**Perceptual Skills**
- Justifies visual choices verbally after thoughtfully considering alternatives
- Recognizes and appreciates past and present (State) artists
- Begins to make simple judgments about own art and that of peers

**Conceptual Skills**
- Uses a full palette including achromatics
- Builds sculpture by both adding on and cutting away
- Utilizes varied line quality and dark and light pattern
- Incorporates the principles of unity and balance

**Motor Skills**
- Combines various sculptural materials using tools
- Controls wet and dry media in combinations
- Combines pinching and coiling to make a clay pot
- Carves into a flat surface to make a relief print
- Weaves and stitches
- Practices proper use of materials and tools with emphasis on care and safety
Thus, we could assume from this presentation that in the third grade, media exploration or control of media will be emphasized more than perceptual and conceptual skills. In the fourth grade, 46% of the skills are motor, 31% are conceptual, and 23% are perceptual. We again can assume that media exploration will take precedence over the personal fulfillment, social, and cultural aspects embedded in the perceptual skills presented. Making, doing, and producing seem to be embedded in both conceptual and motor skills in this document.

**Sequential Development**

The rationale for the graded course of study states, "visual art education offers the student a sequential development of the above skills." Thus, there is a claim that what is to be learned by students is arranged systematically, based upon an implicit theory of human development or order of growth—from the simple to the complex. Bullough and Goldstein (1934) illuminate the dilemma of simple truisms (readiness or development) and necessary sequence:

...Developmental readiness is not the same as a necessary sequence of learning activities. It must be shown by those making the claim that the sequence is...precisely coordinated with developmental facts or that there are some other compelling reasons to assert that "learning will not take place if the instruction is out of sequence."

The rationale contains developmental language sprinkled here and there e.g., "sequential development," "growth," "building skills," "building upon," "needed transition," and "toward self-direction and refined control of materials." Another example states, "Each educational level emphasizes structure and methods different from, but relative to, the others." It does not define how this is so. Regarding
Thus, we could assume from this presentation that in the third grade, media exploration or control of media will be emphasized more than perceptual and conceptual skills. In the fourth grade, 46% of the skills are motor, 31% are conceptual, and 23% are perceptual. We again can assume that media exploration will take precedence over the personal fulfillment, social, and cultural aspects embedded in the perceptual skills presented. Making, doing, and producing seem to be embedded in both conceptual and motor skills in this document.

**Sequential Development**

The rationale for the graded course of study states, "visual art education offers the student a sequential development of the above skills." Thus, there is a claim that what is to be learned by students is arranged systematically, based upon an implicit theory of human development or order of growth—from the simple to the complex. Bullough and Goldstein (1984) illuminate the dilemma of simple truisms (readiness or development) and necessary sequence:

...Developmental readiness is not the same as a necessary sequence of learning activities. It must be shown by those making the claim that the sequence is...precisely coordinated with developmental facts or that there are some other compelling reasons to assert that "learning will not take place if the instruction is out of sequence."

The rationale contains developmental language such as, "sequential development," "growth," "building skills," "building upon," "needed transition," and "toward self-direction and refined control of materials." Another example states, "Each educational level emphasizes structure and methods different from, but relative to, the others." It does not define how this is so. Regarding the secondary level, the
document that fourth graders need to know how to coil and pinch clay, but we must surmise that third graders are expected to only decorate clay. We can determine that there is a fairly equal distribution of two and three-dimensional material to be used, implied in the skills that must be developed. Not only can we see what kinds of skills teachers are expected to introduce or "build upon" at these two grade levels, we also can surmise areas that are missing because of the lack of specificity and clarity in the document's language, both within and between grade levels.

The Intermediate Creative Arts Curriculum Guide

The Creative Arts Curriculum Guide is a 73-page document that is "just used for ideas," according to the supervisor (I). It encompasses goals, objectives, and lesson ideas for visual art, music, dance, and drama. (See Appendix H for a sample lesson.) A two-page philosophy stresses personal expression/fulfillment and appreciation, reflecting the broader more sensitive tone of the state objectives. There are twelve ideas reflected in the section on "effective instruction." Instructional effectiveness is defined by the following provisions made for students:

Sequential instruction in the basic skills (in the arts)
Common elements and relationships across all the arts
Perception of the natural and man-made environment
Art response to visual forms and performances
Positive self-image, self expression
Education of special student populations
Career opportunities in the arts
Life-long participation in the arts
Problem-solving skills
Criticism of works-in-progress and purposeful reworking
Care and conservation of arts resources
The goal of "developing basic skills in visual art" includes twelve teacher-student objectives. The student objectives reveal the following categories: exploration and experimentation with media (8), which in most cases relates to specific media or subject matter (7); skill (8), as in psychomotor/control of media, or "gaining skill in making letters and numerals, free hand, with various media; perception (2), such as "making aesthetic judgments regarding relationships of structures and trees within the area," or drawing what one sees in the environment; art elements (1) and appreciation (1), as in "identify the use of art elements and principles in the work of famous artists and student art work." Again, our once-equal trilogy of personal fulfillment, art in society, and cultural heritage has been ordered toward media exploration and skill development of the motorical kind.

One of the last goals in this document states, "Student will weave the creative arts skills into the fabric of the curriculum." We can only hope that students are afforded this opportunity and shown ways to go about this in a fragmented elementary curriculum (by subject area and scheduling) and in a lopsided curriculum (the ratio of time spent in the arts to time spent in other subject areas).

The "Curriculum Agreements" Document

An agreement was developed before 1983 by the third and fourth-grade art staff and the supervisor to avoid repetition or omission in the curriculum, particularly between the two grade levels. This is the "Curriculum Agreements" list (see Figure 4.4). Such an agreement can be interpreted as an attempt to standardize the curriculum. It is organized primarily by media, from drawing to painting; ceramics;
3rd GRADE

A. Objects
   1) in schools
   2) in desks

B. Rooms
   1) classroom
   2) office

C. Animals

D. Full figure: shadow shapes, basic

E. Portraits: front face, basic

F. Tempera
   1) mix secondaries

G. Watercolor
   1) large area
   2) black crayon for detail

A. Clay
   1) subtractive animals or
   2) pinchpots

B. Intaglio/etching
   1) styrofoam

A. Paper/crayon
   1) cityscapes
   2) still life
   3) human figure

A. Weaving
   1) paper
   2) yarn

B. Stitchery
   1) paper & yarn (collage/painting as background)

4th GRADE

FROM DRAWING TO PAINTING

A. Full figure with details
   1) self
   2) school staff

B. Portraits with details
   1) profile
   2) full-face

C. Body parts
   1) arms, hands
   2) feet
   3) etc.

D. Tempera
   1) mix values

E. Watercolor
   1) detail and line
   2) lightest to darkest

CERAMICS

A. Clay
   1) additive figures or
   2) double pinchpots or
   3) coil or
   4) slab

PRINTMAKING

A. Relief
   1) 3 x 3 linoleum

B. Intaglio/etching
   1) plexiglas

COLLAGE

A. Paper/scrap
   1) people (crowds/parades)
   2) landscape
   3) masks

TEXTILES

A. Weaving
   1) yarn-decorative or

B. Stitchery
   1) burlap and yarn

Figure 4.4 Curriculum Agreements - Grades 3 and 4
prints, printmaking; collage; and textiles. However, once within each of these five categories of media, one gets lost in predetermined subject matter and particular kinds of media within media. Under watercolor, we see the repetition of words across the two grade levels, such as "black crayon and detail" in the third grade and "detail and line" in the fourth grade. We see "yarn" under textiles in the third grade and "yarn-decorative" in the fourth grade list. Under third grade, we see the human figure under three media—drawing/painting and collage.

For persons concerned about artistic development, we note the "subtractive" method in clay is suggested for the third grade when research tells us that youngsters ages 5-11 naturally draw and add on details, "the primary method of construction (being) additive" (Brown, 1934, p. 59). This was found to be so in 1970 (Brown, 1970). We are hard pressed to know if mixing color values is more difficult and complex than mixing secondary colors, or if landscapes are more difficult than cityscapes.

When it gets down to the pragmatic brass tacks in this program, as represented in this "agreement," we lose the delineation of skills and the trilogy of personal fulfillment, art in society, and cultural heritage. Starting with activities, media, or subject matter, rather than the eloquence of the state curriculum objectives that implied equal time and attention in the trilogy, we now view art primarily as media, production, and product. Depending on individual interpretation of this document, the broad theoretical orientation is virtually lost.

In one of the last staff meetings of 1984, the art supervisor attempted to have the teachers review and revise the curriculum
agreements list. The meeting stalemated on media and art forms. Revisions, I discovered, had not been made in the curriculum for five years. The only accomplishment in this meeting was the crossing out of "intaglio/etching on plexiglas" and an attempt to develop a new list of media parameters or art forms: "drawing, textiles, painting, printing, three-dimensional, and collage" (written on the board). A disagreement ensued related to three-dimensional and two-dimensional art. "Wasn't weaving in textiles three-dimensional?" someone asked. Confusion set in. Mrs. North appointed a subcommittee to revise the agreement, but to my knowledge they never met, and there was no resolve on this for the following 1984-1985 academic year (FN).

In this meeting, it also became apparent that the teachers and supervisor were not aware of which teachers received whose former students in the feeder schools. I was asked to remark about my observations of the curriculum during the 1983-84 year, and I mentioned the risk of repetition and omission because of this lack of knowledge. One teacher exclaimed, "I don't think it hurts a kid if he does something two times in a row. Kids need practice." I agreed, but then mentioned that I had observed the same group of students two years in a row, draw the same kind of round peppermint candy. I then turned the problem around and asked, "How about what they may not get over two years then?" There were a few grumbles, and the supervisor (to my dismay) then asked the teachers to reconstruct their entire academic year of lesson-plan forms before the summer break. Obviously, unless teachers had kept a record in their planbooks, scratchings and all, this would have been extremely difficult and time-consuming. It seemed a bit
nuch to ask, too late, and the teachers did not reconstruct their year's worth of lessons either. It was the end of the year, they had just matted student work, hung three exhibits, and participated in a large city arts festival. They appeared too exhausted to deal with curriculum matters or to think about the coming year (FN).

An Anatomy of a Lesson Plan

The art teachers were asked to develop long-range lessons plans in the early fall for the entire school year (see Appendix I). The art supervisor elaborated:

We know after they write these that this will not—or should not be carved in stone. But it gives them a foundation. But still in all, they need to be careful to be checking on their agreements (curriculum agreements).

This legal-size document presents five features per lesson: subject (such as cityscapes), medium (such as crayon and paper), design (art elements employed, such as shape, color, texture), product (crayon etching), and style (realistic). If there is any continuity perceived by the teacher from one lesson to the next among these features, horizontal arrows illustrate this. Objectives from the state curriculum guide (numbered 1-36) are selected for each lesson in the categories of personal fulfillment, art in society, and cultural heritage, each of which include both expression and response, as discussed earlier. Each teacher planned about 16 lessons for each semester of art (third and fourth grades).

In this study, four teachers were observed teaching five groups of students (three in the third grade; two in the fourth). An analysis of these long-range lesson plans (79) revealed the following. The third-
grade teachers planned the following subjects, (ordered by the amount of
time they planned to spend on each): clown faces/masks/fantasy faces;
pottery (vessels or animals); weaving; still life; drawing objects in
the school or room; color-mixing; cityscapes; the human figure; and
nature/trees. There was one breach of the curriculum agreement at this
point, as one teacher planned to have third-grade students do
landscapes.

About 80% of the media teachers planned to use was two-dimensional.
The only three-dimensional media (20%) were clay and yarn for weaving.
The elements of design most intended throughout the semester were, in
order of coverage: color (23); shape (17); pattern (14); texture (13);
detail (11); proportion (10); perspective (10); line (6);
composition/placement (4); mood/expression (3); and movement (2).

Products planned, ordered by the time to be spent making them, were
painting (11); collage (8); weaving/wall hangings (5); and pinch pots
(3). Again, a teacher breached the curriculum agreement by planning to
have third graders make slab dishes and coil pots. The focus on style,
according to the teachers' plans and time to be allotted, was realistic
(72%), abstract (24%), and fantasy (5%). One must wonder how this low
proportion of abstract or fantasy style relates to the high proportion
of intended subject matter that seemed fanciful or abstract (clown
faces, masks, or fantasy faces).

The most popular objectives among all the teachers were located in
the area of personal fulfillment. These two objectives were chosen by
all the teachers:

To help children:
Find sources of subjects and themes in their personal
experiences with objects and events in the natural and man-made environment. (Expression)

Develop their powers of perception by taking note of visual qualities in works of art and the environment. (Response)

The following three objectives from the area of personal fulfillment also were popular among the teachers, and they represent the "expression" area:

To help children:
Interpret their ideas and feelings by studying different ways of presenting them in visual form.

Explore various qualities of media to make appropriate selections for expressing ideas.

Develop control of various media to enable them to produce intended effects.

There were fewer objectives listed under art in society, and when noted, these related primarily to expression, not response. The same was true for the objectives under artistic heritage.

Figure 4.5 compares the focus of the state objectives and those generated by the art teachers in their long-range lesson plans. Personal fulfillment objectives were predominate, particularly under expression. And within this category, exploring the qualities of media and developing control of media were the most pronounced goals in the teachers' lesson plans. The most frequently selected objective among all the teachers was "finding sources of subject and themes in students' personal experiences with objects and events in the natural and man-made environment." These sources were dictated by teachers, however. In the response area, perceptual development in relation to the elements of design in art work and the environment was unanimously selected, as well.
Figure 4.5. A comparison of interests and objectives in curriculum documents and teachers' long-range lesson plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIENTATIONS</th>
<th>STATE DOCUMENT Objectives</th>
<th>GRADED COURSE OF STUDY Rationale</th>
<th>GRADED COURSE OF STUDY OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>CURRICULUM GUIDE PHILOSOPHY</th>
<th>CURRICULUM GUIDE EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>CURRICULUM GUIDE OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>CURRICULUM AGREEMENTS</th>
<th>LONG-RANGE LESSON PLANS (n = 47)</th>
<th>Fourth Grade (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL FULFILLMENT (Total)</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>Inner Personal States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Desig., Subject Matter; Media &amp; Motor</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Media &amp; Motor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART IN SOCIETY (Total)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTISTIC HERITAGE (Total)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages rounded
** Individual Teachers
X Cursory mention
"students' inner feelings, beliefs, and personal concerns as sources of subjects and themes" (objective #2), for example. None of the teachers selected this objective. Thus, it is somewhat misleading to interpret personal expression or response as an individualistic category. The selected focus is more external—toward objects, media, or the elements and qualities of these—than it is internal. There was little difference in the focus of objectives and intended plans between the third and fourth-grade teachers.

We also note in Figure 4.5 (above) that different curriculum documents and portions of them focus on particular areas within the category of personal fulfillment. As the documents become more localized, they become more particularized and narrow. This seems to be true for the distribution of category emphasis as well, albeit the Philosophy of Intermediate Creative Arts document adopts the more broad notions of general education that include the categories of art in society and artistic heritage. Because this document was developed for a cluster of art forms—visual art, music, dance, and drama, we could interpret this as an attempt to address and accommodate the more fundamental aspects of art's significance in society for all people. The more art forms we address, the more we must recognize their significance and the potential for them to touch more people.

To summarize this chapter, we have explored the program context and the explicit curriculum. In this description and analysis, we saw how amorphous art knowledge can be—how it can be changed, reshaped, even ordered when areas of knowledge originally were presented as equal in importance. Thus, we have a kind of camera obscura effect, where an
image of art has been projected in the field and in curriculum documents and presented to the perceiver (see Figure 4.6). As this image passes through contextual and/or social structures and the lens of the perceiver, the image is flipped upside down and perhaps distorted in some way. It is human nature to interpret and reinterpret phenomena, particularly when the phenomenon is art. Art is a human endeavor and a human construction, therefore, we should expect interpretation and reinterpretation of the "facts and values" embedded in documents and held by the perceivers of such artifacts. Figure 4.5 illustrates intended knowledge at this point. In the real context of the classroom, these intentions may or may not be presented to students. For the students, as perceivers, also will negotiate and influence a reconstruction of art knowledge with teachers.

We now will enter the more pragmatic element of this study, indeed the essence of it. In Chapter V, we will enter the art classes and examine some of the findings of the "enacted" curriculum. This chapter will reflect the active construction of art knowledge in the classroom and the meanings persons attached to this experience.
Figure 4.6. Art knowledge through the eyes of beholders and contextual constraints.
Chapter V

THE ENACTED CURRICULUM

The enacted curriculum is the teaching-learning process related to some subject matter, which is presented by a teacher or students and negotiated in an educational context. Most often the nature of this content or process is precipitated and guided by the teacher because of his/her adult status in the classroom. Unlike the explicit, official, or planned curriculum, the enacted curriculum is that which actually takes place in the classroom. Shaped by the natural setting of the classroom and the persons interacting there, the enacted curriculum is imbued with intentionality and practicality, both of which may be tacit or taken for granted by the persons in this setting. This negotiation of art knowledge is the pragmatic realm of curriculum.

This chapter focuses on the enacted art curriculum in the three third-grade art classes and the two fourth-grade art classes. At each level, distinctions among individuals, settings, groups of students, and curricula will be presented. Then we will examine pervasive similarities of activities across groups.

For most students in this school system, third grade meant their first encounter with an art specialist on a steady, once-a-week basis for a semester. To students of all ages, art ranks high on a list of
most liked school subjects, as was pointed out in Chapter I (Goodlad, 1984). We do not know why this is so, other than Goodlad (p.114) posits that art—like physical education, music, and vocational education—means activity to students:

...Students reported that they liked to do activities that involved them actively, or in which they worked with others. These included going on field trips, making films, building or drawing things, making collections, interviewing people, acting things out, and carrying out projects.

Goodlad's study of 38 schools found a paucity of demonstrating, showing, and modeling on the part of teachers and of constructing things, acting things out, and carrying out projects on the part of students. But there were "more of these in arts, physical education, and vocational education" (p.115). Let us now enter the third grade with three groups of students.

**Third Grade Art**

Before working with the art teachers, students generally felt positive about themselves as artists, the artistic process, and art objects (PC).* And although students focused heavily on the making and doing aspect of art (40%), several students were aware of art as an object to admire (19%), some were aware of the design qualities inherent in art forms (8%), and many focused on the expressive potential of

---

* PC = "Zork" Precheck  
SI-3 = Semi-structured 3rd-grade interview  
SI-4 = Semi-structured 4th-grade interview  
Q = Questionnaire  
I = Informal interview  
FN = Fieldnotes
different media and a positive emotional experience related to this expression (20%). Some identified with the artist and his/her ideas or skill in making an art object. Students said they got ideas for subject matter or how to make art by looking at art. Animals, popular images, people, nature, and vehicles were the most selected subjects students said they portrayed in their work, and these were selected for a variety of reasons—from a fondness of the object represented to being able to create a representation, or investigating the elements of design inherent in these images. Students enjoyed looking at three-dimensional work in particular. Some third graders were aware of our cultural heritage and the history or stories that can be told through art forms. And several students enjoyed the participatory and communicative nature of creating or sharing art with someone else, particularly family members (PC). Table 2 illustrates media preferences of students before their art semester began. Table 3 illustrates the reasons students gave for these preferences.

Table 2. Third graders' preferences for media before they had third-grade art ("Zork" preassessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Group B-1 (n = 30)</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paints*</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Crayons</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt tips</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Felt tips</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayons/craypas</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Paints</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yarn</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardboard</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Media categories generated by students
Table 3. Third graders' reasons for media choices, before having third-grade art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Comments</th>
<th>Categories of Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Generic, &quot;It's fun!&quot; or &quot;I like paints.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Qualities of the medium, such as &quot;(Clay) is gushy,&quot; &quot;(Craypas) because all the colors blend,&quot; or &quot;It [sic] got beautiful colors.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Flexibility of ideas/expressive potential of medium, such as &quot;You can build anything with it,&quot; or &quot;You can use your imagination.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Manipulation/sensing, such as &quot;I like using my hands,&quot; or &quot;It's sticky—yuk! Yuk!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Product outcome, such as &quot;Crayons make pretty pictures,&quot; &quot;They make good pictures,&quot; or &quot;tc shape faces.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see from Table 2 that Group C students listed more media than Group B, as well as media that had potential for three-dimensional work, such as wood, cardboard, and yarn. In Table 3, we note the positive response of students to art and working with different media, as well as the low ranking of product outcome. Indeed the doing, creating, and making were more important than the outcome.

School A-1

Students in School A-1 were from one of the poorest neighborhoods in the city. The two-story school building was old, but alluring in its own stoic way, with spacious halls, tall ceilings, large windows, dark wood trim, blackboards, and warm wooden floors in the classrooms.
Students in this second-floor classroom had few art activities, but when they did, these were often of the cut-and-paste, predefined kind, as in coloring in dittos or copying pictures from textbooks to illustrate plant and animal cells, birds, or aqueducts and reservoirs. The students made bird houses, halloween masks with paper mache, rabbits with paper and yarn, and insects out of clay the semester before the art teacher arrived. The room was colorful, but covered with teacher-made and commercial materials. There was little student work exhibited, but for a few colored dittos of birds. The teacher stated she felt "fairly adequate" providing art instruction, and she usually did this for one hour on Friday afternoons at 1:30 (O & FN).

There were 27 students in this class at the time of the study. This often was difficult to ascertain, as there seemed to be a rather high mobility rate and absenteeism among students, who all lived within walking distance of the school. The neighborhood was well-integrated, with mostly low-rent duplex housing in need of repair. In most respects, teachers said parent support was lacking (FN & I).

There were several volatile, physical explosions between some of the students, particularly on the playground. Some students seemed like little fuses, sparked to ignition over the least provocation. When the art teacher arrived, the classroom teacher usually left the room.

**Art Class A-1**

The art teacher was sometimes a little late for the first art class of the week. She worked directly in the students' classroom because there was no available art room space in this school. She brought in supplies by the boxloads and was sometimes a little slow getting
organized and setting up as the students came in from recess or from the reading specialist. There was no sink in the classroom, although a large custodial sink was located in the girls' restroom directly across the hall. Students were spread out deeply into the room in short, narrow rows. "Trouble-makers" were seated in the very back of the room or on the periphery by design of the classroom teacher, and these frequently were the students who—perhaps because of their location in the room more than any other reason—had difficulty hearing, seeing, and following directions. The art teacher's voice was very soft and did not carry very far either.

This art teacher seemed to have a way of presenting material to students on "their terms." She seemed to anticipate language and experiences familiar to students this age. For example, when using pen and ink for the first time and attempting cross-hatching:

...Crosshatching is a compound word. It means hatching marks that you cross. (She demonstrates on the board with a felt tip pen.) And what you end up with is little things that look like rice checks. ("Ooo," the students chime softly.) (FN)

Another example that reveals the teacher seemed to understand student concerns or responses:

I know that when you go to kindergarten the teachers work hard to make sure you learn to cut. But it's kind of funny to get to third grade and have me say, "Now, I want you to tear." (FN)

Her primary instructional strategy was to take students through an activity, step-by-step, where the art lesson was fragmented with stops and starts, whether or not all students were ready for each new step. She made large examples for each lesson and showed students exactly how and where to put things as she made a new example for each class. Most
of her lessons were "cut-and-paste," she suggested somewhat sheepishly (FN). She moved less around the room to assist students and focused more on the first two or three rows of students as the semester progressed. Some of the students had names on the fronts of their desks; some did not. Since the art teacher did not tend to ask students questions or engage them in verbal interaction as a group, it seemed calling students by name was of little concern to her (FN).

Students were very attentive and quiet during art class. Usually, you could hear a pin drop. After presenting each section of the lesson, step-by-step, the art teacher would go around and assist individual students. Several times she drew troublesome parts of students' pictures for them. Some of the students seemed very hesitant about getting started on a task or making mistakes (I & FN). But invariably, art tasks with this teacher meant using the teacher's example or the visual referents she brought in as subject matter. For example, during a collage exercise focusing on shapes, a small 10" stuffed teddy bear or puppy was the subject:

Jonathan wants to make a deer. The art teacher says, "The only thing we have here to really look at is this dog and the bear, so that's all you can do." (FN)

The following excerpt may help the reader get some sense of what it means for any art teacher to assist students individually in an elementary art class.

Trisha shows T her practice paper. Tanya is told to take her pen out of her bottle. Derinda's hand is up some time before T gets to her. She is unhappy with her work, pouting. Linda's hand is up. T shows Tanya how something looks on the board, and Tanya wads up her paper, unhappy. T assists John. Derinda's hand is still up. Brendon gets ink on himself. Derinda says, "This thing (penpoint) splits," and T says, "It's supposed to—
you're not supposed to push it down that way." Derinda is sitting in the far end of the room today (apparently as punishment) and has already broken one penpoint. Earl is sticking a safety pin into his thumb and holding his thumb upside down, just like I mentioned earlier in the lesson about the sharpness of penpoints. Earl shows Carlton his trick. (FN)

But for a few confrontations with Earl over the semester, art class with this teacher ran fairly smoothly and quietly. This group of students seemed particularly anxious to please the art teacher and hesitant about some of their projects. There was generally a flat and passive tone to the regular classroom, but for confrontations between students entering and leaving the classroom or on the playground (FN). The teacher mentioned that she was "terribly dissatisfied" with her position (Q).

Figure 5.1 provides a synopsis of the art lessons presented to these third graders. Students' favorite lessons were those related to clay (47%). The reasons students generated dealt with their enjoyment of the plasticity of clay (22%), manipulating and sensing (17%), flexibility of ideas (11%), and being able to give their work as a gift, primarily to someone at home (17%). They also found clay to be "fun," in the generic sense (17%). Students also found the clay lessons the most difficult and trying (59%) because the clay was too dry, and their products fell apart. The least favorite lessons (41%) were the ones related to color-mixing, pen and ink, and making woven paper Easter baskets. Students found the media difficult to control or disliked the subject matter, particularly a Jehovah's Witness student who did not celebrate Easter. Ironically, some children selected the two pen and ink lessons as their favorite lessons (SI-3 and FN).
1 Torn-paper teddy bears

2 Teddy-bear backgrounds/collage

3 Pen & ink practice and drawing candy: red paint & white chalk

4 Pen & ink plant; pen & ink bunny from real stuffed object

5 Tracing around shoes and hands; collage

6 Color-mixing with watercolors

7 Clay coil pots

8 Painting coil pots with watercolor and polymer finish

9 Plant collage

10 Woven Easter basket collage & eggs

11 Clay animals

12 Arts festival posters (Drawing)

13 Arts festival posters (Coloring)

14 Checkerboard collage with name

Figure 5.1. A synopsis of the lessons presented to Group A-1 third graders
School B-1

School B was another school built several decades ago, this one much older than School A. It had two stories with a more recent one-story wing for kindergarten. The school was located on the north side with very little playground, most of which was blacktopped and chain-linked against the traffic on the north side.

Group B's classroom also was on the second floor. It was a spacious corner room with wooden floors and large windows on two walls. There was even a coat room with a large vaulting archway right inside the door. There was little evidence of student work in the classroom, as most of it was the teacher's displays or commercial. A couple of the bulletin boards stood bare most of the semester, and some of the displayed work did not change, even seasonably. The classroom was very task-oriented, and there always seemed to be a productive hum. Students were encouraged to cooperate with each other, and the teacher spent as much time helping students develop healthy self-concepts and peer relations as she did on the basics (FN).

There were 27 youngsters in this classroom, also, and most were from low-income households. Most of the black children were bused from a housing project, and other students lived within walking distance of the school. The neighborhood contained housing much like that on the south side—duplexes in need of repair; this also was true of the housing project and its immediate neighborhood. But, as on the southside, one could find beauty—geraniums hanging from a porch, the sound of delicate wind chimes somewhere around the corner, neighbors clustered on front porch steps watching little ones zip precariously
along the curb with their little plastic hot wheels and bare feet.

Teacher B, like Teacher A, felt fairly adequate about providing art instruction (Q). She also stated she provided art once a week on Friday at 1:30, however, for two hours. Like Teacher A, Teacher B said she got her art ideas from fellow teachers, professional journals or magazines, how-to books, and herself. But unlike, the former teacher, Teacher B said she got ideas from her students and their interests. In health, for example, she did a unit on "moods," and the students explored feelings and facial expressions, using construction paper and drawing materials. However, there was very little evidence of student work in the classroom, except for a bulletin board with pictures of nouns students had selected and illustrated with crayons.

Art Class B-1

Art class in this school was conducted in the regular classroom, for lack of artroom space. Student desks were arranged in extended horizontal rows facing the chalkboard, with an aisle down the middle. The art teacher would arrive with her "art cart" on Friday afternoons, and this held the media and materials of the day. Students always attentively awaited her arrival (FNI).

"Good afternoon, third graders," she would announce as she wheeled in her art cart.

"Good afternoon, Mrs.———," they would respond in unison. Then she would turn to write the steps of the lesson and art vocabulary on the board, while many students mouthed the words attentively as she wrote. While she wrote, she told the students what they would need to get out of their desks for the lesson e.g., scissors, glue, pencils.
Art Teacher B seemed extremely organized and matter-of-fact, always in control, calm, and business-like. She tended to use about 50% of the allotted 55-minute class time lecturing and explaining, even though the students got wigglesome (but remained polite) after about ten or fifteen minutes (FN & I-3). This art teacher had a distinctive way of engaging students in verbal interchange during her presentation, using a question-answer motif and teacher or student-made examples. Always, she seemed to be after "the correct" answers to her questions.

"What's special about the way these (shapes) are put together?" she asks the whole class.

"You made them kind of close together," says Gwyn.

"They're close together...in fact, they're almost touching. There's something else special about the way they're put together. Deedee."

"The colors."

"Yes, they are colored, but it's not telling me how it's special about the way they're put together. Tara."

"They're real neat."

"Yes, I try to be neat," the teacher continues, in pursuit of the right answer and perhaps misinterpreting Tara's comment. "Jim."

"Different shapes?" someone else offers. The uncertainty sets in.

"Yes, they're different shapes...but I need somebody to tell me how it's special about the way I made them close together there." (The children never guess the correct response, "overlap.") (FN)

By instructing this way, the art teacher may have learned a great deal about student thinking and what they knew. She also helped students think through the meaning of words or principles with this
"guessing game" approach. For ten or fifteen minutes, this strategy seemed to hold students in rapt attention, several hands vying for recognition. However, after a while students began squirming and stretching at their desks and in their chairs (FN).

The art teacher stated that it was important for students to understand "why they will be doing what they will be doing, like in reading and math" (I). Her voice was loud and distinct, and her manner of presentation so organized it seemed rehearsed. Not only did she pursue correct responses (verbally and artistically), but she often asked many cause-effect questions e.g., "What would happen if I did it this way?" to illustrate the correct response with a negative example. This teacher also demonstrated with examples, constructing as she went. However, she presented an entire lesson in one sweep; and although it was step-by-step and very thorough, it was lengthy and difficult for students to remember the content or directions when it came time to make their art. She assisted students when they began their work, covering the room extensively. The students had names on the fronts of their desks, and this teacher made a point to call students by name in her question-answer motif and when assisting individual students. Figure 5.2 provides a synopsis of the lessons presented to this group of third graders.

These students' favorite lessons were fantasy faces (33%) and the positive-negative shape lesson using cut paper and chalk (24%). Students enjoyed these lessons the most because of the subject matter and freedom of expression. For example, "You could make your own
1 Drawing objects in desk (crayon)

2 Line design (crayons)

3 Drawing/collage of shapes in room

4 Color wheel; texture rubbings (warm & cool)

5 Still life using black over rubbings

6 Design (two designs reassembled into one)

7 Figure drawing; proportion

8 Watercolor animals; animal shapes

9 Watercolor butterflies, spaceships, birds; color mixing

10 Rabbit/butterfly paper sculpture glued to paper

11 Positive and negative shapes in a pattern (cut paper)

12 Positive and negative shapes (stencil and chalk)

13 Fantasy faces with crayons and wet chalk; symmetry

14 Paper weaving; pattern

Figure 5.2. A synopsis of the lessons presented to Group B-1 third graders
faces...and create what you want." They also said they enjoyed these lessons for the manipulative and sensual qualities of the medium used (wet chalk, chalk). The least favorite lessons were the still life (19%) because the students perceived the teacher expected realism and the line design, where directions were particularly confusing. The same positive-negative shape picture using chalk was selected as the easiest lesson by many students (24%), primarily because many of the students elected to cut out hearts or other stereotypical shapes. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the students also selected the still life as the most difficult lesson; and several did not like the paper weaving or human figure drawing (33%). (SI-3 & FN)

School C

School C was located on the east side, and it was a more modern building than Schools A and B. It stretched into an "L," with wide halls, plants, and colorful student art throughout the building, both two and three-dimensional. Because the classrooms were much smaller in this school than in the older structures, it seemed every nook was used. For example, Teacher C had an old upright piano in her room, a small rug, a science center, art center, display area of student projects, and the window sill flowed with kits and activities for students to do. The students' desks were clustered into fours and fives; later in the year they were clustered into two groups of desks, two short rows of students facing each other in each cluster. Thus, students were never organized in isolated straight rows, but always faced each other or a group.

There were 29 students in this classroom, most from middle and lower income households, many bused from a housing project, and some
within a short walking distance of school in a modest neighborhood. Thus, there was a greater mix of income background in this school than there was in Schools A and B.

This classroom was an active and alive place, compared to those in Schools A and B. Students were observed peer teaching from the basal reader, working on a hooked rug, making wax horses for their diorama (which emerged from their interest in a story in one of the basal), and voting on an upcoming project. The classroom was a testament to the students in the room, all walls and nearby halls covered with their work, a chores-area chocked with mugshots of students arranged for rotating responsibilities, photos on the door from recent field trips, and a large banner spread the length of the windows on a clothesline in celebration of Black History Month. This evidence of student activity and decision-making seemed a testament to their teacher who believed "anything can be taught through the arts," and to be meaningful, "curriculum should derive from students" (I). Even in routine procedures, students were given more responsibility, such as going to the restroom:

"Does anyone need a bathroom break?" T inquires, after addressing the morning chores. Those who need this break get up order and leave the room quietly. This is about half the class. No lines. No waiting. No commotion or confusion. I am amazed. (FN)

Teacher C was a trained artist and actively involved in the visual arts and drama. She was neither totally satisfied nor dissatisfied with her position and felt more confident about her own artistic ability than the other two teachers did. She stated she did art "everyday, at all different times," amounting to about 5-7 hours per week. The classroom
evidenced this activity. Teacher C got her ideas for art from art education texts, professional magazines/journals, how-to books, and her own creativity (Q). She also stated she got most of her ideas from her students and their interests, as well as the local/state curriculum guide (Q & I).

Art Class C

The art teacher used an available room for art classes. Students were led to the art room for instruction, late Friday afternoons. The room was decorated colorfully with student art, prints, and other materials taken from the resources available at Fort Armand. There were two long lunch tables with metal folding chairs, and individual student desks and chairs of varying sizes. Much of this equipment seemed to be castaways, as bent chair legs and desks rocked with little persuasion from students. Most of the time, individual desks were bunched together into fours and sixes; and each art lesson presented a different arrangement of furniture, geared to the media and activity. There was a tiny sink near the door with cold water only. Because there was no insulated ceiling, books in shelves, or other typical classroom items, the least noise bounced around the room and was exaggerated in volume. The scooting of desks and chairs with wigglesome students and the level of chatter was sometimes a strain on the nerves, even to students (FN & I).

The art teacher preferred demonstrating while she explained, as she asked students to bring their chairs and gather around her at one of the desk arrangements. Like Art Teachers A and B, Teacher C seemed very organized. Her demonstrations were usually sitting ones, about ten to
fifteen minutes in length, with no teacher-student verbal interchange but for correcting errant behavior. Students and the art teacher may have been tired by this time of day and week. The art teacher claimed, however, that this was the "worst class" of all her assigned schools. She suggested this group of students was "horrible" the previous year when she taught them as second graders (I). (They had the same classroom teacher as second graders, as well.)

For whatever reasons, in the art class there was much teacher yelling, screaming, turning off of lights, and reprimands throughout explanations and the making of art. This occurred in another art class as well, as yelling could be heard at the end of the art class scheduled previous to this one (FN). Several of the students complained to me of getting headaches or earaches during art class (I & I-3). It seemed the volume of talking among students rose above the art teacher's threshold and that of the non-absorbing structure of the room.

The art teacher had a rapid voice that rose in pitch and intensity when she raised the volume. It often was difficult to follow or understand her, whether she was reprimanding or giving directions to a task:

Sh-sh! (Pause) How many of you have your names on the front of the booklets? (Pause) Sh-sh! Do you have all your paper numbered? How many did you end up with? ("Twenty," some volunteer.) Good. Now, if you don't have the twenty spaces and you did something wrong, you can probably fix the pages or something, so go back and check—uh, we don't want any marks on the front or back of booklets, except your name, and number them, class—not just count them! You're supposed to start right inside the cover and put a number on each space—quickly—Sh-sh!! (FN)
Rather than the soft, reassuring ways of Art Teacher A, who used, "Honey, what's your problem?", or Art Teacher B's way of shaping student responses in a predictable, yet engaging "guessing-game" manner, Art Teacher C's verbal interactions sometimes came off to students as sarcastic, even though she may not have intended it (I-3 & I):

In the first lesson, T presents the notion of "realistic style" on the board. She asks if anyone knows what doing something realistic means.

"Something that looks real," Nancy responds.

T points out that there are different degrees of realism. She holds up one of her teacher-made examples (a still life) and asks if it looks like a photograph. Someone says that it does, and she responds,

"This looks like a photograph?" The kids seem stumped. "Can you tell what I used to make it?" The students then describe the lines and textures of crayon or pastels.

"Then it must not be a photograph." (FN)

After demonstrating, the art teacher tended to sit in a different place each week, and students, for the most part, came to her to seek assistance. This art teacher's forte was working individually with students, rather than doing whole-class presentations. She managed her class much like one would expect a secondary class to be run—ten to fifteen minutes of lecture and a lot of studio time, working with individual students and their problems at hand. Although she had students hand out and pin on name tags each week, (which took about 10 minutes of class time), she rarely called on or knew these students by name, even though she had taught them the previous year.

Figure 5.3 presents a synopsis of the lessons presented to these third graders. Students' favorite lessons were clay pinch pots (36%),
1 Drawing objects for a still life; crayon on colored paper

2 Still life collage using wallpaper and objects drawn previously

3 Still life collage, adding plant leaves and details

4 Flash slides (charcoal; perceptual memory); still life in chalk of plants

5 Styrofoam plate preparation for printing; plants/plant designs

6 Printmaking in a pattern

7 Pen & ink trees

8 Tissue paper background for clown faces

9 Clown faces, white paint on colored tissue paper background

10 Clay pinchpots

11 Cardboard loom preparation for yarn weaving

12 Yarn weaving (neutrals and hues; pattern)

13 Monochromatic painting, close-up of plants

14 Painting fired pinchpots and completing weaving

15 Cityscape; crayon etching

**Figure 5.3.** A synopsis of the lessons presented to Group C third graders
weaving (16%), and the clown faces (16%). They stated they enjoyed these lessons the most because of the qualities of the media (16%), manipulating and sensing the media (15%), and the generic, "It's fun!" (18%). Least favorite lessons were the still life (pastels and crayon) and flash slides (28%). The still life was not enjoyed because students were confused by the directions; the flash slides were not liked because they required drawing shapes from memory (18%) without an explanation as to why this was an important or helpful thing to be able to do. Many students found weaving with yarn the most difficult lesson (28%), as well as the still life with pastels and flash slides. There was wide variation in what students perceived as the easiest lessons, from weaving, to the still life (cut paper), clown faces, and to clay. Some students suggested that several of the lessons were repeated from second-grade art.

Summary of Art in the Third Grade

There were distinctive features among the three art classes related to routine and instructional strategies, but for the most part the routine for all three art classes can be summarized as follows:

1. The teacher readied materials and told students what to do.
3. The students made what the teacher requested, usually by mimicking the teachers' examples or producing some close facsimile.
4. The teacher collected the students' work at the end of each class.

Table 4 illustrates routine across the three art classrooms, as perceived by students and astutely described (SI-3). After a semester of instruction, the question was asked: "What usually happens in the
Table 4. Routine across the three third-grade art classes as perceived by the students.
art class? Pretend I haven't been with you all semester. Tell me what happens first, then next, and next, and so on."

Table 4 (above) illustrates distinctions as well as commonalities among the three-third grade art classes. All categories were developed from the student responses in interviews (SI-3). One student said, "We discuss--," then changed her mind and said, "No, she explains it." Thus, there is the category of discussion, left blank. None of the students perceived their interactions in art class with art teachers or peers as "discussion." Student references to evaluation related to art teachers judging correctness—to "see if we got it right." Teacher B was perceived to have had few discipline problems, whereas Teacher C was perceived otherwise. Teacher B wrote on the board, whereas Teacher C was more noted by students for her explanations and demonstrations. The order and number of activities generated by students ranged from three to ten steps, but generally they all encompassed the four steps mentioned earlier. All three teachers demonstrated the desired product and left it up as a visible referent, wherein many students attempted to copy this representation. Group C students and the art teacher were a little more independently inclined, perhaps because of their regular classroom art experiences and the art teacher's instructional preference or style.

Fourth Grade Art

Some children were bused to intermediate schools in the fourth grade, and others then went to school in their own neighborhoods, having been bused in their primary grades. A-I students on the south side went to a newer building, which sprawled out into an "H" with one leg
missing. B-1 students on the north side also went to a newer school that stretched out into long hallways, more like a "U". As students were dispersed into new fourth-grade classrooms, the original groups in this study were split up. Because this is now fourth grade, I will call the A-1 students, A-2; and the B-1 students, B-2. I lost School C students due to a schedule conflict during this inquiry.

School A-2

School A-2 had a new computer room, and this was one of the more innovative aspects of the school program. Artists-in-the-Schools also was a program used by the school. Several of the students participated in some drama experiences and created a play with the help of one of these specialists. The school was located in a quiet area of the southern part of town and had a huge parking lot between it and the busiest of the streets nearest the school. The playground was spacious, containing a large lawn.

The teacher of Group A-2 students did not seem particularly supportive of the arts. She had a wide range of students in her classroom, some of whom attended the gifted and talented program once a week, and some of whom needed remedial reading. She brought students to the art class and returned for them each morning, with little said about what they had been up to.

The classroom was split into two clusters of student desks with an area in the middle occupied by a round table that seemed rarely used (FN). There was no evidence of student work or art on the walls, yet there were several teacher-made displays. Large blooming plants lined the window sill all along the low bookcases. This, too, was a task-
oriented classroom, and students were held to task. This was done gently and harshly, depending on the teacher's mood. Once while I was speaking with this teacher, one of the students came up with his book to ask a question. "Sit down! I said sit down!!" she boomed. I was inclined to envision a cartoon with a little person knocked back on his heels from the mere volume of this command. At other times, the teacher was soft-spoken and pleased to show me her gifted students' work (hand-made books) that had been made with another specialist.

There was little evidence of art in this school on an on-going basis, but for the occasional wall exhibits put up by the art teacher. In fact, art could not be scheduled early on any morning because the principal insisted reading and math took precedence over art. This resulted in the art teacher backtracking the second semester to "pick up" those fourth graders in the third-grade semester she missed in the designated fourth-grade semester. The art teacher found the principal difficult to work with, as in getting a large sink or making the one available in the art class function by calling a plumber. (I)

**Art Class A-2**

Fourth-grade art for this group of 31 students meant going to an art room. This was different from their third-grade year when the art teacher came to their classroom with boxloads of materials. This room had one large lunch table with metal folding chairs and several individual desks and chairs of varied sizes arranged in single, no-touching fashion. There were student examples and visuals from Fort Armand and the teacher's own collection of visuals displayed all around the room. Most of the bulletin boards changed frequently as new work
was produced, procured for art exhibits, or taken home. Art class rules were posted: (1) Stay in seat; (2) Follow directions; and (3) Work quietly; and as an afterthought, "Smile, things could be worse." Also, on a bulletin board in large letters was, "Artists use lines, shapes, colors, texture."

Of the art teachers observed, Teacher A-2 seemed to have exhibited the most outward enthusiasm for art (FN & I). And, among the teachers, she was the only one to consistently use visuals, prints, and other materials from Fort Armand to help motivate students, to help them see a variety of interpretations and styles of art. The students seemed most responsive to this, particularly when the visuals portrayed people and animals. In fact, of all the subject matter students seemed to have recalled when visiting an art museum or exhibit related to people and animals (SI-3). What this teacher seemed to point out most when showing visuals were different styles, expressive qualities, and rhythm or movement. For example, when showing a Picasso print before students did figure drawings:

> When you look at this picture, you know that these people are sad. Their bodies have been made long and thin, abstracting them—reshaping them, giving you a feeling of thinness, sad... Uh, the colors are cool, sad colors. This is a painting by Picasso—Pablo Picasso. (FN)

This also was the only lesson where students, one at a time, were asked to actively pose in a sports gesture and freeze. Soon, about half the class was frozen in a pose:

> Now, look at all these body movements around you that when you look, you can see the action, and you can see the rhythm—the line of the body. (FN)
For the most part, students were asked to do things realistically, however. (The nature of this realism will be discussed in the next chapter.) Teacher A-2's directions were not always clear and she seemed to have assumed a great deal about youngsters' knowledge of shading, perspective, or proportion. Think about what tasks and knowledge would be required in drawing pieces of popcorn realistically:

Notice when you shade the popcorn with light, medium, and dark shading that it comes out from the background. It makes it stand out when you shade it all in. See these shapes up here...how they come out when you shade them in with light, medium, and dark? If you shade all real dark, and if you want it to come out, you shade it in lighter. It all comes out when you shade it darker. (FN)

This was all with students having little previous knowledge about forms with volume, light and shadow, or shading principles—particularly for the former A-1 students in this group who I observed the previous year. Not only was the teacher's language confusing, with the lack of previous concepts or experience it seemed the students were doomed to fail at this task, which most found frustrating (FN & I).

In many lessons, the teacher requested students start over several times, even when they assumed they were near completion. In one lesson, nine children had been asked to start over more than twice. The teacher also marked, crossed through, or corrected students' work, which to some fourth graders was a terrible thing to do. They perceived it as, "messing up my paper," and "changing people's paper" (SI-4). A request for realism certainly was perceived by students, whether or not the teacher intended it:

(I wish art teachers would) let kids do what's on their mind...in drawing...like drawing the people the way they want 'em instead of like she wants 'em. (I)
Another reflected somewhat differently:

(Student should have a choice) between using the teacher's thing or their own design because (art teacher) really wanted us to do our own designs. (I)

This art teacher did something else that the other teachers did not do, and that was hold up students' art as they worked and make a brief comment about each: "I like the nice pattern that Joan's putting on her dress (human figure). Isn't that neat?" (FM) Interspersed with these comments were reminders and "by-the-ways" to the whole class.

Figure 5.4 illustrates a synopsis of the lessons presented to the A-2 fourth graders. The favored lessons were those where students made clay animals and did stitchery (68%). The reasons for this selection related to manipulating and sensing media, the generic "It's fun!", and a reference to home. Like last year, this year's students enjoyed taking things home and giving them as gifts to their parents. The least favorite lessons dealt with a tissue paper background for pen and ink trees (24%), primarily because students said that it was messy and difficult to control; stitchery (14%) because some felt it was tedious and boring; and drawing popcorn because student perceived the teacher expected realism. The most difficult lessons to students again were stitchery and drawing popcorn (43%). The easiest lesson to these fourth graders was making a piece of Christmas wrapping paper (pattern) with familiar symbols (52%); the subject matter was familiar. As with all the groups of students, there was great variation of favorite, least favorite, most difficult, and easiest lessons. Invariably, the most difficult lesson also was perceived to be the least favorite; however, favorite lessons were rarely perceived by students to be the easiest.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawing popcorn (pencil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drawing still life in charcoal (objects set up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Figure drawing: shapes and proportion; movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>College background for figure drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Animal drawing: outlined in black crayon and glue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Painting animals and background in watercolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adding details to animal pictures with craypas; landscape/experimenting with craypas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Full-face portrait; proportion; crayons and craypas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colored-paper masks; cut paper and collage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tissue paper background for pen &amp; ink trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pen &amp; ink trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Half, clay animals; half sketching ideas for clay animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Half, clay animals; half folded paper design using pattern (crayon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cardboard frame preparation for stitchery; sketching idea onto burlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Christmas wrapping paper; folded construction paper; felt tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Stitchery on burlap; running and satin stitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Stitchery on burlap; cross stitch; painting clay animals with polymer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stitchery on burlap; chain stitch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.4.** A synopsis of the lessons presented to Group A-2 fourth graders.
School B-2

School B-2's neighborhood was a low-rent housing project in which many of the students lived. The lobby and office of the school always seemed busy with parents dropping off or retrieving students. The hallways were filled with student work, and there were several bulletin boards with photos of students selected as "good citizens" of the week. The atmosphere of the school was businesslike, but very open and friendly to parents and visitors alike. For example, one elderly woman was adopted as "grandma" by the students, and she often was seen tutoring children or telling them stories. At Halloween, students brought hand-made costumes and masks and paraded through the neighborhood.

The classroom of these students had few of the students' work displayed. The students' desks were arranged in a large "U" with a double row of desks inside the "U" facing each other. The open end of the "U" faced the chalkboard, and the teacher's desk was in the back corner. This, too, was a task-oriented classroom with little funny business. On one occasion, I observed four children at a time, standing at the back of the "U" of desks, being drilled on multiplication tables. This was a fast-paced, flash card activity which had the students each step forward with his/her own correct response, however, in unison. Thus, some students stepped forward quickly, while others stood tensely trying to think fast enough to step forward with the next flash card. Failure and success were highly visible, but the teacher seemed supportive, matter-of-fact, and low-key in her approach, yet on top of things and each student constantly.
Of all the classroom teachers, this one attended almost every art class and often assisted the art teacher when students began working on their projects. The art teacher seemed pleased with the extra hands. This classroom teacher was particularly helpful when Margarita, a Spanish youngster who could speak little or no English, was in the class. The teacher was of oriental background, yet spoke fluent Spanish. She was the interpreter for the art teacher's directions and questions, as well as the questions of Margarita. Several times, the classroom teacher sat in the back and scored papers, keeping a watchful eye on students and disciplining them, which seldom was necessary. That the teacher came to the art room with the students said something of her interest in students learning in this area, yet there was little outward enthusiasm for the arts in the classroom or the art room.

Art Class B-2

The 30 students in this class attended art class in a room designated for such. Unlike the other teachers who used an art room, this art teacher did not put up many displays of student work, or any other visuals for that matter. The room was quite barren all semester, actually. The most dominant objects in the room were three long lunch tables that had round, connected stools. These tables were number one, two, and three, and before the first art class of the semester was underway, students were assigned seats. The classroom teacher then reorganized students, knowing the children better than the art teacher.

Group B-2's art teacher was the same art teacher most students had in the third grade—the teacher who came to their classroom with her art cart. Fourth-grade art would have a different slant than third-grade
class, however. During the first class, she told the students:

I'm going to be grading artwork this year. I didn't do that last year at (School B-1)... The checkmark in the middle is what most of you will get. The checkmark simply means that you worked that day... and that's satisfactory work—you tried, you were working, and whatever you got done was good for you.

(Last year) we worked a lot in design—worrying about shape, and color, and line, and size, and texture, and making a lot of things. We didn't do a lot of drawing. Drawing is not easy... It's very hard for some people to even see how a line might need to go—like what direction it needs to go. Drawing (is) using your eyes to put down on a piece of paper the things you see in the world around you. (FN)

As in the previous year, in the fourth grade the art teacher presented the whole lesson, step-by-step, using about 50% of class time. Again, she used a question-answer motif in presenting the lesson, and again, students seemed to tire after about fifteen minutes. In the fourth-grade year, the art teacher used fewer visuals and more demonstrations on the chalkboard. There was more drawing and realistic representation than exploration of design concepts or "messy" media, even with a room for art. One of the "star" pupils in the third grade was in this fourth-grade class. However, she was somewhat disgruntled with fourth-grade art:

(I wish the art teacher) didn't talk so much! They shouldn't be so bossy and sit people by their enemies. She made us stay in for our recess. I don't think that's fair. We had to lose our recess. (SI-4)

Table 5.5 presents a synopsis of the lessons presented to the Group B-2 fourth graders. Most of these lessons required realistic representation and drawing skill. But the art teacher felt that fourth graders "want so badly to draw realistically and just can't do it yet" (I). There was no doubt that Group B-2 students, like the previous
1 Drawing a shoe (pencil)
2 Figure drawing: shapes cut out, assembled
3 Rubbing of above, cutting out; adding details and background (crayon)
4 Drawing eyes, nose, mouth; front and side view (pencil)
5 Portrait, face (pencil)
6 Magician posters; making and cutting out letters
7 Birds in a crowd; fanciful birds; crayons on black paper
8 Pen & ink trees (pencil and pen & ink)
9 Faces in a crowd (cut-out ovals and crayon)
10 Quilled Christmas tree ornaments (rolled paper)
11 Winter or Christmas collage (substitute teacher)
12 Winter landscape (white chalk, charcoal on gray paper)

Table 5.5 A synopsis of the lessons presented to Group B-2 fourth graders
year, selected favorite lessons on the basis of subject matter (33%). The most popular lesson was quilled Christmas ornaments (38%), primarily because "it was fun, and we could use it for Christmas" (SI-4). This activity required no drawing skills, and it certainly had timely relevance to students. Another popular lesson was the "fantastic birds" (19%) where students could "draw it any way you want," according to one youngster. The least favorite lesson was drawing the shoes (33%) because it required realistic representation, according to students. Others did not like cutting poster letters (19%) because "it was boring," primarily. Doing the pen and ink trees and drawing the shoes were lessons perceived by students as the most difficult (43%). Pen and ink was difficult, according to fourth graders, because manipulating and controlling the medium was difficult; the shoe lesson was difficult because students perceived the teacher expected realism (57%). The easiest lesson, according to students, was the winter/Christmas collage when a substitute teacher taught class (19%). "You could do anything you wanted to," according to one student. (SI-4)

**Summary**

To summarize this chapter, the distinctions and similarities among art classes have been presented—not only those within a grade level, but also between grade levels. We see similar kinds of lessons, even the same subjects and media, some of which are suggested by the curriculum documents and many of which teachers perceived to work in the practical context of schools. It would seem that the teachers carried out their primary intentions: that of offering students the exploration of media and the necessary development of control over media and
materials. They did this in a variety of ways. And, as the supervisor and teachers suggested there would be, there was little attention given to art in society or our artistic heritage. Despite what teachers expressed, in practice personal expression seemed narrowly defined for students.

The passage of time can play havoc with first impressions. In all fairness, I would like to return to impressions momentarily. Student products, matted and displayed for exhibits, possessed a rich vitality about them. These artistic products were not like those observed in most regular classrooms. Student representations created through art instruction seemed to have exhibited an attentiveness to color, detail, and proportion. Many of the subjects, qualities, and media portrayed in such exhibits would not be found in regular classroom art e.g., a still life, full figure drawings or paintings in active poses, mixed media representations that obviously would take longer than one class period to produce. Observing whole-class results often allowed me to forget the beauty displayed in public exhibits. Exhibitions required a high degree of selectivity. In an exhibit, only the "best work" could be exhibited—two or three pieces per activity or class.

Another impression that should not be lost among the findings was the art teachers' incredible ability to manage and organize materials and activities so that tasks could be accomplished in the allotted time with few accidents or student movement. Management skills related to the availability and distribution of resources were commendable, particularly where there were no facilities for art activities. As a teacher, I learned much from these teachers' procedures.
What did students learn about art? What did their experiences in art class mean to them? How might we assess these perceptions in relation to the active construction of art knowledge observed over a two-year period? In the next chapter we will explore these questions.
Chapter VI
WHAT STUDENTS LEARNED IN ART...AND ABOUT ART

The most pervasive finding in this study was the routinization of art knowledge. This routinization can best be described as nested like a Russian doll or the layers of an onion. Depending on one's perception, this routinization was top-down because of structural constraints in the program or schools, or bottom-up because of individual instructional practice, teacher beliefs, and actions. I believe the findings in this study suggest the routinization of art knowledge was influenced by both of these layers interacting, as well as those perceptions students brought to the situation. What was the character of this routinization, and what sense did students make of it? We have already examined the third-grade students' perceptions of routine across their art classes.

The art teachers in this program leaned toward the teaching of "realistic" skills. "Realistic" or "realism" can be defined in several ways. One way to define this emphasis was represented in the teachers' request that students make art objects that mimicked nature, a still life, the human figure in proportion, or the teachers' examples. Even though the curriculum documents emphasized "enjoyable developmental experiences" that are "wholesome" for youngsters, it was dubious that
"spontaneity, intuitive decision-making, self-direction, appreciation of others' art, or working with a group" were general espoused goals being met in actual practice. The emphasis on realistic representation was only one particular kind of skill developed. The enacted curriculum, in fact, may have thwarted expressive, individualistic, or cooperative goals. Life in the art class was much more subtle and complex than the language of paper documents.

The above kind of definition of "realistic" or "realism" requires a kind of instructional approach that teaches children to see objects as they "really" exist in nature and to reproduce these. The visual referent did not have to be a still life set up by the teacher; most often, it was the teacher's example. This focus best suits one of Efland's (1983) models of art instruction based upon a mimetic-behavioristic theme. Practice makes perfect, and perfect is what the teachers offered as "real."

Another definition of "realism" embedded in routinization is illustrated in the teachers' tacit expectation that students adopt their view of reality as the "right" one. For example, all the art teachers had a preferred way of looking at the world and art, and these beliefs were exhibited in their presentations and actions in the art class. Remember Teacher B-2, who believed fourth graders wanted to draw realistically, but "just couldn't" yet? Also, drawing was one of her favorite activities, thus she presented this two-dimensional view of reality in the fourth-grade art class (I). Over a two-year period, her students never experienced three-dimensional media, such as clay, yarn, or other construction materials. Teacher C apparently enjoyed nature
and plants. Most of her lessons had plants or abstractions of plants as subject matter. Teacher A-2 "loved color" and the expressive qualities possible with different media. However, in her zest for expressiveness, she tended to impose her idea of "real" expressiveness on students by marking on their papers and having them start over many times.

Yet another kind of "realism" was that imposed by the pervasive structures of schools and their emphasis on basic skills rather than the arts. Even by the third grade, many students had gotten the message that "art must not be very important" or real because of its low status in the total school program and in their classrooms (but for Classroom C).

Students brought their own perceptions of "real" to the art class. Their home activities related to art often were discontinuous with or more eclectic than those of school (I & Q). For now, let us go back to the art classes and examine how art knowledge was routinized and how students attempted to negotiate a more three-dimensional or eclectic view of art.

A Closer Look at the Construction of Art Knowledge

The demands in constructing art knowledge were as great for students as they were for their art teachers who selected concepts and arranged activities for them. Because lesson plans emanated from media and the exploration/control of media, a procedural kind of knowledge was apt to occur. This also was true for students if they entered art classes believing that art was primarily making and doing.
The Paradox of Following Directions

By the teachers' definitions of goals and tasks, there was a very thin line between what was considered "realistic" and what was "abstract" or "self-expressive" in children's art products. It was as if teachers believed students were being "creative" or "self-expressive" because students each got a piece of paper and produced something—even though this "something" frequently was what teachers had in mind or said they wanted. For the most part, students were shown teacher examples to copy. Teacher A-1 did this step-by-step, even though she reassured students on several occasions that their work did not have to look exactly like hers. The students' choice, however, usually was to play it safe. If making a torn-paper teddy bear was the objective, a teddy bear it would be...as nearly like that of the teacher's example as possible. A teacher's example left up intentionally seemed to have been an implicit signal to do art the teacher's way, or to copy her work.

Examine this mixed message:

Your bear isn't going to look just like mine, and mine's not going to look like yours, and yours isn't going to look like your neighbor's. But they're all going to be bears 'cause you're going to try to make this fellow right here. (And later...) This is the bear you're making. You're trying to look at him and make your bear look like this one. (FN)*

Teacher B-1/8-2 encouraged even less deviation. Like her question-answer lecture pattern, there was a correct way to go about creating an

* SI-3 = Semi-structured 3rd-grade interviews
SI-4 = Semi-structured 4th-grade interviews
Q = Questionnaire
I = Informal interview
FN = Fieldnotes
art product or accomplishing an art task, either in verbal instruction
or in recipe-type directions on the board.

"Where is the glue bottle for you to look at (to draw)?
You need to put it up in front of you so you can see it,
Jan." (FN)

(On board)
Rules for Portraits:
1. Draw an oval or egg for the head. Divide in fourths.
2. Draw eyes on center line. Both the same.
3. Draw nose on half of either side of center line.
4. Draw mouth and change chin [to refine symmetry].
5. Ears go on line with eyes.
6. Add eyebrows and hair. (FN)

In all of the classes, "following directions," "using your eyes,"
or "rules" were impressed often upon students publicly and privately.
Frequently, students would copy the teacher's example, rather than the
"real" objects to be drawn, even when these objects were sitting right
on their desks in front of them. Also, they would succumb to "cheating"
or tracing around objects if these objects were small and handy
(scissors, glue bottle, popcorn, or candy). Students tended to draw
what they "knew" about objects, rather than really observing them, which
seemed to be a natural developmental phenomenon for youngsters this age,
particularly in the third grade (Chapman, 1978; Eisner, 1972; Gaitskell
& Hurwitz, 1970; Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1970). This phenomenon was most
evident at both grade levels when tasks required knowledge and skill
related to three-dimensional perspective.

Thus, "following directions" could be equated with copying the
teacher's example or drawing realistically. Even if the teacher's
example were not realistic in the life-like sense, her product was the
concrete and "realistic" referent, slice of reality, or object to
imitate. When third graders were asked about this mimicking, they did not equate copying the teacher's example with cheating, nor were they led to believe this through the teachers' actions. In interviews, youngsters stated that copying—in the cheating sense—occurred when one copied a classmate's ideas or work (I-3). Interestingly, almost all of the students stated that they preferred to use their imagination over copying, even in the fourth grades. Table 5 illustrates the strength of student preferences for using their imagination, rather than copying.

Table 5. Percentage of students who preferred copying an example or using their imagination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Grade Schools</th>
<th>Prefer Copying an Example</th>
<th>Prefer Using Their Imagination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>(3) 18%</td>
<td>(14) 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>(3) 13%</td>
<td>(18) 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(1) 4%</td>
<td>(24) 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(7) 11%</td>
<td>(56) 89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Grade Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5 (above), we notice that there is a slight increase in
the fourth grade toward a preference for copying. One might surmise
that this is because of the "dawning age of realism" or "crisis of
confidence" espoused in the literature related to artistic development.
For example, Chapman (1978, p.187) suggests:

> Because children of this age are more self-critical
> than younger children, they are quick to judge their
> own efforts as "good" or "bad." Children begin to
> perceive themselves as talented or untalented in art.
> Their lack of confidence is usually apparent in such
> behavior as starting over and over again, hiding work
> in progress, copying, and throwing away completed work.

Interestingly, I saw little evidence of fourth-grade students "starting
over and over again" of their own volition. Starting over again usually
was at the request of a teacher; and as many third graders started over
as did fourth graders (FN). Most of the fourth graders who preferred
copying perceived "the right way" to do a task as copying the teacher's.
However, several fourth graders suggested their ideas were better than
the teacher's (18%). Table 6 illustrates why some students said they
preferred copying. Note the paraphrased reasons. Furthermore, in Group
A-2 only one fourth grader preferred copying, the reason being, "I want
mine to be pretty like the teacher's." In Group B-2, where realistic
drawing skills predominated the lessons, five students preferred
copying. One student suggested, "That way I don't have to think and
spend all my time--I just draw what the teacher draws." Another said,
"I can think of my own ideas, but all the time I always gotta ask (the
art teacher), and so I do it by her example" (S1-4).

The number-one reason for students preferring to use their
imagination was that they perceived more flexibility of ideas or
Table 6. Why some students preferred copying an example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Reasons (Paraphrased; n = 18)</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Sample Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So I can get it &quot;right&quot;/like the teacher's</td>
<td>3rd Grades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's easier</td>
<td>3rd Grades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For want of any better idea</td>
<td>3rd Grades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining is confusing</td>
<td>3rd Grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of comments generated by students

expressive potential (I-3 & I-4). This was true for both grade levels. For example, "I like using my imagination 'cause I got a bunch of weird things I want to draw in my head." Another said, "You can make lots of things, instead of just doing one thing." (SI-3 & SI-4). Others did not like externally imposed standards. How could one's work be judged if it was a private affair, with one's own criteria or standards? (See Appendix J for a table that illustrates student preferences for using their imagination.) Because mimicking the teacher's example was not construed as mimicking a realistic style, but "following directions" or "only getting guidance for a task" as one teacher put it (I), the heavy tilt toward
realistic representation or imitation seemed taken for granted by teachers and students. However, students frequently expressed their dislike for lessons where the teachers' explicit objectives required them to do work in a realistic style e.g., still lifes of stuffed animals, plants, assorted objects; figure drawings; full-face portraits; or copying photos of animals, plants, and faces. One third grader suggested, "We were afraid to draw those things." Another student complained that he "couldn't see what was behind what, and (he) couldn't draw anything that was on the cart (still life)." Another student remarked in exasperation, "Why can't we just have—rather than sort of like a high school art class, why can't we just have fun or something? I mean, not like fun at recess—fun doing the art and stuff...her telling us to use our imagination." (SI-3)

To these students, art meant imagining, creating, making, doing, manipulating, and sensing the qualities of different media—not drawing realistically; only two or three students in each classroom seemed to have a natural desire or ability to make things look more realistic. The art teachers called these students "more visual." For example, Jeff said that he liked making a still life collage "because it looked real." Also, at home he preferred to make "things that look three-dimensional and stuff," and he said he preferred having "real-looking" kinds of paintings in his home to admire (SI-4).

**Thwarting Interpretation Through Classroom Discourse**

Student interpretation or free expression was thwarted in the ways in which lessons were presented—in terms of following directions and mimicking teachers' examples. Even more so, the lack of student
interpretation or opportunity for expression was shaped through classroom discourse.

Language That Shaped Student Responses

Instructional language in the classroom shaped student responses a certain way. For example, Teacher B's approach concerned right answers in her question-answer patterns. She reinforced student responses by appraising these until she received the "correct" ones. The right answers usually centered on the elements of design—not on interpretation of subject matter, mood, style, or personal response. For example, students were asked to observe an 8 x 10 photo of a palm tree, shot from an extreme angle:

"What pattern do you see?" she queries.

"A peacock," someone in the back offers with an enthusiastic hand.

"No, what pattern do you see—what kind of lines? This is a palm tree, seen from the very bottom. The lines are arranged in a fan pattern." (FN)

Or, another picture was shown. See Figure 6.1.

"What kinds of lines are in this photograph?"

"Big and small."

"Yes, they're different thicknesses, aren't they? So what kind of lines are they, Josie?"

"Xs."

"No, they're not x lines. Darren?"

"Zigzag."

"No, they're really not zigzag, although you can think of it that way..."

"Square," someone else offers.
"That's not telling me what kind of lines yet."
(The teacher's desired response is 'straight'). (FN)

Figure 6.1 A visual presented to students in classroom discussion

Although many of the students' interpretations of this visual seemed plausible, there was only one correct response.

During art activities, students made numerous interpretive and imaginative comments related to their work. They seemed to enjoy telling stories about what was happening in their pictures or verbally interpreting objects they were to draw realistically. "See, he's in a sailboat, and here's a volcano and all this junk spilling down, and here's an island, and he'll probably be able to save himself if he paddles fast enough." (The object of the lesson was simply to do a landscape, using the concept of foreground-background). Or, "Everybody says this looks like a cabbage patch doll, but it's me. See, it's got my hair, and I'm in my bedroom, and I'm about to read to my dolls." (The object of the lesson was the human figure and proportion). (FN)

Unsolicited, students tended to tell me their brief but rich stories. Teachers' comments to individual students while they were making their art stuck steadfastly to the objectives of the lesson:
"Where is your foreground?" "Your legs there are too short. You need to make longer ovals. Start over." "You think that (piece of popcorn) looks like a 'fat sheep'? Well, that's interesting, but you need to shade in here and here...and don't forget you've got to draw at least three pieces in your composition," all said with an encouraging smile (FN).

"Using the eyes to see" is one way to thwart interpretation, if what we want children's eyes to see is the same thing we see. In this respect, the teachers expected students to adopt their view of reality, as well as the reality presented in natural objects.

Language That Confused or Was Not Shared

Another conflict appeared in the difficulty teachers and students had in sharing the same meaning of words. When students were asked for a word that means "over and over again" and responded, "redo," "rerun," "overlap," and "erase," these responses seemed legitimate as interpretations, but these were judged by the teacher as incorrect. Position cues for drawing in perspective also were difficult for students e.g., "up," "down," "right," "left," "higher," "lower," "close up," "far away," "front," "back," all in one lesson. When these cues were combined, they were particularly difficult to comprehend. For example, "The bottle is higher up on your paper because it is further back and behind this jar." Such conceptual confusion was as intense for students as was their inability to "see" or to produce such relationships in their work. In the preceding chapter, another example was presented related to shading popcorn.
The Absence of Language

The above examples represent the more formal kinds of verbal interaction in the classroom. Informal verbal interaction was forbidden for students, for the most part. An explicit and implicit art class rule in all art classes was "no talking," or "talk quietly." Students were not at liberty to talk among themselves very much, to spontaneously describe what they were seeing or experiencing with media or in the artistic process, to discuss, compare, analyze, to question, to learn from one another, or to explore verbally through their own systems of meaning and doing.

The reason for no talking given by the teachers related to a need for students to "concentrate on their work." This rule added a dimension of seriousness to the art period and reinforced the notion that art was not fun or play. Art was work. Art was like the more "serious" subjects labeled as "work." This achievement ethic was reiterated by teachers with, "get back to work," "art is hard work," "art takes practice," "put forth the effort," and "it's not time for you to be finished yet." However, this work ethic seemed related more to the teachers' intolerance for noise and fear of loss of classroom control than artistic concentration and refinement of ideas. Some of the art teachers shared the folk wisdom that in the beginning of a semester, one should present lessons that require realistic drawing skills so that students get the "serious" message that art is not "play time" or merely "fun" (I & Q). Also, a reported lack of classroom control was a potential reason for the supervisor to visit and "supervise" an art teacher in his/her classroom (I).
The Lack of Professional Discourse

In Chapter IV, we examined the nature of art staff meetings and the interactions of art teachers and their supervisor. We could interpret this lack of professional discourse as a potentially negative example of interaction for the classroom. If not a tacit example, issues greater than the juggling of supplies and material resources were rarely discussed. The staff meetings were dominated by "business." Thus, the work ethic was alive and well at the teachers' level. There was little discussion or reflection about practical matters, curriculum issues, goals, or teachers' personal theories. The individualistic expressions of teachers "presenting" during staff meetings were met with interest, but little time to explore this interest. Because of program constraints and logistics, some of the teachers felt a keen sense of isolation and depersonalization. In some ways, this pervaded classrooms as well.

Depersonalization

Depersonalization of students occurred when teachers did not and/or could not know students by name, nor call them by name when these were available. It occurred in the absence of talk or time to help students reflect upon their experiences. It happened in the arrangement of doing art, which was isolated and independent. In the classes observed, there were never any socially organized art activities, such as planning or making projects together, discussing works of art, or going on field trips.

Depersonalization occurred in the teachers' silent selection of student art for exhibits and in how they were evaluated, for the most
part. Students usually received blank checkmarks for simply doing a task and exhibiting effort; and in many cases, it was the classroom teacher—not the art teacher—who marked student report cards. Many students could not even recall the grades they received in art on their report cards (SI-3 & SI-4). Depersonalization occurred when teachers were unaware of individual student interests or abilities, or when planned activities and subject matter ignored the experiences or interests of students.

**Stereotyping**

There was evidence of teacher stereotyping in assignments e.g., a gender stereotype: "The girls can make butterflies, and the boys and make spaceships." Stereotyping was present in many of the teachers' artistic examples presented to students e.g., butterflies, hearts, bunnies, and Easter baskets. And possibly because nine of the ten art teachers were women, subject matter for art activities often ignored the subject matter interests of boys. For example, the art teachers focused on hearts, butterflies, plants, weaving, and stitchery, when interviews with students and parent responses on questionnaires suggested that many of the boys expressed a keen interest in vehicles and mechanical, moving things. This is not to say boys should not learn how to do stitchery or draw still lifes of plants, but the same media can be used to express many different kinds of subject matter and ideas to get at the same fundamental elements of design which seemed of great concern to the art teachers (I & Q). Many girls disliked stitchery and weaving as well, particularly when this activity stretched over two or three weeks (I).
Both boys and girls expressed a greater variety of interest in subject matter and more use of three-dimensional material at home than was presented in art classes. The most popular subject matter explored at home among both boys and girls was the construction of three-dimensional environments for creative play, vehicles, animals, and fantasy creatures or monsters. There was little evidence that students drew popular images such as Snoopy, Strawberry Shortcake, or comic heroes in the third grade. There was more evidence of this at the fourth-grade level, particularly with comics.

In many ways, children were automatically stereotyped as behaviorally inept and incapable of taking responsibility for their own actions. Rules were imposed upon students, rather than negotiated with them. "Special" students were labeled publicly as such by one art teacher. "This is my 'specials' class," she said often. No amount of overt teacher praise of these students' work could erase the "ability stigma" attached publicly to these students. One boy explained why he "wasn't very good" in art: "I was never taught (pen and ink) before. See, I work with Mrs. (Remedial Reading Teacher)." (I) Any adult artist could attest to the difficulty of learning how to handle pen and ink for the first time, while also being asked to make a realistic representation of a still life. The task was a kind of double jeopardy, and this third grader rationalized his difficulty through the lens of a label.

**Frustration**

As teachers and learners ourselves, we can easily recognize frustration in the classroom. Temporary frustration is the kind
embedded in tasks of problem solving, learning, and growing. We enjoy the puzzling journey toward a conceivable end and feel challenged to seek a solution. But when frustration is prolonged or too intense, we find the situation stressful if not intolerable. In this study, prolonged student frustration occurred most often when teachers expected realistic products (more than other kinds), when directions were unusually convoluted or ambiguous, when information overload made recalling and following such directions an impossible task, and when the emotional climate was punctuated with thunderclaps of teacher anger (SI-3, SI-4 & FN).

When frustrated, many students crumpled their papers (as students often do). However, several made numerous, heroic attempts—often 6 or more times—at the request of a teacher (FN). Students were the most frustrated when they were far along on a task and pleased with their work, but were asked by teachers to erase a large portion of their work or start over. Such an investment in time, ideas, and energy often went bankrupt when a teacher repeatedly asked a student to begin again. As these requests increased beyond something "reasonable" or educative, student interest and confidence seemed to wane to extinction (FN).

Students had ways of compensating and blunting their frustration. Some traced around small objects that were to be drawn realistically. Some requested rulers to draw straight lines when they were never observed using rulers for straight lines in their "natural" drawings. Some were clever enough to get the teacher or a friend to do large portions of their work; in the sea of students, a teacher could easily forget which individuals she had assisted the most.
Playing with media and materials was a kind of exploration or learning, but the longer the "play" (10-15 minutes), rather than producing the art product, the more I perceived frustration. For example, I observed some students stirring and stirring paints, splaying brush hairs and pen points, fingerpainting over brushed mistakes and making pictures from their fingerprints (printed elsewhere), spinning scissors, peeling and shaving crayons with fingernails, until a teacher reminded them of the task at hand.

Some students' frustration was more obvious than others. There were long periods (ten minutes or more) where heads would be down or propped in hands covering eyes, or actual tears. There were critical asides to neighbors about the task, mugging and contorted faces behind the teacher's back, and complaints to me. These complaints related to unrealistic demands in a task or ambiguous directions and not necessarily to positive or negative perceptions of teachers as persons. A few students turned to mischief, disrupting class, destroying tools (spinning a brush between the palms, bristles flattened to paper, and pretending to make a fire). Most students, however, simply gave up on tasks to the degree that they could without getting into serious trouble with the teacher. They "played at" doing, only doing when they perceived the watchful eyes of a teacher or the teacher herself approaching their vicinity.

It was the teachers' expectation for realism and the inability to control media that frustrated students the most (SI-3 & SI-4). Teachers were frustrated by the students' frustration, sometimes unable to identify the possible causes of frustration or a way out, midstream.
One teacher related such difficulty after a rather disastrous still life lesson in which three students cried:

"When I run into problems, I go home and think about what it is—usually I pitch it—pitch the idea if it's been terribly frustrating for a class and say 'we don't do that again'."

"Well, once you're in it, how do you get out of it?" I inquire, wondering why she couldn't change her plans when three students were crying in frustration and some of the others had given up completely.

"I don't know. How do you get out of it?" she seems a little defensive.

"I don't know." I wait, hoping an alternative will come to her beyond the press of the classroom. (Pause)

"There's not enough time to change midstream, is there?" she responds, seemingly resigned and frustrated herself. (FN)

The pressure of time, the belief that there were particular kinds of content and skills in the curriculum that had to be covered, fear of losing classroom control, or perhaps the fear of appearing to the classroom teacher (who often remained in this classroom during art instruction) as unorganized or inept seemed to override this teacher's otherwise intelligent, thoughtful, and sensitive nature with students.

Most often the teachers blamed students for any lack of success in a lesson. They justified prolonged student frustration as a necessary "challenge" or the ineptness of a particular class of students. They perceived student resistance to drawing realistically as their "wanting to be able to draw realistically so badly, and not knowing how yet."

Student complaints were often seen as consumer attitudes toward "instant products without wanting to work" or laziness. Student confusion was sometimes perceived as inattention to directions. Student enthusiasm or
excitement was perceived as potential disruption to be nipped in the bud. And students' natural artistic abilities were often perceived as something unsophisticated and crude to be changed, shaped, and refined. Although most students' products were seemingly acceptable to teachers at the end of an activity and admired during staff meetings and the preparation of exhibits, teachers rarely praised students during or after any art activities for their individual expressions. An exception was Teacher A-2 (FN & I).

Students' Assessment of Their Art Experiences

Third-grade students felt more positive about their performance in art class than the art teachers speculated the students would say (Q). See Table 7. For example, third-grade students rated their performance as "terrific" or "very good" (38% and 25%, respectively), while 80% of the teachers felt that students would rate their performance as only "okay." Both levels of students rated their artistic abilities lower than they rated their performance in art class. Third-graders rated their performance higher than their abilities because "their work turned out all right," they "followed the teacher's directions," "did things correctly," and "did not get into trouble" (SI-3). In the fourth grade, students' self-ratings of performance in the art class dropped somewhat. They rated their performance in art class higher than they perceived their abilities for reasons similar to those of the third graders. Figure 6.2 illustrates third-grade students' self assessments; and Figure 6.3 illustrates those of the fourth graders. Included in these tables are students' self-ratings of themselves as artists and their performance in art class.
Table 7. A comparison of perceptions of third-graders’ performance in art class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student self-ratings</th>
<th>Art teachers’ perceptions of how students would rate themselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38% Terrific!</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% Very good</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% Okay</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% Not too good</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Terrible!</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 63 or 76%) (n = 7 or 70%; 1 marked two)

On the other side of the coin, many students attributed their success or talent to someone else. Third-grade students who felt they were "terrific" in art said they were by association or sanction—a family member was talented and had worked with them (23%), or others had judged them this way (23%) e.g., teachers, parents, or peers (SI-3). Likewise, fourth graders attributed their talent to external criteria (19%), such as others judging them this way, having their work selected for exhibits, or winning awards during or previous to the years of this study (SI-4). Thus, it seems that discriminate praise and acknowledgement of students’ efforts or products color their self-assessments.

What Students Said They Learned in Art

When students were asked, "What did you learn in art class this year?", their responses were varied. There were some students who claimed they learned nothing in art. For example, 33% of the third graders said this, and 19% of the fourth graders made this claim. In
Figure 6.2 Third and fourth-grade students' self-ratings of their artistic ability.
Figure 6.3 Third and fourth-grade students' self-ratings of their performance in art class
other words, about one-fourth of both grade levels (26%) said they learned nothing in art (SI-3 & SI-4).

What students said they did learn is summarized in Table 8. Indeed, students learned how to use specific media and make specific subject matter. They also learned how to make things look more realistic, and they learned about elements of design, such as line, shape, color, or pattern. Learning about the artistic process and/or creativity made up only 2% of the students' responses in either grade level. "Persistence" and style ranked lowest at 1% each. Of course, one must admit that learning about the qualities of media and how to control them, as well as the elements of design, may help persons see creative potential both in themselves and materials.

Could students remember any art vocabulary or particular "art words" used in the art class over a semester? In the third grade, 29% of the students could not recall any art vocabulary. Much of this may be due to the teachers' presentation of art vocabulary. For example, only 14% of the third-grade students of Teacher B-1 could not recall any art vocabulary. This teacher was the person who always put the steps of the lesson and key art words on the board. She also focused on design elements in the third grade, and 71% of the art vocabulary students generated related to this category. The words School A students remembered most were media or material words, such as "scissors," "glue," or "paper." They recalled no words in the categories of design elements or style. Sixty-two percent (62%) of Group C students recalled words in the design category, and these were the students who had a daily dose of art in the regular classroom (SI-3).
### Table 8. What students said they learned in art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Third Grade (n = 63)</th>
<th>Fourth Grade (n = 43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to use specific media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-1</td>
<td>(4) 13%*</td>
<td>School A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1</td>
<td>(4) 21%</td>
<td>School B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>(17) 44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to make specific subject matter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-1</td>
<td>(6) 19%</td>
<td>School A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1</td>
<td>(7) 37%</td>
<td>School B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>(8) 21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to make things look more realistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-1</td>
<td>(0) 0%</td>
<td>School A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1</td>
<td>(0) 0%</td>
<td>School B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>(3) 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design elements/principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-1</td>
<td>(2) 6%</td>
<td>School A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1</td>
<td>(5) 26%</td>
<td>School B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>(4) 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-1</td>
<td>(9) 28%</td>
<td>School A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-2</td>
<td>(5) 26%</td>
<td>School B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>(6) 15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artistic process/creativity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A-1 (1) 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1 (0) 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (1) 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-2 (1) 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-2 (0) 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A-1 (0) 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-1 (1) 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C (0) 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A-2 (1) 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B-2 (1) 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Criticism/positive self-appraisal |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| School A-1 (0) 0%                 |   |
| School B-1 (1) 5%                 |   |
| School C (0) 0%                   |   |
| School A-2 (1) 3%                 |   |
| School B-2 (1) 3%                 |   |
| Total 1%                          |   |
| Total 2%                          |   |

| Style                             |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| School A-1 (0) 0%                 |   |
| School B-1 (1) 5%                 |   |
| School C (0) 0%                   |   |
| Total 1%                          |   |

* Numbers and percentages represent number of comments generated by students; School A-1 (32); School B-2 (19); School C (39); Third-grade total (90); School A-2 (39); School B-2 (39); Fourth-grade total (78).
Around 35% of the fourth graders could not recall any art vocabulary. Only 19% of the A-2 students recalled any words related to the elements of design, whereas 89% of Teacher B-2 recalled such vocabulary. Again, the Group A-2 students (like the year before) recalled more words related to media and materials (S1-4). In many ways, the above findings suggest that instructional style and focus may have much to do with what art concepts or vocabulary students will remember. This finding is significant if educators desire having students develop a language with which to talk about art, either in creating or responding to art forms. (See Appendix K for the table which illustrates these findings.)

Was Art Important to Students?

In the third grade, art was important to students (87%) because they could "learn how to make things" (29%), it was "fun and enjoyable" (16%), or it could help one in the future if one wished to be an artist (12%). (See Table 9.) Three students from School C remarked that one could get good grades in art and learn how to perform better on visual portions of standardized tests as a result of art. Those who felt art was as important as reading and math revealed that art had subject status because it was scheduled, one received grades in it, it required skill, and it was a kind of learning (47%). Twenty-seven percent thought it was just as important because it was "fun" and they "liked it." Several students said that without art, the world would be "so plain," "ugly," and "not pretty." "The world just wouldn't be right (without art) to look at." One youngster suggested that art "helps people open up their minds...like you can do anything with art...you can
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Grade Schools</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>As Important as Reading/math</th>
<th>Not as Important as Reading/math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>(16) 94%</td>
<td>(1) 6%</td>
<td>(5) 33%</td>
<td>(10) 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>(18) 90%</td>
<td>(2) 10%</td>
<td>(1) 8%</td>
<td>(12) 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(20) 80%</td>
<td>(5) 20%</td>
<td>(9) 53%</td>
<td>(8) 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(54) 87%</td>
<td>(8) 13%</td>
<td>(15) 33%</td>
<td>(30) 67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Grade Schools</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>(21) 95%</td>
<td>(1) 5%</td>
<td>(3) 14%</td>
<td>(19) 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>(19) 90%</td>
<td>(2) 10%</td>
<td>(3) 14%</td>
<td>(19) 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(40) 93%</td>
<td>(3) 7%</td>
<td>(6) 14%</td>
<td>(38) 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

explore with it." A few students remarked that you could make money selling your work, so art could be a lucrative kind of business. One boy from a poor neighborhood even suggested that art was a way to lift oneself out of poverty (SI-3).

Students who thought art was important—but not as important as reading or math—reasoned that if art is fun (which it was to them), then it must not be very important (33%). Others suggested that doing
art in the regular classroom only gets you in trouble. In relation to the regular classroom, one boy said that "sometimes you have other things to do, and you just can't get to it. After a while, it doesn't matter." Thus, many third-grade students had learned to see art, perhaps through the social and political structures of schools, as insignificant, irrespective of having an art program. They knew art was not important if: art was scheduled only once a week and detached from the everyday activities of the classroom; if one could do art only after completing "work;" or if the absence of art—not getting to go to art class—was used as punishment for not getting work done or other misdeeds.

In the fourth grade, student perceptions about the importance of art did not change significantly. However, there were some interesting discoveries. First of all, students' reasons for perceiving either the importance of art or reading/math related to functional, instrumental concerns. For example, art was perceived to be important if you wanted a career as an artist (17%), if you wanted to be able to help your youngsters with their art, to sew, to get into college, and the like (15%). Again, art was perceived as a vehicle for learning other subject areas and doing well on visual portions of tests. The same kinds of functional remarks were made about reading and math being more important than art. "You gotta have reading and math" was a pervasive comment among all students. Reading and math precluded art. For example, an artist needs to know how to measure his canvas, buy materials, and read store signs. This kind of functional literacy for either art or the basics was more pronounced at the fourth-grade level. (See Table 10.)
Table 10. Why fourth graders said art was not as important as reading or math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Reasons (paraphrased; n = 50)</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional literacy; reading and math will help you get a job later/survive.</td>
<td>A-2 (9) 32%</td>
<td>Total 30%</td>
<td>If you go to a store one day, and they probably could cheat you; you have to read the form to get a job; jobs don't involve drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You gotta have reading and math.</td>
<td>A-2 (7) 25%</td>
<td>B-2 (6) 27%</td>
<td>Total 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art is fun. Learning is not fun and is work; reading and math are learning and hard work.</td>
<td>A-2 (4) 14%</td>
<td>B-2 (4) 18%</td>
<td>Total 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and math skills preclude art skills.</td>
<td>A-2 (5) 18%</td>
<td>B-2 (0) 0%</td>
<td>Total 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You learn more in reading and math.</td>
<td>A-2 (1) 4%</td>
<td>B-2 (3) 14%</td>
<td>Total 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like math more.</td>
<td>A-2 (0) 0%</td>
<td>B-2 (1) 5%</td>
<td>Total 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It isn't important to the teacher, so it's not supposed to be to me—but it is.</td>
<td>A-2 (0) 0%</td>
<td>B-2 (1) 5%</td>
<td>Total 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three (6%) could not comment.
Self-expression persisted, albeit in a lower key. For example, "If you didn't have art, you wouldn't be able to draw a picture of how you felt" (SI-4). Another student remarked, "(Art's) important to me and probably to famous artists. You can show what your feelings are sometimes. You can bring out colors and new life" (SI-4). One thing I discovered in asking the question of art's importance was that most students—third and fourth-graders alike—said that art was important. Half-way through the third-grade interviews, I learned to follow the question with another: "Is art important to you?" This is when the students' discrimination became apparent. Paraphrased, art was important to those who wanted to pursue it, and for the most part, it was an enjoyable experience and personally significant. But most students told me it was more important to be able to read, write, and figure so that one could get a job later on. This was followed by another question: "That's interesting. Where did you get the idea that reading and math are so important in getting a job?" What usually followed was, "My Dad and/or Mamma told me," or "My teacher says..."

Student Art Beyond the Realm of School

Art beyond school seemed to have meant something different to students than school art. Students illuminated their home activities related to art in interviews, as did their parents in questionnaires. Art was something to create and give as a gift. This was a frequent response from students. It was a way to come in touch with oneself on a rainy day on the front porch swing. Creating was shared with a buddy who was "mentally retarded, but done good anyway...he likes how I showed him how to make a submarine out of wood." It was constructing fantasy
worlds out of cardboard, bath towels, and construction paper for the corner of a bedroom. It was sketching in a "gigantic pad—where everybody in my family puts things into it." It was transferring an interesting image from one medium to another, discovering possibilities and limitations. "I drew a monster, then I took my Play Doh and looked at my picture, and I made the monster out of Play Doh...but the monster fell apart" (SI-3).

On their own, students seemed to enjoy constructing and building three-dimensional things out of found objects—mud, wood scraps, cardboard, paper, etc. They created sculptures, mobiles, vehicles, play houses, castles, models, and dioramas. Nearly one-third of the students used construction materials, and some of the material was commercial (SI-3, SI-4 & Q). A fourth grader illuminated:

You can do things better with your imagination sometimes. That's what I do when I use my Legos. I don't use directions anymore. I use things like real cars, and then I build my back-end to make it weird looking.

Subject matter varied a great deal in what students made at home; however, the most popular subject matter seemed to be vehicles, animals, and fantasy creatures or monsters. Fourth graders tended to do more popular images, like comic heroes and cartoons (SI-3, SI-4 & Q). Making animals in school art was welcomed by students (SI-3, SI-4, I).

Art also meant taking a trip to the art museum with the family. In fact, 40% of all the students in this study had gone with their families to the city's major art museum, and over half of the students in the lower SES school population said they had been with family members. Most children had never gone to an art museum via a school field trip. Students vividly recalled art forms that had people or
animals as subject matter, design qualities, and interpretative
efforts made with family members. Students recalled:

A picture that had some fruits in it, a bowl, and
this girl getting ready to eat it.

A lady and her children—they were at a pond, and
water was coming off of something. When the water
comes down, the lady and the children they start
moving their heads.

Rugs that were weaved together that (were) about a
thousand years old. Pretty. I liked most of the
blankets (tapestries) because they're different colors,
and they've got really pretty designs on them like
nobody else has got...of the forest.

There was this one sculpture...we didn't really know
what it was. There was a whole bunch of feet and arms
and people all over it, sticking out of it—it was
just a whole bunch of people blobbed in a big mess...
It was neat. (SI-3)

Obviously, the demands and experiences between school and home were
different. Parents cared about art, and most did not want their
children to draw realistically, as several of the art teachers suggested
might be the case (Q). A parent from the School A area said she thought
it was important for her youngster to "display things on paper with art,
to put feelings and emotion in his work, which (child) does well."

Parents from the School B area were interested in the "basics" in art,
such as design elements, but they also were interested in the expressive
potential of art experiences. For example, "(Child) should be able to
appreciate art as a part of her everyday life...learn the different
forms of line, pattern..., and learn to appreciate other forms of art as
part of her cultural life..." (Q). A parent from the School C area
commented:

I think they should learn self-expression and be free
to have a day of art where they can create what they
would like. Sometimes in schools, year after year, they seem to do the same things over and over again and become bored. (Q)

In the poorest of the schools (A area), few of the students had participated in an art program beyond school. In the School B area, only 20% of the students had. However, in the School C area, 62% of the youngsters had participated in some recreational, university, or church-related program (Q). From what the students reported, art in these programs did not appear to be much different from that in schools (I-3). Likewise, parents from the School C area responded more to the personal fulfillment/expressive dimensions of art than did parents from the School A area, who seemed more concerned that their youngsters "take (their) time and do (their) best," learn "how to work with colors," or "would [sic] with there [sic] hands and texture" (Q). Although, the parent returns were few, one might wonder if SES might have any influence on people's perceptions of art--"high" art/culture in the middle, upper-middle, and upper SES range, and "manual or vocational" art in the lower SES range. Unlike School A and B parents, School C parents (the middle SES population) did not talk about art's contribution to decorating one's home, selecting clothing, or implicitly promoting the work ethic (doing your best, taking your time).

The discontinuity between home and school art experiences may have been great enough to contribute to student frustration in formal art instruction. Their interests in subject matter and manipulating certain media differed from many of the opportunities presented in art classes. Some students actually may have learned to dislike art through their school experiences. Any budding belief that they could not draw was
cultivated through the teachers' demands for realistic representation and the discouragement of divergence. Students perceived the absurdity of some of these demands, but they seemed to have internalized failure as their own inadequacy or disinterest as much as they blamed a teacher for instructional inadequacy:

If I do what she (teacher) tells me to do, it'll be wrong, and then she'll make me start over. Why doesn't she tell me to do it right the first time?

I hate doing people; I can't draw.

I can't draw popcorn, but I can sure eat it. (I)

A Look at Perceptions of Goals in Art

Students in this study seemed to have engaged spontaneously in the kinds of art processes and thinking most art educators today would desire for them; however, this engagement often was beyond the arena of school. Students were attentive to and appreciative of their own expressions and those of others. They engaged in the creative process both independently and cooperatively with peers and siblings. They seemed aware of many aesthetic elements and qualities in art forms. It would seem that children's capacity and interest in responding aesthetically to works of art were underestimated in this setting, as has been suggested elsewhere (Hurwitz & Madeja, 1976). And whether aesthetic or pragmatic, youngsters saw the potential for found objects to become art forms, objects either to admire or use. They honed and developed their skills, practiced, and experimented with a variety of media and subject matter—not just with a box of crayons to make lollipop trees, cars, rainbows, or Snoopy. Most of them thought art not only brought beauty to the world, but that it was a vehicle for personal
expression, doing, and communicating.

The goals in the official curriculum used in this program and the broad goals proposed by art educators today are synonymous. They accommodate an eclectic view of art (Efland; 1983). This view represents a desire to develop cognitive and perceptual skills, to encourage self-expression using these skills, to see art's place in society, and to appreciate our artistic heritage through criticism and interpretation. As was mentioned in Chapter II, four major aesthetic theories are tapped with this eclectic view: (a) person-centered or self-expressive; (b) cognitive-objective or information-processing; (c) mimetic-behaviorist; and (d) pragmatic-interactive. In choosing a viewpoint, we choose a lens through which to see the world and act. Thus, these beliefs will guide our practice; they will suggest a particular way of going about things. As we saw in the comparison of curriculum documents and lesson plans, teachers' intentions strayed from this broad or more eclectic conception of goals. And, in the enacted curriculum we saw goals become even more narrow in scope and definition, when activities and concepts were presented to students.

The broad coverage suggested in the four views above represents the interests of many art educators today in defining art as a discipline with its own inherent structures and kinds of knowing, feeling, and doing (Madeja; 1984). It also reflects the historical nature of the role of art education in our society e.g., from support of industry, moral education, social cohesion, therapy, and aesthetic literacy (Efland; 1954), to "basic-ness" or mastery as was observed in the Bullough and Goldstein study of art curriculum in Utah (1984).
These four major theoretical perspectives and/or goals were paraphrased and presented to students, parents, classroom teachers, and art teachers to rank in order of preference. If we "couldn't do it all," which goals in the curriculum should be the most important for third and fourth graders?

1. Self-expression, creativity, exploring personal feelings, finding ways of relating and communicating the self to others

2. Learning the basic elements of design—line, shape, texture, color; seeing the structures of art forms

3. Perceptual training; learning how to "see" so that these images can be transferred into realistic representations e.g., learning how to make a tree look like a "real" tree

4. Social and cultural heritage; popular images; the uses and meaning of the arts for society; aesthetic criticism, appreciation

When parents, classroom teachers, and art teachers ranked the above goals in order of preference, each group ranked the goals in the order presented above. "Self-expression" persisted as the number-one preferred goal of art education across all groups. When ten art teachers were asked to rank the goals according to what they felt they had actually presented in instruction, "learning the basic elements" was top on the list, followed by "self-expression;" the third and fourth goals remained in the same order. When classroom teachers were asked to rank what they felt the art teachers had presented in actual practice, "learning the basic elements" ranked first (like the art teachers' ranking), followed by "perceptual training," "self-expression," and "social/cultural heritage" (Q). Student views of the enacted curriculum were more in line with my observations and those of classroom teachers—
a perceived slant toward realism and design elements (SI-3 & SI-4).

Students' number-one preferred goal was self-expression (67%) at the fourth-grade level. Some students' comments were as follows:

If you're doing a picture, it should be the way you want it, and it should be from you. It should just be like you—the picture should be like you...not like they want it, or how your mom wants it, but how you want it to be creative.

It doesn't matter if it looks real or not... You can use your brain and everything—it'd be just like spelling or math. And you can be imaginative, too, because sometimes you can draw things that aren't really there—that don't exist.

You can use your imagination better than somebody telling you because when you use your imagination, things aren't real clear, but someone tells you to—it just feels like you don't know how to do it...

It makes you feel like, "Well, I don't know how to do this, and I couldn't do it." But as my mother say [sic], "You're not supposed to say you can't do it—just try." (SI-4 & I)

The fourth graders who felt realism was a worthwhile goal (24%) reasoned that "sometimes you just draw for fun, and you have to make 'em look real." Another suggested that the subject dictates the style: "Sometimes you have to make stuff look like they're real, like people."

Another reasoned that realistic portrayal was one criterion for becoming an adult artist, and another equated realism with adding more objects or details in a picture, rather than "leaving it plain" (SI-4).

**Summary**

It appears that in this study, the primary focus of the knowledge constructed in these settings was that of realistic representation (a mimetic-behaviorist orientation) and design elements (a cognitive-objective orientation). The cognitive-objective orientation originated
decades ago in formalism and Academy art. How the teachers went about teaching the principles or elements of design in this study did not have the information-processing band. Teachers did not seem interested in (or have the time) to explore how students processed information or perceived qualities inherent in art forms. Students seemed to do this serendipitously and naturally. Thus, the teachers' ways of presenting art knowledge focused on design elements and the making and doing of art realistically, rather than on perceiving, talking about art, working cooperatively, or assessing the meaning and quality of art in contemporary society, in popular images, and in our cultural heritage. The views pronounced in this study forwarded and intensified a mimetic, rationalistic, or production-line approach to the construction of art knowledge. Furthermore, structures in the art program, in schooling, and in the community (parents) seemed to have influenced what meaning students made of their art experiences in school.

Presented in this chapter were the pervasive qualities found in the construction of art knowledge, primarily from the students' point of view. As we exit the classroom, we will explore several curriculum issues and the implications of the findings in this study for education.
Chapter VII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

In this study, I examined what meanings a group of students made of their art experiences in the context of school. Students constructed their understanding of themselves as artists, of other artists, art objects, the artistic process, art in society, and our artistic or cultural heritage through their experiences within and beyond the school setting. These experiences encompassed interactions with parents, siblings, peers, and teachers, as well materials, media, and resources in the schools and community.

The focus of this study was on the teaching-learning process or enacted curriculum that took place in the art class. Much of what students learned about art was presented by the structures of schooling and art teachers in particular. All of what was learned or exactly what was learned could never be determined, and it would be presumptuous to claim such truth-finding. But since the schools, an art program, and art teachers were the primary brokers of art knowledge in this case study, they seemed to be the primary forces that influenced the nature of students' construction of art knowledge. Schools, as institutional organizations where youngsters spend much of their lives, are primary shapers of students' understanding of subjects. Through these
institutional structures, we not only teach explicit or "official" curriculum—that which the public understands the schools teach, but we also teach through the "hidden curriculum" (Jackson, 1968), to be discussed later.

In this chapter, I will summarize the institutional and programmatic structures in this context and address the implications of these for the art curriculum. Then I will present the pervasive qualities of the "hidden" curriculum and how these influenced student learning. And finally, I will not leave these interpretations and conclusions without some recommendations.

Curriculum Issues and Implications

That art was taught by specialists once-a-week, for 55-60 minutes, covering one semester of two in an academic year presented certain conditions for teaching and learning. That each art teacher served six to ten schools and about 1200 students a year presented certain conditions for teaching and learning. That the interpretation of the explicit or official curriculum evolved into an enacted curriculum that focused on the exploration and/or control of media, design elements, and realistic representation presented another set of conditions for teaching and learning. Let us look at the implications of these findings for curriculum.

Specialization Versus Integration

Increasingly, specialization has crept downward from the secondary schools into the elementary classrooms. This is noticeable in how the school day is fragmented into scheduled times for subject areas, even
though the elementary teacher often is considered having more flexibility than secondary teachers in designing the day as s/he sees fit. Elementary teachers most often are responsible for an array of subject areas—they are not subject-area specialists like secondary teachers. What most elementary teachers see as appropriate involves a heavy focus on the basics in the mornings and other learnings in the afternoons (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Closer to the issue at hand, art most often is perceived as a Friday-afternoon event. This was evident in all of the classrooms in this study, but one. The emphasis on mastering the basics is plausible in the contemporary climate of mastery, accountability, and testing, but it isn't merely a contemporary condition. It is the pervasive belief in our society that the primary purpose of schools is to teach children the basic skills so that they may become productive members of society. "Basic" frequently is defined narrowly as the "3 Rs." Eggleston (1977, p.10) states:

> Every teacher in a classroom undertakes his work on the twin assumptions that what he is teaching is right for the children, and moreover, that he has the right to teach it. It is the value and power system of the school that supports the teacher in these views, in short, it legitimizes his role.

Thus, schools and those who teach in them can be seen to reflect what is acceptable to the normative and power structure of the society.

Fragmentation and specialization allow for easy sorting and ordering of subjects. It "deskills" both the generalist and specialist in their roles as teachers. What I mean by deskilling is a kind of reduction in the professional choices teachers might exercise because of pervasive public or administrative attitudes toward the teacher's function in the educational enterprise and attitudes toward the nature
and purpose of this enterprise itself. It deskills the generalist in that s/he can dismiss or under-emphasize areas of specialization in which s/he perceives himself or herself less knowledgeable. This is not merely a perception, but also perhaps a truth due to the nature of teacher training. Also, if society perceives particular subjects or ways of knowing as less important or more peripheral than others, then it is easier for the generalist to select and order those areas which society deems more or less important.

Fragmentation deskills the specialist in that s/he may wish to present a particular way of knowing that happens to run contrary to the popularized notions in society of this subject. If schools forward the belief that art is peripheral, a tolerated therapeutic release, or a prefunctory acknowledgement of individualism or personal freedom in a democratic society, then the specialist who wishes to treat his/her subject as a discipline with additional aims in mind will be rubbing against the grain. To reduce this friction, s/he may compromise in the real context and structures of school settings because it is the specialist who—to begin with—has been given unequal time, status, and resources. His or her voice is not strong enough, and s/he does not represent a large constituency.

What this fragmentation and compromise may teach youngsters is that art is non-integral to everyday experiences, that learning or experiencing such is peripheral to the "real work" of school, and that perhaps art is only for a select few who exhibit a penchant for it or talent in it. Gross (1983) posits that the capacity to acquire competence in the symbolic modes we associate with the arts "withers for
lack of nourishment" (p.74). He suggests that in our society, encountering the arts where few adults manifest competence or the expectation of competence in the child, or where the arts no longer function as powerful common carriers of cultural knowledge (as in the relationship of religious art and society during the Renaissance), guarantees the arts continued marginal status. Art becomes a "reservation" on the border of our culture:

"Real people" do not live on this reservation; they visit it in their leisure, spare time; the reservation is inhabited by a fringe, spare, not quite real people. (p.75)

Youngsters quickly absorb the contradictory messages they encounter about art, as we have seen in this study. "(Art is) valued and scorned at the same time, treated with respect yet vagueness, fundamentally alien to the real business of life" (Gross; 1983, p.76). When art becomes a specialized province and ceases to be a prime source of basic knowledge and value for most people, it loses its importance. To live on a specialized reservation requires special qualities or a vocation. Many of the third graders in this study had already figured this to be the case, despite their wanting to visit this pariphery, find out about it, and engage in its activities.

**Continuity**

The specialization and scheduling of art in this program were perceived as opportunities for learning in and about art. The once-a-week, one-hour, one-semester orientation to art impinged upon curriculum continuity. By continuity, I not only refer to a kind of coherent vertical articulation of opportunities for experiences through grade
levels, but also refer to a constructivist notion of continuity, which is related to experience itself. In the Deweyan sense (1938), this continuity of experience relates to the interaction of situation (conditions or opportunities for learning) and internal states within individual learners. Thus, it is the interaction of these that provides a measure of educative significance and value of an experience. It is the teacher's task to provide a situation where the most meaningful interaction between individual learners and a situation might take place.

Curriculum continuity was at risk if students received formal art instruction only one semester a year. Art teachers were assigned to a variety and number of schools, and children were bused to different schools from third to fourth grade. Continuity was diminished by this arrangement of persons in settings and by the fact that teachers were unaware of students' previous art experiences in the classrooms, with their art colleagues, at home, or in the community.

Continuity also was diminished in that art teachers operated on tacit beliefs about children and their interests or needs, rather than on informed judgment about these particular students and their activities and interests in the classrooms and beyond school. Would it have made any difference if teachers had acquired such information about students? I believe it would have enhanced both planning and evaluation. But how was this to be done, given the constraints in which these art teachers taught? When were teachers to find time to explore such issues with either students or colleagues? It would seem more pertinent to determine if there was a desire to know in the first place,
or a perceived benefit in knowing such things. This desire or perceived benefit must first be acknowledged. If it could be determined that such information is desirable and potentially helpful, then alternative courses of action might emerge that would enhance students' continuity of experience, constraints or none.

**Repetition and Omission**

Repetition and omission in curriculum content was at risk in this program for several reasons. First, the content of the curriculum seemed ill-defined beyond the state curriculum document. Remember the confusion and unresolved issues that emerged in the staff meeting when the supervisor asked the art teachers to reconsider the "curriculum agreements" document? The teachers did not quite know how or where to begin—from media, art forms, or what; and the lack of energy present at the end of the school year militated against deliberating these tough issues and arriving at some consensus and mindful alternatives. The state curriculum guide provided excellent examples of developing curriculum content using five broad features or points of focus: subject, medium, product, design, and style. Any of these broad features could have been used as a dominant or related focus in any individual lesson or unit of plans. Even though these foci were components in the lesson-plan forms, the holistic and flexible nature of these features interacting seemed to have gotten lost in practice. This would not have been an issue had the interplay of more of these foci been evident in actual practice, irrespective of paper documents.

Repetition and omission were at risk because the teachers were unaware of each others' enacted curriculum. It would not have been
helpful to have shared yearly lesson plans submitted in the fall to the supervisor because most of these were expected to change and did so dramatically in practice for obvious reasons: teachers' personal interests and expertise; attentiveness to different schools or groups of children and their perceived needs or abilities; the availability of materials or resources; accessibility and/or use of facilities; and the tacit mimicking and sharing of each others' ideas and activities. For example, the "clown face" lesson had run its course, reported Mrs. Worth in one of the staff meetings. Central office personnel were beginning to comment at student exhibits that some of the products looked awfully familiar...just like the year before. Mrs. Worth announced to the art staff, "No more clown faces."

Another example of potential repetition was in some of the art teachers' use of lesson plans designated for substitute teachers. I observed one teacher use four of these lessons. After these lessons were developed by the art teachers and contributed to this packet, they were to be used only by substitute teachers. However, it was sometimes easier for a few teachers to pull from this packet than to create something new. For some beleaguered teachers, the packet served as a reliable "textbook manual" or source of ideas.

As noble as their efforts might have appeared, teachers who included second-grade classes to balance their schedules in a third and fourth-grade art program contributed to potential repetition in the curriculum. This was apparent with the Group C third-grade students. In interviews, students commented frequently that "we did that last year," when they were asked about their favorite and least favorite
lessons in art. Even though the same art teacher had taught them, this was no guarantee that some of the same or highly similar lessons would not be presented to them in the third grade. When one person teaches 1200 students a year, one is apt to forget which group of students has done which activities.

The supervisor mentioned another potential area of repetition in the curriculum. This was when classroom teachers became interested in some of the activities or media presented by art specialists:

...This summer we're going to revise (the curriculum agreements)...because this is the end of our fifth year, and by now some classroom teachers are picking up on some of the kinds of things the elementary art teachers do, which are the real short, one-day or two-times kinds of lessons. So, we're contemplating whether or not we should try to design something in units. (I)

She discussed how the same media may not be necessary for each grade level so that depth related to particular media could be increased. Thus, a third grader might have a five to six-week unit in clay, and a fourth grader may have only one clay lesson. Or fourth graders might work with textiles for a long period of time, while third graders would have no lessons in textiles or weaving. In her "thinking out loud," she divided these extended units with media into "experimental, performance, and refinement" kinds of phases.

Over two grade levels, some students were asked to draw the same object—round peppermint candies; some students never experienced particular media, like clay or yarn; some students did not do landscapes in the third grade and cityscapes in the fourth; and most students never were given the opportunity to examine prints, slides, or films of "famous" or popular art and respond verbally to these. Some of the art
teachers suggested that the same content, subject, or medium could be approached differently a second or third time around to develop skills. However, students were keen to perceive repetition or omission in the curriculum, particularly with regard to subject matter.

The greatest risk of omission occurred in the organization and scheduling of art classes. Gnaowing into this precious time were parent conference days, professional development days, snow days, or field trips. When art was offered only once a week for a semester (about 16 available lessons), the loss of any time due to the above was considerable. We noticed in Chapter V that one fourth-grade art teacher had eighteen available art lessons, while the other only had twelve. Fridays and Mondays seemed to have been the days of the week that short-change art instruction most. The cry from art teachers that there was simply "no time" to pursue some things certainly seemed legitimate.

**Depth and Breadth**

Depth and breadth in curriculum are associated with allocated time, content, and trade-offs. For example, one could focus on the medium of clay for a whole semester. Although at first glance the curriculum balance seems terribly lopsided in favor of only one medium, the focus does not have to be conceived narrowly. Depth is illustrated in the medium, clay. However, breadth could be enhanced by exploring the plasticity of the medium, mastering some degree of control of this medium to enhance personal expression and self-confidence, exploring the strengths and limitations of the medium in the expression of different subjects (utensils, masks, sculptures, for example), examining the use of ceramics in society, exploring professional careers related to
ceramics, or understanding the different styles and meanings of ceramics from different cultural and historical perspectives. The dimensions of learning in depth with less media provides knowledge beyond production or product.

Students might balk at the above notion. If they have been socialized to believe art is making and doing with "a bunch of stuff," the art teacher is challenged to introduce the depth rationale to youngsters as a plausible and enticing approach to art. I believe such could be accomplished and negotiated with students if teachers themselves genuinely believed in this approach. Children are perceptive enough to ascertain mindful and mindless approaches. The teachers in this study believed that students had "consumer-minded" attitudes about art, such as the one of "make-and-take." Perhaps they did. The teachers also believed that the exploration of a variety of media was best for students this age, and their enacted curriculum revealed this. Thus, the breadth-without-depth approach to this curriculum was influenced by both student and teacher beliefs, as well as the time constraints. To design opportunities for learning otherwise will take considerable rethinking of goals. It is my guess that such rethinking would allow goals related to "art in society" and "artistic heritage" to emerge, with more space around fewer media to do so.

What we see in the curriculum practice of this case study was an attempt to do breadth and depth approaches—breadth in a variety of media, and depth into two or three-session lessons that required more time for completion of a product because of the nature of the media or art forms selected, such as clay, weaving, or stitchery. Breadth, then,
was not defined as extending curriculum goals or the scope of student understanding of the social, cultural, or critical aspects of art. Breadth was defined as: some products take longer to make because of the media used and the constraints of time. The supervisor’s remarks about revamping the curriculum tended to lean toward a focus on less media with more skill refinement. Thus, students still might come to understand art as making and completing products—some products just will take longer to make than others, or some media require more practice in order to have any sense of control over it.

**Sequence**

There was an attempt to sequence and standardize the curriculum with the "curriculum agreements" document and the perceptual-conceptual-psychomotor skills list. What these documents revealed was vague. It seemed that in this setting, an understanding of sequence in relation to students’ artistic development was tacit and rarely shared or discussed. Teacher B seemed to have defined sequence by having third graders focus on the elements of design and fourth graders on drawing skills. She was the only teacher in this study I was privileged to observe over a two-year period. Judging from the lesson plans and activities of the other teachers, characteristic distinctions made between the two grade levels based upon students’ developmental level did not seem pronounced.

Because of some of the teachers’ tendency toward realistic representation, they seem to have assumed third or fourth graders were "ready" for this. Teacher B stated that fourth graders "want so badly to draw things realistically, and just can't yet." Thus, with the assumption that students wanted this naturally, she designed her fourth-
grade curriculum to meet this perceived need, despite what students may have otherwise said or felt. As a result, we have a phenomenon called the "null" curriculum (Eisner, 1985), which is that which we teach by not teaching it. For example, most children in this program learned that art was not constructing, viewing, appreciating, or critiquing.

At the end of 1984, when I mentioned in a staff meeting students' ability or inability to recall art vocabulary, one teacher questioned the significance of this. "Kids this age don't care about art vocabulary." My point was, some students seemed to have recalled art vocabulary and understood rather complex design concepts because of the nature of instruction. Art was not merely doing, but also being able to talk about what one does or sees when encountering art. What seemed to have made the difference in students' being able to do this within the same age level seemed to have been the simple procedure of writing vocabulary words and steps on the board and engaging students in verbal interaction about these concepts and directions.

Sequencing in this curriculum was primarily tacit and serendipitous in nature and not equally understood or shared among the art staff. Teachers' beliefs about artistic development and student needs or abilities remained individualistic and somewhat private. And because of this privacy, different groups of students experienced art quite differently. Therefore, we find a paucity of student understanding of design elements, the qualities of particular media, or particular motorical skills among some groups of students. And, we find a paucity of student understanding of the social, cultural, and critical dimensions of art among all the groups because of these beliefs about
learners and their needs, interests, or abilities. If there is a tacit but shared belief that children this age are incapable of or disinterested in goals beyond media exploration and manipulation, then broader educational aims will continue to be unconsciously dismissed as irrelevant and implausible. The findings from students and parents in this study seem to support the reverse. Students seemed to possess a natural capacity for and an interest in broader issues. Why should art class look and feel like all other classes, with the only difference being the materials used--paint instead of a ditto?

The Hidden Curriculum

The hidden curriculum provides important knowledge for students. First of all, in order for students to fit successfully into the institution of schooling, they must learn how to accommodate what they understand to be subject matter to what others in positions of authority perceive as subject matter. Those in authority (teachers or parents) and those not in a position of authority (students) interpret and define the subject matter. By so doing, they also define their roles in experiencing, understanding, or reconstructing this subject matter.

Art was defined by students in this study primarily as self-expression or making and doing, as many parents defined it. However, the teachers—in their manner of presentation of subject matter within the context and constraints of schools—defined art as subject matter and technical skill acquisition. The students' definition of art implied that they would be active agents in the construction of this subject matter. For example, recall the third grader who said, "Why can't we just have fun or something? I mean, not like fun at recess—
fun doing the art and stuff...her telling us to use our imagination!"

Most of the teachers' definitions implied that students would be passive recipients of knowledge: some students would learn the elements of design, some would refine realistic representational skills, and all would explore media selected for them by their teachers and determined by their teachers when they could use these. I never observed an array of media in an art class in one period, with the suggestion that students could explore a particular idea, theme, or subject by choosing and selecting a medium to use as a vehicle for this expression.

This difference of subject and role definition was negotiated in the natural setting in some of the following ways. Students learned how to satisfy the requirements of teachers and how to respond to the normative content of a subject area in ways that seemed acceptable to peers and teachers. Some students resisted these demands more than others by destroying their work or misbehaving. Some resisted by persisting in expressive interpretation, rather than adopting the norm. For some students this worked well, particularly if they were artistically talented and could carry out such divergence with quiet, unassuming flair without snarling the routine of things too much. For example, when a student decided to make a deer in the quilled Christmas ornament lesson, rather than a candle, Christmas tree, or star, he was rewarded by the teacher in that she allowed him to continue making the deer, complimented him publicly, and kept his work to show as an example to the following class.

Such divergence and the sanction of such was a rare event because when teaching and managing large numbers of students and materials, it
may be easier to orchestrate sameness rather than diversity. The problem is if divergence or personal interpretation is to be cherished and rewarded, the opportunity for such must be increased and made more visible to students. Divergence was not really available in the above lesson because of the teacher's examples or directions and the students' usual compliance to such in the context of schools. Perhaps what students learned in art class most of all was how to give an acceptable performance. Eggleson (1977, p. 19) suggests:

Most children are capable of and willing to give the teacher egg-crate sculpture, embroidered napkins, avant garde music or poetry or whatever else he desires. But giving this acceptable performance may in no way modify their construction of reality which may have its roots in areas of thought and experience not shared by the teacher.

In practice, schools as institutions more often regiment social roles required by society, and this socialization may be contrary to the rhetoric of curriculum documents and the manifest functions of schools as perceived by society. Thus, teachers learned to give an acceptable performance as well by maintaining classroom control, by channeling the production and exhibition of school art, and perhaps even by compromising broad goals for narrow ones. If narrow ones were acceptable, which apparently they were in the contexts of schools and the program, then narrow ones it would be. Given the constraints in which they and their supervisor operated, teachers had little time to consider much else.

It seems clear in this study that students were aware of the hidden curriculum dimensions pervading schools and large portions of our society—that art is not really that important, or that it is only for
the select few who will pursue careers in it. Students' definition of an art career did not include curators, critics, or consumers/viewers. Through their interactions with parents, schools, and art teachers, they had little experience with such notions. Art was only for doers, not viewers, buyers, or critics.

Students already had accepted the notion of art's peripheral importance in society through their interactions with parents, teachers, and schools. I believe self expression or creativity pervaded their remarks as a kind of personal resistance to the ho-hum, colorless and lifeless routines of schools in general. Many put up with the routine demands of art teachers and their zest for mimicking or design elements in order to get a taste of something colorful, involving, active, sensuous, alive, and potentially expressive like art. Likewise, the art teachers put up with the unrealistic demands of program structures in order to locate this color and sense of self expression for themselves as fringe professionals within the alienating structures of institutions in general.

The once-a-week, one-semester-only organization of art in schools contributed to a peripheral understanding of art. Withdrawing art class as a kind of punishment for students who had not done their work or behaved according to a norm contributed to this peripheral understanding. It also perpetuated the notion of art-as-therapy. The once-a-week theme, isolated from the daily lifeworld of students in classrooms, also perpetuated a peripheral theme. Except for one classroom, art was not part of the fabric of the everyday activities of the classroom or student experience. Dewey (1934, p.40) suggests:
The enemies of the esthetic are neither the practical nor the intellectual. They are the humdrum; slackness of loose ends; submission to convention in practice and intellectual procedure. Rigid abstinence, coerced submission, tightness on one side and dissipation, incoherence and aimless indulgence on the other, are deviations in opposite directions from the unity of an experience.

Is routinized, "recipe," or realistic art in elementary art classes any more appropriate for youngsters than recipe and cookie-cutter art frequently found in regular classrooms? Are students' art experiences in this study any different from those in other art classes, at other schools, even in other subject matter? I think not. The studies of Johnson (1931; 1932; 1935), Goodlad (1984), and others suggest that a kind of limp, flat quality exists in classes, no matter the subject area. It would seem that learning in an art class is no different than learning in reading or math. This would not be so perverse an idea if the educational process in other subject areas did not appear so routinized, colorless, and detached from the lives of children. The fragmented, incremental, and factual character given to learning in reading and math in most classrooms today is no more appropriate for the arts.

In this curriculum, self-expression might have been a natural basic bridge to the social, cultural, and critical concerns of art. Sanctioning many "right" answers or open-ended outcomes, exploring the qualities of media with less teacher emphasis on duplicated outcomes, examining and talking about art forms, styles, or processes, and displaying art frequently in the students' school environment could have been steps toward more meaningful art experiences. Such action might have reflected many beliefs and approaches to art, rather than only that
of the mimetic or objective vein. To make intelligent choices, students need to have experienced several alternatives. What can we do?

**Recommendations**

Art educators claim that what art education is about is instilling in youngsters an ability and an appreciation to attend and respond to art forms in personally meaningful and critical ways, be these art forms creations of the students themselves or those of Proctor & Gamble, Frank Lloyd Wright, Rembrandt, Disney, or Picasso. This is a tall order for such a short space in the general curriculum.

It seems art educators, who are removed from the realities of public schools and the constraints therein, misjudge the studio experiences offered by art teachers as a loose focus on self-expression. I did not find much self-expression in the art classes observed. Obviously, this depends upon one's definition of self-expression, intentionality, choice, or personal fulfillment. Art educators tend to chide art teachers for perpetuating something that does not really exist—self-expression. One need only pick up the issues of the last decade of *Art Education* to sense the accusations. Thus, I think it would do art educators well to re-enter the natural setting of the art class to experience the constraints with which art teachers struggle and succumb to on a daily basis. They, like their supervisors and students, are caught in a tangle of self-imposed and superimposed constraints. To conceive of mindful alternatives will require considerable dialogue and reflection in real places with real people. Somehow what is desired must be balanced with what is practical, and the only way to determine this delicate balance is to see and hear both sides.
The ten art teachers in this study were not afforded much time or very many opportunities to critically reflect about the nature of art knowledge, students, curriculum goals, or instructional strategies, particularly as a collective professional group. Their concerns were understandably immediate and practical. Neither were students afforded this critical and reflective opportunity due to programmatic constraints and the viewpoints teachers then presented them, explicitly and implicitly. Thus, routinization in the curriculum seemingly was nested in the pervasive structures of classrooms, schools, programs, and system-wide policy, as well as in individual teachers' approaches to curriculum. The teachers or supervisor in this study were not perpetrators of an unjust situation. However, in continued silence and a state of unawareness, they risk becoming both victims and perpetrators of an unjust situation. What are some alternatives to routinization?

Collaborative and Action Research

Collaborative and action research (Borthwick, 1982; Carr & Kemmis, 1983) are not new notions, but they are approaches to inquiry that encourage the teacher to actively research his/her own questions, dilemmas, or the phenomena encountered in the practical world that interests him/her. Teacher's knowledge, as we discovered in this study, can be perceived as highly individualized, personal, or tacit (Diamonti, 1977; Polanyi, 1966; Yinger & Clark, 1981). Collaborating or directing one's own research brings the tacit dimensions of teaching to a level of consciousness so that more informed action can take place. Research related to reflection or practical reasoning seems promising (Elbaz, 1983; van Manen, 1977).
Dewey's reflective action (1933) concerned developing teachers' abilities to examine the moral, ethical, and political issues (as well as the instrumental ones) that are embedded in everyday thinking and practice. Developing "habits of inquiry" has a long tradition in teacher education. This represents an attempt to prepare teachers in the analysis of what they are doing in terms of their effects upon children, schools, and society (Feiman, 1972; Zeichner, 1981; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982).

To encourage such exploration requires administrative leadership, interest, understanding of such exploration, encouragement, and the sanction for teachers to do so. Collaboration could be developed among the art teachers themselves in this setting, without university interference. There are several ways administrators and teachers could be encouraged to reflect upon their own practice and the goals to which they aim, such as follows.

Re-Examining Curriculum Goals and Documents

What are the goals of art education and how have these been articulated in actual practice? Staff meetings could be rescheduled so that more time and energy could be focused on curriculum matters. The examination of documents and the sharing of enacted curriculum could be a starting point. What kinds of coherence are perceived in the paper documents and in actual practice, and how are these different curricula both "real" and of value? To speak of deviation from paper documents as a detriment is to stifle the exchange of ideas and disclosure. To speak of deviation as particularized because of individuals' inclinations, or the lack of facilities, or the perceived abilities of children is to
pursue mindful alternatives in the face of multiple realities.

How might the goals and issues pervasive in the curriculum documents and enacted curriculum be deliberated? Coming to some consensus without too much conformity or standardization might channel energies toward a collective effort and take some of the stress off of individuals who are simply trying to manage in the face of isolation.

A collective group with a common purpose is greater than the sum of its parts or individuals. If a group cannot eloquently articulate in word and action what it is about individually or collectively to itself, then how can its members articulate its beliefs, aims, or importance in the role of general education to those outside the immediate group? To deny the socio-political nature of schooling or the constituencies that influence schooling is to deny the power and right to change things.

**Observing Other People and Places**

These teachers exhibited an interest in seeing what each other did. "I'd give anything to do what you're doing," one teacher told me. "Just to see how other people do things--how they go about organizing materials, teaching similar concepts, anything!" (I). It would not seem necessary to exchange teachers to sample other settings or students, for these teachers have enough variety in settings and students. What seems likely as a rewarding experience, however, would be a day observing a colleague with the expectation that this would not be a day of "assisting," but of observing and talking about what was observed. Such observation and dialogue, as was seen in the conduct of this research, raises the awareness both of the person observed and the person observing. Such activity stimulates reflection and questions and jars
our assumptions and things we have taken for granted. Using release
time or finding funds for substitutes could assist such an endeavor.

The focus of such observation also could be on students, rather
than a colleague. Getting the opportunity to observe a group of
students, without having to teach them, allows for reflection and
analysis. It allows for one to see what one cannot when given the
responsibility to teach and oversee students. Observing other students
might help one become more sensitive and attentive to one's own
students.

Where are the student teachers? I never found the answer to this
question from university or school personnel regarding this program. It
would seem to be of benefit that practicing art teachers work with pre-
service teachers. This would give practitioners an opportunity to share
their expertise, as well as reflect upon practice—that of someone else
or their own. Being a cooperating teacher, particularly if one has
never been one in this program, might instigate better planning and
modeling for the neophyte's view. Toward the end of the student
teaching period, it would also give the cooperating teacher time and
space to consider bigger issues than the minute-to-minute demands of
actual teaching or to observe in a colleague's classes for a day.
Certainly, it would be of benefit to student teachers to encounter the
structure of such a program and its demands. Few elementary art
teachers will be hired full-time in one school because of funding and
the low status of art in general education. Many will become itinerant
specialists.
Rejuvenating the Juices

Attending professional conferences with like minds is one way to revitalize a professional spirit. Ideas are liberally and vicariously exchanged among practitioners in such settings, away from the press of the classroom. Every field has its evangelists—the few, but powerful and eloquent speakers who can pull you into their ideas with metaphor, who can cause your blood to run, who can prick the senses, who can make you believe in yourself and your specialized world again without condemning you to hell. Though perhaps not long-lasting, because of the inevitable return to real places and people, the evangelists nevertheless can help remind teachers that they are real, thinking, and feeling adults and not merely cogs in a wheel.

Some of the teachers in this study were revitalized and made themselves feel more real when they took a course in watercolor painting at a community center, attended a gala opening of a new exhibit or a stage musical, or participated in a community sing-along. These are sensual, cultural events that bring us closer to ourselves as individuals and as members of the human race that because they are personally meaningful events, stimulate images for possibilities that potentially carry over into our professional lives. If teachers cannot feel stimulated and alive, how can we expect them to help youngsters feel likewise?

Including Students in Curriculum Decisions

What might students be able to tell teachers about their expectations, beliefs, opinions, and evaluation of the practical enterprise of teaching and learning? It seems to me that much can be
learned from the students' perspective, given the nature of this inquiry. Such information also might nudge what we have taken for granted about students, about learning, and about our own teaching. We might be better judges of students' abilities and interests if we inquired about them, and in so doing we might be able to develop and implement better curriculum.

Such an inquiry might suggest how we should select topics or activities that will enhance the coherence of paper documents and broad educational goals, while at the same time ensuring relevance to students. What lessons do students like most and least, and for what reasons? What do they find difficult or easy, and why? What do they say beyond "Art's fun," when pressed gently and sincerely. What do they like or dislike about particular instructional approaches? In their disclosure, several of the students in this study provided excellent advice for art teachers and schools in general. Although I never asked, there were many clues and comments that have made me more sensitive to my own role as a co-creator and co-evaluator of curriculum and the teaching-learning process.

**Leaving the Obvious to Last**

I left the more obvious kinds of recommendations to the last for a reason. I wanted to explore what might be done in such a situation or a similar one that would require little external revision or demands in budget and reorganization. What I mentioned above primarily were things that could be done internally with little extra funding. It was a matter of reconceiving the less obvious.
It is much easier to suggest that this program is understaffed and its people overworked, or that such a program should be extended into all the elementary grades because it is better than most regular classroom offerings (according to the literature and my own observations). However, to suggest "something is better than nothing" is not a very persuasive recommendation. My argument has been that there is more to this "something" I have witnessed in the last two years than meets the eye. I believe there is the potential for positive change through the kinds of recommendations I made earlier. However, none of the structural changes may take place until some things are pursued vigorously and internally, particularly the re-examination of curriculum goals and the enacted curriculum. It might be that when the group examines its enacted curriculum in relation to state or local goals, they could build a case for hiring extra personnel or extending the program on the basis of structural conditions militating against these goals, in fact making many of these goals impossible to attain.

The literature and the findings in this study suggest that teacher education programs need to be re-evaluated. Teachers may have difficulty reconceiving curriculum goals and practice, having had little experience in the social, cultural, and critical dimensions of art as young learners and as pre-service teachers. To break a vicious cycle, the nature of teaching and learning in art and the parameters of this field must be examined at all levels.

The findings related to the peripheral dimensions of a specialist program deserve more attention. For example, how are the constraints for teachers and broad curriculum goals in this program similar to other
specialist and/or itinerant programs e.g., gifted, remedial, dramatics, physical education? What are the variables in some situations where, despite similar constraints, broad goals are enacted and vivid experiences for youngsters flourish? It seems the teacher is a key factor. How might the teacher be the key?

Issues related to curriculum and instructional matters that emerged in this study are generic in nature. They are not peculiar to art. For example, might not broad curriculum goals in all subject areas narrow in focus the closer they come to the classroom because of similar constraints? Are we to do away with broad goals because they never seem to get to the classroom? I think not. Reading means more than being able to decode and fill in workbook pages; math means more than balancing a checkbook; science means more than identifying leaf parts or memorizing equations; social studies means more than learning the seven major rivers of Brazil or eating "hoecakes" because our forefathers did; and art means more than learning to draw a still life or making a pinchpot. We would like to believe that educating means more than routinized teaching and learning. Educating is empowering persons to think critically, reflectively, and aesthetically. It means one learns how to express his or her intentionality, make mindful choices, develop an inquiring attitude, and possess a lust for life that is both humane and personally meaningful.

We need to critically examine and reflect upon actual instructional processes and art knowledge presented in art classes, also helping teachers develop skills of inquiry and reflection. We need to re-examine curriculum documents or paper goals for their coherence and
goodness (or lack of such) in the face of practical constraints and real people. We must do likewise regarding the nature of teacher planning which emerges from such documents and individual understandings, expertise, and inclinations. We need a safe and trusting climate in which to entertain possibilities, no matter how absurd these ideas might seem on first utterance, even to ourselves.

We need to involve students in our planning and in the evaluation of ourselves and our own practice. We need to find out what students know, feel, and do and what current research says about youngsters without assuming so much or so little about them; this is required with each and every new group of individuals we encounter. We somehow need to make better connections to the lives of students in regular classrooms, at home, and in the community through the experiences we offer them, through the inquiries we make of them, and through shared knowledge with classroom teachers and parents.

Through the above kinds of inquiries, we need to elasticize constraints or conceive of less oppressive organizational arrangements. And once we have carefully examined such alternatives, we are obliged not only to stretch and grow internally, but to present a well-grounded argument to others in the school hierarchy so that miseducative arrangements can be reconstructed into more educative, enlightened practice. Thus, through debate, consensus, and informed conviction, we can act as change agents. We can become a greater voice with supportive parents, visiting artists, internal or external evaluators, developing meaningful liaisons with schools.
Some youngsters' tears, actions, and words alert us to the nature of their experiences in art. These are the kind that beg immediate attention, for the pervasiveness and intensity manifested in them suggests that things are not as they should or could be. This has not been a plea for self-expression's free rein nor an indictment against caring teachers or specialist programs. I have suggested in this study that life in the practical world is very complex, and that the enacted curriculum is the result of many influences which constrict real persons in real places. There are many consequences encrusted in the layers of routinization that are played out in the actual negotiation of curriculum knowledge, perhaps debilitating teachers and students, rather than empowering them. Some of these consequences may not be those we hoped for, planned, or even want for our children.
Afterword

ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE CONDUCT OF THIS INQUIRY

This afterword presents some of the ethical issues I encountered as a researcher conducting this inquiry. I offer these issues so that the reader can judge the methodological decisions I or others made in the conduct of this inquiry and the resulting analyses and interpretations. By disclosing some of my research diary, I hope this afterword will serve as caution and encouragement to those who wish to conduct or assess naturalistic research.

Gaining Entry and Consent

Several of the issues related to selecting field sites or gaining entry and consent were covered in the methodological chapter. However, some events and conditions colored the conduct of my research in the beginning phases of inquiry. These related to my own psychological state as well as to external conditions or those beyond my control.

How to Wait at Stoplights

Selecting field sites and gaining entry to conduct this inquiry was complicated by my wanting to observe in more than one location. Because I had conducted two pilot studies successfully and had little difficulty gaining entry, my confidence rode quite high. Past experience, however,
was no guarantee that I would have an initially well-developed conceptual framework. There was something that marked the dissertation as distinctively different and more important than previous class assignments, self-motivation, curiosity, or pilot studies, all of which had guided me in the past. This loose conceptual framework, the high anticipation about conducting this research because it was a dissertation, and trying to gain access into more than one public school were all dimensions that intensified both my enthusiasm and desperation in conducting this inquiry and getting into schools.

Naturalistic research usually means more than one gatekeeper or single functionary who grants access to a setting and participants. This is particularly true in dissertation research conducted in schools. For example, I essentially had six gatekeepers. My adviser gave me a confident go-ahead based upon a condensed proposal. I spoke tentatively and informally with the art supervisor about the possibilities of this research without a written proposal. I did this before going through the appropriate channels because, as my diary recollects, "what's the use of going through all of this if the art supervisor ends up saying no? Then I've wasted everybody's time and have lost a month or two in the process." The supervisor exhibited interest in this study and encouraged me to pursue the proper channels, "using her name."

The Human Subjects Committee had to approve a different kind of proposal and form, and they included certain requests, such as my providing in advance all questions that I would be asking all participants. This was without my knowing any of the field settings or ever having met any of the participants. Some of these requests were
somewhat devastating because I had planned to involve classroom teachers, art teachers, and parents, as well as students in this study. I complied with this request. The university had a liaison person who approved all research to be conducted in schools. This meant another kind of proposal format that also was submitted to the school personnel.

The school system perused this proposal at three levels: a review committee, an administrative person responsible for the particular grade levels involved in this study, and a person responsible for seeing that such research did not breach the union contract of teachers. Clearance also had to be sought from each building principal and classroom teachers. Thus, site selection was as much voluntary as it was granted or sanctioned by higher-ups.

Now, consider a person who was anxious to do her research—and with a rather loose conceptual framework at that, having to formulate and reformulate this proposal for different audiences and gatekeepers. Each of these steps, approvals, and formulations meant waiting; it also meant solidifying this conceptual framework somewhat in advance. In some ways, these different proposals were helpful in refining a conceptual boundary for this study; and in some ways this felt premature without knowledge of particular contexts and participants that would inform better questions.

One learns to wait at stoplights by turning wholeheartedly into what is available and into places that are conditionally accessible. In my case, these places were art staff meetings, literature reviews, and curriculum documents. My desire to be in schools where students were was an incredibly persistent and anxious concern. I perceived art
classes and students as the core "location" of my research. Waiting for approvals of proposals to get at the core of my research took five months.

Well, Some People Call It Research!

Qualitative inquiry does not have full acceptance in the university sector, much less in the public school sector. It is not a conventional form of inquiry, and as a result, it may be highly suspect. I also believe that a research proposal can raise red flags when one uses conventional terms, such as "semi-structured interviews" or "open-ended questionnaires." Some of the approval committees were willing to wait for these to be submitted at a later date and allow me to begin research; others wanted such questions up front. This proved problematic, as it yielded the opportunity for censorship, scrutiny, and ill-defined questions to occur. One person in the school system was designated as a review member who would see if my research questions "complied with the teachers' union contract." This person acted as primary censor of some of the questions to be asked of participants:

We can't have people asking for judgments of our professionals. This is against our contract...
No one, professionals included, are to make judgments of another professional, except those who evaluate...
those are the only legal people—principals and supervisors. (Telephone conversation, 11/21/83)

This censorship implied that I, students, or their parents had no right to assess the education they perceived they were receiving via classrooms and teachers. For a person interested in student perceptions, I was dumbfounded that students' assessments of art class or instruction would have to be purposefully ignored.
Some of the potential interview and questionnaire items seemed harmless in this regard and certainly did not seem to relate to the evaluation of teacher performance. For example, some questions were much like those one would ask students for sociogram data: "Who in this class is good in art? Why do you say so?" Or, "Who would you like to work with in the art class? Why?" Any questions that requested students rate the art class (A, B, C, for example) obviously were censored, as were questions related to students' perceptions of how their art teacher and classroom teacher were alike or different in the teaching of art. These questions obviously requested assessment of professionals. I generally felt that such questions would have been harmless, as I hypothesized students would be fairly positive about their art classes and teachers.

Any questions that seemed to require one person speculate about another person's beliefs or actions were censored. Likewise, parents could not be asked, "From what you have heard or seen, what do you think the art teacher wants your child to know about art?" I was told, "Parents wouldn't be able to answer this." Even so, might not responses such as these have told me something about home-school relations or student-parent communication related to school and art in particular? I was perplexed.

Although discouraged by this censorship, I considered the larger socio-political context and time in which this study was conducted. Perhaps school personnel had a legitimate fear of evaluation in an age of accountability and public criticism of schools and teachers. I acknowledged the possible insensitivities of past "commando" researchers
in a large, university-laden city who may have left schools in silence with only a taste of bitterness and resentment, giving nothing in return but criticism, if anything.

Such censorship slowed an already cumbersome start. I was told that any new, emerging questions (which are common in naturalistic research) would have to be approved before I could present these to participants, informally or otherwise. A final assessment of my proposal was, "Well, this isn't really research." It was at this point I was most convinced that not everyone understands or appreciates naturalistic inquiry, and that the findings to be shared at the end of this inquiry might be just as scrutinized as the proposal and its questions were.

The Volunteer-Versus-Volunteered Syndrome

How a researcher acquires participants with whom to study is an age-old problem in field research. Although a researcher may request volunteers, some persons may be volunteered by their administrators. This is particularly true when having to gain entry through a hierarchy, and this is problematic because of the power structure inherent in social hierarchies and organizations. If someone has been selected by his/her administrator as a potential "volunteer," s/he may find it more difficult to decline participation in research—even question the nature of it to clarify decision-making. Depending on the nature of the research questions, a person might feel flattered to be considered for selection, annoyed, or tremendously anxious. Beyond these feelings is the fact that one has no choice in such matters because of a hierarchical relationship. Thus, selection is disguised as
volunteerism. Acquiescing to the hierarchy may mean that it will be more difficult to discontinue participation in the research once it is underway and better understood, even with one's increasing displeasure or discomfort.

The Boss Said I Could

Not only did entry into schools involve principals and teachers agreeing to my conducting research in their schools or classrooms, but it involved the cooperation of art teachers. The supervisor suggested three candidates for my research without consulting them ahead of time, I believe. This made me very uncomfortable. When I presented my research proposal in the first staff meeting, consent forms in hand, I realized that I was the first person who had presented this proposal to the teachers. The message was that three particular teachers would be participating in this study. Thus, in my ignorance I contributed to what could have been perceived by the art teachers as a kind of coercion.

Although these three particular teachers complied, there was no apparent enthusiasm about the research and quite a lot of reserve, rather than questions. Mrs. North also told the art teachers that I wasn't "looking for anything negative or anything." I tried to keep the focus of my presentation on students. Aside from the administrator selecting teachers for me without full discussion with them or time for them to consider their own participation, I also suspected that she selected teachers she perceived to be her "best" teachers. She also complied cooperatively with my schedule and request for three different school locations and SES populations.
At this point, I did not know I would be continuing research a second year. This had ramifications in the volunteer-versus-volunteered syndrome at the end of the first year when I had made the decision to do follow-up. By then I was such a familiar face, it might have been difficult for the teachers or supervisor to have discontinued the research effort without seeming somewhat arbitrary.

**The Temptation to Resort to Bribery**

Although permission from parents to have their children participate in this study was waived at my request, two principals requested permission forms anyway, "just to let parents know what you're doing." This seemed plausible, but I never received a 100% return of permission forms from parents. After spending months trying to gain entry into these settings, this seemed like another stumbling block, particularly since permission had been waived by what I considered to be the "greater powers that be." It may be a misconception to visualize hierarchies of gatekeepers in hierarchical organizations. It was obvious in this case that principals and classroom teachers retained some autonomy in their gatekeeping, and rightfully so. No matter what "higher-ups" sanctioned, the ultimate gatekeepers were those closest to the desired location of inquiry and observation.

At one point, to increase returns of permission forms I considered buying university-engraved pencils for each student (a much coveted item among students where a university was very visible to them in athletics). This was with the understanding that this could be a yes or no response, but I felt uncomfortable doing this and didn't. It seemed like too much pressure for something as unobtrusive as this study. Such
might have drawn more attention to the research than I felt was necessary. In two classes of one school, I made a thermometer chart to graphically present returns to encourage student returns. But without the classroom teachers' help, a 100% return was next to impossible. This return process did not last long anyway in this school (see next section).

Because the principals and classroom teachers, after a few weeks, did not seem concerned about this anymore, I let it drop. I planned to use pseudonyms for people and places in my writing, but this would be impossible with the use of photographs, which I planned to use in this dissertation and in other publications. Thus, I will never be able to use the photographs of children for whom I have no parental permission. Although I spent several hundreds of dollars on film and processing, I don't feel this was a waste. I can use some of the photos, I can illustrate from those I cannot use, and these certainly were useful in the conduct of interviews with students and in sharing art class activities with the regular classrooms.

I'll end this section with the hope that the reader understands by this time my sense of frustration, as well as increased—if not zealous enthusiasm for finally being able to get into schools to conduct this research. One waits at stoplights by finding other important things to do, which I did. But this did not alleviate my anticipation and anxiety about being in actual classrooms and art classes. The peer debriefing group with whom I met every two weeks helped funnel some of these frustrations and disappointments, yet my friends were merrily going about their research as planned. This allowed a sense of
competitiveness to creep into my feelings of frustration. I felt that all I could contribute to these sessions was feedback related to their work. Thus, undergirding the meaningful aspect of my research related to staff meetings and curriculum documents was this nagging, if not keen desperation to be in schools and to "get on with the real matters of interest." It was this buoyancy about being able to do something I enjoyed and anxiety about not being at the "heart of matters" quickly enough that led to the following demise.

Losing Entry and Face

At the very beginning of my research, I was pleased that the art supervisor and I could arrange for me to observe in two classrooms in one school. I was excited about the possibilities of this arrangement because I could observe the same art teacher presenting the same lesson to two different groups of students who were very much alike in background. Thus, such factors as different classroom environments and interpretations of similar material could be closely examined. The school also was conveniently located, and the principal most outgoing and accommodating. The principal more or less selected two teachers for observation. They, too, were given my presentation of proposed inquiry in the presence of their administrator and complied by signing consent forms. Again, I felt uncomfortable about the volunteer-vs.-volunteered syndrome, but this time suggested they "sleep on it." In front of them, the principal said they "could already decide." Thus, they did.

After the first three observations in these two classes, I was intrigued because the two teachers were so different. One classroom seemed to be very student-centered and activity-based; the other seemed
rather oppressive and bleak for students. One of my strongest biases is revealed in the response to the question I enviously asked myself: Would I like to be a student in this classroom? I identified greatly with students. Because of the differences in the two classroom settings and instructional styles, I was beginning to note how students responded similarly and differently to the art teacher's lessons once a week.

How to Get Kicked Out of a School

As I had done in pilot studies, I began sharing fieldnotes and observations with both regular classroom teachers and the art teacher. Each teacher received copies of the observations done in her class with her acting as teacher. Because I used a word processor, I would make me a personal copy of my fieldnotes (highly subjective or otherwise); and I would "blip out" highly evaluative remarks or observations and give this "revised" copy to the designated teacher.

Obtrusiveness Clues

It is normal in the early part of research to see participants who read shared fieldnotes respond with surprise, if not dismay, at all the researcher sees and hears. The concreteness of such notes is quite a shock, even if they are as unevaluative as you can make them. This shock is illustrated in what I call "obtrusiveness clues." These go something like, "Boy, you don't miss much," "You must think I'm a terrible teacher compared to ___," "I'm sure you know all about that" (being a university person, quip-quip), "I just work here--you know what I mean?" or "Don't you ever show up on good days?" Graduate students normally do not have enough time (3 to 6 months) to "mess around" in the
field and establish rapport and trust, before suggesting to another party that they would like to conduct research for another several months, a year, or even two. This would be an ideal situation because the participant would know the researcher well and hopefully trust him/her. The researcher's role, however, still would change, and neither researcher nor participant would be able to fully comprehend what consenting to or conducting research means until each are into it.

The above obtrusiveness clues were evident in the above school with the teacher who ran an oppressive classroom. Such "obtrusiveness" comments did not go away after three weeks, even though she had consented to participate in this research. She seemed so uncomfortable, in fact, that for the fourth visit I had planned to ask for an interview to determine if she wished me to continue doing research in her classroom. I obviously was making her very uncomfortable and was willing to relinquish observations in this classroom, as interesting as the pursuit of contrasts was to me. If there was any way I could alleviate her discomfort, either through a discussion to iron things out or by pulling out totally, I was willing to do so.

On this fourth visit, I was met by the school secretary (where I had to sign in) and told to "sit in the red chair" before going up to one of the art classes. I felt "very small, vulnerable, and suddenly in trouble," as my diary reflected. "The principal wants to see you first," added the secretary. Little signals began flashing, and somehow I knew something was terribly wrong.
The Meeting

Sitting at a table in this unfamiliar room was Mrs. North, the art supervisor, the school person in the central office who had judged the appropriateness of my questions in accordance with the union contract, and of course, the principal. In their hands were copies of fieldnotes I had shared with each classroom teacher. The principal was very disturbed and announced that one of the teachers was very upset and sueing me.

In this meeting, I discovered what was wrong: (1) I had failed to "blip out" a derogatory remark I made about the principal's behavior during a school function, and I had failed to catch this error in my proofreading. (2) I had identified three students in a classroom by ethnicity and vicinity (not yet knowing their names). (3) I had recorded a curse word expressed by a teacher in the classroom who claimed she "did not say that." (4) I had noted the lack of classroom displays in one classroom, and I was told there were "objective instruments to assess classroom climate." This led to (5) a justification for observing in regular classrooms when my study pertained to art classes. (6) I reported a conversation that occurred in the teachers' lounge that related to a discussion about students and their families' problems. (7) My notes were so detailed that I was suspected of concealing a tape recorder in the regular classroom, when I had not used audiotaping there. And, (8) I was being sued by one of the classroom teachers.

Thus, I was accused of being subjective on the one hand, noting no displays in a classroom, citing the ethnicity of three children, quoting
an "un-uttered" curse word, and describing the principal's behavior in derogatory terms. On the other hand, I was accused of not being subjective (positively so) by reporting the faculty lounge discussion related to students and family problems without also stating that I felt such knowledge was not only remarkable, but an asset in understanding students and relating to their difficulties and needs.

The upshot of this was that I was dismissed from this school by the principal. I was asked to destroy all tapes, turn in all fieldnotes completed to date, and to not use any information gathered at this school in the remainder of my research. I apologized to the principal, and the "sueing" teacher was asked to come in so that I could apologize to her. I apologized, we shook hands, and she exited. Before this meeting ended, Mrs. North said, "Now, let's see if we can find you another school that will fit into your schedule." She suggested that I not share fieldnotes with teachers in the future, and I agreed not to with classroom teachers. I was not sued, by the way.

What To Do About Hurting

The best one can do in such circumstances is to learn from them. In my anxiety to get into schools, my zealously to share fieldnotes openly with each teacher for clarification of my observations and to open dialogue, and in the general press of time, I slipped terribly. I slipped by not carefully proofreading fieldnotes to be shared. I slipped by not backing off of the uncomfortable teacher earlier, giving her an out. I read the obtrusiveness clues soon enough, but did not act quickly enough. I underestimated this teacher's growing discomfort. I
hurt others and myself in this awkward situation. Consider their perspectives.

The art supervisor and central office person had to have been embarrassed for permitting such research in the first place, for not really understanding the ramifications of detailed fieldnotes, the sharing of these, or observations that related to things other than art class. Wasn't my work evaluative in the long run? How had I hurt future researchers' chances of doing inquiry in this school system—particularly if this inquiry might be naturalistic in orientation?

The principal had to have been embarrassed by the derogatory comment about her and the cold distinctions made between these two teachers. Put together, the contrast reflected in the fieldnotes was only highlighted. What was she to do with this hurting teacher who threatened to "go public" with a lawsuit? How was she to deal with her classroom practice if she did not like what was described there? And what about the other teacher who seemingly had enjoyed the sharing of fieldnotes and the focus on her students and her practice? The only comment made in reference to her fieldnotes was the faculty lounge discussion. She was not sure that was "appropriate".

What about the art teacher, who remained in this school working with this particular principal and the two teachers? Would she have to defend me, when she herself did not know if I was yet worth defending? Would she have to defend herself? In what kind of position did my errors leave her? Or the supervisor, who had to continue relations with this school and its principal? Or again, the art teacher who would be "assigned to me" again by Mrs. North, only in a different school?
Wouldn't this make this art teacher all the more wary of me? As it turned out, it didn't. She was remarkably sympathetic to my plight.

What about my adviser, who had to defend an otherwise good student who apparently had done something awful and unbelievable? She had no copy of the fieldnotes and a difficult time figuring out what the real problem was over the phone when this upset principal called her the day before this meeting. She may have felt coerced into letting me "learn my lesson" for fear of me (or future students) losing entry altogether into field settings. Or, she may have felt I needed to "learn a lesson." Dissertation work is the expression and decision-making of an independent adult. Mentoring and protection can go only so far, even if you must have your adviser's signature as "principle investigator" on all communications. Who really is the principle investigator, and who really is responsible for his/her conduct of inquiry? On paper it is the adviser, but in action I believe it is ultimately the advisee.

I tried to put this hurt into perspective and use it constructively. I had not lost entry into the other schools, and had even been granted entry to a new one. Mrs. North helped me save a little face, and I will be forever appreciative of this action and her apparent trust.

Since this incident, I have been invited almost every quarter to qualitative research classes to discuss the more practical matters of research. Although I have never been asked to review this incident, each time I have chosen to present it. It has been cathartic for me and important, I feel, for other students to experience this situation vicariously—first from my anxious point-of-view, and then from the
perspective of others who were hurt by my anxiety, if not their own. I believe this incident occurred primarily because of my carelessness and insensitivity. The principal may have over-reacted, the teacher may have been bitter in the first place, the central office person may have been suspicious from the start, but all of this happened because of my own built-up anxiety to gain entry and get on with my work and the carelessness and insensitivity that resulted. Perhaps when hurt in the research process the best therapy is to learn from the hurt by expressing it to others, to slow down, reflect and reassess, graciously accept what is granted you or withdrawn (even if it is not exactly as you wanted or planned), and trust things will fall into place, perhaps for the better. There are innumerable phenomena in the field that may relate to your inquiry. The researcher must perceive any withdrawal of access as a shifting and refocusing—not necessarily a loss.

Despite what was temporarily withdrawn or lost in confidence, I gained in knowledge about the human aspects of the research process: the psychological distortions when one feels "behind" or on the periphery of the heart of her study; distortions that provoke mistakes and insensitivity in the field; legitimate and paranoid responses to outsiders' interpretations of insiders' domains; the delicate nature of time juxtaposed with interacting and feeling human beings; the political aspects of professional relationships within the school hierarchy as well as between schools and universities; and the power of the human voice and the silencing of it.
Role Definition

Defining my role as researcher was a constant struggle. It was more difficult defining my role with some art teachers than others. This struggle for role definition was most pronounced in the sharing of fieldnotes for triangulation, in my activities with students in the art class, and in the more subtle interactions between teachers and myself.

The Sharing of Fieldnotes

Already, I have alluded to the concreteness of fieldnotes and their impact upon teachers when shared with them. Sharing fieldnotes may not be the only way to triangulate observations, but it is one of the better ways. It also has higher risks. It is surprising how many events or observations can occur in relatively short periods of time in the classroom, particularly if audiotaping devices are used in combination with fieldnotes. Participants need preparation for their first few readings of such material. They will feel embarrassed about their grammar, their use of certain words, how much they seem to talk, how they talk, or how much you seem to see that they do not. Reading such is much like seeing yourself on videotape for the first time or viewing an artist's portrait of yourself.

Reading fieldnotes is an ambiguous experience in that teachers see the complexity of their own teaching in raw, reflected form, suddenly reminded of this complexity. This may result in a kind of delightful, self-appreciative feeling or one of horror. Likewise, the reading of fieldnotes may force teachers to see too much at once, more imperfection than that which coping mechanisms and living the classroom experience normally screen out. The teacher also will see an interpretative
account of this experience, as it is perceived and reported by someone else.

With the above in mind, I found it helpful to remind teachers that they could see what I could not, and that I wanted them to share such. I reminded them that I was not critiquing their grammar or use of words—no one (including me) speaks like a book, and that I did not care about that. I recorded what I heard...likewise with youngsters. This is part of the rich vitality of portraying classroom life as it unfolds. I tried to counterbalance one-way fieldnotes with the suggestion that teachers keep journals or diaries or jot down notes and share these to balance my observations. I reminded teachers that no one else would see these running accounts of classes but them, that pseudonyms of people and places were used, that they would see my developing interpretations and final report and be able to respond to these and revise them if they wished. I scheduled informal interviews with the teachers after they had received the first set of fieldnotes so they could respond immediately to them in any way they wished. This helped me, to some degree, gauge how much trust and rapport had been established. Informal interactions and "guesstimates" were not as revealing as was responding to fieldnotes in interviews.

In these interviews I tried to mirror teacher comments, rather than defend or justify what I observed. I allowed teachers to "teach" me, so that our relationship did not seem lopsided. I tried to find out more and more about "their ways" in these discussions. I believe this helped teachers feel they had some control over my observations and interpretations. It helped them feel they could set me straight, and
this needed to be established very early and continued throughout the research.

One art teacher never had or made time for any such interviews or discussions, although I tried on numerous occasions to establish such. Again, this was a negative kind of situation because my fieldnotes and audiotapes mirrored back her yelling at children, and she was volunteered by her supervisor when she may not have wished to participate in this study in the first place.

I Don't Wanna Be Your Supervisor!

With most art teachers, I was allowed to play my role as researcher, interacting mostly with children. By interacting and assisting children, I indirectly and discretely assisted the teacher while getting to know youngsters. For two art teachers, defining my role was particularly problematic at times.

One art teacher had completed coursework for her master's degree without completing her thesis. She said that she had gathered the data, but felt they didn't "say anything." She wondered if there was any way "we could work together so she could finish her master's...if (she) could use any of my research." On the one hand, I was delighted in her interest and pleased to do potentially collaborative work; and on the other, working with two teachers in two other settings per week made this suggestion seem impossible for me to pursue. Furthermore, she seemed so vague about what she might focus on that I did not pursue this. I suggested that the record of the fieldnotes might be something she could work with, but she had no ideas about what to do with it, what to look for, or how to proceed. I suggested she talk with her adviser,
which she didn't. Her interest soon dissipated. I felt very guilty for not pursuing this because it was an excellent opportunity for a teacher to do a meaningful investigation related to her own practice, but I was juggling so much myself, I couldn't be of much help or encouragement.

Another art teacher felt she "deserved something in return." She was so persistent about my assessing how things went in the classroom or giving her new activities that I finally relented and gave her some ideas. I avoided this as long as possible because I did not want this kind of relationship and reactivity. I wanted to observe what and how she would have normally presented activities to students. I kept trying to explain this to her, but she was so persistent that I once shared how some of the other art teachers approached similar activities, or how I had done a few things when teaching a similar concept. She did not seem particularly responsive to this or appreciative, so I did not do this again. She did mention that she wanted all of the lessons (fieldnote accounts) to help her teach the following year.

On numerous occasions, the above teacher also requested me to select student work for exhibits, "just to have someone else's opinion." She would request this while students were still present. On the one hand, I was pleased that she trusted my judgment or wanted it; on the other, I resisted by "forgetting" to do this while students were still present, or taking so long by the window sill that this could not be accomplished until the students had left. I did not like being put in this position, and apparently she was uncomfortable making such selections as well, as so few pieces could be selected from each class (only one or two) because of the large number of students and small
exhibition space. I complied with this activity to avoid alienating her, but I certainly did not like doing it, nor did I feel I could refuse this demand.

**Don't You Like Me—Just a Little?**

Researchers speak about "trust and rapport," but they never really talk about what these terms mean to individuals, particularly themselves. Is trust and rapport consenting politely to each other's demands without much fuss or conflict, or is it a genuine respect and liking of each other?

I believe trust and/or rapport is like a developing friendship, a genuine liking of each other, an enjoyment working together, an appreciation of each other's knowing and understanding. One teacher never seemed to like me, no matter how helpful I tried to be or what I said or did. For example, I would stay after class and help scrub tables, arrive early and help her get materials ready, assist students more than usual during class time, and compliment her when students seemed to really enjoy an activity, which was often. This teacher, however, never seemed particularly responsive to such behavior or to really like me as a person, for whatever reason. I found myself bending more than I normally would to establish a friendlier relationship. Thus, I learned "it takes two to tango" in developing such a relationship, but that one could conduct research without much of a tango. The degree of friendliness or genuine liking obviously may color findings. What can or cannot be discovered through this distance and somewhat icy, businesslike silence remains a question.
This teacher's encounters with other teachers and children seemed to have been of the same character as with me. Still, it did not diminish my hypersensitivity. I wondered if male researchers are as sensitive and concerned as female researchers about the nature of such relationships, since research tells us that males and females differ in their expectations of relationships and interactions in such. Are male researchers as concerned as female researchers about "being liked," even when data can be successfully obtained?

About Kids

Doing ethnographic research that involves children presents its own kinds of dilemmas and ethical issues. Though parents and teachers may consent, what choice do nine and ten-year-olds have about participating in one's research? I tried to be sensitive to this issue by respecting children when they did not wish to talk with me or disclose their feelings, particularly early in the research process. For most children, however, disclosure was not a problem. They were willing speakers and actors and enjoyed interacting with me. In fact, sometimes I felt they disclosed and trusted me so much because few adults asked their opinions or talked with them often on an individual basis in schools. Life in school means life in a group. Thus, it seemed most of the children in my study were hungry for individual attention and talk. As we became more accustomed to each other, this worked in the reverse. It was very easy for me to share my feelings and thoughts, as well.
I Don't Wanna Be Your Teacher!

If the researcher has elected to assume a role that is not one of a surrogate teacher, then she has to work hard against this perception in students' eyes. In the beginning, students suspected I was an evaluator of the teacher, sitting in the back of the room taking notes. Then they assumed I might be a student teacher or parent helper. Finally, with a little help over time, they were able to see me as a regular visitor who was doing research. They finally came to understand research as my homework—only a kind of homework that I actually enjoyed doing...that was a lot like being a detective. And it was a kind of homework that I did during school hours, as well as late at night.

In the beginning, students requested a lot of help from me, asked me to intercede in their conflicts, asked permission to do things, told on each other, all of which students usually assign to the teacher's role, in my opinion. Such behaviors seemed to have been a kind of testing of the stranger in the classroom, as with substitute or beginning student teachers. Students soon got the message that I did not operate in a teacher's role because I most often referred these complaints, questions, and requests to the teacher. Teacher behavior sometimes was difficult for me to resist, particularly when the teacher had her hands full or a student was about to get seriously clobbered by another. On these occasions, I interceded or pitched in, hopefully more as an interceding friend than teacher.

Honesty and Revelations!

Students will tell you more than you might expect. For example, in my interactions with children and their teachers I discovered: physical
and emotional child abuse; the nature of adult relationships in many homes; children left unattended by an adult for long periods of time; custody battles and kidnapping attempts; and one child who already had been in trouble with the police for breaking and entering. As a "friend" to children, I was privy to their mistreatment of each other, from name-calling to more serious kinds of physical torture and emotional taunting which often may be more concealed from teachers and their authority.

These revelations often left me wondering how anyone makes it out of childhood. Being privy to such information requires the researcher to respond to these accounts as seems appropriate. It suggests that some things are better left unsaid to anyone else, and some things are best investigated, such as physical abuse. It suggests that some things might be interesting to probe, but that the researcher is not a psychologist and might not know how best to handle a situation in the child's best interest. Children's honesty and revelations require sensitive responses. There was the brighter side.

I also learned that children have a fond affinity for their grandparents and speak of them and this relationship; delicate ways of handling potential abuse toward one another and resolving problems; speak freely and positively about home art activities, pets, siblings, neighborhoods, friends, relatives, and the like. Children are very giving of their thoughts and feelings. Therefore, the researcher has many ethical issues to consider when working with youngsters, whether responding to their accounts or reporting them.
Card Tricks and Other Things Up One's Sleeves

Children are vulnerable. Information can be elicited with little effort, or one can devise other "tricks" to explore children's feelings and thoughts. I felt that the card game was much like this, only it seemed relatively harmless. But this activity did cause me to consider the devices and sorcery a clever researcher with a child-like imagination could use to gain the trust of children and to ultimately elicit information. The potential bribery with university-engraved pencils, using a card game to elicit information in a "gaming" format, or doing a "thermometer chart" in an effort that implicitly suggested competitiveness and manipulation seemed devious and unethical to me in the long run. Perhaps the more experienced one becomes in doing research, the more trusting one becomes in his/her ability to elicit information, consent, and trust fairly and ethically. Genuine trust is worth more and lasts longer than an engraved pencil.

The Urge to Be a Hero

Another peculiar thing about doing research with children is the researcher's urge to be a hero sometimes. When children disclose alarming information, such as that presented earlier, the researcher must decide in what way to respond. The urge to be a hero is often less dramatic. What does the researcher do when s/he witnesses teacher behavior that seems abusive or extremely frustrating to students? In the regular classrooms and sometimes in art classes, I witnessed irrational screaming, yelling, and yanking kids around to the more quiet kinds of control like isolating children on the peripheries of classrooms. This was one child's place in the classroom for two years!
My urge to intervene was sometimes incredibly overwhelming. I had to remind myself that I did not experience what teachers experienced daily under duress; but I also had to wonder what the students experienced daily, and if this was under duress. My identification with youngsters was pervasive and strong.

Sometimes a teacher presented a lesson that I somehow knew students would have difficulty with from the beginning. Some tasks seemed unreasonable, some students cried in frustration, and some teachers could not relinquish to an altered plan. In such cases, I tried to assist students. Often, I was so upset that I could not force myself to be an adult party to this frustration of students, particularly if a few students were crying or were punished for misbehaving. I couldn't encourage students because I felt no amount of encouragement would help them do some of the impossible tasks. When I tried quietly to make light of the demands or illustrate a way out, the teacher often would come by right after me and reinforce the demands. Thus, I had to witness such events on occasion. I did one of two things: I tried to assist students individually and took my tape recorder with me to record their comments for fieldnotes; or I retreated to the periphery of the classroom, snapped pictures, quietly took fieldnotes, or whatever to avoid being actively involved in the demands of the lesson. The latter made me feel like a reporter witnessing and recording a human being torching himself in protest without intervening. I felt very guilty about retreating and recording, and in either event—assisting or withdrawing—I could not be a hero. In my witnessing, the only hero could have been the teacher changing plans midstream.
Reporting Findings

Once data collection is complete, the researcher must select, assemble, organize, rework, and write data into findings, usually for a research audience or dissertation committee. The gatekeepers in this situation wanted a final report, and I was glad to report my findings to anyone interested. In the zest for data analysis, deadlines, and reporting to adults, I felt it was important that each interested audience receive a report. For example, the students and parents received little booklets with the descriptive findings. No big comparisons. No big interpretations and conclusions. Just a description of what art class was like, the lessons that took place, and which activities children said they liked most and least, found most difficult or easiest, and why.

Although I have reported a fairly complete rendition of all the information I gathered, censorship was necessary because most participants in this study offered unsolicited and censored information. Also, I agreed to certain conditions during the negotiation of this research, whether unsolicited information turned out to be positive or negative.

Silencing positive as well as disturbing findings to some degree reduces the potential for critical reflection and seems counterproductive to educational change. How is censorship of questions or findings related to the research enterprise to inform theory-building or practice in the field? Where must the snipped pieces fall, and where can these be discussed? A very thin but steely line wedges between open discourse and secrecy, trust and distrust, language that penetrates or
glosses, accuses or reports. The issue of objectivity and subjectivity raises its indestructible, Janus head. Either end of the continuum can be perceived as fair and balanced or stinging and biased in the tone of the report. Perhaps it is in the reporting, not so much in data collection, where the researcher must learn to bracket his own biases and restrain interpretation.

It is an elitist and presumptuous attitude for the researcher to think s/he has discovered so many answers and that all of these need to be expressed. Triangulation and other methods of structural corroboration may tend to dupe the researcher into adopting such an overly-assured attitude, as might a sense of accomplishment and exhilaration in completing a lengthy and intensive research project. No matter the research paradigm, this may be a phenomenon among neophyte researchers more than seasoned ones. Whatever it is, it is an uncanny wedding of researcher to product, rather than process. A kind of restraint is in order, as I believe the participants and readers of such research will get more out of the report and bring more to it than the researcher may expect, trust, or recall in his/her own reading of other such research. The researcher may need to think of his or her product as a continued process. The reader who encounters the product will render meaning to it, much more like an active conversation than passive ingestion.

**Taking a Two-Year Trip and Reporting It on a Postcard**

There is probably more information in the presentation of this study than many readers can tolerate. This is because naturalistic research is rich, and the reams of data are many. This is also because
the researcher's focusing and selecting remain a problem to the bitter end when organizing and writing up the report. How does one report all the findings in one presentation? One doesn't, and one cannot. One thing that helped my selection and focus to some degree was to write smaller articles along the way that were complete pieces on their own. This will be done with findings yet to be presented. Even so, data reduction and selection were difficult.

Assessing the significance of findings may nag the researcher long after the final report. Distance from immediate reporting can cause reflection and new insights about data long after articles, reports, and dissertations have been presented. As in all forms of research, knowledge is amorphous and has little finality or completeness. One realizes this most when trying to reduce data to various formats or focusing only on particular aspects or ideas from the data. New ideas will inform the old ones no sooner than the old ideas have been typed out of the heart and head onto paper.

Selectivity Related to Chronology and Process

There are some ethical issues involved in reporting, other than that of which data and findings to report to whom because of agreements made between the researcher and gatekeepers or the researcher's understanding of particular reading audiences. Such issues involve which quotes to use or not use; how much evidence to present toward an argument or to counterbalance an argument; how wide or narrow to present or vary the focus in one presentation e.g., program, school, classroom, interactions, single utterances; and when to vary the focus. Further, my preference in presenting this study would have been to present it
more inductively, actually as it occurred during the research process. The dissertation format, as flexible as I made it in this case, still could not allow this inductive meandering and clue-seeking toward a climax or some solution. It could not illustrate the inductive and deductive interplay that was apparent throughout the inquiry. This story could not be told as I experienced the research process, nor could all of it be told, nor may I ever realize the "whole" story. The desire to reconstruct and present the research experience as it occurred was embedded in the belief that such might better inform future methodological strategies and the research paradigm itself. This reason extends beyond those of personal disclosure for the reader's vicarious experiencing or the provision of process for the scholarly assessment of this study.

**Multiple Realities Suggest Multiple Interpretations**

One final issue related to focus is how many ways one can develop arguments or interpret the findings using the same rich, detailed data. This depends, of course, on one's conceptual framework or lens. I am convinced that some people (like myself) do not have nor should they have an impenetrable or inflexible lens from the start or throughout the conduct of inquiry. To be able to dismiss bias or subjectivity "absolutely" in any kind of research may be an absurd notion. This request is much like asking the researcher to walk away from her own feet. I realized I could have advanced interpretations more from a critical theory approach, a developmental and/or constructivist approach, a cultural, sociological, sociolinguistic, or psychological
approach using the same data. Does this represent flexibility or conceptual confusion?

My conceptual framework warped and wiggled throughout the inquiry as different kinds of phenomena caught my attention. Rather than try to control or dismiss these phenomena or variables, I attended to them whenever they appeared. Thus, it becomes the reader's task to warp and wiggle along with this divergence, sensing several potential interpretations along with the researcher, or to dismiss the entire piece of work as poppycock because it seems unfocused. In summary, what is considered to be "good" or trustworthy research of any kind is defined by the known canons of the methodological strategies employed in good faith and the conceptual framework (be it flexible or more rigid) of both researcher and reader. The researcher is not in total command of conceptual framing; the reader will interact with the researcher's ideas presented in a document, co-constructing knowledge and judging its worth in both personal and scholarly terms. Where the value of such knowledge approaches scholarliness is perhaps in the researcher's ability to communicate effectively to many individual readers, enhancing an intersubjective understanding of his/her work.

Despite the dilemmas I faced as a researcher, my enthusiasm for naturalistic inquiry has increased rather than decreased. For some, the dissertation is a swan song. For me, it was the water, and I was an ugly duckling, imprinted with previous joyful assignments and experiences in this vein. But the approach penetrates more deeply than just having been exposed to it. The naturalistic orientation tends to throb in my veins and nourish my tissues. Perhaps we must remind
ourselves of the personal dimensions of inquiry...our individual inclinations, interests, talents, curiosities, and preferred ways of looking at the world which attract us to a certain orientation to inquiry in the first place. It is more than seduction, hoopla, bandwagons, assignments, resistance to the status quo, trends, and training that draws us to the kinds of phenomena we find intriguing, the questions we tend to ask, and the amount of time and energy we are willing to expend in the exploration of our questions.
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Appendix A

Sample cover letter and consent form
Dear Parents,

I am doing research in your child's regular classroom and in his/her art class this semester. This research is for my Ph.D. dissertation. I am interested in how youngsters experience art activities and what they learn from such activities. The kinds of questions I am thinking about are as follows: "How do children understand art concepts presented to them? What do they find difficult/easy to do in art, and why? What kinds of things do they learn when they make art or talk about art?"

The [blank] Public Schools district office, your child's principal, teacher, and art teacher have agreed to participate in this study. A description of the kinds of things I will be doing is enclosed. Mostly, I will be observing your child and his/her classmates in the regular classroom and in art class. Sometimes I will chat with students while they are working, but I won't interfere with their work in any way. About once a week I will assist students with their seatwork in the regular classroom.

This study will begin in January and end at the end of the school year. I will be in your child's art class once a week, and I will be in your child's regular classroom about once a week.

Please read the enclosed description about this study. The only thing required of parents is a brief questionnaire toward the end of the school year. The questions will be about your views about art and your youngster's art activities. I will select some students for further study toward the end of the school year because I would like to do some follow-up of students as fourth-graders in the fall when they again have art. I will make this selection at the end of the school year.

If you have any questions about this study, please do not hesitate to call me at 422-1280. Names of schools, students, teachers, and parents will be fictitious throughout the study to ensure anonymity. I will also give you a summary of my findings when they are complete.

Cordially,

Wanda T. May
Ph.D. Candidate

Dr. Gail McCutcheon
Principle Investigator
and Adviser
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

(Principal Investigator) or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here ____________.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ________________  Signed: ____________________

(Participant)

Signed: ____________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed: ____________________

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12-81) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
Appendix B

Stages of student responses to the researcher taking fieldnotes and photographs
Suspicions-----Are you writing if we're good or bad? (No, I'm writing all the lesson's words.) Are you taking down our names? (No, I'm writing down the lesson -- the teacher's words and everybody's words.)

Curiosity------What are you writing? (My homework. Or, what's happening because my memory's not very good.) (Glimpse) I can't read your writing. (Hm-m... me neither! Or, Well, I'm used to my writing... no one else has to try to read it, thank goodness. Or, what kind of grade do you think I'd get in handwriting?) Why do you have to write down stuff? (The tape won't tell me who said what. I write down times on the clock and names 'cause the tape can't do that... see? [Share notebook for a moment].) You drew what the teacher put on the board. (It helps me remember what today's lesson was all about. It helps me remember what (teacher) wanted you to do.)

Acceptance------No more comments regarding fieldnotes or notebook.

Figure 9.1 The stages of student comments regarding fieldnotes
Suspicion--------Are you a reporter? (No, I'm a student at OSU. Taking pictures is part of my homework). Is our picture going to be in the paper? (No, I don't work for the paper. I just like to take pictures.)

Embarrassment-----Don't take my picture. (I was taking a picture of your art work, but I won't take a picture if you don't won't me to. Or, Okay.)
(For some)
Did you take a picture of me? (Teasingly, as in sneaking around like Candid Camera). (I responded honestly, yes or no. Or...I'm taking pictures of your art.)
It don't look good. (I comply and do not snap).

Curiosity--------Why are you taking pictures all the time? (I like to take pictures; I like to look at pictures of kids doing art; I like to show how art gets made, step by step; I like seeing the different ways you do art--everyone's is so interesting; I want to be able to remember better what the art lessons were about, and pictures help me remember.)
(Mugging for camera). I stop and say, "I only take pictures of people making art or pictures of their art."

Acceptance-----I share selected photos in an album to be placed in regular classroom for a week or two at a time; these pictures show no mug shots, but students doing art and their art work.)
Take a picture of mine. (Okay.)
Wait till I'm finished. (Okay, or, I like what you've done already. Let me show how you made it step by step.)
(A little reverse psychology, said teasingly)
Now, don't you take a picture of mine! (Okay).
(This continues throughout class period, and I abide student's request; before leaving for the day he says, "Okay, you can take a picture, I guess." (Okay).

**Figure 9.2** The stages of student comments regarding taking photos
Elaboration----(I use photo album for simulated recall in student interviews).

Recall

Oh, I remember that! That was so hard, and I kept messing up this part right here...
I gave that to my Mom for her birthday. She thought it was the best thing I ever did.
(Student's) the best artist in class. He draws these cars that have pipes and the works.
I think (art teacher) put that in a contest. I wanted to take it home so bad.
Appendix C

Interview guides
THINKING ABOUT ART

Here are the things you did in art.

1. You made teddy bears out of paper and a background.

2. You made A,B,C blocks and tissue-paper balloons to go with your teddy bears.

3. You used pen and ink to practice. Then you drew candy with the ink. You added white and red.

4. You drew a plant with the ink. And you drew a bunny with ink.

5. You made footprints and laced your shoes. You put yellow circles all around your picture.

6. You mixed some paints and painted with watercolors.

7. You made clay pots out of clay.

8. You painted your clay pots with watercolors.

9. You cut out a plant and made a window. You glued these onto paper.

10. You made a woven Easter basket and made eggs to go with it.

11. You made a clay rabbit.

12. You made clay animals.

13. You thought up a design to put on an arts festival poster. You looked at slides.

14. You finished your posters by coloring them.

15. You made a checkerboard with black and white paper. You drew around a paper plate. You put your name on your plate and posted it all together.

1. Put a star * beside the lesson you liked the best. Why did you like that lesson the best?

2. Put an X beside the lesson that you liked the least. Why did you not like that lesson?

3. Put an H beside the lesson you thought was the hardest. Why was it hard for you?

4. Put an E beside the lesson you thought was the easiest. Why was it the easiest for you?

5. What kind of things do you learn when you make art? How many things can you think of?
6. What kind of artist are you? Check one.

Terrible: Not too good. Okay. Very good. Terrific!

7. What did you learn this year in art that you didn't know before?


8. Which two things would you like to use most in art?
Put a 1 and 2 beside these two things.

1. Pencils and crayons
2. Scissors, glue, and paste
1. Pen and ink
2. Clay
1. Crayons
2. Cardboard and wood to build things
1. Watercolors and other paints
2. Chalk or pastels
1. Yarn
2. Felt tip pens or magic markers

Why do you like these two things the best?


9. What is hard for you to do in art? Why is it hard for you?


10. Do you make things at home? What kind of art do you make at home?


11. If you could have art all over your house, what kind of art would you like to have to look at? Describe it.


12. Have you ever taken an art class somewhere else, besides school? If so, what kinds of things did you learn? Did you like doing that kind of thing?


13. Have you ever been to an art museum or an art show?


14. Can you think of any art words the art teacher used this year? Can you remember what they were?


15. Is art important? Why do you think so, or not think so?


16. Put an X beside which you like doing the most.

1. Copying an example
2. Using my imagination or coming up with my own ideas for art.
17. Why do you like doing what you just put an X by?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

18. Pretend that you have a friend who goes to another school. Pretend that you have invited your friend to come to art class with you. Tell this friend how your art class usually goes. Tell him what the art teacher usually does, step by step.

First, the art teacher usually __________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Then, she ______________________________________________________________________________________

Then, she usually _________________________________________________________________________________

We usually _______________________________________________________________________________________

And then the art teacher ____________________________________________________________________________

Finally, we ______________________________________________________________________________________

And that's the way it goes in our art class.

19. What grade would you give yourself in art?

___ A ___ B ___ C ___ D ___ F

Because: _______________________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
FOURTH GRADE ART

Here are the things you did in art.

1. You used pencils to draw pictures of objects. You tried to show how it bulged out in places and shaded and overlapped.

2. You drew still lifes of objects the teacher set up in the room. You used black charcoal or chalk.

3. You learned how to draw a person doing a sport or moving. You used pencils and crayons.

4. You finished your picture of people. You cut them out and pasted them on other paper. You added clothes and things to show what your person was doing and where.

5. You drew a picture of an animal. You outlined it with black crayon and glue.

6. You used watercolors to paint your animals from before and the background.


8. You learned how to draw a face. You used pencil and colored them in with crayons or craypas. You added a background.

9. You made masks out of colored paper. Everyone's masks were different.

10. You used pencils and colored tissue paper to make trees.

11. You finished your tree pictures by using pen and ink over the tissue paper backgrounds you made before.

12. Half of you made clay animals.

13. Half of you drew designs for your clay animals.

14. Half of you made clay animals.

15. Half of you made designs and patterns on a folded piece of paper. You used crayons.

16. You made your frames for your sewing. You used a crayon to draw your ideas onto burlap.

17. You made wrapping paper for Christmas. You folded paper and made a pattern with felt tip pens.

18. You started sewing your stitchery. You learned how to do a running stitch and a satin stitch.

19. You learned how to do the cross stitch and continued to work on your sewing.

20. You learned how to do a chain stitch and many of you finished your stitchery.

1. Put a star beside the lesson you liked best. Tell why you liked that art lesson best.

2. Put an X beside the lesson you liked the least. Tell why you did not like that lesson.

3. Put an H beside the lesson you thought was the hardest. Tell why that lesson was hard for you.

4. Put an E beside the lesson you thought was the easiest. Tell why that lesson was the easiest for you.

5. What kind of artist are you? Check one.

Terrible, Not too good, Okay, Very Good, Terrific.

Why do you think so?
6. What did you learn in art this year that you didn’t know before?
7. Do you remember any art words that the teacher used this year? What were they? What do they mean?
8. Which did you like best? Art in the third grade, or art in the fourth grade? Why?
9. Which two things would you like to use the most? Put a 1 and a 1 beside those two things.
   ___ Pencils or crayons   ___ Scissors, glue, or paste
   ___ Pen and Ink          ___ Clay
   ___ Crayons             ___ Cardboard or wood to build things
   ___ Watercolors or other paints ___ Chalk or pastels
   ___ Yarn to do stitchery or to sew ___ Felt tip pens/magic markers
   Why do you like these two things?
10. Is art important? Why do you think so, or not think so?
11. Is art as important as reading or math? How so, or how not so?
12. Put an X beside which you like doing most:
   ___ Copying an example to go by, like the teacher’s
   ___ Using my imagination or coming up with my own ideas
   Why do you prefer this?
13. What grade would you give yourself in art? Why? (Circle one).
    F  D  C  B  A
14. What is the best thing you did in art this year? The worst? How come?
What is "good" art?

What is the easiest thing to do in art? How come?

Who is the best artist in the whole world? What makes him or her the best?
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"Zork" precheck or preassessment
Poor Zork! He is from another planet, and he has so many questions!!! He wants to know your feelings, and no one else’s. Can you help him out?

1. What is art? Zork just heard that word, and he doesn’t know what it means.

2. What do you learn when you make art?

3. What do you learn when you look at art?

4. What do you like to do most in art? Why?

5. What is your favorite thing to draw or paint? Why?

6. What is your favorite thing to make or build? Why?

7. What is your favorite stuff (medium) to use in art? Why?

8. What kind of artist are you? Check one.

   - Terrible!
   - Not so good.
   - Okay...
   - Very good.
   - Terrific!
Appendix E

Context Check
The following statements are assumptions which someone might make of your particular teaching context (or any other art context, for that matter). Consider your teaching stint thus far in this art program (not just this year). Perhaps you can help illustrate the complexities of your teaching situation. Respond to each statement with which you strongly agree (True) or disagree (False). Feel free to clarify any of the assumptions with comments.

T F 1. "I work with one grade level a semester, and only one."

T F 2. "Most students this age like art."

T F 3. "Most students can make art easily."

T F 4. "Most students can respond to art forms easily."

T F 5. "I usually work with about 100 students a day."

T F 5. "I work with about 900 students a year."

T F 6. "I work with only two or three schools a semester."

T F 7. "Most of my assigned schools have an art room."

T F 8. "Supplies are fairly ample and at my fingertips."

T F 9. "Students are well-behaved in art because they like art."

T F 10. "Most classroom teachers seem to support the art program."

T F 11. "The classroom teachers stay in the room when I have their students for art."

T F 12. "My school-related work is from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. only, unlike other teachers who must grade papers, attend faculty or PTA meetings, etc."

T F 13. "I teach the art curriculum exactly as it has been developed/established, both locally and statewide."

T F 14. "I teach only art. I don't teach any other subjects or subject-area skills while teaching art."

T F 15. "Compared to other subjects, teaching art is easy."
T F 16. "I have more free periods or planning time than classroom teachers."

T F 17. "I can get an in-service day to attend any art-related in-service or conference I desire during the school year."

T F 18. "Art is the only subject I've ever taught."

T F 19. "Third and fourth grades are the only grade levels I've ever taught in my teaching career."

T F 20. "Art is the kind of subject that is important and good, simply for a child's creativity, self-expression, and enjoyment."

T F 21. "The art curriculum that I use is probably different from what classroom teachers might do in art."

T F 22. "When I go to a school, all I'm expected to do (or actually do while there) is teach art. I have no other duties or responsibilities."

T F 23. "Anybody can teach art."

T F 24. "Students have 80 minutes of art per week."

T F 25. "In my opinion, the general public has little interest in art--all they're interested in is reading and math."

T F 26. "Weekly staff meetings, like faculty meetings, are usually a waste of my time."

T F 27. "Compared to what I know about other school systems, I would say that our art program here is adequate."

T F 28. "Teaching in support program such as this one is a rather lonely job. I have no real 'home,' or sense of belonging to a school or faculty."

T F 29. "I'm not sure many people have any idea what I do, or why, when I teach art."

T F 30. (Write your own, if you wish!)

The results of this questionnaire will be shared with you as a group profile in two weeks. Please complete and mail in the envelope provided as soon as possible. Thank you!
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Questionnaires
ART TEACHERS

Name: ____________________________

1. Check all of the items which apply to you personally:
   ___ I am a practicing artist/craftsperson myself.
   ___ I have a degree in fine arts.
   ___ I have a degree or I am certified in art education.
   ___ I am certified also to teach ____________________________.

2. In the last year, I have:
   ___ taken a university course related to the arts.
   ___ taken a university course not directly related to the arts.
   ___ attended a local or regional arts education conference.
   ___ visited an art museum or exhibit, unrelated to school activities.
   ___ participated in an artist in an exhibit or an arts festival, unrelated to
       school activities.
   ___ made a monetary contribution to a local arts group.
   ___ been involved in art forms other than the visual, unrelated to
       school activities (drama, music, etc.).
   ___ led a system-related art in-service for other teachers.
   ___ found some interesting research or an article in a professional
       arts journal.

3. How satisfied are you in your present position?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Totally dissatisfied  Totally satisfied

4. How would you describe yourself as an artist?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not an artist at all  Quite the artist

5. How would you describe yourself as a consumer/viewer of art?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very active or interested  Very active and interested

6. How satisfied are you with what you believe were your third-graders' art
   experiences this semester?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Very disappointed  Very pleased
   Because:

7. How satisfied do you think your third graders will say they were with the
   art experiences with you this semester?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Very dissatisfied  Very satisfied
   Because:

8. What art media do you think your third graders will say they enjoy the most?
   Rank the top three.
   ___ Pencils and crayons  ___ Scissors, glue, or paste
   ___ Pen and ink  ___ Clay
   ___ Crayons  ___ Cardboard and wood to build things
   ___ Watercolors or other paints  ___ Chalk or pastels
   ___ Yarn  ___ Felt tip pens or magic markers

9. How do you think most of your third graders will rate themselves as artists?
   Check one.
   1 2 3 4 5
   Terrible! Not too good  Very good
   Not very good  Okay

10. How would you rate/grade yourself as an art teacher this past semester?
    A B C D F
    Outstanding  The pits.
    Because:
11. As an art teacher, what do you perceive to be your own personal strengths?

Any weaknesses?

12. While teaching third grade this past semester, what are the three most important things you feel your students probably learned and will remember?

1.

2.

3.

13. Let's assume that you "can't do it all." In considering third graders, how would you rank the importance of the following as goals for your curriculum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent time</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptual training: teaching kids how to "see" and to transfer what they see into visual form realistically.
Learning the basic elements of design: line, shape, pattern, color, etc.
Self-expression, creativity, exploring personal feelings, ways of communicating this to others
Social/cultural heritage in the arts; meaning of arts for humankind; popular images; criticism

14. Go back and estimate what percentage of time you actually spend in each of these areas over a course of a semester with a group of third graders.

Comments about 13 and 14?

15. What do you think your third graders' parents will say is important for their children to learn in art? Why?

16. What do you think your third-grade classroom teachers will say is important for their students to learn in art? Why?

17. In teaching art to third graders, what comes easiest for you? Why?

18. In teaching art to third graders, what is most difficult? Why?

19. If you were the art supervisor, what would you do differently regarding your art teaching staff? Regarding in-service for classroom teachers? Regarding the curriculum? Regarding anything else?

20. To be honest, how did you feel about having a researcher in one of your art classes all semester? [At the beginning? Toward the end of the research?] Did this affect your teaching? Did you have any insights? Any suggestions?
CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Name: ____________________________

1. Check all of the items which apply to you personally:
   ___ I am a practicing artist/craftsperson myself.
   ___ I have a degree in fine arts.
   ___ I have a degree or I am certified in art education.
   ___ I am certified to teach __________________________
   ___ I feel fairly adequate in providing art instruction for my students myself.
   ___ I do not feel adequate teaching art.
   ___ I have attended an art-related in-service in the past two years.

2. In the last year, I have:
   ___ taken a university course related to the arts.
   ___ taken a university course not directly related to the arts.
   ___ attended a local or regional arts education conference.
   ___ visited an art museum or exhibit, unrelated to school activities.
   ___ participated as an artist in an exhibit or arts festival, unrelated to school functions.
   ___ made a monetary contribution to a local arts group.
   ___ been involved in art forms other than the visual, unrelated to school activities (drama, music, etc.)
   ___ found some interesting research or an article related to art in a professional educational journal.

3. How satisfied are you in your present position?

   1 2 3 4 5
   Totally dissatisfied    Totally satisfied

4. How would you describe yourself as an artist?

   1 2 3 4 5
   Not an Artist at all    Quite the artist

5. How would you describe yourself as a consumer/viewer of art?

   1 2 3 4 5
   Not very active or interested    Very active and interested

LET'S THINK ABOUT THE SEMESTER YOUR STUDENTS DO NOT HAVE AN ART TEACHER:

6. I provide about ___ hours a week for art activities in the fall semester.
7. We usually do art on (day) ___________ at (time) _____________.
8. This is usually art related to some other subject area ___.
    This is art for art's sake, if you will ___.
9. Parents do ___ do not ___ participate as teachers of art in our school, or as volunteers.
10. Artists do ___ do not ___ participate as teachers of art in our school.
11. I get most of my art lesson ideas from: (Rank the top 3)
    ___ a local or state curriculum guide.
    ___ an art coordinator or supervisor.
    ___ a trained art teacher.
    ___ fellow teachers.
    ___ art education texts.
    ___ in-service or COTA days.
    ___ professional magazines/journals.
    ___ how-to books on art activities.
    ___ my own creativity/ideas.
    ___ my students and their interests.
    ___ Other:

12. Some sample art lessons/activities the students and I have done are:

   Subject/main ideas.    Media:
13. How satisfied do you think your third graders will say they were with their art experiences this semester?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because:

14. What art media do you think your third graders will say they enjoy the most? Rank the top three:

- pencils and crayons
- pen and ink
- crayons
- watercolors or other paints
- Yarn
- scissors, glue, or paste
- cardboard or wood to build things
- chalk or pastels
- felt tip pens or magic markers

15. How do you think your students will rate themselves as artists?

Check one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrible! Not too good</td>
<td>Okay</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Terrific!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. While having art lessons with an art teacher this semester, what are the three most important things you feel your students will have learned or will remember?

1.
2.
3.

17. Let's assume that we "can't do it all." Considering your students, how would you rank the importance of the following goals for the art curriculum?

Percent time Rank

- Perceptual training; teaching kids how to "see" and to transfer what they see into visual form realistically.
- Learning the basic elements of design-line, shape, pattern, color, etc.
- Self-expression, creativity, exploring personal feelings, ways of communicating these to others.
- Social/cultural heritage of the arts: meaning of art for humankind; popular images; criticism

18. Go back and estimate what percentage of time you think may have been actually spent in the art lessons regarding these goals.

19. What do you think your students' parents will say is important for their children to learn in art? Why?

20. What do you feel is most important for third graders to learn in art?

THANK YOU FOR SHARING YOUR STUDENTS WITH ME THIS SEMESTER! If you would like the results (as they come) from this study, please give me your name and address below:

YOU HAVE BEEN A GREAT HELP TO ME IN MY RESEARCH ENDORSE. THANKS AGAIN!
PARENTS: ______________________ Child's Name: ______________________
First______ Last______
School: ______________________

1. Check all of the items which apply to you personally. In the last year, I have:
   Write all that apply.
   __________ visited an art museum or exhibit, unrelated to school activities.
   __________ visited an art exhibit or festival related to a school.
   __________ participated myself as an artist in an exhibit or arts fair, unrelated to school functions.
   __________ participated as an artist for a school function.
   __________ made a monetary contribution to a local arts group.
   __________ been involved in art forms other than the visual, unrelated to school functions (drama, music, dance, etc.)

2. Are you aware of any art activities your child has been involved in since Christmas at school? If so, what kinds of things did your child make? Has s/he told you about any of his/her art activities? Describe:

3. Has your child ever been enrolled in other kinds of art programs outside of school, for example at a city park community center, university-related offering, etc.? If so, describe:

4. What seems to be your child's general reaction to art in school?

   1. Dislikes
   2. Intensely
   3. Likes
   4. Immensely

   Describe, if you wish:

5. Does your child seem to be naturally interested in making art, for example, at home?

   1. Usually has little interest
   2. Usually very interested

6. How would you compare your child's artistic ability or talent with other youngsters his/her age?

   1. Not so talented
   2. 3. 4. 5. Very talented

   Describe, if you wish:

7. How creative is your child in areas other than visual art, like pretending, building, dancing, music, writing, etc.?

   1. Not so creative, really
   2. 3. 4. 5. Very creative, actually

   Describe, if you wish:

8. As a parent of a third grader, what do you believe is one of the most important things your child should learn in an art class? Describe.
9. How would you describe yourself as an artist?

1. Not at all
2. Somewhat
3. Moderate
4. Quite good
5. Quite the artist

Describe, if you wish:

10. How would you describe yourself as a consumer/viewer of art?

1. Not very active
2. Somewhat interested
3. Moderate interest
4. Very interested
5. Very active and interested

11. Your child is a third grader. If we couldn't "do it all," how would you rank the following goals for your child to learn in art? Put a 1 beside the goal you think is the most important for your child, etc.

- Children should be learning how to "see" things better; perceptual training, so that they can make things realistically.
- Children should be learning basic elements of design—like line, shape, color, pattern, etc.
- Children should be learning how to express themselves and explore their own feelings and creativity.
- Children should be learning about the social and cultural aspects of art; our arts heritage; art's importance to humankind.

12. Are there adult artists in your family which might influence your child's ability or interest in art? If so, who, and in what ways might they influence your child?

13. Some people say that children should be concentrating on "the basics," like reading and math. In your opinion, is art "basic," too? How should art fit into your child's life? How important is art?

14. What art media do you think third graders will say they enjoy the most? Rank the top three, in your opinion:

- pencils and crayons
- scissors, paste, glue
- pen and ink
- clay
- watercolors or other paints
- cardboard or wood to build things
- chalk or pastels
- yarn
- felt tip pens or magic markers

Why do you think these things?

15. How do you think your child will rate himself/herself as an artist?

1. Terrible!
2. Not too bad
3. Okay
4. Very good
5. Terrific!

16. Number of children at home in your family and their ages, including your third grader:

- Child
- Age

17. Your occupation(s):

18. Your home address so that I can send you the results of this study about children and their art:

19. Any other comments?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS RESEARCH!!
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Sample pages from student feedback booklet
YOUR FAVORITE LESSONS

There were lessons which you thought were the easiest and hardest. Different people liked different lessons for different reasons. A lesson might have been hard for you, but not hard for one of your friends in the class. Can you guess which two lessons were your class's favorite art lessons?

If you guessed clay pinch pots and weaving, you're right! Kyle (not his real name) said he liked clay because "you can use all your fingers, move it around, and you can shape it easily." Tom liked it because you could change clay if you messed up. Jeremy liked weaving because "it looks like real art—when you get done with it, it looks real good." Tara and Michael liked weaving because you could use your hands. People liked the clown faces, too, because it was easy, and they liked the colors of the overlapping tissue paper.

THE LESSONS YOU DIDN'T LIKE

Can you guess which two art lessons your class did not like very much?

If you guessed the still life, flash slides, and weaving, you're right. Many of you did not like having to make the plant loosely with chalk, and you didn't like the way the chalk felt and smeared. You did not like the flash slides because you did not have enough time to look at them carefully and draw them from memory. And more of you disliked weaving than liked it. Many of you thought it was confusing and boring. Some of you did not like doing the still life with cut paper, either. Carlos said, "It was real confusing 'cause she said to put it up, now back, and we were really confused about where to put things." And some of you did not like that lesson because you thought it was just cutting and pasting things, even though your art turned out beautifully.

THE EASIEST LESSONS

Can you guess which lessons your class thought were the easiest to do?

There were many different lessons you thought were easy! Four of you thought weaving was easy, three of you thought the still life with cut paper was easy, and some of you thought the clown faces and pinch pots were easy. Most of you started your reason with, "All you had to do was..." I wonder why so many of you thought so many different lessons were easy?

THE HARDEST LESSONS

Can you guess which three lessons your class thought were the hardest lessons?
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Sample lesson from Creative Arts Curriculum Guide
GOAL I: STUDENTS WILL DEVELOP BASIC SKILLS IN VISUAL ART.
(cont.)

TEACHER'S OBJECTIVE
6.0 Provide a variety of clay experiences to help students understand the qualities of clay and possible techniques with it

STUDENT'S OBJECTIVE
6.1 Use a variety of techniques in manipulating clay to explore and develop skills in ceramics

ILLUSTRATIVE STRATEGIES

Preliminary Exercises

Have students first practice manipulating skills with plasticine clay before progressing to earthenware clay. Plasticine clay is oil based, will not dry out, and can be used repeatedly. (NEVER FIRE PLASTICINE CLAY IN THE KILN.)

Allow students to work clay by:
- flattening with hands or rolling pin
- making coils
- carving
- pinching, pulling, and shaping
- marking, pressing, and scratching to create designs

Explain the differences between plasticine and earthenware clay to students.

Exercises with ceramics

Demonstrate:
- creating texture, pattern; scoring
- hollowing out thick clay sculpture from the base
- permanently marking piece by scratching name or initial in clay
- eliminating cracks or breaks which could cause breakage when firing

Suggested types of articles to make with earthenware clay:
- body adornment (clay medallions, beads, pins, slab masks)
- pottery (pinch, coil, slab, draped pots)
- relief (slab, bas-relief, textured slabs)
- sculpture (pinch or pull to make shapes; additive sculpture by scoring pieces together to make desired form)
- mobiles (pinch pot, slab)

Reference:
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Sample long-range lesson plan
A Profile Of Long-Range Planning for Art Instruction

**Grade Level:** 3  
**Unit Theme:** 1964-1965

### I. Five Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Number: 1</th>
<th>Lesson Number: 2</th>
<th>Lesson Number: 3 &amp; 4</th>
<th>Lesson Number: 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potted plants and or classroom objects</td>
<td>Classroom (flash slide exercise)</td>
<td>Still life</td>
<td>People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayon</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>Paper, crayon, wallpaper</td>
<td>Chalk, paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape, line, detail</td>
<td>Line, shape</td>
<td>Line shape, perspective</td>
<td>Proportion, perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Sketches and drawing</td>
<td>Collage with drawing</td>
<td>Collage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>Realism</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Fulfillment Expression</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Art in Society Expression</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Art Heritage Expression</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7, 8, 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Numbers refer to objectives (attached) from Guidelines for Planning Art Instruction in the Elementary Schools of Ohio, State of Ohio Department of Education, 1970.
Appendix J

Table - Why students preferred using their imagination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Reasons (paraphrased; n = 94)</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More flexibility of ideas; expressive potential</strong></td>
<td>3rd Grades (17)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>You can make something kinda good— that you never made before; it's in your mind; I can do different things with it; I'd rather make up my own ideas 'cause you get more creative; you can picture things in your mind that you could never see outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades (17)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (34)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can't duplicate things well, and following directions is difficult; I don't like externally imposed standards.</strong></td>
<td>3rd Grades (13)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>I don't like copying—I'm afraid I can't make it like that one; when you copy off something, you don't quite do it right, and when you do your imagination...nobody's telling you &quot;well, that's wrong and that's right;&quot; it's hard to listen to the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades (7)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (20)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It is unethical to copy someone else's work.</strong></td>
<td>3rd Grades (11)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>If you copy, then people'll call you a copycat; you should use your imagination—find something else to do; if you copied, it's not really good because you got something off somebody else; everybody'll say, &quot;You copied off the te-acher's.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades (1)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (12)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You learn more this way; it's more of a challenge, like solving a problem.</strong></td>
<td>3rd Grades (7)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>It helps you learn more 'cause you gotta figure things out on your own; when you copy you never learn nothing but just how to copy; if you do your imagination, you let your brain work; it's more of a challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades (1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (8)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I simply prefer it and enjoy it.</strong></td>
<td>3rd Grades (8)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>I like my ideas; it's funner; I like using my imagination; I love doing it; it's fun; it's just fun to think of your own; I just like imagining stuff; I like to create my own things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Grades (0)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (8)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 (continued)

| My ideas are better than the teacher's; I can do much better than her. | 3rd Grades (0) 0% | 4th Grades (8) 18% | Total (8) 9% | I can make better things with my own imagination; it's proving what you like to do; I get more experienced than the teacher and can do my own examples; it might be something that she wants us to do, but I don't agree with, and I could do something better; you're being polite sometimes when people want to help you, and you can do it better yourself. |
| It ensures more independence later on; you don't have to rely on someone else in the future. | 3rd Grades (4) 6% | 4th Grades (1) 3% | Total (5) 5% | You should always do something yourself—don't always depend on other people; if you copy someone, every-time you need to copy, but if you could use your imagination you could do it yourself; I can go further; if you got imagination, you don't just use it at home. |
| The end product will look better; a viewing audience would appreciate looking at different things, rather than the same things. | 3rd Grades (4) 7% | 4th Grades (0) 0% | Total (4) 4% | If she hung them up, they wouldn't all be the same and look like they were put together; sometimes what she puts on the board ain't that good, and I don't always like what she draws; you can like make a funny, funny creature; I like to draw my own things...so maybe they'd like to put it in an art show. |
| It's faster and easier to use your imagination. | 3rd Grades (0) 0% | 4th Grades (2) 5% | Total (2) 2% | It's easier instead of getting it just like the teacher's; it'd be easier; when you use your imagination you know what you're doing; it's a little faster to get done. |
| You can set an example for others. | 3rd Grades (0) 0% | 4th Grades (1) 3% | Total (1) 1% | Don't just copy off of (teacher)—make something different from hers, and you create a good example for the other classmates. |
| No comments | Total (1) 1% |
Appendix K

Tables - Art vocabulary students recalled
Table 12. Art vocabulary recalled by third graders after a semester of art instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A-1</th>
<th>School B-1</th>
<th>School C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>None Recalled (29%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) or 24%</td>
<td>(3) or 14%</td>
<td>11 or 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Elements/Concepts (55%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern (7)</td>
<td>Hues (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap (4)</td>
<td>Pattern (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (4)</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (4)</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines (4)</td>
<td>Shading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (2)</td>
<td>Three-dimensional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape (2)</td>
<td>Half-circles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture (2)</td>
<td>Curve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat (3)</td>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetry</td>
<td>(color neutrals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media or Materials (22%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>Glue</td>
<td>Craypas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen &amp; ink</td>
<td>Pencil</td>
<td>Crayons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Chalk</td>
<td>Coloring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scissors (2)</td>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>Colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glue</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point (pen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art form-related (8%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fold</td>
<td>Weaving (3)</td>
<td>Collages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>Still life</td>
<td>[Warping] in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Still life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (6%)</th>
<th>Managerial (3%)</th>
<th>Style (2%)</th>
<th>Other (3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6% Window effect                                  | 8% Peanut head                      | 2% Scales (fish--second grade projects | 7% You'll need crayons.  
|                                                   | Fantasy faces                       |                               | Be quiet!  
|                                                   | Hearts                              |                               | Sit back in the corner!  
|                                                   | Stars                               |                               | 2% Fantasy  
|                                                   |                                     |                               | 3% Realistic  
| 0%                                                |                                     | 17%                           | Ideas  
|                                                   |                                     |                               | Important  
|                                                   |                                     |                               | You use imagination.
Table 13. Art vocabulary recalled by fourth graders after a semester of art instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A-2</th>
<th>School B-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None Recalled (35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) or 36%</td>
<td>(7) or 33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Elements/Concepts (48%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 19% Shapes (2)
  - Value
  - Light on dark
  - Form

- 89% Overlapping (7)
  - Shapes (3)
  - Details
  - Color circle
  - Size
  - Texture
  - (Near-far; placement for perspective)
  - Vertical
  - Parallel lines

- Media or Materials (20%) |
  - Pencils (30%)
  - Crayons
  - Pen & ink
  - Paper
  - Scissors
  - Glue
  - Colors

- Art Form-related (20%)   |
  - Running stitch (4)     |
  - Cross stitch (4)       |
  - Satin stitch
  - Chain stitch
  - Stitchery

- 0%
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial (13%)</th>
<th>Art Criticism/Appreciation (4%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15% Everybody who needs glue, go up there and get it. Pay attention. Make sure you don't get it on your clothes. Here's the learning pattern.</td>
<td>11% Take your time. Take your patience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% Go over it and see if it looks creative.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picasso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
