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Art activities of children have been observed and described since late in the nineteenth century. Most of the focus has been on classification schemes of their visual configurations. Ebenezer Cook and James Sully did pioneer work in this area by examining and classifying the drawings of children aged two to six. According to Read (1958) this work became the basis for many later schemes for classifying stages in children's art and among those influenced were Levinstein - 1905, Kerschensteiner - 1905, Stern - 1910, Rouma - 1913, Luguet - 1913, Krotzech - 1917, Burt - 1922, Wolff - 1927, andEng - 1931.

Gradually others emerged including the work by Victor Lowenfeld (1947). His classification scheme was based on the developmental stage theory. He divided the stages into five categories: scribbling (disordered, controlled, and named), preschematic (search for form), schematic (the development and use of form), dawning realism (characterization of form), and the pseudo-naturalistic (stage of reasoning).

Lowenfeld believed that any significant or meaningful experience will precipitate a change in the drawings of children. Yet no attempts other than informal ones have
been made to discover and describe significant relationships between the experience and changes in representation.

An important aspect of children's visual configurations has apparently been overlooked. This aspect has to do with the changes in the visual configurations (schema) resulting from sensory/aesthetic experiencing. Crowe (1974) in a pilot study discovered that eighty percent of children in the schematic stage made changes in drawings of self-portraits after the sensory/aesthetic experience of "chewing". Some of the changes were dramatic and expressive. Others were slight or rigid--representing no change whatever. No attempt was made to relate any of the changes to a cognitive area such as reading achievement. Yet, according to McFee (1970) art is an activity related to other behavior. It is a process which fuses the intellect, the child's perceptions, and his inventiveness in organizing that which he is learning from his environment.

The recent edition of the widely used art education textbook Creative and Mental Growth, by Lowenfeld and Brittian (1975) continues to give consideration to the aesthetic experience in relation to art education. They believe that the aesthetic experience is mainly responsible for stimulating the students' potentialities for finding meaning in art expression. Therefore, they consider it the responsibility of an education for art to promote the development of the student's ability to experience aesthetically
as well as to provide for the development of his creativity. They believe that the student not only learns through his senses, but his senses are the main intermediaries through which life becomes richer and more meaningful. It is for this reason that Lowenfeld and Brittian emphasize that unless the student penetrates into experience by means of his senses, it will remain superficial and general without the richness of details.

Madenfort (1965) proposed a theoretical bases for aesthetic education. From his point of view, the purpose of aesthetic education is to allow for the development of the student's ability to experience the world as given in its immediate sensuousness prior to any conceptualization. He believes that aesthetic education is related to art education in that art is the expression of the aesthetic experience.

According to such views, the art educator fundamentally needs to be an aesthetic educator. In order for this to come about, art education itself had to come to terms with the nature of the aesthetic experience and needed to understand how such experiencing influences art activity.

Aesthetic theories reviewed in Chapter 2 identifies and places the aesthetic experience within the realm of unique, immediate and personal experiencing. The movement from Kant to Langer has been one which began with a description of human sensibility to aesthetic expressiveness in the
greater context of human experience in general (Kaelin, 1962).

One of the most comprehensive education programs dealing with aesthetic education ever undertaken was the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL). It proposed the development of national curricula in aesthetic education at every grade level, representing components chosen from such arts as music, the visual arts, drama, dance, and literature. Its directors distinguished between aesthetic education as they defined it and humanities programs: "Whereas the humanities attend primarily to the cultural or historical aspects of pervasive ideas and patterns that man shapes and confronts, aesthetic education attends to experiencing and expressing these ideas and patterns." (CEMREL, 1970). They considered experiences for any reason other than those of "intrinsic perception" to be extraaesthetic.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to inquire into the changes that occur in children's drawings after sensory/aesthetic experiencing. The secondary purpose was to inquire into the relationship of the changes to the variables of sex, culture, and reading achievement. This study was intended to look at this phenomenon as a specific of the recent inclusion of aesthetic education within art education within curriculum reorganization.
Statement of Problem

This experimental study was conducted and the following questions were central to the investigation:

1. Were there significant changes in the use of details in the schema of self of second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience as operationally defined by the Goodenough - Harris Drawing Test?

2. Were there significant changes in the expressive qualities in the schema of self of second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience as judged by a panel of art education experts?

3. Was there a significant relationship between the changes in the use of details and the expressive qualities in the schema of self of second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience?

The changes in schema discovered were discussed and analyzed with respect to sex, culture, and reading achievement. The following specific questions underlie this phase of this investigation:

1. Were there significant differences in the changes in the use of details in the schema of self between boys and girls at the second grade level?

2. Were there significant differences in the changes in the expressive qualities in the schema of self between boys and girls at the second grade level?
3. Were there significant differences in the changes in the use of details in the schema of self between culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged second grade children?

4. Were there significant differences in the changes in the expressive qualities in the schema of self between the culturally disadvantaged second grade children?

5. Were there significant differences in the changes in the use of details in the schema of self between developmentally advanced readers and developmentally delayed readers at the second grade level?

6. Were there significant differences in the expressive qualities in the schema of self between developmentally advanced readers and developmentally delayed readers at the second grade level?

Overview of Procedure

The subjects who were included in the study were students at the second grade level in the Oakwood City Schools, Dayton, Ohio and Dayton City Schools, Dayton, Ohio. The four classes in Oakwood were considered culturally advantaged and the four classes in Dayton City were considered disadvantaged as defined generally be geographic location.
The following is an outline of the procedures followed:

1. Administered Part C of the Goodenough - Harris Drawing Test to all children in all eight classes.
2. Provided a common treatment to all children in two classes in Oakwood and two classes in Dayton City with a sensory/aesthetic experience built around the concept of "growth".
3. Provided a rest period for all children in the other two classes in Oakwood and the other two classes in Dayton, Ohio.
4. Administered Part C of the Goodenough - Harris Drawing Test to all children in all eight classes.
5. Scored each Drawing Test to discover changes in the use of details.
6. Judged each drawing on a scale of one to seven by a panel of three art education experts to obtain an average score for changes in expressive qualities.
7. Used the appropriate statistical procedures to discover and analyze changes in schema.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are offered for terms used throughout this study:

1. **Sensory/aesthetic Experience**: Intense consciousness of the immediate experience.
2. **Schema:** Complete visual symbol for objects in the environment.

3. **Expressive Qualities:** Qualities in the visual symbols which are viewed as being expressive and communicative in the artistic sense.

4. **Developmentally Advanced Readers:** Students who have been identified by their teachers as being advanced readers for their age group. Their criteria was all available data and personal experiences with the children.

5. **Developmentally Delayed Readers:** Students who have been identified by their teachers as being delayed readers for their age group. Their criteria was all available data and personal experiences with the children.

6. **Culturally Advantaged:** Students who are culturally advantaged by definition of geographic location.

7. **Culturally Disadvantaged:** Students who are culturally disadvantaged by definition of geographic location.

**Limitations of Study**

1. This study was limited to eight second grade classes.

2. The sensory/aesthetic experiences and the drawings were limited to one hour per class.

3. The presentation for preparation for the sensory/
aesthetic experience is specific but may be unique and vary with each investigator if the study were to be duplicated.

Importance of the Study

It was intended that this study should extend our knowledge of the effect of the aesthetic experience upon the art product and the relationship of the effects to the variables of sex, culture, and a cognitive skill-reading. Emerging particularly should be questions related to the importance of the aesthetic upon general learning and to areas of art evaluation.

Organization of the Study

This chapter, chapter one, has identified the problem for consideration and presented the rationale for this study. An overview of procedure for the study, definitions of terms, limitations and importance of the study were also included.

Chapter two will review the related literature. Selected elements of some aesthetic theories within the realm of the Expressionist Theory of Art will be presented in part one of the chapter. Part two of the chapter will present a review of the literature related to the inclusion of the aesthetic dimension into the reorganization of the art education curriculum since 1957. Included in the presentation will be conferences, articles, and art education
text books, selected programs, criticisms and further definitions.

Chapter three will present the design of the study and the methodology used in this study. A statement of the hypotheses to be tested is included as is a discussion of the population and sample, the treatment, sources of data, data gathering instruments and statistical procedure.

Chapter four will present the results of this study and analyses of the data in terms of group differences for sex, culture, and reading ability in the use of details and expressive qualities in the drawings. An analysis of the relationship between the scales will also be presented.

Chapter five will present the summary and conclusions of this study, questions posed by this study, and implications for further research.

The Appendice will include an example of the form of the instruments used, a profile of the person who supervised the scoring of the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test, a profile of the art educators who rated the drawings for expressive qualities, raw pre-test and post-test scores for details and expressive qualities for control and treatment groups.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are specific elements of some aesthetic theories on the aesthetic experience which are pertinent to this study in a historical sense. The elements are those which identify and place the aesthetic experience within the realm of "unique, immediate and personal experiencing". It is these elements which are examined from the theories of Immanual Kant, Soren Kierkegaard, Henri Bergson, Robin Collingwood, John Dewey and Suzanne Langer and are discussed in part one of this chapter.

Part two of this chapter reviewed the literature relating to the inclusion of the aesthetic education within art education within recent curriculum reform in art education since 1957.

Selected Elements of Aesthetic Theories

Immanual Kant (1724-1804)

Kant's Critique of Judgment, 1929, is considered by many to mark the beginning of modern aesthetic theory (Kaelin, 1962). He was concerned with aesthetic judgment but he, also, gives clues into the nature of the aesthetic experience. An aesthetic judgment expresses the fact that an aesthetic experience has taken place. According to Madenfort (1965), Kant presupposes that there are three
elements involved in an aesthetic experience. "First: a subject, an individual consciousness. Second, an object grasped by this individual consciousness. And third: the relationship between the two, which can be seen as the manner in which the object is grasped by the subject on the one hand, or the attitude adopted by the subject to what it has grasped, on the other hand (p. 10)."

Madenfort further asserts that in Kantian terminology, the object is grasped by the subject on an immediate level in an "intuition". "An intuition is the grasping of an object in its concrete sensuous givenness (p. 10)."

Kant gives further clues into the nature of the aesthetic experience in sections forty-five to fifty of Analytic of the Aesthetic Judgment, 1929. He believed that art objects should be viewed in and of itself and not in relation to any other thing if the aesthetic experience can occur. The imagination should be unfettered by definite concepts. The necessary element of a work of art is "...its purposiveness or purposiveness without purpose (p. 417)." "In a product of beautiful art we must become conscious that it is art and not nature; but yet the purposiveness in its form must seem to be free from all constraints of arbitrary rules as if it were a product of mere nature (p. 416)."

This can be interpreted to mean that in viewing an art object an observer must think of a nature whose products
are determined by a principle rather than the mechanical or laws of nature. This must be done to experience aesthetically because imagination is unfettered by definite concepts.

Kant (1929) further asserts that it is genius to produce a work of art, or that for which no definite rule can be given. Genius is not an aptitude for what can be learned by rule. Art cannot be learned or copied for if it is, it is no longer art (p. 418). The products of the artist must serve only as a standard or rule of judgment for others. This should be true even though the artist is unaware of the rules that guided him (p. 419). For a subject to experience the products aesthetically he must be prepared to experience on a personal and unique level.

Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855)

Kierkegaard (1944) believed that life is primarily a matter, not of what we think, but what we feel. The more deeply we feel about things, the more we live and find the meaning of life. He believed that all abstract descriptions and explanations (such as dimensions, density, and weight) fail to convey the real meaning of our deepest experiences and relationships (p. 116).

He further gives a presentation of the three ways in which humans experience their own existence. Each is characterized by certain attitudes toward life and its purpose. The three levels are aesthetic, ethical and religious. The
aesthetic level is the lowest, the ethical is middle and is of the universal, and the ethical which is highest transcends the universal by the religious (p. 77). He believed however, the three levels were not gradually merged or transformed one into another but by a leap or decision on the part of an individual (p. 51).

As Kierkegaard (1959 b) defines the aesthetic, the characteristic of experiencing life on an aesthetic level is sensory immediacy. This means valuing the dictates of feeling rather than conceptual reflecting. The aesthetic individual reverberates with pleasure as an expression of the relationship to the environment. In such enjoyment of pleasure he lives in the immediate moment of experience. (p. 188).

He (1959a) analyzes the aesthetic response in three stages in terms of desire. In the first stage, a desire is dreaming, buried in contemplation--not yet awake--to its object of desire (pp. 74-75). During the second stage desire awakens and objects are sought. This is often a playful and carefree search (p. 79). The third stage desire discovers its objects and aims at conquest--experience (p. 83).

Henri Bergson (1859-1941)

Bergson (1960) distinguishes ordinary perception from the aesthetic as two very different ways of knowing or experiencing. The first way implies that we are separate
from objects. As we move around we are provided with many points of view for observation. These are experienced separately and each view is relative to the position taken at any one time. This information must be translated or communicated by means of symbols (p. 21).

The aesthetic way of experiencing implies that we enter into it with our imagination. As we move around objects the many views are experienced qualitatively as an undivided whole continuous movement. The object is grasped from within the individual (pp. 21-22). Bergson (1911) claims the aesthetic experience is one of entering into immediate sensuous communion with reality itself (p. 157).

In order to do this, Bergson (1946) claims that it is necessary to renounce the usual forms of analytic and synthetic thought and achieve a direct intuitional effort for immediate contact with reality (p. 48). We return in an act of intuition to the direct view of things beyond all figurative symbols and descend into the inmost depth of being (p. 31).

Robin G. Collingwood (1889-1943)

Collingwood (1931) believed the aesthetic experience to be the creation or apprehension of works of art. "The terms creation and apprehension are here synonymous, for the essence of art is that nothing is asserted and everything imagined, so that the question whether the work of art has or has not existence independent of the apprehension
of it is a question which has, for the aesthetic consciousness, no meaning whatever (p. 296)." He (1958) further states that artists are artists in so far as he succeeds in affecting his audience in certain ways (p. 300).

He speaks of the authentic aesthetic experience. It is the act of expressing emotions whether artist or viewer of art. The objective of the artist is to express his emotion and the objective of the viewer to find his own feelings expressed in the work of art and not to discover the artist's feelings. If the artist is unable to express his feelings the viewer cannot find his own feeling expressed. But the viewer can only discover those emotions which he is capable of having. There is an interdependence between the artist and viewer in order to experience a work of art aesthetically (p. 118).

Work which uses familiar forms to express emotion are classified by Collingwood as craft. If its purpose is to produce a pleasant emotion then he calls it amusement and if its purpose is to produce in the viewer a certain emotion that is a means to some other end, then it is magic. Neither magic nor amusement is bad art, they are just something other than art and, therefore, unaesthetic (p. 277).

John Dewey (1859-1952)

Dewey (1958a) recognized a tendency to separate the "artistic" process (the act of production) from the "aesthetic" (the act of perception and appreciation). Art
is regarded as something imposed upon aesthetic material and is viewed as a process of creation. Perception and appreciation are not viewed as creative acts. He considered it unfortunate that no word in the English language exists to designate the two processes when taken together (p. 46).

Artistic production and aesthetic perception are regarded by Dewey to be organically related (p. 47). The act of producing a work of art and the act of perceiving and appreciating it are both human experiences and, therefore, subject to the conditions that determine experience. They both require an interaction with an environment, and this interaction is a "doing" as well as an "understanding" of the environment (p. 48).

Dewey (1958 b) places the aesthetic within the ongoing continuous flow of experience. The flow of experience is determined by the essential conditions of life itself. In order for us to continue it is necessary for us to be not merely in an environment, but to be interacting with it in the most intimate way (p. 282). Experiencing is a demand, an active reaching out into the world of objects and events in order to retain a state of unity with them (p. 280). We seek constantly to obtain equilibrium in the rhythmic process of give and take that occur between self and environment (1958 [a] p. 56).
Aesthetic experience is rounded out into completeness and unity by its significant emotional qualities. However, emotional qualities are not separate entities in experience, but arise out of a significantly developing movement of interaction between the self and environment (1958 [a] pp. 41-42). He believes that both "creator" and "perceiver" create an experience that is comparable in organization. If the perceiver is locked into conventional seeing rather than creating their own experience, fulfillment on the aesthetic level cannot be achieved (p. 54).

Susanne K. Langer (1895-____ )

Langer (1953) believed that a viewer is not called upon to understand a work of art or the artist's ideas but is asked to give into the work of art—to the aesthetic emotion which is not in the work of art per se, but in the percipient. The aesthetic emotion is a psychological effect of the artistic activity (p. 395). It is a feeling directly inspired by the art object. This impact then acts as the psychological lure to long contemplation (p. 397).

She views art as a language and has developed a semantic explanation of its expressiveness (Kaelin, 1963 p. 7). According to her theory the significant or expressive in a work of art is the symbol symbolic of human feelings (Langer, 1953, p. 40). The symbol is not that which refers to a specific concept, but rather it negotiates insight.
It does not rest upon convention, but motivates and dictates convention (p. 22). Therefore, art expresses ideas of actual feelings not the actual things and events.

She contrasted verbal and artistic (aesthetic) symbolism. The language with words are seen as a succession of symbols which are linear and discrete. They are strung out one after another according to the conventional rules of grammar. This property of verbal symbolism is known as discursiveness, and such mediated symbols are referred to as discursive. She points out that unless a thought can be arranged in a particular manner according to the rules it cannot be spoken at all (pp. 74-75).

In contrast to the discursive language is the artistic. The sphere of subjective experience (emotion, feeling and wish) are communicated through "presentational symbols" (Langer, 1962, p. 89). This is often referred to as the "unspeakable" (p. 81). Since it goes beyond the limits of discursive language—and only comes to us in the form of metaphysical and artistic fancies which are mere symptoms and a possible source for symbolizing, expressing, and apprehending life (p. 90).

Summary of Aesthetic Theories

The aesthetic experience, according to Kant, proceeds from no concept, follows rules that originate in the mind itself rather than rules from external sources, and is unique to each individual. Kierkegaard analyzed the
aesthetic response as a stage of experiencing for individual meaning in the life process. He believed a characteristic of aesthetic experience was to value the dictates of feeling rather than conceptual reflecting. Bergson identified it as consciousness. Consciousness of the immediate through which individuals penetrate more deeply into the reality of "being" within an environment. Dewey emphasized the continuous interaction between the self and environment. He felt to experience aesthetically an active investment of the emotional qualities as well as the intellectual or practical was necessary. Collingwood had the notion that the aesthetic experience was both the artist and viewer expressing their emotions, and, therefore, it must be a language. They must be aware individuals who can experience on the emotional level. Langer expanded this notion by explaining the aesthetic emotion as a psychological effect of artistic activity. Art as a language was one which goes beyond the discursive into presentational symbols. These symbols negotiates insights out of which grows human individuality.

These selected elements identifies and places the aesthetic experience/response within the realm of the unique, immediate, and personal dimension of being within the environment. These theories influenced the definition of the aesthetic experience into the structure of art education.
The event which instigated the inclusion of aesthetic education component within art education within curriculum reorganization was the launching of the Soviet satellite, Sputnik. According to Silberman (1970, p. 169) the Russian space coup merely hastened the revolution in curriculum thinking which had been in the making for some time prior to 1957.

The work of a diverse group of philosophers, subject specialists, curriculum theorists, and behavioral scientists provided the revolution with its initial thrust. In the group were some individuals who were to prove particularly important in the evolution of present educational programs. Hurwitz (1972, p. 3) identified Jerome Bruner as being instrumental in the move toward designing curricula out of the very fabric of a discipline even though he was not directly concerned with the arts.

Bruner's influential book, The Process of Education (1961), has as its main thesis the widely known statement: "We begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development (p. 33)." The book grew from the Woods Hole Conference held in 1959. The initial impact of the conference and book was to simulate the development of curricula in mathematics and science. However, Bruner's interest extended beyond mathematics and science. He envisioned the need for applying the same energies to the
development of curricula in humanities as well. His series of essays, *On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand* (1962), held particular interest for advocates of aesthetic education. In one of the essays he establishes what was to become a theme: "... I find myself a little out of patience with alleged split between the two cultures, for the two are not simply external ways of life, one pursued by humanists, the other by scientists. They are ways of living with one's own experiences (pp. 5-6)."

Even though the writings of Bruner and other lent academic prodding, actions taken by the federal government were quite possibly the critical factors for the development of curriculum changes in the arts. A federal commitment to the humanities by the United States Office of Education was reflected in the establishment of the Arts and Humanities Program in 1963. The humanities had previously occupied a very low level of priority (Madeja, 1970).

During the same year of 1963 two other actions taken by the federal government supported the humanities. The Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts was instituted to investigate ways in which government could support the arts. The National Council on the Arts with a National Arts Foundation to make matching funds to states and non-profit professional groups to encourage and support the arts was established (Bloom, 1971, pp. 89-99).
Bloom (1971) further described the impact of the federal government. The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act was established in 1965 which created the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities. The year, 1965, also saw the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which supported the establishment of teacher training institutes in arts and humanities. Support funds for innovative projects in the public schools were provided by Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as well as encouragement of information gathering—regarding the educational role of organizations of the arts. It was, however, the Arts and Humanities Program that provided funds for developmental activities which "... was one of the most important of the developments that led to the interest in aesthetic education (p. 93)." The developmental activities which the program supported were"... planning conferences around central issues in the arts and humanities (p. 93)." Aesthetic education as education in all the arts became one central issue emerging from the many conferences held.

Conferences

Broudy (1965, pp. 24-30) in an address to the National Arts Education's Eighth Biennial Conference challenged art educators. The address, entitled "Aesthetic Education in the Secondary Schools" made clear that in order for art education programs to be included in general education it must combine
with music, drama, and literature under some course or area such as aesthetic education. In the same address, his central argument for aesthetic education in the public schools was that the experience involved in the study of the arts is distinctive and worthwhile for everyone. Another argument presented by Broudy was that formal schooling could make a difference in the quality of aesthetic experience.

The Seminar for Research and Curriculum Development in Art Education held in 1965 at Pennsylvania State University influenced the direction of aesthetic education. Eisner's (1965 [a] pp. 222-225) presentation at this conference outlined an aesthetic education program organized around a "center concept". His proposal included establishing curriculum research and development in various parts of the country that would perform a variety of functions. The first function was to provide the technical skills necessary for evaluating curriculum and school learning that was beyond the competence of teachers. The second was to assist in the formulation of curricula at the academic and subject matter level. The third was to carry out studies of the communities which were considered useful for curriculum innovation.

At the same conference Barkan (1965 [b] pp. 240-255) proposed additional tasks for centers which included 1) development of curriculum materials--packaged reproduction collections, literary materials, programmed teaching
instruments and curriculum guides, including the test and evaluation of all of these, 2) demonstration of the efficiency of the tested materials by member of the center staff in cooperating schools and in the extended region, and 3) dissemination of the material, including field training to inform teachers about the materials and to advise their use.

Bloom (1971) identified this conference as being very significant in the fact that a decision was made to work with the Office of Education to explore ways to strengthen aesthetic education in the schools. The groups so designated to advise was composed of small groups of people in art, music, theatre, and dance education from several universities. Madeja (1973) felt that it was out of this conference the concept of aesthetic education emerged. Eisner's and Barkan's proposals did, in fact, become the basis for the curriculum in aesthetic education at CEMREL which will be discussed later in the chapter.

The United States Office of Education sponsored a conference in 1967 on aesthetic education through the Arts and Humanities Program. The participants were scholars, educators, and researchers in the arts and in the behavior sciences. This was the first multi-disciplinary group to express a commitment of further research and development in aesthetic education (Madeja, 1973, p. 11).
Madeja (1973) identified two outcomes from the meeting. The participants pledge their time and effort to serve as a reference group and made the decision to obtain funds for an educational laboratory. The later decision eventually influenced the housing of the program in the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory which became CEMREL, Inc.

CEMREL, also sponsored a conference concerning aesthetic education in 1967 which was held at the Rhode Island School of Design. Out of the conference grew a proposal for a design for curriculum development in aesthetic education by dividing CEMREL operation into two phases. The first phase ultimately resulted in the publication of Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education (1970). Phase two had the task of designing and developing curricula resource materials based upon the concepts formulated in Guidelines (Madeja, 1973).

Articles and Text Books

An article by Eisner (1965 [b] pp. 7-12) appeared at about the same time as the Seminar at Pennsylvania State University wherein he identified a crisis in art education. He believed the crisis resulted from a period of opportunity in which funding was available for art education to establish curriculum development centers but art education lacked leadership. The need for leadership was obvious for the curriculum in art education in the schools was a hand-me-down from another era and another decade. The solution according to Eisner would be to adopt Barkan's idea of art education
curriculum built within three areas of focus. The three areas of focus would be artist, critic, and historian. Eisner believed that students should concentrate upon the expressive and aesthetic after they have overlearned the basic technical skills in handling a media in the "artist" or productive area. The "critic" area was necessary for those who would become consumers rather than producers of art. To facilitate the student's awareness, he suggested three types of statements which could be made about a work of art. The types were descriptive, evaluative, and interpretive. The "historical" area would be beneficial to students for a sense of culture and for individual meaning from works of art.

Art education literature became increasingly concerned with definitions of aesthetic education and curriculum construction. One new journal concerned with aesthetic education appeared. In the first issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education Arnstine (1977 [a] pp. 13-21) discussed the aims for aesthetic education. He felt standards should be available so that learners could experience aesthetic quality during the educative process. Experiences which can be apprehended aesthetically by learners should illuminate the content of experience through the heightening and refinement of sensitivity to emotional qualities of experience.

The autumn issue of Studies in Art Education 1966, was concerned with aesthetic education. Several authors
contributed articles related to the topic and among them was Kaelin. His article (1966 pp. 3-32) argued that an existential ground was necessary for aesthetic education. It would be particularly so if teachers were considered artists whose universe included students attempting to order individually significant expressive content.

He outlined the manner in which results would be obtained by the use of existential ground. To further human growth in individual or social terms, the educational process must not be thought of in terms of assimilation already existing culture. He felt the purpose of assimilating a culture is to be able to use it in such a way as to surpass it. The students must be allowed to make their own contribution "... he must be allowed to communicate as he can, and for many students this means to communicate without verbal symbols. His work is to construct objects which have significance." "... in the first instance, perhaps, only to him--but calling attention to the nature of the world in which he lives (p. 11)." Kaelin believed such individualism did not preclude the possibility of education in the field. Educators should be guided by the nature of the individuals to be educated "... human individual with an inherent openness to experience (p. 12)."

Arnstine (1966 b) in the same issue defined aesthetic education as "... whatever conditions might increase sensitivity to the aesthetic qualities of experience and
whatever might increase the understanding, appreciation, and the enjoyment of those features and qualities (p. 13)." He further suggested five general directions which aesthetic education could take. Art instruction should be so organized to make it possible the appearance of aesthetic quality in student experiences. An aesthetic impact on students will be increased by the presentation of art works which render into artistic terms student interests. Common objects of daily experience can serve as a focus of aesthetic analysis and creative activity. The role of the art teacher would be transformed to a broader responsibility to include being an aesthetic consultant for the entire school.

Art Education (March, 1967) was devoted entirely to aesthetic education. An article by Gotshalk (1967) suggested that aesthetic education could be considered as a subdomain of education, an integral part of culture, and concerned primarily with intrinsic perception. He described the differentiating aim of aesthetic education as the development of sensitivity to aesthetic values. He felt this aim contributed to cultural life in that aesthetic values helped shape character and personality, individual behavior, group conduct, historical information, insights into human nature, entertainment, and understanding of artistic foibles (pp. 11-16).

Aesthetic education appeared to be a substantial force in curriculum theory by 1967. Smith (1967) acknowledged the
acceptance of the aesthetic experience as having educative values. Biettel (1967) also, acknowledged the valuing of the aesthetic experience. "There has been renewed emphasis on aesthetics and criticism as well as art production (p. 205)." Barkan (1967) characterized the goals of aesthetic education movement as becoming increasingly apparent even though he felt that they must become more widespread. Programs in many educational contexts began to integrate aesthetic values within their structure. Selected programs are discussed later in this chapter.

Various interpretations of the place of aesthetic education were found in art education text books. Its consideration was limited to a few general statements in the opening pages of Emphasis: Art (Wachowiak & Ramsay, 1965), and elementary classroom teacher's book. Among them is the suggestion that criteria of design, composition, and basic art structure may be employed as aesthetic standards. The appreciation component should be in terms of observations within the environment. An extended proposal for the importance of arousing and maintaining children's interest in the diverse forms in nature and man-made objects is the focus of Linderman's Invitation to Vision: Ideas and Imaginations for Art (1967).

The authors of Understanding Children's Art for Better Teaching (1967), Gaitskell and Hurwitz, felt the enjoyment of art should be built on existing interest and the
cultivation of the senses. They felt vision itself if the only determinant of the value of a work of art. "If knowledge of principles were the essential quality needed to produce great art, aestheticians would be the artists (p. 229)."

A somewhat different view is presented in Visual Thinking (1971). Arnheim argues for the union of sensation and reason. The meaning for art education is that once it is recognized that productive thinking in any area of cognition is perceptual thinking, the central function of art in general education would become evident. He felt the most effective training of perceptual thinking can be offered in the art studio. This does not lock Arnheim's view into perceptual thinking to the production of art since he suggests that it is possible to extract meaning in the form of thought from every visual pattern.

Substantial amounts of aesthetic material and ideas were incorporated in a group of texts. Among them were: Art, Artists, and Art by Lansing (1969), Structure and Potential in Art Education by Schwartz (1970), Encounter with Art by Hastie and Schmidt (1969), and Becoming Human Through Art by Feldman (1970).

Several chapters of Lansing's (1969) book are devoted to the nature of art, the nature of the artist, the value of art, and the development of the child as artist. He believed teachers of art must have a background which
includes art history and aesthetics (p. 16). The value for students of both process and product lies in how they contribute to the good life (p. 82). He sets forth behavioral objectives for each grade level through which teachers could structure learning experiences for students as artists and appreciators, (pp. 280-329). Aesthetic or value education through a study of exemplars in the fine arts should not replace studio activity according to his views.

Schwartz (1970) communicates the need for offering instruction in aesthetic education, (p. 120) but only in combination with studio activities (p. 16). Among his proposals were the use of commissioned works of art in the construction of schools and for collections of original paintings and sculptures to enhance them (pp. 41-44).

Hastie Schmidt (1969) main concern were aesthetic awareness, art judgment, appreciation, and design from the standpoint of the artist and audience. They distinguish between art appreciation and art evaluation, stating that the aim of appreciation is to achieve an aesthetic response. Evaluation involves the application of specific criteria to determine merit (p. 336); while appreciation involves both knowing and feeling (p. 385). They felt appreciation is dependent upon personal involvement (p. 402).

Feldman (1970) indicates that his book can be taken as an art education text with a strong aesthetic education bias, or as an aesthetic education text with a strong art
education bias (p. v). The orientation is eclectic which approaches art from an anthropological, sociological, psychological, and ethical viewpoint as well as aesthetic. He calls his suggested curriculum humanistic for there is an inherent relationship between a child's ethical and aesthetic behavior. Their visual expressions can be seen as a type of moral activity in which they name and actualize (gives form) to hopes and fears thus coming to terms with them (p. 180). Teaching for Feldman consists of establishing a "model of ethical discourse (p. 101)."

Creative and Mental Growth, Preparation for Art and Children and Their Art were well established art education text books in which in their revised editions continued to deal with aesthetic education. Aesthetics and its relation to art education receives more consideration in the sixth edition by Lowenfeld and Brittain. They state that education can be considered to be the "development of aesthetic behavior (p. 32)." Aesthetic education involves experiences covering a wide range. The nature of the aesthetic response is based upon an interaction between a given individual and a perceived object from which a stimulating and harmonious experience results. They cautioned that the over-zealous about aesthetic awareness might need to remember that it can't be imposed from without. The need must come from the individual (pp. 316-317).
McFee (1970) described attitudes which art education could develop in each pupil. The first a capacity for aesthetic experience in work and play with skills to express the experiences. The second an appreciation of art as a way of life, permeating personal, community, and national planning. Thirdly, a capacity for independent aesthetic judgment as a consumer and a producer, based on experimentation in design (pp. 173-174). She felt that virtually anyone can make some sort of aesthetic response.

She identifies the nature of the aesthetic response within a cultural context. Her Perception-Delineation Theory stated that all learning situations must consider readiness, psychological differences, cultural differences, levels of perceptual, conceptual, and symbolic development (pp. 262-286). The aesthetic judgment is the result of the transaction of an individual's capacity to respond with the qualities inherent in objects (p. 7).

Gaitskell and Hurwitz (1970) made some evident changes in the second edition. They made the suggestion that teaching objectives should be based upon behavioral objectives and they added "criticism" to their list of recommended approaches to the teaching of art appreciation (p. 59). Art appreciation includes the acquisition of information about works of art with the knowledge gained being used as the basis for subsequent discriminating, interpreting, and judging--an aesthetic response (p. 415).
Selected Programs

CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program was one of the most widely known to base curriculum organization upon aesthetic concepts. Others of interest include the Stanford University's Kettering Project and the Indiana Program of Hubbard and Rouse. Dayton's Living Arts Program and New Visions Museum Program were examples of localized programs.

The CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program (1970 a) had several distinct features. It was intended to complement current instruction in the arts rather than replace it. The program would juxtapose several arts in units of instruction which demonstrated potential sources for aesthetic experience from all the arts. A range of art forms, styles, periods of artistic development, and a range of approaches to study for aesthetic education would be represented in the units of instructions. They would also include a representation of varied points of view about aesthetic qualities in objects and events, the creative process, and the aesthetic response (pp. 1-2).

The primary mission of CEMREL was the development and application of curricula and instructional systems based upon relevant research in the social and behavioral sciences, systematic instructional analysis and planning to organization and management of instruction, assessment of individual learners and learning outcomes, and the use of
new and promising instructional technology (p. 3).

The program was divided into two phases. Phase I resulted in Guidelines which provided for curriculum development in aesthetic education by defining the process of designing curriculum plans. Phase II was to develop curriculum materials around content groups. The groups included "Aesthetics in the Physical World", "Aesthetics and Art Elements", "Aesthetics and the Creative Process", and "Aesthetics and the Culture."

The Five Sense Store was the packaged materials for the content group. The development of packaged units of instruction was a process in which staff associates from each discipline (aesthetics, dance, music, literature, theatre arts, and visual arts) defined content outlines for their specific disciplines. These outlines which dealt with interpretive concepts, approaches to study, public impressions of the arts, student interest in the art forms became the primary source of content for the packages (CEMREL, 1970 b).

One package developed by CEMREL was called the "Space Place" wherein students make and carry through aesthetic and creative decisions that directly affect the configuration of their environment. Elements were developed which were manipulative and flexible in nature which permitted children to arrange them in various ways, designing their own room-sized environments. The Space Place allowed
either free experimental activities or highly structured design problems and built upon concepts learned in other packages. (Hurwitz, 1972, pp. 41-44).

According to Hoffa (1979) the CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program was, "... without question, the most elaborate project in the history of arts education (p. 11)." The materials were of good quality and convenient for teacher and student use but the importance of the Program "... is not in the material but, instead, in the process which CEMREL developed to produce them (p. 11)." He believed the process of program development by curriculum design specialists who work full time at the task was feasible. The CEMREL team worked systematically in terms of the structure of the discipline to design, test, and distribute an articulated program of instruction in the arts.

The Stanford Kettering Project was funded in 1967 by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. The work under the direction of Elliot Eisner was done over a period of two years with the primary purpose to develop a visual art curriculum for grades one, two and three (Eisner, 1968).

The project was based upon three domains in the visual arts. The productive which was identified as the area concerned with formulation of objects having expressive and aesthetic qualities. That concerned with the perception of particular qualities in works of art was defined as the critical domain. The historical domain was the one which
referred to the evolution of art in human culture (p. 48).

Eisner (p. 48) selected a number of concepts and principles from each domain which was felt to have most significance in building the curriculum. He described concepts as the identification of a class such as terms of line, color, and composition as well as impressionism, water color, and tempura. Statements which gave information about concepts were called principles. After examining the concepts, particular series of principles were identified. The educational objectives were based on these identified principles.

The educational objectives were divided into two kinds in this program. The expressive was different from the instructional in definition in the fact that the expressive did not specify precisely what kinds of learning experiences were expected. Rather, it indicated the kinds of "encounters" which were intended (p. 49).

The Stanford Kettering model proceeded from the domain, through concepts and principles, to rationale for principles, to objectives, motivational activities, to lessons. The program was designed for use by general classroom teachers; therefore, the manual indicated the bases on which choice principles were made, motivational activity, and lesson options (pp. 50-55).

One of the units which teachers could select dealt with line. The lessons dealt with problems of helping children recognize that different kinds of line convey different
moods or expressive qualities; experimentation to explore ways in which line can be used to create various patterns and textures; create lines which express some emotional quality; and use lines in pictorial representations. The gradual widening and deepening of the child's appreciation of line in nature and as an expressive vehicle in the visual arts. The sequence is important inasmuch as it allows practice and internalization of learning (Hurwitz, 1972, pp. 12-13).

The Indiana Program by Hubbard and Rouse was also, an effort to develop a system for elementary school art instruction for teachers who were not prepared to teach art. Among them was "experimental aesthetics". They decided that aesthetic instruction should begin with the focus upon enjoyment and visual communication (p. 15).

Hubbard and Rouse were influenced by the work of Piaget and Bruner and felt that children in attempting to deal with the visual structure of their world would need art as a major structuring activity (p. 19). Accordingly, they decided to organize the program around six Learning Tasks Categories including 1) perception, 2) language about art, 3) study of artists, 4) criticism and judgment, 5) tools and materials, and 6) skill development. They felt learning in art was not unlike other types of learning and, therefore, emphasized the application of cognitive skills which could be stated in behavioral terms (pp. 21-22).
This program was tested extensively in a number of schools in Indiana beginning in 1968. Revisions were made and resulted in six textbooks entitled *Art 1-6: Meaning, Method, and Media* (1973). They were planned to be used by children as texts with a format similar to readers. The teachers' copies included the same material as the children's but with instructions for lesson procedure overprinted in the margin of pages. Sixty lessons grouped around a particular theme are provided and integration with other subjects encouraged. Lesson organization involved 1) reading in the text, 2) discussion, 3) distribution of materials, 4) activity, and 5) summation. This program would provide a foundation for children's future encounters with art (Hurwitz, pp. 14-31).

The Living Arts Program and New Visions Museum were federally funded or assisted. The Living Arts Center (1969) was financed under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. New Visions (1968) was federally assisted under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The aim of the Living Arts Program (1969) was to make students aware of the world around them and to use this cognizance as a source for expression through the Arts (p. iv.). The purpose was to identify, nurture, and evaluate the potential of students whose interest lie in the Fine Arts. Once selected the students had the opportunity to participate in
many facets and to study in depth one or more of the arts (p. iii).

The program was designed to enhance the educational opportunities in the Dayton Public Schools. It not only benefited the students but, also, the teachers and parents within the public school system. Teachers and administrators had the opportunity to participate in planned, sequential inservice training programs through conferences, seminars, and workshops conducted by the staff and guest artists. Parents of the selected students were involved in the program in discussions and participatory activities (pp. iii-iv).

The opportunities for creative and aesthetic growth were within four general areas which included 1) exploratory experiences, 2) learning in-depth experiences, 3) humanities roundtable, and 4) guest artists. Students selected one art area in which to concentrate but was encouraged to explore and experiment within other areas to develop new interests, ideas, and skills. Specialists, small classes, and superior facilities were factors for in-depth experiences. The inter-relationship of the arts was aimed for in the humanities roundtable. Finally, professional artists in all areas were engaged to work directly with students sharing their experiences and knowledge. This aspect was shared with the entire Dayton Public School population for K-12 (pp. iii-iv).

The New Visions Program was basically a museum for children built around culturally-oriented experiences. It was
directed by the art director of the Dayton Public Schools with docents and their aids to act as tour and experience guides. The artifacts selected for the exhibits were authentic of high quality. The focus on one culture at a time with subsequent activities of "dressing up" listening to music, dancing, and watching films related to the units of experience gave children an opportunity to explore in depth (N.E.A., 1968).

New Visions was designed to challenge the imagination, thinking, and responses through the exposure to artifacts and the use of their five senses. The uniqueness of the museum was that the children knew it was created especially for them. Their individual aesthetic responses were valued and became a means of opening doors during the important early years (Grade Teacher, 1967).

Criticism and Further Definitions

Criticisms were directed at the aesthetic education components within art education. The evaluations focused primarily upon the neglect of the affective domain within the many programs and curricula which emerged from the highly productive sixties. Efland (1971, pp. 13-25) summarized an attitude toward aesthetic education by stating that the philosophy in Guidelines was born in the cognitive tradition and that its present forms seemed limited when the seventies promised to be one when affective learnings will be prominent. Ecker (1971, pp. 26-29) referred to a "counter
culture" rooted in the affective area. He asked that art education re-examine curriculum. Re-examine it in terms of the relationship between the affective and cognitive structures already built into it. This included the structures students displayed outside of school.

Ecker then proceeded to define the purposes of true aesthetic education. He felt it would bridge the gap between the drive for excellence in the sixties with the demand for relevance in the seventies. The restoration of the integrity of the individual and social experience so out of balance could only be restored through aesthetic education (p. 27).

Madenfort and Flannery were two authors who came into prominence as definers of aesthetic education. They felt aesthetic education dealt with the sensuous immediacy of the individual. Madenfort (1972) defined the purpose as the development of student's ability to experience the world as it is given without mediation of concepts (p. 10). Flannery (1973) defined it as an education to increase the sensuous immediacy for the individual.

Madenfort (1975) believed that the conceptual experience of the world is apprehended via concepts. The aesthetic experience put the individual into a sensory immediacy and, thus, did not need mediation conceptually. This realm of experience was described as immediate communication of the individual and environment (p. 19).
Flannery (1973, pp. 10-11) made a distinction between the concrete, immediate, or aesthetic knowledge and that which was called conceptual. Conceptual knowledge educates for function in the practical world and aesthetic knowledge educates toward "being human". She maintained that both types were essential for the human being to function as a whole. Aesthetic education could extend the keyboard of human feeling throughout the educative process.

Madenfort (1972, pp. 11-13) translated his theory into specific objectives for achieving sensuous immediacy. Objectives of aesthetic education was to allow for the development of the student's ability 1) to experience sensuous phenomena as immediately given through an attitude of openness to the unity of the living body and the world, 2) to experience the immediacy of sensuous phenomena as rhythmically spatial phenomena of bodily motion and emotion, 3) to apprehend the immediacy of sensuous phenomena of one modality as a translation of the features that it has in common with other sensuous modalities, 4) to experience a multiplicity of immediate sensuous phenomena of one modality or of one or more modalities at one and the same time and to fuse them into a new sensuous whole, 5) to experience the immediacy of sensuous movement as a creative act of expression.

While authors such as Ecker, Madenfort and Flannery were attempting to further define aesthetic education for the seventies others continued to write criticisms of aesthetic
Dorn (1972, pp. 22-28) amplified the earlier criticisms made by Efland by stating that some art educators were simply bored and uninspired by the intellectual or cognitive behaviors. He labeled it the "... cognitive backlash" which resulted from the "art as discipline (p. 26)" pronouncements of the sixties. He further stated that the goals set in the sixties were no longer viable and that teacher education programs and art learning environments in the schools needed a revolutionary change (p. 27).

Lanier (1974, p. 13) best summarized the growing dissatisfaction many art educators felt about curriculum development. He wrote that no significant change had occurred in the curriculum during the last forty years where the teacher meets pupil--in the real world of art education. He attempted to summarize his perceptions of aesthetic education and art education. He stated that the dominant theory was several varieties of aesthetic education and the dominance was basically the result of funding and the publishing of the ideas of the top echelon of art educators. The vast majority of others working in the field were fragmented and argumentative. According to Lanier they still maintained their usual studio programs and justified them most often by invoking the icon of creativity.

Lanier (1975) appeared to contradict himself in another article called, "Returning Art to Art Education". He
suggested the strong central concept required in art education was "... increasing the scope and quality of visual aesthetic experience (p. 28)." This same basic concept was proposed in 1963 and was, in essence, identical to the general goal of aesthetic education as stated in CEMREL'S Guidelines. Lanier felt it necessary to restate the concept. It was an attempt to return the "... art to art education (p. 28);" for he questioned the foundation upon which aesthetic education was built into art education in the sixties.

Summary of Curriculum Reorganization

The Russian space coup merely hastened curriculum reorganization which had been in the process prior to 1957. A diverse group of philosophers, subject specialists, curriculum theorists, and behavioral scientists provided the initial thrust but one individual was particularly important in the inclusion of aesthetic education into art education. Jerome Brumer in his call that any subject can be taught effectively in some intelligent form to children in any developmental stage provoked analysis of the aesthetic experience, re-examination of curricula in art education and the purpose of the arts within general education.

Aesthetic education through conferences and writings was defined and identified as basic to the discipline of art education with educative potential within the realm of general education. Considerable federal interest and funding provided for the development and implementation of programs
on the local and national levels. The most widely known pro-
gram, CEMREL'S Aesthetic Education Program was accepted and
used in schools throughout the United States.

Criticism of the programs in the 70's focused on the
fact that they were formulated within the cognitive tradi-
tion. More emphasis on the affective domain was called for
in later writings and further definitions.

Chapter three will present the design and methodology
to test one aspect of the curriculum reorganization having
to do with the influence of the aesthetic experience upon
the drawings of children.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The questions identified in Chapter One are stated below as hypotheses that were tested.

H_{o1} There are no significant differences on post-test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and in the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience and second grade children not receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience.

H_{o2} There is no significant relationship at the .05 level between the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self of second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience.

H_{o3} There are no significant differences on post-test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between boys and girls at the second grade level after a sensory/aesthetic experience.

H_{o4} There are no significant differences on post-test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience.
There are no significant differences on post-test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and in the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between developmentally advanced readers and developmentally delayed readers second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was limited to four second grade classes within the Dayton Public Schools, Dayton, Ohio and four second grade classes within the Oakwood Public Schools, Dayton, Ohio. The Dayton and Oakwood Schools are a part of the Dayton Metropolitan Area which has a population of 835,200 people. Dayton City has a population of 243,601. Oakwood has a population of 10,095. The Dayton Metropolitan area is historically industrial in nature. According to the 1974 Census Estimates, the per capita income for the Metropolitan area was $5,633.00, for Dayton City $4,091.00, and for Oakwood City $9,493.00.

The Dayton Public School District had a total enrollment of 45,520 students with a student--teacher ratio of 27.6 to one. As of August (1977), 46.4 per cent of the students were white and 53.6 per cent of the students were black.

The Van Cleve School District lies directly North and adjacent to the central downtown district divided only by the Little Miami River. The population of the student body was 641 students composed of 48.4 per cent black and 51.6 per
cent white. The children were from lower class, blue-collar workers with a good per cent dependent on welfare. Many had immigrated from Appalachia and the South.

The Van Cleve School District was selected by Dr. William R. Stolle, Executive Director of Elementary Education—Dayton Public Schools, to best represent culturally disadvantaged students within the district as defined by geographic location. This identification was made in response to the request of the writer.

The Oakwood School District lies directly South of Dayton City and adjacent at the Southern edge. It has long been considered culturally advantaged because of geographic location. The per capita income according to the 1974 Census Estimates was $9,493.00 as compared to Dayton City of $4,091.00. The Oakwood community has long prided itself on its cultural opportunities and support. It is a small city with a population of 10,095 and had no room for expansion geographically for many years. Emphasis has been placed upon maintainence and renewal. It is known for its parks, gardens, playgrounds, and public school system. They are all excellent.

The total school population stays around 1,800 to 2,000. It is 100 per cent white with some mixture of ethnic backgrounds. The school program is for K-12 students with approximately one-half the student in the elementary program (K-6) and one-half in the secondary program (7-12).
The subjects for this research were all the students in eight second grade classes within the two selected school districts. Four second grade classes were in the Van Cleve Elementary School, Dayton City, and two classes at Harmon School and two at Smith School within the Oakwood School District, Oakwood, Ohio. The four second grade classes at Van Cleve had 88 students while the four classes in Oakwood had 72 students. In all 160 second graders comprised the population for the study.

Treatment

Drawings were collected from all eight second grade classes within the same week in the Spring of the year. All students had been with the same teacher during the entire year.

After receiving permission to work within the school districts, the investigator discussed the reasons for the work with the children with each classroom teacher prior to a pre-visit to the classroom. The teachers were asked to make no effort to build any enthusiasm, but simply introduce the investigator. The investigator asked the students to cooperate the following week by making two pictures. After the agreements were reached, the students were informed that the drawings would be made on special paper with a border, some numerals and lines but that they were to be ignored. Pencils would, also, be provided. They were told they would be asked to put their name and some other information on a
third sheet to let the investigator know the identity of the drawings.

The procedure for the hour spent with each second grade class was as follows. Ten minutes was spent greeting the students completing the cover sheet, passing out pencils and drawing paper, and seeing that all the students were comfortable and ready for work. All students in all eight classes were asked to draw a picture of themselves without any discussion and took approximately fifteen minutes before they were collected and laid aside.

For the next twenty minutes two classes in Oakwood and two classes at Van Cleve were permitted to rest, talk with each other or the investigator about anything they wished, but an effort was made to remain a friendly neutral adult. They were then asked to complete a second drawing of themselves on drawing paper number two. Again, the drawings took approximately fifteen minutes before they were collected and stapled to other drawing and information sheet.

The children in the other four classes were given a sensory/aesthetic experience with the purpose of raising each individual consciousness—awareness of themselves in relationship to the concept of "growth". The investigator gave each student a roasted peanut in the shell and asked that they 1) examine it with their eyes and describe, 2) smell it and describe, 3) listen to it and describe, 4) taste it and describe. An identification was made of the
peanut as a seed. They were asked to pretend that they were a seed by making their body as small and compact as they possibly could (like a seed) by folding their head, arms and legs around the body.

The "seeds" were informed that they were planted in rich soil and a warm Spring rain was falling gently on them. (Can you feel it?). The sun was beginning to shine warmly and they were ready to burst. (Can you feel it?). The seeds need to grow slowly and is beginning to grow one small bit at a time until it has grown as tall and wide as it is possible. (What beautiful, healthy plants!) The wind has started to blow gently. (Can you feel it and move with it?). The breeze settles and a very calm day emerges. The plants breath deeply. The investigator asked the students to return to their seats to complete a second drawing of themselves remembering how they just felt if they wished. The drawings were collected and stapled to the other drawing and the information sheet.

All eight classes were thanked and left a small bag of peanuts for each individual in appreciation for the help and drawings.

Sources of Data

The sources of data for classification of the students as culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged were the geographic location of the school district in which they lived. Oakwood Schools were identified as culturally
advantaged. Van Cleve School within the Dayton School District was identified as culturally disadvantaged.

The sources for the classification of students as developmentally advanced readers or developmentally delayed readers were the eight classroom teachers of the students who completed the drawings. Each teacher who taught reading were asked to identify those students who in their view were developmentally advanced or delayed readers. The criteria was a general classification within the two categories by using all available data of standardized test scores, teachers made test over content, observations, intuitions and experiences with the children in their reading program. The classification was made in terms of advanced or delayed readers as compared to the usual expected reading levels at the same time of the year for second grade children.

A total of forty-three students were identified as developmentally advanced readers. Twenty-eight of them were in the Oakwood School District and fifteen were in the Van Cleve School. A total of fifty-four students were identified as developmentally delayed readers. Nine of these were in the Oakwood District while thirty-nine were at Van Cleve.

The source for data for details in the children's drawings was Part C of the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test. A panel of three art education experts judged the drawings for expressive qualities using a rating scale for an average rating score.
Data Gathering Instruments

Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test

The details in the children's drawings were measured by using Part C (Draw Self) of the Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test. The Draw--A--Man Test was originally published in 1926 by Florence Goodenough. Since that time its use has been widespread. Twenty years after its introduction, Louttit and Browne found it was the third most frequently used test in clinical psychology. Fifteen years later, in 1961, Sundberg found it still in the "top ten". This record is especially impressive considering that the instrument is appropriate for use only in children.

In 1963 Harris published the results of an extensive revision of the Draw--A--Man Test. First he extensively redeveloped the Goodenough scoring criteria on a highly objective, empirical basis. Second, he devoted extensive effort to new standardization of the test. Third, he converted the I.Q. computation from the old mental age/chronological age ratio concept to the deviation I.Q. concept. He, also, introduced a companion Draw--A--Woman Test.

In the present version of the test a Draw--A--Self (Part C) is included. The manual suggests that the scoring of the Self-Drawing be scored on the points of the Man or Woman scale (depending upon the subject's sex).

The test calls for the child to "make a picture of a man". This is a simple task which seldom takes more than
ten minutes to administer. It may be administered either individually or to groups. It is non-threatening and quick. Scoring time is also on the order of ten minutes. Like the original test, the present revision focuses on the child's accuracy of observation and on the development of conceptual thinking, rather than on artistic skill. The number of scorables items or points has been increased from 51 to 73. These items were selected from a pool of about 100 on the basis of age differentiation, relation to total scores on the provisional form, and relation to group intelligence test scores. Data for this purpose were obtained from 50 boys and 50 girls at each year of age from 6 to 15 years, drawn from a larger sample tested in rural and urban areas of Minnesota and Wisconsin and representative of the national distribution with regard to paternal occupation. The manual gives detailed instructions, with illustrations, for scoring the 73 points on an all—or—none basis. Raw scores are converted to standard scores with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Norms were established on a new standardization sample of 2,975 children between the ages of 5 to 15 years, representative of the occupational distribution of the U.S. in 1950, and distributed among four major geographical areas. A table is provided for converting the standard scores to percentiles, although the limitations of percentile scores are noted and the use of standard scores is recommended.
The Self scale was included as a possible projective test of personality, but available findings from the application are not promising. Currently, the manual provides a qualitative checklist for assessing performance on this scale and comparing the Self drawing with the other two drawings. This checklist is presented as a subjective and thus far untested guide. It is also suggested that the Self scale be scored on the points of a standard score found from the corresponding normative table.

In the new scale, as in the earlier version, scorer reliabilities are usually over .90. In part, such inter-scorer agreement reflects the fullness of the scoring instructions and the care exercised in selecting items that can be scored with a minimum of uncertainty. Split-half reliabilities, found on the earlier form over intervals as long as three months fall mostly in the .60's and .70's. Short-term fluctuations in performance are negligible as indicated by a study of the scores obtained on the revised form by kindergarten children given the test on each of ten consecutive school days. Examiner variance has proved insignificant, as has the effect of art training in school upon test scores. Judged artistic merit of the drawings, moreover, bears little or no relation to the point scores assigned to the drawings. Scores in the revised Man scale correspond closely to those obtained with the original version, the correlations ranging from .91 to .98 in
homogeneous age groups. (Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, 1972).

In summary, the original Draw--A--Man Test has been updated, extended, and restandardized. The crude ratio I.Q. has been replaced with standard scores and a parallel form has been developed in the Woman scale. Part C (Draw Self) has been added to be scored with the points of the Man or Woman scale depending upon the subject's sex.

**Rating Scale**

The rating scale to determine the general expressive qualities in terms of communication in the artistic sense was composed of a scale from 1 (Low) to 7 (High). The following criteria defined the expressive qualities in terms of the qualitative:

7 = Exceptional Expressive Qualities  
6 = High Expressive Qualities  
5 = Above Average Expressive Qualities  
4 = Average Expressive Qualities  
3 = Less than Average Expressive Qualities  
2 = Lowest Quality Expressive Qualities  
1 = Absence of Expressive Qualities

Each student drawings (A and B) were judged in relationship to the other in terms of the general expressive qualities. Examples of a drawing for each quality as judged by the art education experts are found in Figures 1 through 7 on pages 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 and 66.

The judges were three art education experts composed of an art therapist who works with children, an art teacher who teaches art to second grade children, and a university
professor of art education methods. Each judge was instructed toward the use of the rating scale by a general conversation of the purpose of the rating, shown examples of drawings to be rated, rated some as practice prior to actual rating process. Each judge was told that their own views as to the expressive qualities within each drawing were valued and to rely on their artistic judgment. It was emphasized that the judgments had no relationship to the scoring of a test.

The ratings were used to obtain an average rating of the expressive qualities from the panel of three art education experts. The Spearman Correlation of Coefficients revealed significant correlations between the judges on both pre and post--test scores as reported in Appendix G (page ).

Statistical Procedure

Statistical analysis for Hypothesis 1, 3, 4, and 5 was the Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANOCOVA) on the post--test scores using the pre--test scores as covariates. Since both dependent variables measure on the same subjects they cannot be considered truly independent. Therefore, the type 1 error of probability is reduced. Analysis of Covariance for Individual Variables is based on the significance of MANOCOVA.

Statistical analysis for Hypothesis 2 was based on the Spearman Rank Order Correlation on post--test dependent variables scores for the group receiving the treatment of the
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sensory/aesthetic experience.

Summary

The sample used in this study was eight second grade classes in the Dayton and Oakwood Public Schools in Dayton, Ohio. The four classes in the Dayton System were considered disadvantaged because of geographic location. The two classes in Oakwood System were considered culturally advantaged because of geographic location. Two classes in Dayton and two classes in Oakwood were given a treatment (sensory/aesthetic experience). The other four classes were the control group. All students in all eight classes produced two drawings of themselves.

The classroom teachers classified the students in each class whom they considered developmentally advanced or developmentally delayed readers. This classification was made using all the criteria available to them about the children's reading performance and skills.

The details in the drawings were measured by using Part C of the Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test. The expressive qualities in the drawings were measured by a rating scale. An average rating was obtained from the judgments of three art education experts.

The Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANOVA) on the post--test scores using the pre--test scores as covariates was the statistical analysis for Hypothesis 1, 3, 4 and 5. Hypothesis 2 was based on the Spearman Rank Order Correlation
on post--test scores dependent variables scores for the treatment group for statistical analysis.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

A pre—test and post—test (Part C of the Goodenough—Harris Drawing Test) was administered to the total sample of 160 subjects and scores were obtained for the use of details in their drawings thus providing the data used for analysis and interpretation. A panel of art education experts provided scored judgments concerning the expressive qualities of each subjects' drawings, which provided scores/data for analysis and interpretation. The raw scores are reported for the Control Group in Appendix D and for the Treatment Group in Appendix E. This chapter describes the analysis of the data gathered from these measures. It is organized in terms of an analysis of covariance for group differences in the use of details and expressive qualities 1) between the control and treatment group, 2) between boys and girls, 3) between culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged, 4) between developmentally advanced and developmentally delayed readers, and analysis of the relationship between the scales in the use of details and expressive qualities.

Analysis For Group Differences

The method of analysis for the following hypotheses was the analysis of covariance. This method results in increased
precision and equated group means, but does not require the matching of subjects. This is done by employing a supplementary measure which is known to be correlated with the Y measure obtained on the dependent variable of the experiment. In this study the X measure is the test administered to the subjects before treatment and the Y measure is the same test administered to all subjects for those who received and did not receive the treatment.

The X measure is not itself of experimental interest, but is considered to be a concomitant measure of observation. The Y measures are then adjusted by eliminating the variability due to differences between subjects on the X measures which were taken prior to the treatment. The adjustment of the dependent variable Y for the initial differences among subjects on the supplementary measure X is carried out through employment of the regression of X on Y (Hill & Kerber, 1967, p. 418).

The analysis of covariance data for all the variables are reported in Tables 1 and 2 (pages 70 & 71). The analysis of covariance was accomplished by using the statistical package (SAS User's Guide - 1979 Edition) at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

Hypothesis I: Differences in the Use of Details and Expressive Qualities

The hypothesis, in null form, stated that there would be no significant differences on the post--test scores in the use of details and in the use of expressive qualities in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.4681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.8623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.2505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.0344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.3314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.5270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

** Critical Value of F at 1/136 df = 3.92

** Critical Value of F at 2/136 df = 3.07
### TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR
THE USE OF EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.0479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.2274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.4024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.5032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.0936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.3889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.0409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.8533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.7521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/136</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.6582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.2834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .05**

Critical Value of F at 1/136 df = 3.92
Critical Value of F at 2/136 df = 3.07
schema of self between second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience and second grade children not receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience. The $F$ ratio for the differences in the use of details failed to reach the .05 level of confidence (see Table 1), indicating that the differences among the groups' means $[F(1/136) = 1.94 p=0.11662]$ were not large enough to rule out chance. This part of Hypothesis I dealing with the use of details was not rejected.

The $F$ ratio for the treatment group for the use of expressive qualities reached the .05 level of confidence (see Table 2) indicating that the differences among the groups' means $[F(1/136) = 16.05 p=0.0001]$ were large enough to be attributed to the treatment. Therefore, this part of Hypothesis I dealing with expressive qualities was rejected.

**Hypothesis III: Sex Differences in the Use of Details and Expressive Qualities**

The hypothesis, in null form stated that there would be no significant differences on post-test scores in the use of details and expressive qualities in the schema of self between boys and girls at the second grade level after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience. The $F$ ratio for the differences in the use of details and expressive qualities failed to reach the .05 level of confidence (see Tables 3 and 4). This indicated that the differences in groups means $[F(1/67) = 0.17 p=0.6784], [F(1/67) = 0.90 p=0.3450]$ were not large enough to be attributed of the treatment. Hypothesis III failed to be rejected.
### TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR THE USE OF DETAILS FOR TREATMENT GROUP ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F**</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.6784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.3851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.0733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  
** Critical Value of F at 1/67 df = 3.99  
Critical Value of F at 2/67 df = 3.14

### TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR THE USE OF EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES FOR TREATMENT GROUP ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F**</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.3450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.4084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture</td>
<td>1/67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.2786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.0894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.9202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Culture/Reading</td>
<td>2/67</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.6473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  
** Critical Value of F at 1/67 df = 3.99  
Critical Value of F at 2/67 df = 3.14
Males and females behave similarly across groups in the use of details in their drawings (see Table 3). There is a difference in male and female behavior across groups in the use of expressive qualities as shown in the graph below:

GRAPH 1: MALE AND FEMALE BEHAVIOR IN USE OF EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES ACROSS TREATMENT/NON-TREATMENT GROUPS

* = MALE  + = FEMALE
Males are more expressive in the control group than females are expressive. They are influenced by the sensory/aesthetic experience but not as much as the females. The treatment caused a crossover effect in the use of expressive qualities in the drawings.

**Hypothesis IV: Cultural Differences in the Use of Details and Expressive Qualities**

The hypothesis, in null form stated that there would be no significant differences on the post-test scores in the use of details and expressive qualities in the schema of self between second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience between the culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged. The F ratio for the differences in the use of details and expressive qualities in the drawings failed to reach the .05 level of confidence (see Tables 3 and 4). The differences in the groups' means \([F(1/67) = 0.76, p=0.3851]\), \([F(1/67) = 0.69, p=0.4084]\) were not large enough to be attributed to the treatment therefore, Hypothesis IV failed to be rejected.

Culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged behave similarly across groups in the use of details and expressive qualities (see Tables 3 and 4).

**Hypothesis V: Developmentally Advanced and Delayed Readers Differences in the Use of Details and Expressive Qualities**

The hypothesis, in null form stated that there would be no significant differences on the post-test scores in the use of details and expressive qualities in the schema of
self between second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience between the students who are developmentally advanced readers and the students who are developmentally delayed readers. The F ratio for the treatment group

**GRAPH 2: DEVELOPMENTALLY ADVANCED AND DELAYED READERS BEHAVIOR IN USE OF DETAILS AS RELATED TO TREATMENT/NON-TREATMENT**
for the differences in the use of details reached the .05 level of confidence (see Table 3). The differences among the groups' means \[F(2/67) = 10.69 \ p=0.0001\] were large enough to indicate a treatment effect. However, this part of Hypothesis V dealing with the use of details and reading ability was not rejected because of the overall reading effect disregarding the treatment. This is shown in Graph 2.

The differences in the reading component is confounded by existing in the no-treatment as well as treatment group for the developmentally advanced readers, although differences for developmentally delayed readers as well as for all other readers.

The F ratio for the treatment group for the use of expressive qualities failed to reach the .05 level of confidence (see Table 4). This indicated that the differences among the groups' means \[F(2/67) = 2.42 \ p=0.0967\] were not large enough to be attributed to the treatment. Therefore, this part of Hypothesis V dealing with expressive qualities in the drawings and reading ability was not rejected.

Developmentally advanced and developmentally delayed readers behave similarly across groups in the use of details and expressive qualities (see Table 3 and 4).

**Analysis of Relationships Between the Scales**

The method of analysis for Hypothesis II to determine the relationship between the scales for use of details (Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test) and for the use of
expressive qualities (Rating Scale by Art Educators) was a Spearman Rank Order Correlation.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was the earliest of all the statistics based on ranks and is perhaps the best known. This statistic, sometimes called rho, is a measure of association which requires that both variables be measured in at least an ordinal scale so that the objects or individuals under study may be ranked in two ordered series (Siegel, 1966).

**Hypothesis II: Relationship Between the Scales for Details and Expressive Qualities**

The hypothesis, in null form, stated that there would be no significant relationship between the use of details and expressive qualities in the schema of self of children at the second grade level after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience. The rho for the treatment group reached beyond the .05 level (rho = 0.65, df = 79, p = 0.0001) of confidence. For this group the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the results of the analysis of the data. The analysis for group differences seemed to indicate significant differences in the use of details in the drawings between the developmentally advanced readers and the developmentally delayed readers. There were no significant differences in the use of details in the drawings for the variables of treatment/no-treatment, sex and culture.
The analysis for group differences seemed to indicate significant differences in the use of expressive qualities in children's drawings between the treatment/no-treatment group. There were no significant differences in the use of expressive qualities in the drawings for the variables of sex, culture, and reading ability.

The analysis for the relationship between the scales indicated a significant relationship between them.

The next chapter, chapter five, will present the summary and conclusions of this study, questions posed by this study, and implications for further study.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions of this study, questions posed by this study and implications for further research.

Restatement of the Problem

This experimental study tested the effects of a sensory/aesthetic experience upon the drawings of second grade children for the use of details and expressive qualities. Philosophers of aesthetics, known as the Expressionist Theory of Art, believe that individuals must possess certain qualities or characteristics in order to respond aesthetically. The individual must have the disposition to respond with ease to that which is original and unique. If a work of art is a unique phenomena it must have come into existence not subject to any external laws or rules. Judgments then can't be made based upon rules or even based on past experience. The content of the aesthetic experience is based upon the "immediate experience" to bring into being a work of art or to experience a work of art. Both creating and experiencing a work of art involves an ability to express one's emotions. The individual cannot rely upon previous judgments or concepts for experience and meaning.
The curriculum reorganization in art education since 1957 had its origin in the philosophy of aesthetics along with educational theorists. Among them was Jerome Bruner who believed that any subjects could be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development. Conferences and articles defined the aesthetic experience which provided the impetus for program development in the arts—including the visual arts.

Victor Lowenfeld, the author of the widely used art education text book, Creative and Mental Growth, believed that any significant or meaningful experience will precipitate a change in the drawings of children. Particularly at the second grade level or "schematic" stage of development. An aspect of children's drawings as related to sensory/aesthetic experience had apparently been overlooked even though the art activities of children had been observed and described since late in the nineteenth century. According to McFee art activity is an activity related to other behavior. It is a process which fuses the intellect, the child's perceptions, and his inventiveness in organizing that which he is learning from his environment.

Since the factor of the aesthetic experience has been identified a meaningful and significant experience it should have changed the schema of second grade children and the changes should be related to cognitive abilities. This study examined the presence of changes in second grade
children's drawings after a sensory/aesthetic experience and its relationship to sex, culture, and reading ability.

Summary of the Design of the Study

The treatment for this study was a sensory/aesthetic experience for the purpose of raising individual consciousness for immediate awareness of self.

The population of the study was limited to eight second grade classes in the greater Dayton, Ohio area. Four classes were the control group and four classes were the treatment group. Four classes were classified as culturally disadvantaged and four as culturally advantaged as defined by geographic location. The children were identified as developmentally advanced or delayed readers by their teachers.

The data gathering instruments were the Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test and a Rating Scale by a panel of art educators. These were used for the pre--test and post--test.

The statistical procedure of analysis of covariance was used to test for the presence of any differences between groups. The procedure to determine the relationship between the scales for the use of details and expressive qualities in the drawings was the Spearman Rank Order Correlation.

Summary of the Findings

Group Differences

Analysis of covariance was used to test the null hypothesis for each of the four variables. The hypothesis
stated that there are no significant differences at the .05 level in the use of details and expressive qualities in the schema of self of second grade children between the subjects submitted to treatment and to those who were not submitted to the treatment on the following variables; 1) treatment/no--treatment, 2) sex, 3) culturally advantaged/culturally disadvantaged, and 4) developmentally advanced readers/developmentally delayed readers.

The following is a re-statement of the hypotheses and below each hypothesis is a summary of the findings:

\[ H_1 \] There are no significant differences on post--test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and in the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience and second grade children not receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience.

The drawings of the treatment/no--treatment group were compared according to the scores on the use of details and on the use of expressive qualities. The group comparison revealed no significant differences in the use of details at the .05 level. This part of Hypothesis I was not rejected. The group comparison on the use of expressive qualities in the drawings achieved significance at the .05 level. Therefore, this part of Hypothesis I was rejected.

\[ H_3 \] There are no significant differences on post--test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between boys and girls at the second grade level after a sensory/
aesthetic experience.

The comparison of the drawings for use of details and expressive qualities, between males and females failed to reach the .05 level of confidence. Hypothesis III was not rejected. Males were more expressive in the control group than females. Females were more expressive in the treatment group thus revealing a crossover effect after treatment.

H<sub>4</sub> There are no significant differences on post--test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience.

The drawings were compared for the use of details and expressive qualities by the identified culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged. The group comparison did not reveal a significant level of confidence at the .05 level in the use of details and expressive qualities. Therefore, Hypothesis IV was not rejected.

H<sub>5</sub> There are no significant differences on post--test scores at the .05 level in the use of details and in the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self between developmentally advanced readers and developmentally delayed readers of second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience.

The drawings when compared for the use of details reached the .05 level of confidence. However, this part of Hypothesis V was not rejected because of the overall effect disregarding the treatment for developmentally advanced
The comparison for the use of expressive qualities failed to reach the .05 level of confidence and; therefore, this part of the hypothesis was not rejected.

**Analysis of Relationship Between the Scales**

A Spearman Rank Order Correlation was done to determine the relationship between the scales used to determine the use of details and expressive qualities. The scales used were the Goodenough--Harris Drawing Test (Part C) and a Rating Scale by a panel of Art Educators. Hypothesis II is restated below with a summary of the findings following.

**H.02** There is no significant relationship at the .05 level between the use of details and the use of expressive qualities in the schema of self of second grade children after receiving a sensory/aesthetic experience.

A level of confidence which reached beyond the .05 level revealed a significant relationship between the scales. Hypothesis II was rejected.

**Conclusions**

The analysis of the data provided the basis for the following conclusions to the study:

1. The sensory/aesthetic experience as described in this study does not influence children at the second grade level to use more details in their drawings (schema) of self. The experience does influence the children to greater expressive quality in their drawings, expressive qualities as defined in this study.
2. The sensory/aesthetic experience as described in this study does not significantly influence second grade males or females to use more details or greater expressive qualities in their drawings (schema) of self.

3. The sensory/aesthetic experience as described in this study does not significantly influence second grade children who are culturally advantaged and culturally disadvantaged to use more details or greater expressive qualities in their drawings (schema) of self.

4. The sensory/aesthetic experience as described in this study does significantly influence second grade children who are developmentally advanced readers to use more details in their drawings (schema) of self. The experience does not influence developmentally delayed readers to use more details. The experience does not significantly influence the use of greater expressive qualities in their drawings for developmentally advanced or delayed readers.

5. A significant relationship between the scales of measures used in this study for the use of details and expressive qualities in the drawings (schema) of self is demonstrated by second grade children after a sensory/aesthetic experience.

Discussion

The conclusion of this study found 1) a significant difference in the use of expressive qualities in the drawings of self of second grade children after a sensory/
aesthetic experience, 2) a crossover effect between males and females in the use of expressive qualities in the drawings of self after a sensory/aesthetic experience, 3) significant differences in the use of details for developmentally advanced readers after a sensory/aesthetic experience but there was, also, an overall effect for developmentally advanced readers, 4) no significant differences in the use of details and expressive qualities for the treatment and non-treatment group, sex, culture, and reading achievement. Several observations relative to the above summary of the conclusions of this study should be included.

Discussion

The effects of the sensory/aesthetic treatment upon the drawings were based upon a total time of one hour for drawing one, treatment/no--treatment, and drawing two. The writer observed that most children in all eight grades became tired by the time they were asked to make a second drawing. It may be, then, that a change in the time to two sessions rather than one would more adequately reflect the effects of the sensory/aesthetic experience. Perhaps, different aesthetic experiences over several sessions to obtain a greater number of drawings would reveal an even greater relationship between the groups among the variables.

The pilot study strongly supported Lowenfeld's theory that significant experiences will cause changes in the drawings (schema) of children. The study, also, supported the aesthetic theories reviewed in Chapter II, concerning the
personal significance of the aesthetic experience. The study showed it was significant to eighty per cent of the subjects by changes made in their schema. The drawings of self asked for in the pilot study were self-portraits (only of the face). Therefore, the time for the drawing task was much shorter, direct, and appeared to be much more dramatic. (Appendix F includes two drawings to demonstrate this point). This seems to indicate that asking for a complete picture of self in this study might have been a mis-judgment on the part of the researcher.

Another factor which might have influenced the conclusions of this study was the relationship of the researcher to the students. Even though a short pre-visit helped with rapport and communication which was necessary between researcher and student; many of the students, perhaps, could not reach intense consciousness of the immediate experience as projected by the researcher because of apprehension.

The awareness of the researcher to the sensitive relationship between the teacher (researcher) and the student seems to point toward some areas for further consideration. One area is the pedagogy of art for the primary grade level to promote sensory/aesthetic experience. Another area is the curriculum content area for sensory/aesthetic experience for the primary level child as related to teacher style and teaching strategies. What significance is teacher style or behavior upon the quality of sensory/aesthetic experiences
for children in the second grade level of development? What strategies are appropriate to best facilitate sensory/aesthetic experiences at the second grade level of development?

Implications for Further Study

The findings of this study suggest that further study can be profitably undertaken in the following areas:

1. A replication of the experiment with groups of second grade children with appropriate modifications of the time element for obtaining the drawings. Drawing one could be obtained during one session and the treatment given to obtain drawing two in another session.

2. A replication of the experiment with groups of second grade children over a longer time span of several months to obtain a greater data base.

3. A replication of the experiment with groups of second grade children with varied sensory/aesthetic experiences. Perhaps, focusing on one of the five senses for each treatment or experience.

4. A replication of the experiment with groups of second grade children asking for only self-portraits rather than asking for a complete drawing of self after sensory/aesthetic experience.

5. An investigation of the "crossover effect" between males and females in the use of expressive qualities in their drawings after sensory/aesthetic experiencing.
6. An investigation into the significant differences in the use of details in developmentally advanced readers after sensory/aesthetic experience.

7. An investigation into the lack of significant differences in the use of details in developmentally delayed readers and average readers after sensory/aesthetic experience.

8. An investigation into the pedagogy of art toward significant sensory/aesthetic experience for children at the second grade level (schematic stage).

9. An investigation into curriculum content for significant sensory/aesthetic experiences for children at the second grade level.

10. An investigation into the influence of teacher style and/or teaching strategies upon the quality of sensory/aesthetic experience of children at the second grade level of development (the schematic stage).
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS: THE GOODENOUGH-HARRIS DRAWING TEST AND RATING SCALE FOR ART EDUCATORS
APPENDIX B

PROFILE OF PERSON WHO SUPERVISED THE SCORING OF THE GOODENOUGH-HARRIS DRAWING TEST
Dr. Lewis K. Shupe supervised the scoring of the Goodenough--Harris Drawing Tests. He is associate professor of Art Therapy and Speech Pathology at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. He received a B.S. and M.S. for the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah in 1957 and 1960 and obtained the Ph.D. in 1968 from the State University of New York, Buffalo, New York.

He is a registered Art Therapist with the American Art Therapy Association (1978). Current professional affiliations include the American Art Therapy Association, Buckeye Art Therapy Association, and the National Art Education Association.

Dr. Shupe is nationally known for his workshops and writings in the field of Art Therapy.
APPENDIX C

PROFILES OF ART EDUCATORS WHO JUDGED
FOR EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES
Kathryn Gardner, Virginia Niswander, and Luisa Lang-Owen were the art educators who judged the drawings for expressive qualities.

Kathryn Gardner is an art teacher from 1976 to present for grades 2-6 at Central Elementary School Fairborn, Ohio. She received a B.S. Degree in Elementary and Art Education in 1971 from State University of New York at Brockport and a Masters Degree in art education and art therapy from Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio in 1976. She is currently affiliated with the Ohio Art Education Association and the Buckeye Art Therapy Association.

Virginia Niswander is an instructor in the Department of Art Therapy at Wright State University. She received a B.S. Degree from Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio in 1942, B.F.A. in 1972 from Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, and a M.Ed. Degree with a concentration in art therapy from Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio in 1975. She presently holds a Certificate of Registration (ATR) from the American Art Therapy Association and a Certificate of Registration (BATA from the Buckeye Art Therapy Association.)

Dr. Luisa Lang-Owen is an assistant professor in the Department of Art Education at Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. She received the B.S. and M.Ed. Degree from Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio in 1970 and 1971, and received the Ph.D. Degree from the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio in 1980. Dr. Lang-Owen is currently
affiliated with National Art Education Association and Ohio Art Education Association.
APPENDIX D

RAW PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST SCORES FOR DETAILS AND EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES: CONTROL GROUP
CONTROL GROUP NUMBER ONE  
SMITH SCHOOL: McCARTHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>DETAILS SCORES</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td>DETAILS SCORES</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td>DETAILS SCORES</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTROL GROUP NUMBER FOUR  
HARMON SCHOOL: PRICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>DETAILS SCORES X</th>
<th>DETAILS SCORES Y</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES RATER NO.1 X</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES RATER NO.1 Y</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES RATER NO.2 X</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES RATER NO.2 Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

RAW PRE-TEST AND POST-REST SCORES FOR DETAILS AND EXPRESSION QUALITIES: TREATMENT GROUP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>DETAILS SCORES</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TREATMENT GROUP NUMBER TWO
## VAN CLEVE SCHOOL: Bazile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>DETAILS SCORES</th>
<th>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td>DETAILS SCORES</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Y</td>
<td>RATER NO.1  RATER NO.2 RATER NO.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 16</td>
<td>2 3 1 3 3 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29 24</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 19</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31 32</td>
<td>4 4 3 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28 26</td>
<td>2 3 2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31 28</td>
<td>3 4 3 5 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17 14</td>
<td>2 3 2 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39 37</td>
<td>4 4 3 4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33 33</td>
<td>3 4 2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21 8</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23 28</td>
<td>3 3 3 4 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35 28</td>
<td>4 4 3 3 3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27 23</td>
<td>3 4 3 4 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25 27</td>
<td>3 3 2 3 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29 27</td>
<td>4 4 2 2 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24 23</td>
<td>3 3 2 2 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>26 25</td>
<td>3 3 2 2 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 25</td>
<td>2 3 2 3 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18 23</td>
<td>2 3 2 4 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23 36</td>
<td>3 4 2 4 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19 26</td>
<td>2 3 1 2 2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 24</td>
<td>2 2 1 2 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24 20</td>
<td>2 2 1 2 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td>DETAILS SCORES</td>
<td>EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

PILOT STUDY SAMPLE DRAWINGS A AND B
DRAWING A: BEFORE SENSORY/AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE.
STUDENT NO. 19: VALLEY SCHOOL
DRAWING B: AFTER SENSORY/AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE.

STUDENT NO. 19: VALLEY SCHOOL
APPENDIX G

SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
FOR ART EDUCATORS’ JUDGMENTS FOR
EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES
### SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
FOR ART EDUCATORS' JUDGMENTS FOR
EXPRESSIVE QUALITIES: PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J1 B</th>
<th>J2 B</th>
<th>J3 B</th>
<th>J1 A</th>
<th>J2 A</th>
<th>J3 A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 B</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.65185</td>
<td>0.51894</td>
<td>0.81693</td>
<td>0.57358</td>
<td>0.35811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 B</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.52167</td>
<td>0.61568</td>
<td>0.83453</td>
<td>0.36461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 B</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.42497</td>
<td>0.41666</td>
<td>0.51881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 A</td>
<td>0.81693</td>
<td>0.61568</td>
<td>0.42497</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.73089</td>
<td>0.56974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2 A</td>
<td>0.57358</td>
<td>0.83453</td>
<td>0.41666</td>
<td>0.73089</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.54137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3 A</td>
<td>0.35811</td>
<td>0.36461</td>
<td>0.51881</td>
<td>0.56974</td>
<td>0.54137</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J = JUDGE NUMBER  
A = PRE-TEST JUDGMENTS  
B = POST-TEST JUDGMENTS