INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9022527

**A qualitative exploration of Discipline-Based Art Education and
the Ohio Partnership**

Markey, Jill Reiling, Ph.D.

The Ohio State University, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Markey, Jill Reiling. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION
OF
DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION
AND
THE OHIO PARTNERSHIP

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Jill Reiling Markey, B.A., M.S.T.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University

1990

Dissertation Committee:

Elsie Alberty

Arthur Efland

Nancy MacGregor

Approved by

Nancy MacGregor
Adviser
Department of Art Education

Copyright by
Jill Reiling Markey
1990

To My husband Matt,
in memory of my mother Jane Kirby Reiling,
and most recently,
my brother-in-law, the educator Robert A. LaMendola, Sr.
--Three very special and loving people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people were instrumental in the conception, continuance, and completion of this exploration. Their contributions are acknowledged with appreciation and sentiment:

The participants, faculty, staff, and evaluators of the Ohio Partnership, whose gracious time, cooperation and inspiration during this pioneer year provided the detailed research data;

My committee, Elsie Alberty, Arthur Efland, and especially my adviser and chairperson Nancy MacGregor, whose expertise of guidance, support, and insight throughout this project made it a most gratifying experience;

Other department faculty, fellow graduate students, especially Paul Sproll, other peer reviewers whose names are too many to mention, and with whose encouragement, inquiry, and responses made this exploration that much stronger, coherent, and revealed the true "adult learner" in me;

My loving family, including my new in-laws and close friends from home, for their continued mental sustenance and understanding when I couldn't "be there";

And most of all, my husband, Matt, for his supportive spirit and relieving humor, persevering faith and patience, and endearing love for me with all of my endeavors.

VITA

- 1978B.A. in Art Studio, University of
Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky
- 1979-1980 Part-Time Art Teacher, Kettering
City Schools, Kettering, Ohio
- 1980-1986Art Teacher, Bethel Schools of
Miami County, Tipp City, Ohio
- 1981M.S.T. in Education, University of
Dayton, Dayton, Ohio
- 1987-1988Graduate Student Representative,
Department of Art Education, The
Ohio State University, Columbus,
Ohio
- 1987- PresentGraduate Associate, Department of
Art Education, The Ohio State
University, Columbus, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Art Education

Studies in Qualitative Research Methods: Professor
Robert Donmoyer

Studies in Art Criticism and Aesthetics: Professors
E. Louis Lankford and Terry Barrett

Studies in Curriculum: Professors Nancy MacGregor,
Arthur Efland, and Elsie Alberty

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
VITA	v
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	1
Society	2
Movements	4
Art Education	6
Research	11
Purpose of the Study	14
Significance	15
Research Questions	17
Methodology Overview	18
Limitations	19
Chapter Summary	20
II. LITERATURE SURVEY	
Introduction	22
Writings About the Antecedents	22
Implementation Issues	27
Role-Playing For Review and Change	29
Finance For Review and Change	35
Public, Private, and Co-Financing	37
Public Funds	37
Optimism	40
Private and Public Funding	42
Concerns	47

Chapter Summary	47
III. METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	49
Rationale for a Qualitative Approach	50
Pilot Study	53
Settings and Participants	55
Entree	59
Data Collection	60
Interview Guide	61
Interview Procedure	62
Trustworthiness	63
Subjectivity and Objectivity	64
Data Analysis	69
Chapter Summary	77
IV. FINDINGS	
Introduction	78
Reporting the Findings	79
<u>DBAE</u> : Teacher Interpretations of Implementing the DBAE Concepts	79
<u>Institute</u> : Teacher Attitudes About the Institute in the Implementation Process....	87
<u>Resources</u> : Teacher Views on the Availability and Use of Teaching Resources Impacting the Implementation of DBAE in the Classroom ...	92
<u>Lesson Plans</u> : Teacher Decisions in Planning DBAE Lessons	97
<u>Teamwork</u> : Teacher Interpretations of the School Team and Group Dynamics	103
<u>Assessment and Evaluation</u> : Teacher Utilization and Attitudes About Assessment and/ or Evaluation Tools for Implementation	109
<u>Adult Learner</u> : Teacher Decisions About and Applications of Information that Has or Will Lead to Further Professional Adult Education.....	113
Chapter Summary	116
V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	
Introduction	118
Summary	118
Teacher "A"	119
Teacher "B"	123
Teacher "C"	127
Teacher "D"	132

Discussion	137
Principles, Relationships, and Generalizations	137
Teacher "A"	140
Teacher "B"	143
Teacher "C"	146
Teacher "D"	149
Reflections on the Methodology and Results	152
Relationships of Findings With Previously-Written Work	154
Theoretical Implications	168
Practical Implications	170
APPENDIX	
Data Relative to Chapter I	173
REFERENCES	182

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	PAGE
1. The Ohio Partnership's Graphic Representation of Instructional Objectives	8
2. The Ohio Partnership's Graphic Representation of the Spiral Movement in Ohio	9
3. Sergiovanni's And Starratt's Graphic Representation of Supervisions I and II	13
4. Modified Levels of Use Chart	74
5. Emerged Categories Discussed as Findings	80
6. Graphic Representation of Teacher "A"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories	142
7. Graphic Representation of Teacher "B"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories	145
8. Graphic Representation of Teacher "C"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories	148
9. Graphic Representation of Teacher "D"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories	150
10. Graphic Representation of the Cross-Site Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories	151

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Introduction

This dissertation is a qualitative report of the implementation of a program known as Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE). (Greer, 1984) The exploration was based primarily upon inserviced art teacher interviews conducted during the first year of a DBAE implementation program through the Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts: Regional Institute for Educators. This first chapter presents the background of the study, specifies the problem of the study, describes its significance, offers guiding research questions, and presents an overview of the methodology used. The chapter concludes with the limitations of the study and outlines the following chapters.

Background of the Study

Special background factors make the study of DBAE and its implementation important. The first of such factors to be discussed is the development and change in society. The second set of such factors include major intellectual and philosophical movements. Third, the factors such as the

developments in the field of art education enable teachers to choose by what means they believe they can best reach the needs of their students. Finally, the factor of research may show us that new methods to teach about art seem worth using, or that the new theories need continued testing.

The above four factors can be further described by what effect(s) they can have on the study of a new educational program. First, they heighten the importance of the study to show us why the program is needed to cause change in the educational process. Second, they can provide a special context about the manner in which the new program is executed and received.

Society

Background factors such as developments and needed changes in society are seen in recent national reports. In an educational era when experts believe the "nation is at risk" (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) and systems strive for "excellence", (Smith, 1986; Efland, 1987) many questions have been posed for the benefit of our children, our future, as to "what is to be taught?" and "who is to teach?"

In its report entitled "A Nation at Risk", (April 1983) The National Commission on Excellence in Education requested the attention and reform of many and diverse societal groups. Their request was put in such manner:

... we issue this call to all who care about America and its future: to parents and students; to teachers, administrators, and school board members; to colleges and industry; to union members and military leaders; to governors and State legislators; to the President; to members of Congress and other public officials; to members of learned and scientific societies; to the print and electronic media; to concerned citizens everywhere. America is at risk. (p.14)

This call reminds us that it is the responsibility of each American, no matter what their title, to meet the needs of those to be educated.

In response to the question, "who is to teach?", the Commission recommended that the "teachers" be selected because they are masters at what they do. They must also be recognized for their efforts. They should be paid well, (as are other professionals) contracted, and compensated for additional time spent toward curriculum and professional development. The Commission also said that teachers are entitled to career ladders (as are corporations), and should be able to receive grant and loan incentives for their efforts.

In the quest for excellence in America's education, the Commission considered the ideas of what should be taught. For the purposes of this dissertation, the point to be highlighted in the following passage is the inclusion of art education on the national level:

The curriculum in the crucial eight grades leading to the high school years should be specifically

designed to provide a sound base for study in those and later years in such areas as English language development and writing, computational and problem solving skills, science, social studies, foreign language and the arts. These years should foster an enthusiasm for learning and the development of the individual's gifts and talents.(p.26)

On the same parallel of national educational concerns toward excellence, the field of art education has also been in debate over what should be taught and who shall teach. This brings about the second area of background factors of this study, movements in the field.

Movements

Major intellectual and philosophical movements can be traced. More than twenty years of writings reflect concerns over the "who" and the "what" issues. (Eisner, 1968; Day, 1969; MacGregor, 1970; Clark and Zimmerman, 1978)

Based on such art curricula writings of previous times, Dwain W. Greer (1984) presented four distinct, but inter-woven discipline areas. He termed these disciplines as "art production", "art history", "art criticism", and "aesthetics", and called this group of teaching concepts "Discipline-Based Art Education" (DBAE). Greer's research provides information as to the "what" in art education.

Currently, The J. Paul Getty Trust offers its support through the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, (formed in 1982), to help incorporate a DBAE program in educational

communities across the country. The Getty Trust's goal is "to improve the quality and status of art education in elementary and secondary grades of U.S. public schools". (Duke, 1988) This may be seen as an attempt to help an "at risk" nation. The stated mission of DBAE in the schools is characterized by being inquiry based, integrated, systematically-developed and evaluation-driven, and cooperative. Recognition of DBAE's mission in the schools is presented in terms of five goals: knowledge, experience, planning, partnership, and professionalism. (Eisner, 1985) These five goals may help provide some understanding of "who" is to teach.

Since the Greer article and the beginning of DBAE implementation in some school districts across the nation, the field of art education has been enlivened with discussion, presentations, and literary debates over this program for teaching art in America's schools. One may view such debates as an increase of communication and education enrichment. Others view this approach in other ways, opposing the program for their various reasons. For the purposes of this dissertation, those views of DBAE as an educational and professional enrichment endeavor will be pursued.

Art Education

More specifically, developments in the field of art education form the third area of background factors to this study. They enable teachers to choose what and how they can best reach the needs of their students. Seemingly, with this factor in mind, an institute was established in Ohio with the aid of a Getty grant. It is known as "the Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts: Regional Institute for Educators" and began DBAE inservice and implementation in the summer of 1988. It is one of six such institutes to be supported by the Getty Center. Other institutes are located in Florida, Minnesota, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Texas.

Five goals guide the Ohio Partnership. The first goal, "knowledge", is to "help participants understand and appreciate DBAE principles, content, and methods". The second, "experience", intends to "provide participants with appropriate experiences related to good DBAE curricula, resources, and teaching models". The third goal is to incorporate "planning" by "helping participants adapt their DBAE knowledge and experiences to plan their own DBAE programs in their schools". The fourth goal, the formation of "partnerships" combines the interests of teachers, administrators, and policy makers for implementation on all levels of education. The DBAE implementation plan is based on an annual calendar, beginning with "teacher training" as

"a progressive life-long professional growth process", thus, forming the fifth and final goal.

To begin DBAE implementation in the Ohio region for the summer of 1988, a consortium including the Ohio State University, the Columbus Public Schools, the Ohio Arts Council, and the Ohio Department of Education formed a partnership with school districts, faculty, discipline experts, national consultants, and an advisory committee. The consortium recognized five sectors and instructional objectives to be followed by the Ohio Partnership over a five year implementation plan. Graphic representations of the sectors, their objectives, and the plan can be seen on the following two pages.

One of the five sectors includes the art teachers, sometimes referred to as "specialists". Another includes all classroom teachers in grades kindergarten through twelve. A third sector is comprised of university-based teacher educators. Administrators form the fourth sector, which includes school principals, art supervisors, community leaders, and representatives from art institutions. The fifth and final sector is that of the policy-makers. This fifth sector includes school board members, superintendents, and state department leaders.

Following a spiralling movement in the model, the Ohio Partnership systematically attempts to develop the goals of the Getty Trust and Discipline-Based Art Education in Ohio's

The Ohio Partnership

Instructional Objectives

Figure 1. The Ohio Partnership's Graphic Representation of Instructional Objectives.

The Ohio Partnership

Coverage Of Districts In Our Region

Figure 2. The Ohio Partnership's Graphic Representation of the Spiral Movement in Ohio.

public schools beginning with the central region. In keeping with the Getty's goals and those of the Ohio Partnership, "Instructional Objectives" were drawn to meet the special needs of the five sectors. Since the needs of the administrators and policy-makers seemed to be very similar in nature, the objectives were combined. The same was done with the objectives of the art specialists and the classroom teachers. The needs of the teacher educators were different from either of these two combined sets of objectives, so a third set of objectives were devised for them.

For the administrators and the policy-makers, the Ohio Partnership arranged the following six instructional objectives: Understanding DBAE, Developing Appreciation for Art, Acquiring Educational Resources, Developing Public Relations, Managing Accountability, and Justifying Resources.

Art teachers and classroom teachers were given the following eight instructional objectives by the Ohio Partnership: Learning DBAE Content and Models, Utilizing Resources for DBAE, Adapting DBAE to Students Needs, Using Student Assessment and Becoming Accountable, Networking with Teachers, Integrating DBAE into General Education, Developing Administration Insights, and Growing Professionally.

There were six instructional objectives provided for the sector of teacher educators. They are: Researching DBAE,

Broadening Experience with Art, Analyzing Education Resources, Developing Links with Teachers, Commitment to DBAE, and Growing Professionally.

It is hoped that the implementation will continue to spiral and 'grow' to reach the outer areas of the state over a five year period. After five years, and with the help of other regional institutes, a continuation of the timeline over a conceivable thirty years will extend the education and implementation of DBAE nationwide.

Various central Ohio school districts were selected to represent four quadrants, each offering curriculum and team participants. A Summer Staff Development Program involving all five sectors across the four quadrants took place for three consecutive weeks in June and July, 1988. (See Appendix A for the Three Week Calendar of events).

Research

The implementation of a new curriculum offers many areas for educational research. Research, the fourth and final background factor to be discussed, may show us that new methods of teaching about art seem worth using, or, that the new theories need continued testing. An underlying research interest during the consideration of this study of DBAE and the Ohio Partnership was the potential of strengthening the educating process toward excellence in art education. Common attitudes, beliefs, motivations, or other factors affect

teacher decisions. Gaining some understanding of the factors which influence the processes teachers engage for decision-making and expressing leadership could provide a broader perspective as to how an art curriculum implementation can be an agent for educational excellence.

Research by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) present the characteristics and effects of both the bureaucratic and professional views of teaching. A diagram of both views can be seen on the following page. They pose the problem of teachers being either subordinate or superordinate to the educational system. Both views managed the same work system similar to that of the Ohio Partnership and DBAE which included: "goals, curriculum, teaching models, evaluation systems and tests". (p.35)

The major difference between the two views of teaching are in the allowances of the teacher's role. In the first, the teacher is to be monitored merely as the implementer. The second view empowers the teacher to be a professional decision-maker and leader. It is believed that of the two, only the second view could result in increased teacher satisfaction, commitment, and capability to produce the desired higher student achievement. This second view agrees not only with the Ohio Partnership's goals, but with other research in the areas of staff development (Kridel, 1984) and teaming for success by art teachers, classroom teachers,

Supervisions I and II: The characteristics and effects of bureaucratic and professional views of teaching.

Supervision I: A bureaucratic view of teaching and supervision: Teachers are subordinate to the system .

Supervision II: A professional view of teaching and supervision: Teachers are superordinate to the system

Figure 3. Sergiovanni's and Starratt's Graphic Representation of Supervisions I and II.

principals and other administrators and students. (Dobbs, 1986; Daresch, 1987)

Education researcher William H. Schubert (1986) used several inspirational quotes in his text, Curriculum, of which one is especially appropriate for this study. He quotes the words of John Stuart Mill, ("On Liberty", 1859) which also expresses what I consider the curriculum implementation decision-making process by the learned adult:

He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life, has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgment to foresee, activity to gather materials for decisions, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold his deliberate decision. (p. 410)

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore and analyze common factors affecting elementary art teacher views and decisions during initial DBAE implementation. In this exploration, major attention was given to find evidence toward the overall goal "to improve the quality and status of art education in elementary and secondary grades of U.S. public schools" in terms of art production, art history, art criticism and aesthetics.

Over the years, the field of art education has researched the many areas of content to be taught, who to teach them, and how to teach. (Chapman, 1982; Hatfield, 1986; Ross, 1986) Given the goals of DBAE, this study is concerned with the question "what is the purpose?". The purpose lies in the opportunity given to the teacher to be the decision-maker and leader in the education process, all for the sake of student achievement.

Significance

Amidst the efforts in curriculum implementation, one may ask if it is really worth studying. Implementation research analyst Eugene Bardach answers with his words of wisdom and humor in a policy text by Pressman and Wildavsky. (1984)

Implementation is worth studying precisely because it is a struggle over the realization of ideas. It is the analytical equivalent of original sin; there is no escape from implementation and its attendant responsibilities. What has policy wrought? Having tasted of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the implementer can only answer, and with conviction, it depends..." (p.180)

In program implementation, studies have shown that its ability to promote participant (teacher) satisfaction, their commitment to new concepts, and expansion of professional views, changes and increases the achievement levels of the receivers

(students). (Ashton and Webb, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1987; Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972; Weick, 1976)

The significance of examining a program such as the Ohio Partnership, which is designed to empower teachers as decision-makers and leaders in the education of art for the benefit of their students is threefold. First, it can relate to such areas as the effectiveness of the institute in delivering new concepts. Second, significance can be seen in the willingness of its participants to take on new knowledge as adult learners, and third, it can note any change (or lack of it) in the classroom.

Possible benefits of the study are many. First, new knowledge may provide insights that apply to theory, research, and practice in the field of art education. Second, applications for evaluation aspects of DBAE may be drawn. Evaluation results may help the teachers continue their own education and further develop art curricula, specifically on the elementary level.

Other benefits of this study may provide direction for further research as to the influence of these various perspectives in relation to DBAE on several levels and over a longer period of implementation. This study will also serve as the springboard for continued use and the future of educating with a specific purpose. The Ohio Partnership's five year plan of

implementation will allow time for any necessary re-grouping and alteration of the plan with the results of this particular research.

The group of selected art teachers, with the approval and support of their administrators, were knowledgeable, not only about their area of special interests, but also about curriculum design. Resources, references, instructional materials, and evaluation methods were provided by the Ohio Partnership to aid DBAE implementation. The planning of lessons considered the aims of the Ohio guidelines as well as the needs of their students. New knowledge and guidance were also provided to them to expand their views and continue as adult learners.

It was hoped that these empowered teachers would be able to critique the DBAE program according to its use in their classrooms. It will then be their critical judgment as to what aspects of the art production, history, criticism, and aesthetics program they select to teach their students. It is also the implementation that will be crucial to the importance, acceptance, and continuance of the program.

Research Questions

A list of questions was kept as a guide for observation and interview. Such questions follow the

ethnographic model discussed in "Cognitive Anthropology and Research On Effective Principals". (Donmoyer, 1985)
They were developed from the "Grand Tour" category to the more specific in nature and are:

1. Describe the setting in terms of size of district, classes, art room, types of students, class routine, amount of teaching time, lesson planning, activities...
2. Have the art teachers noted any changes in their environment? In their students? In the other classroom teachers of their school? Community? If so, in what ways? Are they considered improvements? Why? Why not?
3. Describe any adaptation of DBAE made in order to meet the student's needs.
4. In what ways are any aspects of DBAE incorporated into the school's general curriculum?
5. What art education resources are available and how are they utilized and evaluated in the school/art room?
6. What is involved in the planning of art lessons?
7. How do you assess the lessons taught in art?
8. What are the teacher's views of DBAE, the institute and their involvement in such a program?
9. How does the teacher see herself as the adult learner, including her education background, how she views her own teaching of art, and any professional plans for the future.

Methodology Overview

Since this was a study of teacher views and decisions made in the implementation process of a new curriculum, it involved everyday classroom life in

terms of teacher negotiations in creating, testing, evaluating, and altering daily, weekly, and monthly lesson plans. The research methodology for a study such as this had to remain general and flexible so as to evolve around any unforeseeable areas that developed over the course of time.

The chosen methodology was qualitative in nature, intended to describe multiple-sites by participant - observation and focused interview. (Merton, Fiske, and Kendall, 1956; Denzin, 1970; Dexter, 1970; Lofland, 1971) The research questions are general and follow the Ohio Partnership's objectives. They allow flexibility for the teachers to respond to the many aspects of DBAE with respect to its implementation in their schools. Fieldwork data collection included interviews, observations of general meetings, photographs, documents about the project, and written materials by the teachers. Data analysis followed the constant comparative methods of developing theory (Glaser, 1978, Lofland, 1971) and the "Levels of Use". (Hall, 1975)

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study. One is that it covers only the first-year implementation stage of the DBAE program in central Ohio's public schools. Second, there is an exclusion of many members of the

"Ohio Partnership". Second, even though collaborating classroom teachers, principals, students, and district supervisors may have offered information on their own, (as they were not to be interviewed), the main participants for this study included only one art teacher from each school district. Third, since the procedures described are not standardized, as is indicative of qualitative research, the approach was extremely time-consuming. Fourth, multiple sites, (in this case, four) provide multiple data of which reduction was difficult.

Chapter Summary

This first chapter offered the background of the study, its statement of purpose, significance, and limitations. The background was presented by way of special factors that make the exploration of a new curriculum and its implementation important to society, intellectual and philosophical movements, the field of art education, and research. Information about the inception of DBAE, its supporters, as well as those who were studied during its implementation was also offered.

More specific ideas about DBAE's antecedents and possible implementation processes for funding will be presented in Chapter II, "Literature Survey". The

research questions and methodology overview presented in this chapter will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter III. Data gathered during teacher interviews and organized according to emergent categories will be found in Chapter IV, "Findings". "Summaries, Conclusions, and Implications" from the study will be offered in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE SURVEY

Introduction

A survey of the literature for insight on this research was found to be most advantageous for me. Although quite extensive, the list of writings was simplified by forming categories. Such categories include art curriculum antecedents of DBAE and teacher education as well as the implementation and funding of educational programs. Contributions in each of these categories proved to be significant to this study and they, in the form of a list, will be presented in this chapter.

Writings About the Antecedents

Many writers of art curricula preceded the publication "Art as a Serious Subject of Study" (Greer, 1984) which introduced the term Discipline-Based Art Education, or, "DBAE". Art educator and historian Arthur Efland (1987) notes such major writers as Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, Elliot Eisner, Stanley Madeja, Guy Hubbard, Mary Rouse, Frances Hine, and Harry Broudy as contributors to DBAE. Two of them in particular made their marks in the field of

education with their ideas of curriculum and teacher education. Barkan's (1965) and Eisner's (1965) presentations at the Seminar on Research and Curriculum Development at Penn State shed new light on the nature of art curricula and the classroom teacher, ("generalist") in the curriculum.

As the Getty Trust's program officer, M.J. Price (1987) wrote about the constant need to further investigate various concepts in the field of art education. One of them being DBAE, she encouraged this continuous investigation through speech and the written word when she wrote: "The explication of discipline-based art education is an evolving process that includes the continuing articulation, refinement, and application of concepts." (p.vii) The Getty Center's director is Leilani Lattin Duke. Duke (1988) has written several explanatory and promotional articles about the Getty DBAE curriculum. The Center's first major publication of DBAE, Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools (1985) offers articles by several writers and highlights prime researchers in the field. In it, Ernest Boyer (1985) gives a perspective for "Art as Language" in the schools. William F. Kieschnick (1985) explores the "benefits of the signals received from artistic creation" and Elliot Eisner (1985) offers "the case for art and art education". Because of their expertise in DBAE research and evaluation, several writers are also highlighted in this

publication. They are: Brent Wilson, Robert Stake, Marjorie Wilson, and Michael Day.

The Journal of Aesthetic Education (Summer, 1987)

published a special issue entirely about DBAE. Its collection of articles were of recent reflections and discussions by several authors. The issue became a primary resource to the antecedents of DBAE for this study.

Four articles about the antecedents were included in the Journal's special issue. One was by Ralph Smith (1987) concerning theory and how it has changed in art education. A second article was written by Evan J. Kern. (1987) It dealt with curriculum documents available from state departments.

Arthur Efland's (1987) historical contribution to the special issue reviewed DBAE curriculum antecedents. Although it is not the purpose of this survey to describe them in-depth, a mention of some of them may be helpful to more fully understand this study. Some of the DBAE curriculum antecedent programs are known as "CEMREL's Aesthetic Education Program", "Art Instruction Through Television for the Elementary Schools", Laura Chapman's "Curriculum Planning Model", Hubbard and Rouse's "Art: Meaning, Method, and Media", "The Kettering Project", "The SWRL Elementary Art Program", and "The Aesthetic Eye Project". Efland discussed the attributes of each in terms of their problematic issues and offered recommendations. In view of Efland's writings on the problems prior to DBAE, other

writers were researched for this study. From their own research, many have been found to favor its curriculum and are optimistic of its success.

A fourth "antecedent" article in the special issue was that by Maurice Seigny (1987). It is important to this study because of its highlighted areas on DBAE and teacher education.

The journal's organization of DBAE research continued in three other areas. One provided a rationale for the study of DBAE. To support the rationale, the collaborative efforts of Gilbert Clark, Michael Day, and Dwain Greer (1987) wrote about 'becoming students of art'. Another area included contributions by one expert in each of the four disciplines: art production, (Frederick Spratt, 1987) art history, (W. Eugene Kleinbauer, 1987) art criticism, (Howard Risatti, 1987) and aesthetics. (Donald Crawford, 1987) The final research area was that of DBAE and learning. To illustrate, David Henry Feldman (1987) wrote "Developmental Psychology and Art Education: Two Fields at the Crossroads".

In 1988, the National Art Education published a collection of writings with a format similar to that of the 1987 Journal of Aesthetic Education. However, the articles were copies of the originals published over a period of about twenty years. The group of "antecedents" for this publication included Eisner's (1968) Kettering Elementary Art Curriculum, Day's (1969) research with junior high

applications in art history and studio, and Nancy MacGregor's (1970) article "Criticism in the Arts and Art Education".

At least two prominent research publications are most related to this qualitative study of art teacher views and actions concerning curriculum implementation. One is a descriptive study of community art teachers with implications for teacher preparation and cultural policy. (Degge, 1987) The second, and considered a most significant report, is by the Rand Corporation (1984) which conducted its own cross-site analysis of art history, art criticism, and art production of seven districts in the United States. A brief summary of the Rand study's conclusions are offered in Beyond Creating by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (1985) and are listed below:

1. Support for art education must be broadened.
2. Model programs must be developed to guide practice.
3. Professional development at all educational levels must support training and instruction for such programs.
4. The knowledge base must be expanded to inform training, program development, and methodology.
(p.70)

Theoretically, the implementation of DBAE will provide information viewed first as teacher training. In the summer of 1988, the teachers of the Ohio Partnership began a

life-long professional growth process based on the spiral model. This process is hoped to provide a built-in repetition of a high level of understanding and competence. It is hoped that the teachers will then be able to instruct their students under the ideals of DBAE toward excellence in education.

At this point in the survey of literature relating to curriculum review and change toward DBAE, it may be best to also take a look at the implementation process and the issues it brings concerning a responsibility for financial support. Recalling the requests to aid 'a nation at risk' presented at the beginning of this dissertation, implementation issues to be discussed through the literature are those involving role-playing, views of financial assistance, and public, private, and co-financing tactics.

Implementation Issues

Today's drive for excellence in education has challenged our public institutions with several issues concerning curriculum development. To insure quality educational programs, a call for review and change has been made. (Rand, 1974, 1978; Savage and Skolnick, 1985; Hall and Hord, 1987) Updating and maintaining curriculum effectiveness has also been challenged by the ever-increasing budgetary constraints from declining enrollments, decreased monetary revenues, increased operating costs, and cutbacks in teachers and

their reassignments. (Halpern, 1982; Bradford and Gordon, 1984)

Schools may evaluate or review, develop or adopt, implement, and maintain the curriculum. Each process results in some sort of change. Hall and Hord (1987) cite the 1974 and 1978 "Rand Change Agent Study" as having researched issues concerning the success of an implementation project. The issues did not necessarily rest on the adoption of a curriculum, but more on its implementation. The study was conducted from 1973-1977 and consisted of school districts which had received federal "seed" money to create, introduce, and spread the use of innovative educational practices. It was found that one of the greatest problems of new curriculum implementation was to convince teachers and administrators that they need to do something different. They must change. In addition to staff training, other key processes of successful curriculum implementation include adaptive or constant planning for the needs of the local setting, materials development or adaptation, and the access of a critical group of innovators who are determined to provide support for one another and for the innovation. An example of this approach has already been discussed with the research by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) with the views of bureaucratic and professional teaching.

Methods for implementing new curricula involve a commitment to "curriculum politics". (Savage and Skolnick,

1985) There are strategies that can encourage change in all areas of curriculum development. Savage and Skolnick suggest methods for change that could be considered 'down to earth', 'light on the budget', and objective by all levels of the teaching profession. An overview of the methods includes four areas. They are: Research, Development, Diffusion, and Adoption. From these four areas, Savage and Skolnick suggest activities such as: 1. Inventing, 2. Engineering, 3. Informing, 4. Demonstrating, 5. Testing, 6. Installing, and 7. Establishing. Each of these processes are what Savage and Skolnick consider instrumental to achieve change in educational implementation.

The Issue of Role-Playing for Review and Change

The areas of principal and teacher roles in curriculum implementation have been of vital interest to several researchers. (Rand Corporation, 1974, 1978; Cavanagh and Styles, 1983; Kimpston, 1985; Lieberman, 1986; Van Den Akker, 1988; Eisner, 1988) Successful Rand study programs (1974, 1978) on change and implementation showed teachers and administrators working together as a team for improved student learning. The Rand Change Agent Study (1978:31) quoted researchers Hall and Hord who dealt specifically with the role of the principal. They said:

"In general, the more supportive the principal was perceived to be, the higher was the percentage of

project goal achieved, the greater the improvement in student performance, and the more extensive the continuation of project methods and material."
(Hall and Hord, 1987, p.39-40)

Elliot Eisner (1988) offers a similar focus on the role of the principal in arts education curriculum development and implementation. He promotes the curriculum concept of DBAE because he believes it encourages principals to help strengthen the teaching of the arts in their schools. Eisner sees this strength by offering four suggestions. First, in addition to art-related activities found in science, math, social studies, and writing, he suggests that principals allow enough time each week for arts education alone. Second, Eisner suggests that principals provide leadership in both formal and informal teacher support and implementation programs. The third suggestion for principals is to enlist their community's support as well. By this he believes that principals should ask parents and community leaders to not only exhibit arts education activities, but note its benefits to education as well. Fourth and last, Eisner encourages principals to provide opportunities for teachers to teach other teachers. Allowing teachers some "free" time for visits to, and feedback of other teacher's classrooms has proven to be a great program strengthener. Overall, even though Eisner supports the implementation of DBAE, his views of increased principal roles in an implementation process supports the Rand Study findings and

can be applied to other art education programs or curriculum studies.

Research by Richard D. Kimpston (1985) of the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis is based on the implementation tasks employed by teachers to insure curriculum fidelity. He was inspired by the 1978 findings and statement by Loucks and Lieberman: "It is not yet known what should be done to successfully implement new curricula". (Kimpston, p.185) Kimpston wanted to improve the means toward successful curriculum implementation. He explored the area of teacher beliefs and found that participation and involvement in curriculum implementation tasks were most important especially to those teachers who followed the district's prescribed curriculum.

The effectiveness of teacher involvement of curriculum implementation can also be seen in the work of Ann Lieberman (1986) and Jan Van Den Akker. (1988) They both encourage situations where the teacher is also the learner. Lieberman says that the teachers involved in a curriculum development study "were not afraid of doing the hard work of R&D when they could see benefit to themselves and to their school districts". Van Den Akker viewed the 'teacher as learner' role to be of vital importance to the success of the program. Such research interests were based on the argument that more attention should be given to the teachers because of the many factors which can influence the teacher's actual

use of the curriculum to be implemented. Van Den Akker devised a method of research to find the teachers' views of the problems of implementation. The researcher found that such problems included teachers' difficulties with lesson preparation, background knowledge and confidence, adapting to 'learning by inquiry', and effective learning practices. Therefore, Van Den Akker stresses that new curriculum implementation should involve the teacher as much as the student in the learner role for a more successful program. A quote from Lieberman (1986) best summarizes these studies by saying: "Let us nurture the teachers along with the children. " (p.189)

A study by Cavanagh and Styles (1983) of new curriculum guides and policy implementations in Canada offered twenty of the most often-used objections to implementation. They found that when mandates are made to change classroom practices and/or school procedures, both teachers and principals alike usually object. (Their findings and responses offer a review of what I believe to be the most relevant questions and issues concerning curriculum implementation.)

To summarize the Cavanagh and Styles study as a whole, most of the issues dealt with negative comments toward change, and a mistrust in professional experience. Those studied felt that implementation wasted too much of their time and energy and that the outcomes were not important

enough to study. The participants objected to new curricula either because they didn't have any input or felt it was the job of the administration to develop and design. After all, they felt, the administrators are the ones who receive the glory for this kind of work anyway. As we have seen earlier, Elsner addressed the issue of providing "released" time as well as money for resources and materials. To the Cavanagh and Styles participants, implementation confused school and classroom priorities and they already had too many guides from which to work. Some messages were contradictory. They concluded that the teachers would like to be left alone to implement since "it is the teacher's responsibility", but complained that there was no follow-up after the "fan-fare beginning".

Some of the statements and objections were similar to those of Peter London's (March, 1988) letter to the editor of The Journal of Art Education, as well as in his collaborated effort Beyond DBAE (1988). London's words echo the statements of five years ago and connect them to DBAE implementation. Compared with the 1983 objection:

I've been teaching for 20 years. What makes you think you've got something better to offer me?
(Cavanagh and Styles, 1983, p.10),

London's 1988 cry...

... Have "serious and informed" looking at and talking about art been things that only I have

been doing these last twenty-five years?... For the life of me, I can't find anything more than this which is proposed by DBAE". (The Journal of Art Education, March, 1988, p.5)

...sounds very similar. Not much has changed in the past five years of teacher reactions to implementing new curricula. This issue remains to be addressed by the field of art education and perhaps can be attempted by the research from this dissertation.

The Cavanagh and Styles response to the "I've been teaching for twenty-plus years..." issue can be given to Peter London today. They suggest that an 'openness of mind to new possibilities for productive and creative variations on already sound practices' should do away with London's position that 'everything needed to learn has already been learned'.

Cavanagh and Styles also offered some factors of a practical implementation model as a response to the twenty objections. One factor is that of potential activities, (they list twenty) such as announcement of new policies, orientation meetings, and adoption of long-term plans for follow-up. A second factor involves the policies and curricula objectives, such as resources, evaluation practices, and timelines. Third, (and what I believe to be the most important of all factors) involves the people with their ideas, beliefs, attitudes, decisions, and actions.

The Issue of Finance for Review and Change

Of all the questions and issues uncovered in the Cavanagh and Styles document, one in particular is what I believe to be just as relevant to this study as implementation. The importance is with those who are the implementers. It refers to the issue of money and financial support for implementation. The researchers quote an issue stated by teachers: "If the board officials are really serious about the implementation, why don't they put their money where their mouth is". Cavanagh's and Styles' response to this issue is "to equate implementation of a new policy automatically with monetary costs is a false assumption". (p.12)

Some art educators feel that financial support of DBAE implementation by the Getty Trust is wrong. Robertson (1988) says that the Getty "creates a situation in which ideas are not competing on an equal basis because funding enables implementation and promulgation of one set of ideas over others", and wonders "whether scholars are going for the funds or the ideas".

London scoffs at the financial support issue when art education deals with DBAE implementation and Getty money as an additive source for funding a program. He degrades curriculum development missions under the encouragement of

"a hefty endowment", and "visions of fluttering bucks danced merrily around our heads".

Also from the field of art education are Harry S. Broudy (1968), Vincent Lanier (1980), and R. Bersson (1988) who join London in his low regards for such support by a private foundation.

Lanier (1980) questions the funding of arts education by either a private or public institution with what he sees as an un-yielding administration. He views DBAE supporters as having un-flexible rules. He believes they do not give-in to the democratic way of developing aesthetic choices. Lanier asks "What shall we do with the arts bureaucracy?"

Broudy (1968) classified followers of a program such as DBAE as belonging to a certain class of people, "social elites" he called them, and in his statement about arts education and elitism he says:

...elites, if they survive, are not stupid, and what they consistently prefer probably has some shrewd, albeit not always explicit justification. They are no more stupid about education than about power and money. (p.280)

Bersson (1988) refers to DBAE's supporters as 'elitists' in that he thinks the values of multi-ethnic, cultural and popular arts are distorted under corporate powers and political interests. The Getty Trust has responded to Bersson's accusations in its support of the DBAE program in an active way. They have made certain that such values are

incorporated in every regional institute, including the Ohio Partnership. Evidence of this can be seen in the three week agenda in the Appendix of this dissertation.

In summary, each of these art educators are against using private money to support public programs in the arts, especially one that deals with aesthetics, and view the taking of it as belonging to the elite crowd.

Whatever, the means to attain the goal of excellence in education continually needs to be financed. This budgeting operation can be seen in several perspectives: public funding, private funding, or a combination of both.

The Issue of Public, Private, and Co-Financing for Review and Change

Public Funds

While few will disagree that a local community has the major responsibility for setting educational policy, the role of the federal government in this matter has received much attention. Our nation's policymakers say they continuously support educational funding and see it as a governmental duty and honor. Documents have been written in favor of promoting federal funding for education. (The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986; Congressional Budget Office, 1987) Those with high hopes of increased federal, state, and local funding do so for several different reasons. Some favor public funding for

the support of their candidate in the next election. Others view quality education as an indicator for national economic development. Still others, are for educational systems staying only with public funding in light of what critics say about foundations.

A spring 1988 Gallup Poll (Begeman, The Lantern, August 8, 1988) showed education to be a front-running campaign issue for the Democrats and Republicans. Thirteen issues from drugs to aids to deficit and the quality of our nation's educational system were ranked in importance. Education was considered first or second in importance by three-fourths of the population polled. Increase in general aid to public school systems was favored by sixty-six percent, and sixty-three percent voted for an improved teaching profession status.

It is interesting to see that the Gallup Poll noted sixty-three percent of the participants were also in favor of giving teachers additional authority to determine educational program and policy. This was an issue previously discussed in this chapter on 'teacher involvement in curriculum development and implementation'.

Linking economic development to quality education is a belief held by many today. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) (1986) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) (1987) believe that good schools reap economic growth, thus, increasing our chances

to attract new industries and become more competitive in the world market. The ASCD says that "the economic worth of people is increased to the extent that they receive an excellent education". (p.47) This group of public-funding-hopefuls are confident their proposals to policymakers will 'empower them to enter the policy arena as leaders'. (p.47)

The CBO reports that several current proposals meant to gather or disseminate educational information such as research and development (R&D) will receive direct federal financial support. Also, they note that state-by-state comparisons of student achievement will be expanded. The CBO boasts that together, federal, state, and local governments can control most aspects of educational policy and practice. The co-operative legislative efforts provide over ninety percent of policy and practice, which is most of the funds for public education.

On the national level, the fact of the matter is that there just isn't and won't be enough money to go around to all educational institutions for their programs. This fact especially applies to the areas of research and development. The Chronicle of Higher Education (Cordes, Nov. 4, 1987) cites a case of not enough funds being provided by the federal government and those available funds are being directed elsewhere. They see spending on R&D only rising three percent this year; a slower rate of growth than at any

time since 1977. The Chronicle quoted the National Science Foundation Study: "Seventy percent of all current federal spending on research and development goes to defense-related work". (p.A1)

The stock market crash of October 1987 made many economists weary of a stable financial budget for higher education. Reluctance on the parts of governors and state legislators to increase taxes will hurt the state support for education. The same issue of The Chronicle (Jaschik, 1987) also quoted state funds for higher education as being 'slightly more than thirty-four billion dollars for 1987-88', which is an 'eleven percent increase over 1985-86, but still only equals the lowest in twenty-nine years'. (p.A1)

Optimism

With my personal concern for arts education, I found a survey entitled "Americans and the Arts V" (Philip Morris Companies, Inc., 1988) which interviewed one thousand-five-hundred and one adults in the spring of 1987. Results showed that sixty-seven percent of the public thinks that arts education is essential. Seventy-two percent of those surveyed said they would pay more taxes "to make sure that children in school will be able to learn more about the arts". This is a strong indication that monies spent on arts

education could be found either through governmental support or private donations.

Brent Wilson, a researcher for the National Endowment for the Arts, compiled a report requested by congress entitled "Art Education, Civilization and the 21st Century" (1988). In it, he pleaded for more financial support in arts education. He also said that Congressmen and "people in high places" are the ones who pass the "OK" for federal funding of arts education. Given the report on the current status, and how best to improve the quality of arts education, they may see arts education as important. In this light, federal funding and support may be seen optimistically.

Optimism rang true in Wilson's concluding reflections when he said "If Congress supports the recommendations, it could signal a new era for arts education". (p.14) His recommendations urged state legislators, school board members, and school administrators to work in cooperation with other policy-makers on the national, regional, state, and local levels. These policy-makers could be representatives from teacher education programs, professional arts associations, and arts organizations. A concentrated effort by these groups, along with those of arts advocacy and arts educational materials publishers, hopes to bring about worthwhile change.

The NAEA/Wilson report provided statistical and narrative information on the current status of arts

education as well as implications for the future. It included arts teachers, educational leadership, and the structure of arts education. The Philip Morris report indicated possible voter support, or at least an interest. The next obvious step is to find financial support from the "higher-ups" or private funding, or both.

Private and Public Funding

There are those who see the advantages of funding educational programs from both the private and public sectors. They favor additional educational support by private corporations and foundations such as how the Getty Trust supports arts education. (Cramer, 1983; Bentley and Balz, 1986; Hopkins, 1987; Bailey, 1987; Strassburger, 1988)

Making the 'corporate way of thinking' a means for educational program success is one way John Strassburger (1988) believes in promoting and increasing the quality of a liberal arts program. Despite the debates over curricular adjustments in the liberal arts, Strassburger says it's time they take note on how corporations promote their own market and apply corporate success stories to vocationalism and teaching students to promote themselves for the market.

The need for change in the nature and source of support in the very near future is anticipated. Corporate voluntary gift and tax support research gives new hope to the joint support for education. Richard Bentley and Frank Balz (1986)

studied the trends of financial support to higher education over a twenty-year span. They used data from the Council for Financial Aid to Education and found the growth of corporate gifts to be much faster than that of corporate tax or foundation gift support. This information gives hope to those seeking private funding for educational programs through corporations, even though corporate taxes make up for about eighty-nine percent of the total corporate support.

Today's growing interests in cultural and political issues are competing with education for 'attention' and financial support. Because of this, David Crandall, writer of "The Structure of External Support in the United States", (Hopkins, 1987, p. 122-124) notes a tension between education's local and "external support systems". Efforts for school improvements through implementation will reflect the diversity in our nation's schools and will likewise need a diverse system to fund the efforts. Crandall's ideas on the external support system are welcomed to provide funding diversity.

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) (Nightingale, 1986) noted the tension between the centralized provincial direction and the implementation of curriculum standards by a local school board. It was an educational 'conflict of conservatism and progressivism' in Ontario. It is also known

to have been long-established, due to the country's vast territorial and cultural diversities. Meetings with two opposing forces resulted in a unique "co-existence" where they both met their goals while working with each other to achieve those goals. Revisions for funding, expenditures, and curriculum implementation were among the shared responsibilities assigned for the setting of performance standards by both the province and local school boards.

Advice to those seeking private support for their educational programs is offered by researchers who have studied the system or have even done it themselves. (Schaub, 1982; Woodside, 1984; Halpern, 1982; Bradford and Gordon, 1984; Cramer, 1983)

Economic analysis and educational funding research by Robert Halpern (1982) enables him to give a prospective program director some advice before launching into a private support campaign. He encourages future directors to seek both public and private funding because of rising costs, greater demand for the funds, and an overall competition for decreasing federal funds. Halpern characterizes the roles of early childhood program directors and says they should:

...plan to acquire income from a mixture of sources -- government, business, fees from families, and other fundraising activities. Relying on public funding is not wise, because such funding will become scarcer and more competitive to acquire... The amount of corporate and private foundation money will grow slightly,

but competition for that money will increase dramatically.(p.28)

Advice also comes from a group known as "The Learning Exchange: A Metropolitan Educational Resource Center". (Bradford and Gordon, 1984) They are a non-profit organization which sympathizes with "frustrated" educators in the federal budget squeeze. Like Halpern, The Exchange also offers advice on how directors can "find, approach, and tap into" available private resources. We saw an interest in education improvement for economic development with the hopefuls of the public sector. The Exchange, like the Getty Trust, is seen as a representative of the private sector. It is also interested in education for the betterment of our citizens toward economic growth. The Exchange says that foundations are concerned with "quality of life issues" just as much as those in public policy.

Bradford and Gordon wrote about the Exchange's success story using arts education as an example. It is one that I found to be directly related to my study and the efforts I have seen put forth by the Ohio Partnership thus far. It is explained that The Learning Exchange approached corporations and foundations and received support for training teachers to "help students appreciate art". They recognized the private funders as wanting an appreciation in the arts to grow, "hopefully resulting in an improved quality of life

that will attract and keep high caliber employees in the city where funders operate". (p.60)

My conclusion from these reports is that the combination of "competition" and "tension" appears to be another tug at public financial support. So, a consideration of private and public funding may be what is in store for the future of educational support.

Two more institutions have experienced success in joining corporate forces with governmental funding for public education. One is the case of Eastern Michigan University's Language and International Trade Program. (Schaub, 1982) Here, a Title VI grant was awarded for degree programs after failing to receive federal funds. They claim the success of the program is in the curriculum, involving the student exchanges with business schools in Germany, France, and Spain, and they anticipate more support from the corporate sector in the future.

The second group to enjoy success through public and private partnership is the "Join-A-School" program. (Woodside, 1984) Its goal is to increase the number of small local schools. The program directors are pleased with the increased corporate funding for the welfare of its public schools and their curriculum implementation programs, but insist that school improvement is the ultimate responsibility of the federal government.

Concerns

The additional support of private funding for education may be an enticing route, but its critics find drawbacks just as enticing about which to write. Educational foundation-forming and corporate-funding critics share their concerns in an article by Jerome Cramer (1983). Their ideas formulate significant financial issues for curriculum development and implementation. Cramer asks of the schools contemplating private funding:

If you're unsuccessful in convincing your public to give adequate support to your schools through taxes, how long are corporations and wealthy individuals going to bail you out? (p.37)

Other arguments may be summarized in four ways. First, the concept of equal education for all is violated. Second, existing inequities among school systems are continued by the additional support of foundations. Third, financial mis-management with foundations opens the opportunities for fraud. Fourth, foundation board members may make decisions that might have an impact on the curriculum, thus, changing the nature of school governance.

Chapter Summary

In summary, the issues of teacher and principal roles in implementation and their financial support for review and

change in our schools contribute to our nation's drive for "excellence in education". People from many walks of life-- presidential candidates, government policy-makers, business leaders, teachers, principals, program directors, economists, and researchers-- all have been seen to own some part in the education of our students and how they would like to contribute to the quality of the system.

Cases of reformation of the need and interest to include teachers in the curriculum development and implementation processes have been presented. The role of the principal has been seen more as a key component in the support that teachers and the system need in implementation. The implementation process is not without financial problems, so issues of funding have been raised and commented on in the areas of private and public involvement.

The means for gathering data for this study of DBAE implementation will be presented in the following chapter, "Methodology".

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A qualitative research approach was the methodology used for this study. It was chosen for its compatibility to the background rationale of DBAE curriculum implementation, the guiding research questions, and the purpose of the effort. Information about "what was taught" and "who taught" toward excellence in education was gathered. In a more focused sense, descriptive data about DBAE implementation within an inserviced region were needed to explore and analyze the program. This was done by way of the teacher seen as a decision-maker and leader in the classroom. This chapter offers a rationale for a qualitative approach, information about the pilot study upon which this dissertation exploration was based, and a brief description of the settings, participants, and how entree was sought. Also described are the methods of data collection and analysis. Such descriptions include the interview guide and procedure as well as some notes about issues concerning trustworthiness, subjectivity, and objectivity.

Rationale for a Qualitative Approach

Like most social institutions, schools prove to be more complex than anticipated. A qualitative, or, naturalistic design was chosen for its ability to be flexible to the complexities of the educational institution and accommodate its needs. In some instances of a data gathering process, misfortunes occur. Certain people as informants, situations, or documents are not accessible to the researcher. In order to negotiate access to the sites and gain cooperation from the respondents, a working design of qualitatively collecting data by several means were the tools used.

In the past, qualitative or naturalistic "descriptive" studies have posed some controversies in the field of research. This is partly because unlike quantitative or statistical research, qualitative studies are relatively new, and therefore, do not have the history of applications and successes one would find in other methodologies. Descriptive data or "soft" data (Bogdan, 1972) is unusual from the perspective of quantitative "hard" data and is not easily handled statistically. Here, research primarily deals with various experimental procedures, structured interviews, inventories, and some questionnaires to which numbers can be applied for analysis. Literature has shown that over time, the soft data became more appropriate for particular studies, and as Bogdan and Biklen (1982) note:

Many researchers in education had come to feel that the years of promise for what quantitative research would be able to do (the problems it could solve) had caught up with it. Quantitative methods, relying on the hard science paradigm, had not delivered. As the vision widened, qualitative approaches caught people's imagination. And so, qualitative research mushroomed in education. (p.21)

Qualitative approaches may provide a "complimentary study", (Krueger, 1987) allowing it to view social interaction in a natural setting. Rather than obtaining data to be numerically tabulated as in quantitative studies, qualitative data does not overlook the more interpretive aspects of the classroom activities, nor the priorities and concerns of the teacher. Willis (1977) offers the wisdom of recording social interaction:

Quantitative studies often consider only the most easily observed and empirically verifiable characteristics of the environment. Qualitative studies usually attempt more fully to consider both observed characteristics and specific qualities perceived as personal forms of meaning. (Krueger, p.2)

Unlike statistical quantities, naturalistic studies allow one to obtain first-hand knowledge about the problem in question. Filstead (1970) states:

Qualitative methodology allows the researcher to "get close to the data," thereby developing the analytical, conceptual, and categorical components of explanation from the data itself, rather than from the preconceived, rigidly structured, and highly quantified techniques...and operational

techniques that the researcher has constructed.
(p.6)

Bruyn (1966) compares the analytical viewpoints between quantitative and qualitative researchers:

The traditional empiricist considers himself (as a scientist) to be the primary source of knowledge, and trusts his own senses and logic more than he would trust that of his subjects. The participant observer, on the other hand, considers the interpretations of his subjects he recreates in his own imagination and experience the thoughts and feelings which are in the minds of those he studies. (p.12)

Some critics say that quantitative research's standard methods of gathering data according to the hypotheses and numbered records make it "systematic". Therefore, they say, it is more easily accepted and seemingly more popular for credibility. However, the procedures of qualitative research allow it to be systematic even though it is not standard. Continual revision and re-testing of the hypotheses changes the research questions because of the unanticipated answers and observations encountered in the course of the study, but, this is a process. Although time consuming and tedious, the process becomes systematic, and can be repeated over and over again by another researcher. Qualitative models for this study have been provided by the research of Schwab, (1979) Hadley, (1982) Gutterman, (1983) Neuman, (1986), and Esselstein. (1987)

It is interesting to see that both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies were applied in a recent report by the National Endowment for the Arts on the views of Art Education. (Wilson, 1988) The author's stated goal was to not only provide a statistical representation, mandates, and requirements of arts education in today's American schools, but also that of the practice of arts education.

In this example, qualitative research and narration gave Wilson the unique opportunity to present possible art education experiences of a hypothetical student across the grades and across the nation. Examples of arts education practices were also viewed in various situations, under differing conditions, and with different teachers, practices, and policies.

Results of the research were none too surprising. The most obvious is that such an endeavor would have been quite an undertaking and extremely time-consuming. The report settled on offering examples of the practice in the art classrooms from that of the researcher's vantage point, from that of the art teacher, and a sampling of the "child's-eye-view".

Pilot Study

In order to provide me with data-gathering experience and the study with some baseline information, a pilot study was

conducted. The pilot study became the first phase of the dissertation inquiry and took place about two and one-half months before the first teacher inservice with the Ohio Partnership. The third grade classroom of one school in a large district was selected and used because of its plans to be involved in the first year of implementation.

The teacher-participants were told that this pilot study was entitled "An Exploration of Elementary Art" and knew that it had something to do with the DBAE implementation for the following school year. Background information was given to both the art specialist and classroom teacher. It included a brief overview of the study's purpose, procedures to be followed, expected duration of participation and possible benefits. Each teacher read and signed the voluntary consent form for participation in the study according to the guides set by the Ohio State University's Human Subjects Review Committee.

General areas of inquiry about their classes, project resources, and procedures of lesson planning were orally presented in focused interviews to which the participant was able to respond onto an audio tape. I made some written notes, but the goal was to allow for a free-flowing conversation about art education in the school. Descriptive data were derived from the visits to the school, omitting any identifying names for participant anonymity. The information was then subdivided according to the source such

as observation, photographs, interviews, lesson plans, and personal reflections. A presentation of the pilot study data along with some analysis were discussed with fellow graduate students and a cooperating professor of qualitative research. It is important to note that the findings from the pilot study will not be presented in this dissertation but they and the experience re-shaped the proposed research format to what was conducted for the year-long study.

Settings and Participants

The belief in a strong educational base for art instruction found in elementary schools lies in my background. Therefore, the lower grade levels were chosen as the setting for this study with a focus on the third grade as the middle of the scope. Four elementary art teachers, one from each of the quadrants in the Central Ohio sector of the Ohio Partnership, were the primary resources for this study. All four were voluntarily involved in the institute and this dissertation study. The participants were individually interviewed concerning their implementation of DBAE and what they chose to teach their students. In some cases, the team principals, classroom teachers, art supervisor, participating student teachers, and students were able to provide additional information. Attendance at and observations of the 1988 and 1989 Summer Inservices and

six Institute Participant Workshops also provided information and formal settings.

Many cross-site characteristics can be examined for similarities and differences that may affect the implementation process. Of the four districts, three could be considered small in size and the fourth very large. Two of the districts were "old", i.e., in existence for more than thirty years, and very established; one considered "somewhat old", over fifteen years; and the fourth "very new", under fifteen years. Socio-economically speaking, two of the districts were comparably blue collar, middle class; one white collar, middle to upper class; and the fourth, blue collar, lower to middle class.

The elementary school buildings were always busy due to activities involving the students and the community. The halls and classrooms served as display areas for their work from across the curriculum. A great deal of student artwork, as well as exemplary prints of major artists, were observed as serving a major focus in both the halls and classrooms of three of the four sites. The remaining school building showed very little of either student work or prints of art.

Interviews with the art teachers at each of the sites provided information about the numbers of students, grade range, class size, and the amount of preparation time allotted for their classes. All four art teachers reported that student numbers were in the range of three hundred to

four hundred and fifty, representing kindergarten to fifth grade levels. Similarly, all of the art teachers had the average class size of twenty to thirty-two students in each. In addition to these "regular" art classes, one of the four teachers also instructs a small group of "gifted" students. Art teacher responses to the amount of preparation time given to them for their classes were the same for each district: "very little".

The dates of academic year openings and closings differed for each of the four elementary schools as did the Graded Course of Study, resource material centers, and teacher requirements of written lesson plans. However, each of the school districts showed a great amount of planning and involvement in the city's "Son of Heaven" Chinese Art Exhibition. It opened in March 1989 and ran into the beginning of the next school year. Teachers at each site were able to take their students to see the show. Its influence was visually evident in the displayed student art work in their respective schools.

Art teacher interviews, the primary source information for this study, also revealed a great deal about the participants themselves. Comparisons and contrasts were noted as to prior personal education, current actions for continuing education, years of teaching experience, returning participation in the second year's inservice as a presenter, and their teaching environment and conditions.

Similarities were that all four art teachers were female, had received degrees or earned credit in art education from the Ohio State University, and had cooperated with at least one student teacher during the implementation year. Three of the four had at least ten years of teaching experience. One of the four had received her Master's degree and two others were continuing in credit-earning activities toward another degree. Only two participating art teachers returned to the institute's second year of inservice as presenters and mentors.

None of the art teachers had similar work environments and conditions. Only one teacher had her own art room all day long in the same building. Another teacher had her own room, but in two different schools to be visited for only half of the week. Even though the other two teachers also traveled at mid-week, one school was within walking distance and the teacher had to share her rooms with other classes, while the fourth teacher had no art room at all, yielding to "art on a cart" and a teacher's desk in a corner of the library.

In addition to the intense teacher interviews used to gather data concerning the implementation of DBAE in the elementary schools, I also received information from other "people" contacts. Such contacts were in different forms ranging from confidential in-depth interviews to conversations, passing salutations, and distant

observations. For the most part, the various informants initiated the conversations. Knowing the nature of my study, they said they had new information concerning their DBAE implementation process and thought I might be interested. After the first summer inservice, contact with the art teachers and other informants occurred during the following autumn through spring for most of the districts. Visits with the four team principals were very rare or not at all, as was the case with most of the classroom teachers. However, there were several occasions when members of these two groups, principals and classroom teachers, approached me with information when they felt it might be useful for the study.

Meetings with other people involved in the implementation of DBAE were possible due to my university connection of supervising three of the four student teachers assigned to the districts, and with one of the district's other art teachers and their supervisor. Though not as direct as from the teachers themselves, information sources such as the student teachers allowed for regular and frequent contacts.

Entree

Gaining access into the school sites was acquired through personal contacts growing out of my position as a university graduate assistant involved in the project.

Letters, phone calls, and introductions by presentations at the summer inservice were methods of informal entree. Since this was an exploration of only a small portion of the Ohio Partnership directed by a department of the Ohio State University, accessibility to and study of the participants were approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee.

Data Collection

Indicative of most qualitative research, data retrieval was from several sources and the technique of "triangulation" (Guba and Lincoln, 1981) was sought. Triangulation is the process of converging on a conclusion from different points. Data collected from three points: intensive interviews, field observations and review of printed documents allowed for a cross-check and confirmation toward a conclusion for the study.

I used an open-ended "elite" interview guide, which will be described later. In-progress notes, an audio-tape recorder, and transcribing techniques were the interview tools. Descriptive field notes of art lessons, teachers' meetings, and formal presentations helped formulate the interview guide. Written and visual documents, such as lesson plans, district newsletters, district and institute evaluations, and photographs taken with a still camera of the environments, also provided data for this study.

Duration of the data-gathering process extended over about fourteen month's time, beginning with the first summer inservice and ending with the second, inclusive. Contacts with the teachers after the summer inservice to gather their views were done by way of letters, telephone calls, visits to the schools, joining them at some of the workshops, and for one teacher, seeing her at most of her district's weekly art teacher meetings. The average number of contacts with each of the teachers was about ten to fourteen. Most of the time and emphasis was placed on the interviews at the end of the year from March through June. The uniqueness of qualitative research provided flexibility for minor changes in the proposed design to accommodate my evolving needs as a researcher and of the participants. "Saturation of information" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982) was a major determination in ending data collection.

Interview Guide

An interview guide was designed to be "a flexible strategy of discovering whose object is to elicit from the interviewee what he considers to be important questions relative to a given topic". (Lofland, 1971, p.76) Since the teachers were considered the primary decision-makers and leaders in the classroom, their teaching objectives served as guides along with the questions posed in Chapter I.

Some of the Instructional Objectives for art teachers also presented in Chapter I helped set the stage for data collection, especially for the interviews. They were assessed throughout the phases of the research under the intentions of finding out what opportunities the students had been given to learn about art. However, freedom in the flow of response was just as important during the interviews as structure. Allowing the teachers to concentrate on their own areas of concern and put into their own words about their experiences, priorities and beliefs describing their implementation of DBAE to their students was more important to the design of the study. Therefore, the guidelines were often disregarded.

Interview Procedure

Visits to each of the sites throughout the year were made to accommodate data collection and increase familiarity with the process. Intensive audio-taped and transcribed interviews took place during the last four months of the study. Appointments were made as to the date, time, and location for me to meet with the art teacher. The best time proved to be after school and in the art room. Each session lasted from one to two and one-half hours. An in depth "specialized" interview procedure was chosen where it provided both "eliteness" and flexibility. A specialized, or "elite interview" is defined by Guba and Lincoln (1981, p.

166) as being free-flowing-- moving according to clues and discussions offered from the respondent.

The questions asked and talked about were issues of recent concern to the teacher and for the progress of the study since the last visit. At this time, I listened and took notes while the conversation was audio-taped. Any written notes were reviewed with the teacher for clarity before moving on to the next question. After leaving the school, I reviewed my notes along with the audio-tape within three days, denoting needed areas of clarification or further inquiry at the time of the next visit.

Final year-end interviews included teacher responses as to their beliefs, priorities, and concerns of the entire year of implementation. These areas were organized as the "past", "present", and plans for the "future". The final interviews were transcribed, omitting any identifiable names or terms to ensure confidentiality, then sent to each of the participants for any corrections or additional comments before analysis.

Trustworthiness

"Trustworthiness" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) is the persuasion of all participants in this study to understand that the findings are worth the attention and recording. Trustworthiness was acquired by my many attempts to provide truth, applicability, consistency, and neutrality throughout

data collection, analysis, and reporting. The relationships with the participants depended on trust and assurance of withholding names for "openness" of data based on confidentiality in the final document.

Since my background lies in the classroom as a specialist of art education, an egalitarian atmosphere was hoped for, with the subject as a "friend". When data collection occurred during class hours, I was introduced as another art teacher who was doing some research in the classroom. Previous contact in the inservice program with the teacher-participants, the "participant as learner/colleague" title helped insure familiarity and lead to trust.

Subjectivity and Objectivity

In addition to the noted data-gathering methodology differences between quantitative and qualitative research, other controversial issues were at hand. Qualitative studies tend to be suspect and pose a reader-credibility problem. They are thought to be subjective rather than objective in nature. (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982; Campbell, 1973; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Krathwhol, 1985) Participant observation includes a note of caution by researchers as being one of the least credible. With the association of naturalistic studies to anthropology, D.T. Campbell (1973) refers to the process as the recruiting of "counter-cultural romantics and

displaced novelists". (Kidder and Judd, 1986 p. 3) Bogdan and Biklen (1982) approach the issue of objectivity directly with the question: "Is action research objective?". They continue to apply this issue to a researcher's roles as student, hired assistant and participant-observer. They offer a definition of objectivity:

This question is important to clarify, particularly if you are a graduate student in an academic setting where concern with objectivity in research is high. Objectivity is often defined as giving equal weight to all the information one gathers, or as having no point of view when one undertakes research. In journalism, objectivity has traditionally meant getting both sides of the story (Wicker, 1978). Action researchers believe that objectivity is related to your integrity as a researcher and the honesty with which you report what you find. (p.217)

Honesty and proper selection of resources for information are most important in maintaining an objective view. "For the action researcher, objectivity means being honest, going to the source to gather data, and eliciting the views of those involved in the issue. (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982) Visits for observations included "going to the source"-- in this case, the art teacher in the classroom. Scheduled dates for observation, along with an "open door policy" by the school teams offered structure. Sensitivity was given to classroom conflicts. It was all a matter of timing for the gathering of the data and maintaining that cooperation with the participants. Such researcher integrity

was hoped for through organized fieldnotes, photographs, transcriptions, member-checking, analyzing, reviewing, and honest reporting.

Additional advice followed for this study concerning objectivity in the formulation of not only the design and collection, but in the documentation as well, is offered in the writings of Linda Ettinger (1987):

The theoretical foundations of on-site descriptive research are interpretive and relativistic rather than rooted in the scientific method. One way to address these issues is through the careful development of a research problem. In other words, credible research requires development of a framework in which the methods selected for a particular study are compatible with the research intent. In addition, both the research methods and the research question must be clearly documented. (p.80)

Qualitative studies and participant observations are vulnerable to criticism. They can be subjective on the grounds that their vivid personal testimonials may sound more true than they really are. In defense of this accusation, Kidder and Judd (1986) say:

The ultimate test of the believability of any kind of research...is not its seeming objectivity but its replicability. If no one can replicate or repeat the research and reach the same conclusions, the research is not believable, no matter how vivid the data. (p.182)

The positivist approach in qualitative studies is presented as a means to maintain objectivity. The writings

of Jerome Kirk and Marc Miller, (1986) Harold Brown, (1987) and John M. Johnson, (1975) give evidence to this thought.

By definition, positivist research places emphasis on the process of observation and many times excludes any concern for external reality. (Kirk and Miller, 1986) This statement is in compliance with that of Harold I. Brown, (1987) author of Observation and Objectivity in which he more effectively says: "We should think of objectivity not as an achievement, but as a process". (p.210)

Johnson (1975) contributes to this belief of "process" in objectivity:

For positivism, knowledge was to be considered objective to the extent that its production approximated the normative conventions of the natural and physical sciences. (p.209)

Kirk and Miller (1986) also argue that "qualitative research can be performed as a social science, and can be evaluated in terms of objectivity". (p.73) They define objectivity as "a commitment to integrating new findings into the cumulative body of collective knowledge and confronting ideas with data as well as argument". (p.79) They can also be quoted as saying that qualitative research is "socially concerned, cosmopolitan, and above all, objective". (p.10)

They present a four phase model to help the qualitative researcher make decisions and in which to reach an objective

stand. Their four phases are referred to as "Invention", "Discovery", "Interpretation", and "Explanation" to provide sequential ordering for research design, data collection, analysis, and documentation. It is in the sequential structure and direction of the plan that the qualitative researcher will be recognized for reliable data and defensive objectivity.

The Kirk and Miller plan compliments those of other qualitative research writers. Gail McCutcheon (1981) defined objectivity and subjectivity in reference to the interpretation of classroom observations. When observations of a social setting such as that of a school classroom are viewed, it is questioned whether the "perceptual lens" has been focused on the object to give a real world view, or reveals as much about the researcher (assumptions, categories, and time-frame). This latter rendering of observations could label the study as being subjective. McCutcheon offers the advice:

...to assure objectivity, positivist research, as exemplified by the use of observation schedules, relies on interrater agreement, a type of multiplicative corroboration, in which a number of subjects code their observations. Agreement upon what was seen or experienced leads to a high degree of interrater reliability. (p.9)

This advice is followed in the data collection design to "member-check" the gathered information during the interviews and was done for this study.

The question of bias may be most damaging in terms of objectivity. Prior involvement in the project as a graduate student for the department may deem bias on my part. However, careful planning and execution of the methodology were taken under the advisement of Becker (1970):

We can never avoid taking sides. So we are left with the question of whether taking sides means that some distortion is introduced into our work so great as to make it useless... Our problem is to make sure that, whatever point of view we take, our research meets the standards of good scientific work, that our unavoidable sympathies do not render our results invalid. (p.23)

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was ongoing throughout the gathering phase by the constant comparative method. Analysis was done by sampling, coding, and writing about the emerging categories from the data. Glazer (1978) offers six "steps" of the constant comparative method. Such an approach is said to be applicable to almost any kind of data, especially for multiple-site participant observation. The "steps" were done all at once, allowing the analysis to double-back for more data collection and coding.

1. Begin collecting data.
2. Look for key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become categories of focus.
3. Collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus with an eye to seeing the diversity of the dimensions under the categories.

4. Write about the categories you are exploring, attempting to describe and account for all the incidents you have in your data while continually searching for new incidents.
5. Work with the data and emerging model to discover basic social processes and relationships.
6. Engage in sampling, coding, and writing as the analysis focuses on the core categories.
(Bogdan and Biklen, 1982, p.70)

From the start of data collection, some recurrent events immediately became categories of information. They described the sources of information such as from observations of the environment or activity, polite conversation as "in passing", and collection of district and institute handouts. The categories also described the content such as anything that had to do with each of the four disciplines. These categories were labeled as such: OBS=observation, CON=conversation, DOC=documents, A-S=art studio, A-H=art history, A-C=art criticism, and AES=aesthetics.

As the first quarter of the 1988-89 school year progressed, a sense of familiarity on both my part and the participants' seemed to have been established. The "newness" of faces, settings, and schedules diminished and lent itself to a more comfortable job of data collection and DBAE implementation. This period of "getting acquainted" took about three month's time. Observations revealed an uneasiness on the participants' behalf toward intense interviews about individual DBAE implementation. It was

believed that experimenting with the teaching process caused a slow start on the year's goals.

The next three months, January through March, seemed to be a period of teacher reflection while watching and guiding cooperating student teachers in the experience of implementing DBAE. Gathered data continued to fall under the described categories. Time to gain some expertise introduced "teacher views" to the data bank as to the significance of the implementation in their classes. Some of the interviews began during this time and multiplied during the last four months of the school year.

Each interview was coded according to an assigned school number (1-4) and date of session. Notes and audio-tape transcripts were "cleaned" of identifying names, then typed, and spaced by their "train of thought" relationships within the conversation. The member-checked typed responses were analyzed according to existing and emerging categories. This vital coding process served as a selection of only the most relevant data for the study. (Miles and Huberman, 1984)

Examination and discussion with my advisor and then with a peer qualitative reviewer allowed for further focus from fourteen to seven categories. The synthesized data formed topics such as "teacher decisions concerning DBAE" or the use of any discipline, "beliefs about the institute", "experiences with their fellow team members", "resources"

"lesson plans", "priorities with assessment and evaluation", and "personal professional plans as an adult learner".

Data with coded topics from all four sites were then manually cut, grouped, color-coded, and taped onto papered walls to provide a visual overview of the gathered research. Data within each topic were then sub-divided according to the site for separate school summarization, then re-united and summarized as an entire topic. Data reduction into manageable portions through summary allowed for clarity and ease in the continued analysis. (Miles and Huberman, 1984)

All of the summaries from a given category such as a 2-ADL, (site #2 decisions as Adult Learner) were combined. Since many of the grouped responses, placed under dominant topics, included comments relating to others in different groups, they were cross-referenced and noted.

Further data analysis was done after the major findings were presented. This was to help draw conclusions and meaning for the study. One method of analysis in particular was most helpful to achieve this goal. Gene Hall's (1975) nationally-known and tested method of analyzing data to conclude teachers' levels of use of an innovation proved to be exceptionally applicable to meet my needs. The suggested activities presented in Chapter II by Savage and Skolnik (1985) also draw strong parallels to Hall's work in that they follow a hierarchy of use according to knowledge from experience. Figure four provides a modified chart combining

three aspects of Hall's research and can be found on the two full pages at the end of this paragraph. It will include Hall's 1975 revised "Levels of Use Chart" with his chart for "Levels of Use and Typical Behaviors" and his chart for the "Stages of Concern and Typical Expressions". My application to this analysis model and interpretations of the results can be found in Chapter V, "Summary and Discussion".

Levels of Use of the Innovation

<u>Level of Use:</u>	<u>Behavioral Indices of Level</u>
0 NONUSE: State in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.	
# Non-Use	No action is being taken to learn about new ideas in the area of the innovation.
* Unaware	I don't know anything about it (the innovation).
I ORIENTATION: State in which the user has recently acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has recently explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon user and user system.	
# Orientation	The user is seeking out information about the innovation.
* Awareness	I have heard about the innovation, but I don't know much about it.
II PREPARATION: State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.	
# Initial Training	The user is preparing to use the innovation.
* Exploration	How much of my time would use of the innovation take?
III MECHANICAL USE: State in which the user focuses most effort on the short term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.	
# Mechanical	The user is using the innovation in an awkward, poorly coordinated manner.
* Early Trial	I seem to be spending all my time in getting material ready for students.
IVA ROUTINE: State in which use of the innovation is stabilized. Few if any changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use or its consequences.	
IVB REFINEMENT: State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short and long-term consequences for clients.	
# Independent	The user is doing a good job with the innovation.
* Limited Impact	I can now see how this innovation relates to other things I am doing.

Figure 4. Modified Levels of Use Chart.

- V INTEGRATION: State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.
- # Integrated The user is sharing with others what he is learning about students from using the innovation.
 - * Maximum Benefit I am concerned about relating the effects of this innovation with what other instructors are doing.
- VI RENEWAL: State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications or alternatives to the present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the system.
- # Renewing The user is seeking out more effective alternatives to his established use of the innovation.
 - * Renewal I am trying a variation in my use of the innovation that looks like it is going to result in even greater effects.

LoU Chart (Excerpted from: Operational definitions of Levels of Use of the Innovation. Austin; Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1975.)

- # (Levels of Use and Typical Behaviors for Each Level of Use of the Innovation, Gene Hall, 1974)
- * (Stages of Concern and Typical Expressions of Concern About the Innovation, Gene Hall, 1974)
- # and * (Excerpted from: Implementation of CBTE-- Viewed as a Development Process. Texas University, Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. March, 1974)

Figure 4. (continued).

In 1973, Hall, Wallace, and Dossett developed a Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) for use in educational innovation projects. They offered the purpose of CBAM in the following quote. In reading it, applications may be made to this study by considering "the innovation adoption process" as the implementation of DBAE, the "collaborative linkage" as the common teacher responses which became the major findings of this study, the "individual" as the art teacher interviewed, and the Ohio Partnership as the "adoption agent".

The CBAM is based on viewing innovation adoption as a developmental process. The CBAM organizes the innovation adoption process around the concepts of collaborative linkage, individuals use of the innovation, individuals concerns about their use of the innovation. Information about use and concern provide the adoption agent with the basis for selecting personalized intervention strategies. (p.5)

The "Levels of Use of the Innovation" and "Behavioral Indicies" charts were perfected in subsequent years (1974, 1975) and presented by Hall in Austin at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The "Levels of Use" portion helps identify, define, and measure an individual's use of an innovation. The "Behavioral Indicies" incorporate an individual's level of use and typical behavior for each level with the stages of concern and typical expressions of concern about the innovation. Such

levels presented by Hall vary in range from non-use to renewal.

Chapter Summary

In summary, the chosen methodology was qualitative in nature. It was a naturalistic exploration and analysis of some factors such as beliefs, priorities, and concerns of four art teachers. These teachers were seen as decision-makers and leaders. They were involved in the implementation of DBAE throughout the first year of the Ohio Partnership. Based on a pilot exercise, the study involved a triangulation of qualitative data from elite and specialized teacher interviews, observations of art classes, institute activities, and review of lesson plans and their evaluations. Issues concerning the objectivity of reporting a qualitative and bias-lending affiliation were presented. Methods of sorting the data and forming a preliminary analysis were also offered. The findings of this exploration will be in the following chapter, IV. Chapter V will provide further data analysis according to an established research guide in order to offer some conclusions and implications of this study.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter will present the findings from the data gathered during the study of DBAE implementation. Art teacher informants, seen as professional decision-makers and leaders, provided most of the data during focused interviews. Information about the Ohio Partnership's first year centered around teacher beliefs, attitudes, and motivations. Because the analysis depends on such data, commonalities among teacher responses became the major concern.

Common topics emerged from the data and were focused into seven distinct categories. These categories will first be described and then supported by the teacher responses from all four school districts involved in the project. It must be noted that data was gathered from sources other than teacher interviews such as Institute and district reports by outside evaluators. Since they draw similar parallels to also support some of the emerged categories, but were not direct teacher views, they will be presented in the discussion section of Chapter V.

Reporting the Findings

An outline was drawn to present the seven emerged categories and can be seen on the following page. The outline provides some definition as to what the teachers believed to be important in the implementation of DBAE in their schools. Order was placed to these topics from my personal feeling of progression from general to specific. The order can also be seen as a hierarchy of teacher needs to be a professional decision-maker and leader.

In most cases, the consistency of similar responses to merit the emergence of separate categories was seen in all four sets of teacher transcripts. Only in two cases were there less than three teachers who expressed similar concerns to merit the emergence of a separate category. More than four entries of similar nature will be presented in many of the categories. This is due to multiple interview sessions with the teachers. To avoid misinterpretation of teacher representation, the number of different teacher responses will be noted in each section.

DBAE: Teacher Interpretations of Implementing the DBAE Concepts

Acquisition of desired information and a greater understanding about the teacher-constructed DBAE implementation interpretations were made possible by reporting common topics which emerged from the data.

EMERGED CATEGORIES DISCUSSED AS FINDINGS

1. DBAE: Teacher Interpretations of Implementing the DBAE Concepts.
(in alphabetical order, as I see no dominance of one over the other in importance.)
 - A. Aesthetics
 - B. Art Criticism
 - C. Art History
 - D. Art Production
2. Institute: Teacher Attitudes About the Institute in the Implementation Process.
3. Resources: Teacher Views on the Availability and Use of Teaching Resources Impacting the Implementation of DBAE in the Classroom.
4. Lesson Plans: Teacher Decisions in Planning DBAE Lessons.
5. Teamwork: Teacher Interpretations of the School Team and Group Dynamics.
6. Assessment and Evaluation: Teacher Utilization and Attitudes About Assessment and/ or Evaluation Tools for Implementation.
7. Adult Learner: Teacher Decisions About and Applications of Information that Has or Will Lead to Further Professional Adult Education.

Figure 5. Emerged Categories Discussed as Findings.

Interpretations about the concept of DBAE emerged as being important to the teachers. During analysis, it was found that the theme of DBAE also included the inter-twining of others that had also emerged. This emergence and inter-twining of major themes and patterns into categories suggest that each was significant enough to stand alone as well as co-exist with other categories for implementation. Some of the most prominent teacher interpretations of DBAE can be seen in the following transcripts from two of the four teachers:

I believe that all the DBAE areas overlap. When I'm in class and talking about a print, sometimes I stress one discipline over another, and other times, it would be a different one that I would stress.

To me, I really don't know any other way (than DBAE). When I was in undergrad, I had Arthur Efland's curriculum and looked over the domains... I'd have to say that made it kind of confusing because all of the this was thrown at us. When I got out, I'd have to look at different books--like Arts View, Art Production-- then look at the questions and the "big box" with the six areas of the "Ohio Guide". My main concern was not being real sure what domain I was in, and I wasn't sure whether I was doing aesthetics or criticism.

I taught my first year at the high school before coming to the elementary. The previous teacher had already established the (DBAE) program, so it wasn't real tough. But still, when the students came into the room, didn't pull out the crayons and things, they asked "Well, aren't we going to do anything?". We had just discussed the artwork, I got great responses and they said that... at first, I didn't know what to expect, but I can say now, I don't care very much. My goal was to get them to do the artwork, but to also learn about it. So, I approached it by studying the artist and

his works. I still do that on all grade levels. The third grade starts out with keeping notebooks, they keep all of their art projects together, ... we do criticism... they remember the best artists and styles and use them as references. They get so much of information that they can build on next year. Then, when we work with the projects, they still work with history and the period style... they know what they want to do with this information... that's what I really like about DBAE...

There's so much that you can do with DBAE... they'll (the students will) see something in the art room that another class is doing and they will ask me about it and will want to talk about it rather than want to do the studio that day!

When the theme of DBAE emerged in the data, specific discipline areas were mentioned. They offered further definition as to where the teacher found the information provided by the institute and its affects during implementation met, or failed the objectives made according to the student's needs. Such subdivisions of the DBAE theme can be seen to represent each of the four disciplines. For example, one teacher talked about DBAE and her use of each of the four disciplines in her lesson plans:

I incorporate all four disciplines in most of my regular art classes, but mostly that of studio and art history with the use of reproductions. With these artworks, we talk about how something has been affected by another, especially the medium. We use art criticism with the "Artist of the Month". In all art classes, if there's time at the end, we share our own art works and talk about the qualities of the artwork itself.

Criticism

Many of the teacher interpretations of DBAE and its implementation focused on their students' use of criticism in the art room. Three of the four art teachers responded to its use in the following:

For Criticism, I have them talk about the work in terms of the artist's period style. I like Feldman's (format), so I do that. I don't often get to "judgment". I let them stop at the "Interpretation" point, and they usually don't mind not being able to give a judgment of the art work... they're used to it, they know it's not important when we're talking about an artist.

Criticism--- the use of it --- I guess I'm not really familiar with other methods than Feldman's... I got it (Feldman's) from before (the inservice) and with his being there last year, it's the method I use.

During Criticism, I sometimes mix-up the sequence. I was real sticky about making sure my students critiqued the artwork in the order (of description, analysis, interpretation) until last summer when (one of the institute faculty) gave his lecture and we talked about it (in our breakout groups). Sometimes they (my students) want tell me their feelings right away..."

If I'm doing criticism, I would use Feldman, maybe because that's what I used before. I wasn't aware of any other (critical methods) until the Institute. I knew of (one by an Institute faculty member) because had his class, but I still don't know what the others are... they're so similar... but still, so much information is coming at me at once that it gets so muddled.

"Criticism" to me were the things that the art history or studio teachers talked about, especially when I took Design... such as 'balance'... asking me if this area was balanced with the two shapes over here, and two over

here... balanced with the color...that was criticism... describing.

We do use description, especially about something abstract, or realistic.

My students would call something "art" if it has some of the characteristics we had been talking about before... they would say "it's 'exciting to look at". If I showed them something abstract, they would say "art" looks "real" and would probably try and argue that it wasn't art at all. They did that with some of the abstract prints I had. They would like all of those (pointing to a pile of very realistic prints). They love that Burchfield...With non-objective art, we looked at Mondrian... few would call it art... but the first graders would say it is art... they don't expect everything to look realistic...

Aesthetics

Other interpretations of DBAE and the teachers' efforts to implement its concepts in their classrooms rested heavily in the area of aesthetics. Some of the teacher-talk about DBAE and aesthetics gave hint to a desire for further learning. All four art teachers spoke about aesthetics in the following:

They don't say... "I don't like that", but they do want to say what it (the artwork) means to them... I think that's the division or portion of aesthetics in my lessons.

I can divide studio and art history from the rest, but aesthetics and criticism seem to "blend" in.

I don't want to make up my own definition of aesthetics. I suppose if I were to incorporate aesthetics in my classroom, I would ask "Why do you think this is art-- or why somebody might say this is art-- even though you don't think so?" They (the students) might say 'art is to make

these qualities better than those of something else'.

We use aesthetics, but not very often-- I haven't used the questioning strategy (from the Institute) because the students aren't very receptive to answering those types of questions. With time being so limited, you just don't do it. I would say that I didn't use the questions directly. I have all students one hour per week. In the fourth and third grades, I have about one hundred students, with about four-hundred and fifty students total... averaging twenty-five in each class.

I don't know that if I defined aesthetics it would be any better than what you read. All I know is that if you talk about it, (the art work) -- you know more. I have an idea of what it means to me... but sometimes at the Institute, I tended to get mixed up. It seems like it was that way for everybody... to define it would be like a word game, and I'm not good at that.

Some kind of assessment or evaluation of DBAE as a whole was consistently found in all four of the school districts. The participants often evaluated DBAE for its usefulness and applicability to their needs, sometimes according to institute intervention, application to lesson plans, or self evaluation as the adult learner. The following responses from all four teachers support this categorization:

I enjoyed last summer-- I really did. I liked the presentations and didn't mind attending... plus, I wasn't expected to write a paper... I just can't write. Some of those lectures I enjoyed-- it wasn't much so pressure for me... I just don't like someone looking over my shoulder-- even though you tried not to do that, it was still there... the pressure is here at school with (the principal) when he is making an observation.

I like the idea of DBAE, but I don't like to have somebody pin-point that this is "Criticism", this is "Aesthetics". I just know that this is working. I can see four disciplines... but am I teaching three?... well, we talk about the artist for the history and we talk about the styles the artist uses for criticism. For aesthetics, we talk about feelings; feelings that went into the artwork and maybe why they did it. Production is their doing the artwork itself... so, I do teach all four disciplines.

As for DBAE, there's so much we could do... I think that next year we could do it differently-- do more of it, be more organized about doing it. For instance, I think we could show more of what the artists do...

I would probably call (the implementation of) DBAE a success (our school)... but I've always used it (DBAE). I mean, when I went to the Getty Program, it was nothing new at all, it was a lot of repetition. It was the same thing I did as an OSU student and when I use the Ohio Guide. With all of these things repeated and my already doing it in my classes, I guess you could say I am sort of burned-out on the idea. The commitment of three weeks was too much for my needs. Actually, I thoroughly enjoyed some of the speeches and presentations. Visits to museums and studios were interesting, even inspiring.

I'm more of an open-ended teacher. I don't say I want just description... I let them go off on tangents. Art to me is not a rigid subject! I have a real problem with trying to make it rigid... it's only good in some aspects to make lists.

I know aesthetics for me is an area not as strong as studio, but as with studio, you have it (in art).

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning DBAE

This presentation of data has aided in the understanding of teacher-constructed views of DBAE. It has shown us that the concept of DBAE is important to the teachers. The

teachers expressed their feelings that the implementation of DBAE was not only important and useful in their classrooms, but also very complex. They seemed to break the concept of DBAE down into smaller components to ease the complexity. Some of these subdivisions included specific mention of criticism and aesthetics and how they have attempted to apply them to their lessons. They praised the institute for providing them with useful information about implementing DBAE (especially criticism and aesthetics), but still seemed a bit unsure of the full potential that aesthetics could provide. This uncertainty lead to some of the teachers admitting that they would like to take some additional coursework in the area of aesthetics.

All four teachers expressed their evaluations of DBAE in terms of its usefulness and lesson plan applicability as well as its challenge to them as adult learners.

The next category will present data concerning teacher views about the Ohio Partnership as an educational institute and its attempts to meet their needs during the first year of DBAE implementation.

Institute: Teacher Attitudes About the Institute in the Implementation Process

There seemed to be a need by all of the teachers interviewed to refer to several aspects of the institute itself. Such areas of mention included the institute and how

successful they saw its organization of activities, the renewal activities as post - inservice workshops, guidance and opportunities to work with team members, evaluation tools including the log diaries, and the explanations of ambiguities through continuing education as the adult learner.

A couple of the teachers evaluated the institute on its organization and offered suggestions:

I thought the whole thing last year was very organized... I liked the trips, including the visits to the artists' studios... I liked the breakout groups, but I could see where some of the things said would be a little overwhelming for some of the classroom teachers. I would say that DBAE would probably be a little harder to implement on the secondary level... in the elementary... it seemed like the teachers loved it... I could tell...

As for the meetings (during the year by the institute), I would like to give some feedback: The topics were not totally specific, such as the one on the Black artists. I thought it was interesting, but not really applicable to DBAE and the classroom. The Japanese presentation was so horrible...it was by somebody prominent, Japanese, and, I guess, from the university. Half of the slides used were horrible-- they showed the courts and the gardens of Japanese architecture and its structure. When she ran out of time, she went through the rest of the slides and they all looked like they were really good!

It became evident that teamwork under the guidance of the institute was very important to the teachers. All of the participants commented on the efforts by their fellow teachers:

One thing they told us last Spring to hope for was that the classroom teachers would use that part (the Chapman text) as a part of their social studies or reading programs-- not as an art lesson. I was told that if they didn't have time to do whatever project that was suggested, they just don't do it-- they still think of art just as being practically all studio...

From the meetings I attended, especially the last one, I saw it (DBAE and working with the other teachers) was different with each school. It was nice to see what other people did-- and in doing so, I didn't get to see all the art in the one room.

After the Institute, the biggest thing and most important affect was there was more DBAE input from the other teachers. I sent out a list of what I was going to do for Son of Heaven to all of the teachers in my school. They planned and had a Chinese meal, decorated their rooms, the cafeteria...

I know that the people in my group (at the Institute) really liked the presentations.

The teachers uttered their opinions about the institute's means of evaluation of the summer inservice. Attitudes were expressed both verbally and non-verbally. Most of the teachers just rolled their eyes and shook their heads in dislike of the diaries each was requested to keep. At the end of each of the three weeks, each participant was asked to respond in writing about anything they had experienced concerning the training period. Portions of the responses were done by checking a little box, but the majority of the writing was done on a blank page preceded by a fictitious example. One teacher openly responded three

different times with suggestions for making the evaluation more effective:

If you had the sessions all printed out for you in the log diary, with a comment section-- something specific-- now, that would help, it would be better, not so much of a "chore".

Turning in the summer inservice log diaries without your name on it would be good, but, who would want to read all of that "stuff" someone wrote anyway? What would it really tell you? Just a phrase or a short comment would be good.

As to the log diaries... I was willing to comment on the handouts and just say that I have done it... it's not really "busy work"... they (the participants) should do it...

Two teachers especially noted some ambiguity in their understanding of aesthetics due to their later involvements in the institute activities with other teachers. Their comments can also be viewed with reference to their parts as the adult learner and efforts to continue their education in understanding and teaching more about art:

After the Institute, I thought "OK, I understand aesthetics now"... but when we got to the follow-up sessions during the year, one (Institute faculty member) would say one thing and (another) would say something else... sometimes I thought you could almost make it (aesthetics) anything.

I had a hard time making the distinction between aesthetics and the others (disciplines of DBAE). Well, at the regular meetings (with the institute) we attended in the evening, from what I saw of the use of aesthetics, no one was using it the way they gave the definition of it at the summer institute. They (the "Institute") told us the definition of aesthetics was questioning, talking about art, talking about whether you can know it

is art or not... or something like that...
everybody seems to keep going back to thinking
aesthetics is just something that is "pleasing".

Evidence of planning for, or involvement in future
activities with the institute as the adult learner can be
seen in the comments made by one participant:

They gave us the list of lectures (for this
summer's institute). I'll try to attend, but I
don't want to talk or anything. I hope they won't
ask me to participate.

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning the Institute

Presented data from teacher interviews during the first
year of implementation referred to several aspects of the
Institute itself, thus forming the second emerged category.
Teachers seemed to evaluate the institute's organization of
activities. Some of them especially enjoyed the
"partnership", teamwork, and camaraderie they found while
attending the summer inservice as well renewing those
friendships at the workshops during the course of the school
year. The institute's method of assessment and evaluation of
the inservice by way of the log diaries and numbered grids
did not agree with any of the teachers interviewed.

The issue of not fully understanding aesthetics emerged
in this category as it did in the first concerning DBAE.
Half of the teachers interviewed placed part of this
confusion on the part of the institute. They said this

happened between the institute's presentation of information during the summer and the change in teaching approach during the workshops. All in all, the uncertainty enhanced the need in continuing education through the institute as an adult learner.

The background information of teacher beliefs concerning DBAE was offered in the first section of this chapter. More information about DBAE's facilitator, the institute, has been presented in this section. The teachers continued to offer their views on other implementation facilitators. The next emerged category to be presented will deal with data about the impact of resources toward meeting their needs.

Resources: Teacher Views on the Availability and Use of Teaching Resources Impacting the Implementation of DBAE in the Classroom

One of the more easily-recognized categories of teacher interest involving decision-making was that of resources. The teachers openly talked about art teaching aids used in their classrooms during this first year of implementation. This section of emergent topics will be seen in a number of ways to highlight resources. The first way is how the teachers gathered such resources for future classes and incorporated these unique ways of teaching about art into their lesson plans. The second will show how most of the teachers were interested in using current and local art exhibits and artists as resources. The third way will

exhibit how some of the teachers considered the information, given to them by the institute both during the inservice and throughout the year by way of newsletters and workshops, as resources. Lastly, resources will be seen as teacher-decisions about texts made by their districts for their use in the classrooms.

One teacher talked about her collection of resources, accessibility to them, and her and evaluation of them in the following:

I think my resources are very good. If there's anything I need that I don't have here, I can go to the high school and get it...

Make-shift resources were the result of creative teachers and those who made use of community offerings. It seemed that the gathering of resources during the year nourished future lessons. Here, two teachers tell what they use as resources, how they retained and organized them, and what they had in mind for their use in order for their students to learn more about art:

I have alot of National Geographic Magazines, calendars and what-not, and sometimes I give them to the kids to go through and ask them to cut out anything they see that they think I can use for art. Then later, I go through and pick what can be incorporated into my lessons.

This year, I wanted to get more into contemporary art... to include environmental art and performance art. But, it's hard to get resources for this kind of art. We had an artist come out, showed alot of slides. We (her classes) saw that,

then they (the students) made up their own art and did it.

In talking about how two teachers used their "found" resources, the of "Son of Heaven" exhibit gained recognition and praise...

The resources I received for the field trip to the Son of Heaven exhibit in Columbus were immensely appreciated and they really helped in my lessons.

I rely on the journals... Art Education. I used the Son of Heaven packets... I really didn't have much Eastern information... I had things like the Buddha, the Emperor. I relied totally on their scripts, the slides, the video from Chanel 10...

Resource contributions by the Partnership's Institute were reflected upon by several teachers. Often, the teachers praised the institute for what it had to offer, especially for its influence on a district to acquire 'long-awaited' resources. Decision-making in the classroom was established by three teachers with the following comments:

I haven't used the aesthetic questioning strategy (from the Institute) just because I have so much information. It's in the "to be done" pile. (The classroom teacher) and I have looked at it, she has probably used it more than I have because she's just a "beginner".

I just didn't have the visuals before (my school's involvement in the Partnership). I couldn't find slides or anything that could relate to the lesson. The new visuals they got were a "God send" -- well, before, there were the 10-12 large prints in a package that I used, but that was all. When more art teachers were hired in the district, I had to turn all of my packets in and it was hard to get the visuals I needed.

I actually pick the artist by the prints I have available. (The art teacher showed her numerous collection of large laminated prints, most of which have been commercially reproduced and purchased by the school. She also pointed to a nice collection of art books on the shelf. Previous visits indicated that there are many slides and several videos for her use.)

Assistance in providing resources for teaching about art was found from organizations also involved in the Partnership. The following comment was one teacher's explanation of how she took advantage of what the other Partnership members had to offer, as well as planning for her second year of DBAE implementation:

It worked out that we were able to have artists come here-- visiting artists-- "Artists in the Schools"-- what was done with the kids fit in really well with what I was doing with them. Next year we'll kind of play on that... We had (one artist) and want her to come back next year... the kids saw her work with sculptures. Some (of the students) will be gone and we will not have them next year... I don't know how she'll feel about talking about African Art... it's a thought at this point... We were able to get two artists and there will be marbling by one artist-- who we got from the list from the Greater Columbus Arts Council...

Finally, the emergent topic of resources included teacher attitudes about text and reproduction choices made by their districts for their use in the classrooms. Such attitudes also revealed how three teachers saw the school team's use of district resources:

We have the Chapman book (Discover Art) here at our school as a resource. I use it as a resource and other teachers use it more like a text... that's one area I hope to work on, hope to use it more next year..."

I started out with copies of the synopsis of each lesson at the beginning of the Chapman books to try to follow along with my lessons, but I felt that they just skip along too fast. With some, the lessons can't come up with any product, and a lot of the things are things that classroom teachers could do the way Chapman suggested. I know from my years of experience, it's not any good to go with just the "one shot" lessons. A lot of the teachers I know do the projects in just one period. Maybe they're not expecting as much from them as I do...

Last Spring, the supervisor told me that the classroom teachers would do different things from Chapman. Every classroom has a copy of the text, either to use as a resource, or one for each of the kids if they want to. Only one teacher used Chapman. There were only a couple of DBAE lessons, but the rest... they didn't get around to using them.

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning Resources

This section of emergent categories highlighted teacher views on resources in four ways. Information was offered in relation to how the teachers felt about gathering different and interesting teaching aids for the implementation of DBAE. Overall, they felt they had a good collection of resources, and even though they always sought to add to that collection, DBAE gave them a direction in the search. The teachers also expressed the notion that DBAE broadened the boundaries in which resources could be applied to the classroom. They now considered incorporating the use of

local art exhibits and artists in their plans to a greater extent than ever before. Other resources were easier to retrieve. The teachers commented on how they were saving the written information given to them by the institute in the forms of the workbook, newsletters, and workshop handouts. The textbooks and visuals selected by each district played a prominent role in the motivation of the teachers. They commented on how extensively their teams used the district-purchased materials as well.

The presentation of data concerning resources in this section easily leads us to the next emergent category. It was what the teachers did with the resources that provides us with their views of lesson plans.

Lesson Plans: Teacher Decisions in Planning DBAE Lessons

Lesson plans and the gathering of information to create them was one of the topics most frequently discussed by the teachers. All of the teachers interviewed embellished on planning their lessons based on the four disciplines. Connections within the emerged category of lesson plans to others may be made with teacher motives, information from the institute, information about the resources used, teachers working with their team, and participant evaluations of their own teaching.

Motives in lesson planning with references to any or all of the disciplines of DBAE may be seen in the following comments:

When I teach, I usually start with the artist, then cover all four of the DBAE disciplines. First, we might talk about some of the history then the style of the artist. Evaluation of this might be the studio... it wasn't until I went back to begin my master's degree that I started to understand this all a little bit more. To be honest with you, I still have a lot of trouble with aesthetics. I may be doing it in my lessons and not realize it... to say this is criticism, and this is aesthetics... I just can't separate them and I don't worry about it. One time I told the third graders "We're going to do criticism: first describe, then interpret..." this was the only time I've told them of the breakdown.

My lesson plans are based more on "concept" than anything else. In one half of the year there are 18 lessons... the rest I had to make up as I went along, that's basically what I did. Sometimes these lesson plans were so vague. Some were based around the multicultural concept. I had the kids do a mosaic with Indian Art. They looked at copies of Indian Art, I asked them what the figures were doing, and I showed them books with the Indian art made by children. I gave them copies of the design used on masks and things and asked them what made Indian art unique. Most of the elements we had discussed were combined in just one picture. I think they did well... they were able to point out the patterns and straight lines. Before, we did Impressionism with the trees. That may have helped them in the Indian Art.

I always give them a little bit of history, and what the aesthetics is all about, then I evaluate it.

I have no real plans for "just a day for art history". Basically, my mind goes into units: Cover art history, make the art, do the criticism... I write my plans so I won't forget where I'm at and for the use by a substitute. I don't want the kids to miss anything if I'm gone.

Even though art is not product-oriented, I have them make things for self expression.

Next year, hopefully, I'd try to gradually do more of just studying the art.

Several motives in teacher planning refer directly to the discipline of criticism. The following teacher comments reflect on how they used the power of "talk" in the classroom to discuss the various aspects about art. Many times, the "talk" about a particular work of art, either by a recognized artist or a fellow student, was a welcomed activity by the children. The teachers were pleased with the increased student participation and were amazed with the connections the elementary students were able to make with events in their own lives. The teachers said that with these results, they were encouraged to plan more critical "talk" in their lessons.

My students have always talked about art. They start in the first grade, then their dialogue gets to be very active. Sometimes they become self-conscious in the third or fourth grades... actually, we talk more in the early grades than later. I put up artwork and we talk about that. We do more studio and history the older they get.

The students seem to be able to stay away from saying whether it is beautiful or not. They stay with what it really means to them, how it makes them feel. I try and condition them in the artroom so they can do this with their own art work.

We also talk about the functional kinds of art... about how these activities were a part of the lifestyle with the types of materials that were available to them. I had stencils and muslin and dyes for the project I had the students do. They

used them to decorate pillow cases, sheets and fabric. We dealt with the idea of arts and crafts that were used to produce useful items as well. We stretched the muslin and taped it onto cardboard-- this was all kind of the "Home Decoration" portion... parts of the presentation and a picture were covered in the "Dispatch".

A negative opinion about the presence of the institute during the planning sessions at one school can be seen as an assessment of interaction within the partnership:

(One of the other teachers in my building) and I worked on two third grade classes, on something we've talked about, and the evaluator wrote about, so many times... it gets to be redundant...

The use of resources was inevitable in lesson planning as can be seen in the following teacher transcripts:

Some of the skipping around from one lesson of Chapman to another just didn't seem like a logical transition. She (Laura Chapman) doesn't want you to jump around... having her at the institute didn't help... she said that if we were going to use it (the text series), to do so in sequence...

I went 'bananas' a couple of weeks before school to try to figure out how to work these (Chapman lessons) in... color, to line, to whatever... There are over sixty lessons in the book-- some are just unrealistic-- like for the first graders, or any grade level, there's just no way I could get all of this done in an hour-- at least not to my satisfaction! It's frustrating for the kids. I remember when I was a kid, I wanted to get it done well-- unless you were the kind of kid who did things just to get done with it-- there's not enough time for art...

I can't tell you how much time I actually spent studying each artist for Art History. If I had eight slides to show the third graders, we may only be able to get through two or three of them.

For Son of Heaven, there was really so much material that I didn't feel confined to any deadlines because I'm kind of free in that way... as long as I cover the basics techniques in the first and second grades with line, shape, color: to provide a good base toward a harder level.

I plan to have the kids work on more products... I love having them working with their hands. There will be more art history, and I plan to utilize my resources more, especially the VCR.

The teamwork approach on the planning of lessons to be taught both in the art room and in the general classroom was also a motivational force for three of the teachers in the four districts. Their comments:

Here in our district, we have to be answerable to our art supervisor for all of our lessons. We have to turn them in a couple of weeks after school starts for the entire year. My supervisor didn't want me to change everything just because of the institute... nor start from scratch for all five grades. She is very supportive of everything I do. I didn't know if what our district wants, would adapt to DBAE.

Next year, I plan to do a great deal with the big African exhibit which is going to be at the Columbus Museum of Art. I have told (my principal) and we're already working on it with the help of (the museum education director). The other teachers will do African things, the music teacher and I have been working together on this, and she has some music that she would like to teach. I will be doing the art projects... probably alot of masks and pottery and things.

For this next year with the plans of (the other teacher), the DBAE project will be to follow the movement of the American people from the East coast to the West in the 1800's. I will probably just compile the artworks of that time and cover the artists... not necessarily photography or sculpture done at the time, but primarily paintings of the core of what's happening at that

time. On the whole, it's just more of an historical report, or study. It will combine to continue with what we did this year with the "Colonial Days"...

One teacher reviewed her lesson plans from the year and reflected on her success in executing her objectives:

I try to mix up the area or period style that guide my lessons in the planning. That is what's different between this year and last year. For one half of the year, I like to teach up to the 20th century, and the second half of the year, I teach about the more current, contemporary artists.

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning Lesson Plans

It was highly likely for teacher interview data to result in an emergent category involving lesson plans. This section presented such data gathered during DBAE implementation.

All of the teachers had made strong decisions in their planning based on the four disciplines. In the data, we saw that criticism was one discipline talked about and accepted the most as a practice of inquiry. The teachers increased the use of criticism in their lesson planning as they noted continued success and higher student achievement by its use. One teacher felt that the institute's assessment team was too involved with her team's planning sessions during the year. She did not like this and said that it affected her lessons in a negative manner. For another teacher, lesson plans from this implementation year provided a written

format from which comparisons were made to those plans of the previous year. There were noted differences and successes through DBAE. In this section, we saw that teamwork played an important role in the planning of lessons for most of the teachers. The next section of emergent categories will offer more data to support their teamworking views.

Teamwork: Teacher Interpretations of the School Team and Group Dynamics

The collection of teacher comments about the implementation of DBAE in their various schools rendered itself to form an emergent category to be known as "teamwork". During the data-gathering process, any mention was noted of how the art teacher, with (or without) the help of the other building teachers and principal, sought to enable their students to learn more about art. What was considered as the "team" was extended by several of the art teachers to include the institute and the entire participating district as well.

Such comments will be offered in this section with their interpretations in order to examine the affects of group dynamics amidst the team's structure. They will be presented in five parts. First, they will deal with how the art teacher saw the professional communication among all of the teachers. Second, the affects of the team's efforts on their

students' progress will be seen. Third, comments about the collaboration by the institute and district as team members will be offered. Self-evaluation of the art teachers' team contributions will be offered as the fourth part. What the participating teachers plan to do as adult learners with DBAE teamwork will be the fifth and final part.

There were many art teacher comments concerning the professional communication among the teachers. In this first part, some of the data praises the support and the strength, some shows shifts of leadership, and some exhibit mis-communication in trying to work as a team. Such data can be seen in the following comments by two teachers:

The classroom teacher was very supportive in what I wanted to do. She had the kids writing about and describing art in her room. My school principal is also very much behind the program. I talked to him about the projects I was going to do and he supported everything. The other teachers in my school were supportive as well. They were willing to listen to my ideas and do the things I suggested. With all of this emphasis on DBAE, I think they consider Art to be more serious than it used to be too. A few still feel they're here for a prep time, but for the most part, it's no longer "Arts and Crafts", and they apologize if they miss some time getting their kids to my room. They say "Sorry, I know Art is really important...".

The other teachers use the book (Chapman) if I want them to, or ask them in the planning... we don't get together in any formal sense, more informally. (One classroom teacher) did use the book when I asked. The kids came down here for the studio, and then she was able to do more studio up there (in her classroom) and she combined the lessons with games and writing... on the third grade level, the teacher is really interested in art, that's why she went to the institute as a

part of the team. She had her students work with the dragon (of Son of Heaven unit), and I worked with the Chinese pots. With that, it took me several weeks to get through, so with the classroom teacher, the students were able to write in between lessons (on the topic). The librarian was also part of it... she brought in books on dragons for me to use...

We do have a strong team structure, we meet at lunch, but this last year, we didn't have much time. But, our lunch time is so short, you don't have much time to visit with your friends...

Leadership within the district's team in the selection and direction of DBAE art lessons and activities did not always begin with the art specialist. One district team received most of its leadership and motivation from a non-art teacher. This phenomenon is explained in the following comment by one art teacher:

We did "Colonial Days" which took place over a period of a week. It focused on colonial lifestyles. (One other team teacher) made the plans and we (the rest of the teachers) did it as a group. He researched and got quite a lot of pieces of accomplished music from the period. The students learned songs, made foods, played games and learned the style of dress.

As with the category on "Resources", not all comments about the group dynamics and professional communication among the teachers were positive. Here is a significant example from one art teacher of mis- communication and lack of collaborative work from her team:

My disappointment in the whole thing was I thought the elementary teachers would do more studying and

talking about art, using the Chapman books in the classroom. If they could try to do at least every other lesson... I don't have time to do all the things in the books... if they would do more talking and writing and things like that.

The second part of "teamwork" included the evaluation of student progress throughout the year. The following four art teacher comments from three of the four districts reflect the attitudes about group dynamics and possible student benefits:

There is a noticeable difference in the students whose teachers use the Chapman text.

(The Middle School art teacher) hasn't given me any indication of areas her students may be weak, but we have established some talk about following the (Ohio) Guide and DBAE... She seems satisfied with the students' preparation.

One classroom teacher used some prints of work done in the Caribbean. I really didn't know she had them, but then I saw them on a board in the hall. I really didn't notice any affect it (her use of the prints in her classes) had on my kids in art. I guess she went over the symbolism and had the students write stories about what was represented in the art.

The classroom teacher of the first grade started out using the text book, and I could tell the difference. The kids were talking about art more, I think they always could...

The third part of this section includes comments by several teachers about professional communication among the working "team", but not specifically within the school building boundaries. The following comments are that of sharing information about implementing DBAE. They include

the institute and district as "team members". Two teacher comments could be seen as positive and two as negative:

(Our principal) backs the arts programs here at our school and fights for us in our district. We really want to do it (DBAE)...

The structure and sharing of information from the Partnership (she explained: the teams, including the principal and the classroom teachers) worked very well for me. (Our principal) supports all the programs, he likes to go around to the rooms to see what's going on... the students are not bothered by this... they almost expect him to show up...

I didn't have much time to discuss things about DBAE with my supervisor and our regular teacher meetings (for the district) had very little to do with DBAE.

(The institute evaluator) came into my classroom and watched, it wasn't bad. The only thing was that I kept hearing "Oh, wow, everybody is doing so well!" I don't think anybody really knew what was going on. At least if you did one thing, it looked like alot. I don't think we were really that involved in (the program) that much, not like (another school in the district).

Two other comments by the art teachers about the communication and teamworking efforts from the district also included self evaluation. They form the fourth part of the teamwork category. These teachers seemed to want to say what they had done in defense of any failures, if any, that could be placed on the team's efforts:

Here, (in my school district) decisions were made, things were written down, but it only lasted two to three lessons... there's not much you could do about that. I did pretty much of what I thought I

said I would do. I met my objectives for this year.

This November's project was really our main DBAE focus for the year when the other teachers helped. Other than that, I do all four areas unless a teacher approaches me... I will do a project, but for the most part, they (the teachers) are overwhelmed with their own work and responsibilities. Unless they want me to work with them, I don't.

Two final comments make up the fifth part about the teamworking efforts on the implementation of DBAE. They can also be linked with the teachers' plans for the future both as a professional and as an adult learner:

What I see I want to do differently next year is to do more of working with the other teachers... I have been working with the music teacher on the units so that my lessons about the different movements and artists are similar to the ones she can teach about in music...

For next year, we (the school team) plan to go several times to visit, if I can...I will do it... I know that for our principal, he can just say no, but we do want to go to the Dayton Event... (our team) felt we had such a good time together last year and as a group... we want to do some of the things again...

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning Teamwork

The emergent category labeled teamwork and its data that made it such has been presented in this chapter. Teacher views of the efforts by their fellow educators as well as themselves varied from district to district. Some of the teachers said that the other teachers had taken a different

view of art. They appreciated being told that art was important in their schools and welcomed the extended collaboration in its teaching. One teacher noted failure in what she expected of her team's working together in the teaching of art.

Overall, higher student achievement was noted and the combined efforts of educators in three of the districts were given the credit. The teachers did not hesitate to recognize the added efforts by the institute and the districts as being part of their "team". Some of the art teachers considered themselves as being the ones most responsible to contribute to the teaming efforts, but did not want to take the blame if the team did not succeed in DBAE implementation. Professional communication and teamwork seemed to motivate some of the art teachers toward continuing the learning cycle.

Data about teamwork presented in this section will be followed by that of teacher views concerning the use assessment and evaluation tools.

Assessment and Evaluation: Teacher Utilization and Attitudes About Assessment and/or Evaluation Tools for Implementation

The use of teacher attitudes about the success of a lesson was beneficial to acquire on-going progress reports of DBAE implementation. The art teachers chose various means to measure how well their students were doing in class.

Their comments on assessment and evaluation included written tests, verbal student remarks, notable student progress across the curriculum, and self evaluation as to how much work they devoted to achieving their teaching goals.

Some of the art teachers gave written tests at the end of a unit, mid-year, or year's end to show student progress and where the next lesson needed to begin. The following comments from two teachers deal with written tests. The second comment was from a teacher who felt touched by the emotion and aesthetic quality of a response by one of her third graders:

I rarely give a test! (humorously) At the end of the year, I do. With the fifth grade, I had them fill in the blanks with the artist's name-- using information from discussions and handouts from all of the "Artists of the Month". They numbered them according to the picture I showed... 1-10, 11-20. They did pretty well!

For some tests, I asked my students for their definitions of "ART". I have one student who is a special student and can't write well, but I do remember what she said for her test:" (Student): "Art is the feeling of...Art can be a feeling"... (teacher notes that the student is talking as if she could write this herself...) (Student): "...Art can be as beautiful as April's eyes". April is her best friend. This was the best she could do, and it was most touching to me...

Two significant responses about assessment and evaluation dealt directly with student progress. The following quotes summarize the majority of the teachers' attitudes:

I hear them talking about art more, using better artistic vocabulary than ever, and the interest is there more now. I don't hear "This is stupid" or "Why are we doing this in Art?" anymore.

I can see the difference in the (students') products. I think that goes back to better history, criticism and aesthetics. They're understanding it better so their products are turning out better.

Most of the teachers referred to how much work they did in order to get their students to reach a desirable plateau when they responded to art. In doing so, they were not only able to evaluate student progress, but their own progress as well.

I really worked hard with the third grades this year studying the artists and getting finished just before Son of Heaven. I showed slides and played a detective game. They really had fun with that because they started picking up on the clues.

I guess my biggest success was getting some of the kids to use art vocabulary more, look at artwork more carefully, be able to describe what they see-- not describe just the subject, but design, how it's made... I suppose all the kids improved in that, although it's never evident when you ask them.

Most elementary students don't think of the things we might think they do... when I have to keep fishing and fishing just to get them to say what seems so obvious to me, I'm so determined to get it from them... I've shown them three pictures and asked them what did they have in common... I used things from calendars with animals. It took them so long to come up with the answer... but that might have been just because they were first graders, too.

Art teacher comments about DBAE implementation having anything to do with evaluation also included self evaluations. Some made it clear that they had, and still have, obstacles in the way of achieving their goals and those of the DBAE Partnership. One teacher commented on the stereotype of her district's rating of a good art teacher. Another evaluated her work despite some personal health set-backs. Here are just a two of such comments:

A good example of a "good art teacher" in (my district) is one who can get good artwork out of their kids. Just like over at (one of her schools), we did masks, we stressed the theme of the masks, the materials used, and made great things. That was a good lesson, and I guess I was looked at as a "good art teacher".

I think my year's objectives were met pretty well, considering all the interruptions we had...

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning Assessment and Evaluation

Teacher attitudes about their use of assessment and evaluation in the classroom were presented in this section. Some methods of measurement were in the form of written tests at various times of the school year. Most of the others were oral and were included in the inquiry stage of criticism. However the assessment or evaluations were made, the results pleased the teachers. All four of the art teachers interviewed believed that the implementation of DBAE had a positive affect on student progress. The data

also exemplified the notion that the teachers also measured their own growth in their ability to prepare, instruct, review, and adapt. They too had improved through DBAE.

As seen in this chapter thus far, the first six emergent categories have been presented. Gathered data which formed the seventh and final category, the "Adult Learner", will be found in the next section.

Adult Learner: Teacher Decisions About and Applications of Information that Has or Will Lead to Further Professional Adult Education

The final emerged category of the data gathered for this study is that of the adult learner. When the teachers reflected on their first year of DBAE implementation, they looked at their personal and professional successes, their failures, and what they desired to do in the future for their own education. The teacher responses placed in this category all seemed to be of decisions about and applications to their professional lives as a result of a year full of information and experiences. Such reflective statements will be organized as to what they had learned, how they had evaluated themselves, and in what areas they hoped to learn more.

Indications of adult learning were brought about by educational tools such as the log diaries requested to keep by the summer institute, particular lectures at the inservice, attendance at the inservice, and use of a local

art exhibit's resources. Reflective comments on what had been learned can be seen in the following:

I did learn something from writing in my log diary (at the Institute). But, it was the problem of having a writing exercise to do ... some simple checklist of what you liked that day-- as opposed to writing all of that on the whole page... I suppose if you were taking this for more than graduate credit, and needed something to turn in, besides taking your own notes --- now I'm being honest with you--- I didn't like the diaries.

It was beneficial for me, (attending the Institute's inservice) and probably more for the other art teachers rather than the regular teachers. I liked the lectures from Bob Arnold because I'm interested in that (topic)... you sort of need a lot of energy to listen... for those who teach art it wouldn't be so hard, but not knowing who the artists were that Bob was talking about, or even to tell if it was "contemporary" or not art... we art teachers are all so used to seeing that kind of art, we get to see it more often.

The whole thing (the inservice) could be like a "chore" to attend... I felt that way at first-- then I began to enjoy learning the things... part of it was the fun group, making it not so serious.

From the Son of Heaven art and artists, and the information I received to teach my kids, I learned a lot!

Along with the reflections about what had been learned and how, there were reflections of how well. Some of the teacher comments evaluated themselves as students of art, both during the Partnership Implementation process and the educational systems prior to the summer inservice.

From 1984 to now, I've had some "growth". I can see the difference in the (students') products. I think that goes back to better history, criticism

and aesthetics. They're understanding it better so their products are turning out better. I feel like I'm more successful when I see the kids' work out there (in the halls). If I don't like what I see, I feel like I failed and ask "what didn't I get across to them?". The products are better because I have grown in the other three disciplines to make it more clear, more concise, less fuzzy as to what I expect of them. I'm able to direct the questions and responses better. We stay on track. I'm now able to deal with "That's weird".

I guess the reason why I didn't do so well in art history (in undergrad) was that I had a problem with the interpretations the teacher gave on the art work. Interpretation is the difficult part for me. Some of the interpretations they would come up with just seemed so far-flung to me... I could never understand... I'd never get that from the work in the American Literature class I took either... I thought maybe they were making it up!

The last grouping of the adult learner comments referred to the areas where the teachers wanted to learn more. Three of the four teachers interviewed made the following comments at the end of their first year of DBAE implementation:

Future problems I see I need to deal with include my trying to understand aesthetics a little bit better, by looking at my information, questions, a class (at the university).

It would be the area of art history that I would like to learn more about... when I was in undergrad, that had to be the worst course for me... I can't remember all the facts... I feel like I have a good, well-rounded background to teach art, but in talking with (my student teacher), it doesn't seem like they require as much studio as they used to.

I know that for next year, other people (from my district) will be involved. I will be interested in seeing what they do.

Next year, any changes I can foresee in the implementation of DBAE is just to continue this "growth". I think it is getting better, easier, and more effective. I don't want to change any ideals drastically. I think it all comes with time and experience to get it to the kids better.

Summary of Teacher Responses Concerning the Adult Learner

In this final emergent category, data relating to that of the adult learner were presented. It was filled with reflection and commitment to change. Teachers reflected upon the use of the log diaries. They mentioned particular inservice lectures that caught their interests. They credited the use of "Son of Heaven" to further their knowledge. The teachers also recalled and evaluated the strengths in which they felt they had taught their students using this new knowledge. Commitment to change came about due to this reflection and evaluation. Data were presented indicating teachers' desires to continue such learning.

Chapter Summary

The organization and reduction of similar teacher responses into seven distinct categories (from an initial fourteen) provided the primary data analysis for this fourth chapter. Such categories and their supporting teacher responses were presented. They included the areas concerning DBAE, the institute, resources, lesson plans, teamwork, assessment and evaluation, and the adult learner.

Chapter V, "Summary and Discussion", will follow and is the final portion of this dissertation. In it, a summary of individual teacher responses will be provided. In order to further analyze such data and form conclusions, Gene Hall's "Levels of Use" model (1975) will be applied to the discussion section of Chapter V. Following this last phase of analyses, my "Reflections On the Methodology and Results" and "The Relationship of Findings with Previously-written Work" will be presented. With the deduced information, implications for future teacher development, district use, and institute guidelines will finally be offered.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The intent of this chapter is to review, interpret, and explain what has been written thus far to help provide meaning and significance to the study. As a reminder, the purpose of this study was to explore and analyze common factors affecting elementary art teacher views and decisions concerning DBAE implementation during the first year. A qualitative research methodology was employed involving guiding research questions to collect and analyze data primarily from specialized interviews. Common factors emerged, were focused into categories, and presented as major findings. The organization of this chapter for summary and discussion will follow the pattern of the categories presented previously.

Summary

As a result of this exploration, common factors emerged, forming seven distinct categories as presented in Chapter IV. Summaries of the four teachers' responses as a group in each of the categories were also provided. Due to the

uniqueness of each teacher and her district's situation during the implementation process and the goal to offer implications for further teacher, district, and institute development, a summary of the findings from each individual teacher's responses will be presented. This will be accomplished in the format of Teacher "A", "B", "C", and "D". In some cases, the individual summaries will be supported with specific findings. The format for the findings which will be attributed will be the same for each teacher: "A", "B", "C", and "D". The reader, therefore, can access and examine the summaries either through all of the categories for each teacher (with references to figures 6-9) or through the same category across all of the teachers' responses (with references to figure 10).

Summary of Responses From Teacher "A" Through The Emergent Categories Presented As Major Findings.

DBAE

The summary of teacher "A"'s responses concerning DBAE focused on aesthetics. She acknowledged the efforts of her team in "successful" DBAE implementation especially by giving her students more opportunities to talk about art. To her, the talking about art involved aesthetics. Aesthetics meant questioning... "Is it art?; to know whether it is art; why you think it is art...and to answer with excitement about the art".

Institute

Overall, this teacher said she enjoyed attending the three week summer inservice. She felt she was able to meet the Getty's objectives as presented through the institute. However, she noted that she would feel better about attending the inservice again only without the work required of her. With regards to one of the sessions she attended during the course of the first year, she would like to give some kind of feedback to the presenters in terms of content applicable to classroom use.

Resources

One major aspect of the first year's implementation of DBAE was the expanded availability and use of visuals--textbooks, prints, and slides. Teacher "A" liked the fact that she could show her students more exemplars of art which were purchased by her district's resource center. Even though only one other teacher in her school had used the Chapman text, she noted a positive outcome in the preparation of that teacher's students because of the text resource. This teacher also noted the positive support she received from her district's art supervisor for the retrieval and use of resources throughout the implementation process.

Lesson Plans

When talking about the structure of her lessons throughout the year and what she chose to teach her students about art with DBAE, teacher "A" said she "based everything on concepts anyway, instead of being product-oriented... and that has to be a compromise...". Even though her year-long plans had to be written by September, she admitted that some of her lessons were made-up or changed at the last minute because she saw the results of another teacher's art lesson or was enthused about some presentation during the course of the year. She appreciated the positive influence the institute had on her district and noticed the planning of lessons were easier. This was due to the interest DBAE had created in other teachers in her school and because of the available resources.

Teamwork

Although this teacher notes several instances where she saw a great amount of student progress due to the other teachers' classroom preparation for the lessons, there were at least two disappointments. She was not satisfied with some of the teachers' efforts concerning the longevity of self-motivation and interest in the project. She noted that they "didn't always incorporate DBAE in their class work" as they promised. Another disappointment was that "many

dropped-out after the first half of the school year. Some teachers still created a problem of wanting art to be product-oriented". This disappointment could be seen not only among her team, but also in that of her realization of the district's push for "art products".

Assessment and Evaluation

Teacher "A" was very open and frank about how she assessed and evaluated her students in her art classes. She admitted that she was so surprised with the positive responses she received from her students when she let them talk about art. She was happy to have a greater opportunity to let her children talk more about art and said that this increased time affected their cognitive processes and use of vocabulary in a positive way as well.

Adult Learner

As an adult learner at the three week institute, this teacher considered herself a good teacher, enjoying and benefitting from the lectures on contemporary art, but "didn't feel that the regular classroom teachers got a lot out of it". When asked to consider herself as the adult learner and all that she had learned with the implementation of DBAE, teacher "A" admitted that her weakest area in art was in the "environmental and performance art" and that she would like to learn more in these areas.

Summary of Responses From Teacher "B" Through The Emergent Categories Presented As Major Findings

DBAE

When talking about the implementation of DBAE during the past year, teacher "B" immediately spoke about the discipline of aesthetics and decided to clarify her use of this portion of her program with a personal definition. She said that to her, the teaching of art and aesthetics meant to "talk about it", and she added... " what it means to them, how it makes them feel, what did the artist have in mind?... that there was no talk just about the beautiful".

She stressed the use of Feldman's method of criticism; incorporating description, analysis, and interpretation into her lessons. When asked about the application of judgment, she responded "not always".

Her feelings about the impact of DBAE and the first year's institute were "good!". She said she especially liked the trips they took with the other teachers as well as the time spent talking and working with one another in the breakout groups on the elementary level. This teacher noted the fine direction of the smaller groups by a particular institute faculty member.

Institute

Teacher "B" spoke about the institute in a positive tone. She attributed the increased collegiality among the

participants to the efforts put forth by institute's renewal activities throughout the year. She said the institute also tightened the bond of communication and the sharing of experiences among her own team members. She expressed an interest in returning to some of the second year's institute events and help as a mentor in any way she could. She admitted that she was able to reflect on her inserviced time without the need of the diaries and that the institute should find a better way to retrieve such information for the participants.

Resources

The availability and use of resources in this district is reflected upon by its art teacher in terms of being "very good". She said her district provided her with ample visuals, books, slides, and support for any outside coursework she wished to do, such as her involvement with the Ohio Partnership. This teacher said she was interested in what current artists were doing-- both in and around her community and the "world". It was her ambition to get her students involved more with contemporary art and to take advantage of the vast amount of resources available to do this.

Lesson Plans

In reviewing her plans from the year, teacher "B" noted that most of her lessons fell under the topics of "Art Movements". She had these topics lead to the art of the 20th century. All of the art works were based on the images or "prints" made available to her. In addition, the selection of artists depended heavily upon decisions made in the planning stages by both the music teacher and herself, as they have paired their lessons. In her classes, she would present information about an art movement of a particular time period and use at least one artist from that period. The music teacher did likewise. She felt this "pairing", along with the "generalist" classroom teachers' work, helped offer some continuity for the students. A good example of this was in the fieldtrip planning and preparation to see "Son of Heaven" in downtown Columbus. More specifically, she said she worked with the other teachers on the third grade level to have their students study symbols and create a dragon.

Plans for the future and continuing the implementation of DBAE in her lessons include taking the students to the Columbus Museum of Art in February to see the African Show. Teacher "B" said that she has already made plans with the other teachers and administration, as well as with the

director of art education at the museum, to prepare their students for this visit.

Teamwork

The collection of responses by this teacher indicate that she was completely satisfied with the amount of team effort she was given in her building. Student successes were noted and she credited them to the wonderful support and communication she experienced from the other teachers and her principal alike. This teacher was already planning for the next year of DBAE implementation. Her lesson plans included the addition of teachers other than those on the initial team that attended the 1988 summer institute. She seemed excited about the "learning" she saw in her students and was motivated to continue that "learning" herself.

Assessment and Evaluation

A search for more meaningful ways to assess and evaluate students in art is a goal for teacher "B". She said she does not like to give written tests, but does so occasionally just to have numbers on paper. Her greatest joy in the evaluation process is hearing the students talk about art in the hallways during class changes and when they want to extend the "talk time" about a particular print or artwork during class. She was willing to adapt her lessons to these student requests.

Adult Learner

As to seeing herself as an adult learner and needs for the future, teacher "B" admitted that she did not feel strong in the discipline of aesthetics used in her classes, adding a desire for more history and getting into an interpretation of the art. She didn't feel that "judgment" in criticism was always necessary, nor was it always incorporated in her lesson plans. She also expressed the interest in taking more coursework about contemporary art.

Summary of Responses From Teacher "C" Through the Emergent Categories Presented As Major Findings

DBAE

Interpretations of DBAE implementation by teacher "C" involved her description of a major unit of lessons taught school-wide. She admitted that DBAE had taken too much of her time as a teacher. Along with the demands on her time from her district in other education-related activities, she felt DBAE had been very "stressing" on her. She also noted that in other lesson units, all four disciplines of DBAE were incorporated in most, but mainly involved art production and art history, using reproductions of art. Art criticism was incorporated in her 'artist of the month' sessions. This teacher admitted that the questioning tactics provided by the institute in a recent newsletter "were of no help" to incorporate aesthetics in her lessons.

Institute

Reflections on the past year of implementation began with the three week inservice. She said it was a "most valuable aspect" of an opportunity to meet other teachers. Admittedly, this teacher commented that many presentations at the inservice by some of the presenters in the disciplines were "over my head". Other speakers were considered "redundant" since she had heard them speak so many times before at other art education conferences. She offered suggestions for next year's institute to include a glossary of terms in the participant workbook given at the inservice. She also suggested that the institute offer a list of speakers to the past participants so that they may attend a session the following year if they wished.

Resources

With regards to resources, the comments by art teacher "C" were mainly concerned with requesting that the Ohio Partnership provide resources and information that hadn't been covered by the field so heavily in the past. She gave examples of how she had already heard from many of the inservice's guest speakers at the state conferences and had read about the disciplines in the journals. This teacher said she was interested, but that the resources and information provided was "nothing new". She offered

suggestions as to how the Partnership might be of greater help to "non art teachers" when they present their workbook of readings and exercises. Although she did not offer any information about the resources available from her district, fellow teachers, or her own collection (as did the other teachers interviewed), this teacher indicated she was not very motivated by any of the information or resources from the Institute.

Lesson Plans

The best source of information about lesson planning by the art teacher in this district was from a paper she wrote describing the implementation of DBAE in her school. Since the information from this paper was not included in the quotes from the focused interviews, a portion of it will be presented here: "Simultaneously, the students did research necessary to design and construct Indian shields. They made clay figures of animals important to their respective regions, and chose elements from myths to incorporate into a design on tooling metal. These were combined with beads, yarn, and feathers to create shields." Her lesson plans for the third grade level in this unit were to focus on history and studio to teach the students "about the way of life and the experiences of the Indians who inhabited the Great Plains during the 1700's as the white man moved westward across their land".

The stated objectives were: "The students will study the life-style and picture writing (art symbols) of the Plains Indians, use natural materials, wooden sticks, clay and manila paper to construct teepees and then will draw Indian symbols and decorative designs on teepees much like those on the actual teepees". Lastly, the students were to "make a replica of a Sioux village with teepees on poster board, brown paper, models of trees, racks of dries furs and clay pots".

Teacher-student activities included reading a story, demonstration and illustration, discussions, then do the above-described studio. In the future, (meaning next year's implementation of DBAE), this teacher hinted with her ideas about focussing on "Western, USA" in her lessons.

Teamwork

At this particular school, the art teacher said the main DBAE focus was on one major event which took place just before Christmas. The project, "Native American Studies", was a combined unit effort by teachers in Art, Language Arts, and Social Studies. The art teacher said the teacher for the gifted and talented students expressed the most amount of enthusiasm and organization, and "was the only one who was interested in continuing with the project". Very little continuous teamwork efforts throughout the school year were noted from this district.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment or evaluation-type comments concerning the implementation of DBAE, if any, were not noted from the teacher interviews in this district.

Adult Learner

It was teacher "C"'s belief that DBAE opened her school to new projects because it was labeled a "DBAE School". When asked if she considered herself as an "adult learner" within the implementation project, she responded "yes", but reminded me that she had continued her education at the university through a master's degree and had taught for ten years. In addition to the DBAE project, she told me she was already involved with another project for the advancement of the arts of ballet and music. Any desire to continue her education of DBAE would include coursework in art history and aesthetics, but with her time being spent on the other project, it was "highly unlikely". Former instruction in Art Education included knowledge from working with the Ohio Guide. During an early spring interview, this particular teacher added that she felt somewhat "burned out" having taught for ten years -- due to various reasons. "Demands on our own time" and a repetition of what was presented at the state conferences "seemed to fail to provide anything new".

Summary of Responses From Teacher "D" Through The Emergent Categories Presented As Major Findings

DBAE

In response to the question about DBAE and any adjustments as to what was needed to teach about art to her students, teacher "D" said she had been schooled in DBAE all during her undergraduate studies at the university and that "DBAE has been my life". In addition to the DBAE concepts, she noted other similar programs with which she has worked, naming the Ohio Guide and Arthur Efland's "Domains for Art" and that she doesn't stress "just the product".

Institute

This teacher couldn't get over the wonderful support she received by her school staff during the school year following the summer institute. She figured that it must have been the institute's stressing of team ownership and leadership that she was able to convey what she planned to do with her students. Her staff followed her wishes and contributed to the learning throughout the building. She found the follow-up workshops during the year a little confusing in content but offered great opportunities for her to discuss her problems with other participants from other districts.

Resources

"Resources" by teacher "D" were important to her in the implementation of DBAE because they related most to her prior education at the university. She felt that the influence of the text, the hand-outs and the visuals that she and her team chose to use complimented her plan of incorporating the art history, criticism, production, and aesthetics in her classroom. She said sometimes she was in awe over the realization of the many areas of resources-- artists, exhibits, and even the questioning strategies that were available to her. She felt confident and committed enough to DBAE and able to sort through this "richness of resources" to allow her children to grow in art.

In addition to the increase of resources, she was dedicated to continue collecting art visuals, literature, and resources around the city to use in her lesson plans. She said there was an increased awareness of art as a "real subject" after her team of teachers and principal attended the three week inservice. DBAE had become a well-known name around her building, so other teachers and staff were "looking" for art-related items to add to the collection as well. This teacher was motivated to get many things accomplished during this first year of DBAE implementation. But, she indicated, she felt somewhat overwhelmed by the end of the year and relinquished to wait until next year to

begin some of those projects. She was pleased to have received such a comprehensive list of readings from the Institute.

Lesson Plans

Teacher "D" desired to incorporate the curricular goals from the previous art teacher who is now at the high school, also involved in DBAE. She admitted that she had some trouble following the DBAE curriculum about three years ago, but the past two years have been "real good". The "trouble", she told, dealt with the discipline of aesthetics in that it was "hard to divide"; that she did not utilize the questions well. But this year, she said "yes to growth", and in the importance in the product "because of incorporating aesthetics as well as art history" in her classes. She noticed a greater use of "artistic vocabulary" in applying aesthetics and the whole of DBAE with an approach that is "more clear, more concise, and can direct the question with the response".

Plans for the next year of implementation of DBAE, especially on the third grade level, include what she referred to "an Artist Selection", similar to that of this year, which included the study of Miro, Matisse, Cezanne, Pollock, and O'Keeffe. She hopes to include her team principal, team classroom teacher and the other building teachers in next year's implementation. Her future

target-zone for herself is to "go back to the literature" and "learn more about aesthetics".

Generally, this teacher's process of implementing DBAE lessons followed the pattern of first offering the information about what they were going to do, who they were studying, employing Feldman's method of Criticism to discuss these matters, and then doing the studio for the lesson. Often, there would be a written or a talk session after the studio, again employing Feldman's Critical Inquiry methods. When asked for her own definition of "criticism", she said that it was "getting and looking at a work with Feldman's process", ... "analyzing through a microscope"... This teacher also acknowledged the fact that she did incorporate a "judgment" aspect to the process of criticism, but that "the best part was the interpretation". Teacher "D" stressed her feelings on the importance of using criticism in her classes.

Teamwork

This teacher seemed enthusiastic and pleased with the team support. Most of all, she noted a change in attitude about the importance of art among her fellow teachers. Many of them have extended their support for art and want to be more involved in what their children are experiencing through DBAE-- school-wide.

Assessment and Evaluation

Evaluation of what had been taught in the DBAE art classes centered mostly in talking with the students in review and closure of the lesson. Some evaluation techniques employed by this teacher also included quizzes which were graded by a "check", "plus" and "minus" system. This teacher noted that she gave a "major" test at mid-year over the first three artists studied. She then went on to teach about the "Son of Heaven" exhibit, used slides of the works and evaluated the learned knowledge by a student debate panel, and followed by a studio lesson on the information discussed.

Adult Learner

When asked to respond to the self-application of DBAE as an adult learner, this teacher noted that DBAE seemed to open her eyes to more abstract art and then she felt more comfortable with it... enough to present it (abstract art) to her students... calling it "different, fun". As far as any changes she noticed from the year's implementation of DBAE, this teacher immediately responded with the acknowledgement that by her attending the institute last summer and incorporating what she had learned in her own classes, it all seemed to have set off a "spark" in her as a person and as a teacher.

Discussion

To help provide meaning to this study, the discussion will include my interpretations and implications of the findings for teacher, district, and institute development. This will be done in five ways. First, I will offer what I believe to be the principles, relationships, and generalizations suggested by the results of the findings. Reflections on the methodology and unanticipated results will be presented second. Third, I will attempt to show how my findings agree or disagree with previously-written work in the areas of this exploration. Fourth and fifth, I will speculate on the implications of my work in terms of both theory and practice.

Principles, Relationships, and Generalizations

The principles of the study are suggested by its results. I have come to learn and decide upon seven major emergent categories to be known as the principles and upon which relationships and generalizations can be made. In making this decision, I have used my knowledge about and experience with DBAE in practice, the Getty's goals, and the Ohio Partnership's project. I have also applied knowledge gained from academic writings about the DBAE antecedents and implementation issues. Knowledge from the literature and

experience with a qualitative methodology has also helped me decide upon the principles which guided this study.

The seven emergent categories are related to the significance of this study. They can be seen as the areas of most importance in DBAE implementation to those interviewed. Responses made by the teachers were grouped and categorized as such because of their repeated appearance in the data and commonality with one another across the sites.

The results presented as emergent categories can also be seen as answers to the guiding research questions posed in Chapter I. Answers to all but the first nine were provided in the data of the emergent categories of Chapter IV. For the first question, Chapter III's "Settings and Participants" generally described each teachers' district size, classes, art room, types of students, class routine, amount of teaching time, lesson planning, and activities.

Answers to question two concerning changes in the educational environment, students, classroom teachers, and community were noted as a form of teacher evaluation in the related categories, especially in "Teamwork". The category of "Lesson Plans" answered number three as it presented most of the data concerning DBAE adaptations made by the teachers and their teams in order to meet their students' needs.

Aspects of the incorporation of DBAE into the school's general curriculum answered number four. They were portrayed primarily in the "Teamwork" section, as it was here that the

teachers described how their teams communicated (or didn't, as was seen in several instances) their implementation tactics.

Clearly, teacher descriptions of what resources were available and how they were utilized were presented in the category of "Resources", but can also be seen in other categories such as "Lesson Plans" and their use of the "Institute" and "DBAE". These descriptions answered question five. Likewise, question number six was answered in the category of "Lesson Plans", as was number seven in terms of "Assessment and Evaluation". Since most of the emergent categories provided answers to number eight concerning teacher views and involvement with DBAE and the institute, no one category in particular will be mentioned.

The last of the guiding questions, number nine, was answered in "Adult Learner". Here, notions as to how the participant viewed her own teaching of art and her future professional plans were portrayed. However, some information about the teachers' backgrounds in education were also in the "Settings and Participants" section of Chapter III.

My interpretations of the categorized data will be applied to Hall's "Levels of Use" (LoU) Chart (described in Chapter III, pp. 74-75). This information of participant use of the innovation will help form generalizations for further development on the teacher, district, and institute levels. My presentation of interpretations, applications, and

generalizations will follow the organization of the "Summary" section of this chapter. A graphic representation of these generalizations for each teacher will be provided on the page following their respective sections. An overall view of the cross-site use of the implementation will be offered at the end of this entire "Principles, Relationships, and Generalizations" section.

Teacher "A"

My interpretations of teacher "A"'s responses place her on several different levels of use of DBAE in the first year of implementation. Her views of the institute, lesson plans, and herself as an adult learner assumed the same level of "Integration" in usage. Her views about the institute were stabilizing because she felt she had met her goals. However, her desires to offer feedback to the presenters causes me to believe she is concerned about relating the effects of DBAE with others. Therefore, I place her use of the institute on the "Integration" level. Her last minute changes of lesson plans due to the results of another teacher's work also describe her as combining others' efforts with her own to achieve a collective impact. Reflections on her role as an adult learner evaluated what she knows and where she felt she "stood" next to the classroom teachers. Her interest in learning more in some areas were taken as her concern to

relate the effects of DBAE with what the other teachers were doing.

Her responses about the concept of DBAE and the influence resources had on her teaching lead me to believe teacher "A"'s use of them could be linked to the "Routine" level. With her focus on aesthetics and feeling comfortable with its use in the classroom showed me a sense of stability. She did not mention, however, any planned changes or need of improvement in her application of it. The same was done with the resources... she used the prints, slides and text made available to her and liked the positive effects they had on her students. No motion was made to go beyond what was already there for refinement of her collection or use of resources.

Her use of teamwork and tools for assessment/evaluation were placed at the level of "Refinement". I believe her efforts as a team member and evaluating her students' progress were good. She mentioned she saw how these two areas related with her work as a teacher. To elevate this level of use to "Integration" would not be sound, as she did not note any effort to share her concerns with others to reach a higher goal.

LEVELS OF USE DISTRIBUTION
TEACHER "A"

<u>Level of Use</u>		<u>Emergent Categories</u>						
Renewal	VI	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Integration	V	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Refinement	IVB	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Routine	IVA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mechanical	III	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Preparation	II	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Orientation	I	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Non-Use	0	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
1	DBAE							
2	INSTITUTE							
3	RESOURCES							
4	LESSON PLANS							
5	TEAMWORK							
6	ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION							
7	ADULT LEARNER							

Figure 6. Teacher "A"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories.

Teacher "B"

After I reviewed the data gathered about teacher "B"’s views and decisions, I had an astounding discovery. I placed most of her utilization of the implementation at the level of "Renewal". This is the level of use at which Hall suggests is the most desirable in an innovation. I consider this teacher to be one who seeks more effective alternatives in the categories pertaining to the institute, resources, lesson plans, teamwork, assessment and evaluation, and the adult learner. It was only in my perceptions of her use of the concept of DBAE that I placed her one level lower-- in "Integration". In this area, her sharing of ideas with other teachers on DBAE trips and discussion groups in order to achieve a common goal encouraged me to make this placement.

As to the "Renewal" applications, I noted several efforts on her part to re-evaluate herself and the system and to set new goals. For the institute, she not only evaluated its ability to increase teacher communication, but added suggestions of how she would return the next year to help do this. She said she had found many uses for the resources made available to her, but added comments about her efforts to continue to collect them and use them more effectively. Her views and use of lesson plans and the teamworking efforts were positively affected by her drive to achieve an increased impact on her students. Pairing with

the music teacher offers evidence of this. Even though she thought her methods of assessment and evaluation were not the best, she was looking for better ways to accomplish this. The efforts in these areas also help explain her "Renewal" level of use as an adult learner. Her mention of wanting to take more classes in both her "weak" areas and those of special interest credit her to this highest level of use.

LEVELS OF USE DISTRIBUTION
TEACHER "B"

Level of Use		Emergent Categories						
Renewal	VI	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Integration	V	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Refinement	IVB	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Routine	IVA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mechanical	III	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Preparation	II	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Orientation	I	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Non-Use	0	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
1		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	DBAE							
2	INSTITUTE							
3	RESOURCES							
4	LESSON PLANS							
5	TEAMWORK							
6	ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION							
7	ADULT LEARNER							

Figure 7. Teacher "B"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories.

Teacher "C"

I applied teacher "C"'s comments from three categories into the "Routine" level of use and those from four categories into the "Mechanical" level. I felt her use of the institute, resources, and opportunities as an adult learner seemed "Routine". To me, they were stabilized and showed no signs of change in the near future. Her comments of her experiences while attending the inservice sounded to me that she was "going through the motions", so to speak, especially since she felt she had heard much of it before. The same could be said of her use of resources-- "nothing new". Obviously, if very little change had taken place by the end of the first year, this teacher's use of additional learning was at a standstill as well. The "burned-out" feeling she expressed gave me the indication that it will be awhile before efforts toward change or improvement will take place.

This teacher's views and decisions concerning the use of the concept of DBAE, lesson plans, teamwork, and assessment/evaluation were all placed on the "Mechanical" level. She said she used all four disciplines in her teaching, but her descriptions of their use seemed superficial and somewhat 'disjointed'. From our conversations, I got the feeling she thought of their possible uses with her established lessons to be only on a

day-to-day level. She seemed to continue to rely primarily on lessons that had been taught over the past few years. She suggested her stressed feelings with the implementation because it took too much of her time. When this teacher described her efforts toward the preparation and teaching of the one DBAE unit with the team, it seemed to be a 'step-by-step' process. This approach probably attributed to its seeming a bit awkward in coordinating the art-learning efforts with those by the general curriculum team. Even though this teacher expressed nothing about assessment and/or evaluation in the interviews, I suspected that she was neither abstaining from any methods of this sort, nor putting any effort to making them routine. Therefore, I placed this use at the "Mechanical" level as well.

LEVELS OF USE DISTRIBUTION
TEACHER "C"

<u>Level of Use</u>	<u>Emergent Categories</u>							
Renewal	VI							
Integration	V							
Refinement	IVB		***	***				***
			***	***				***
Routine	IVA		***	***				***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mechanical	III	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Preparation	II	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Orientation	I	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Non-Use	0	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	DBAE							
2	INSTITUTE							
3	RESOURCES							
4	LESSON PLANS							
5	TEAMWORK							
6	ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION							
7	ADULT LEARNER							

Figure 8. Teacher "C"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories.

Teacher "D"

Teacher "D"'s responses were applied to several different levels of use. I interpreted her use of three categories during implementation to be on the "Renewal" level. I placed two categories on the "Integration" level, and two others on the "Refinement" level.

Those on the highest level, "Renewal", were in the areas of resources, lesson plans, and the adult learner. I felt her enthusiasm and ability in encouraging others in her building to collect DBAE-related resources was a sign of innovation. She presented her written lesson plans to me and re-evaluated her year's work. As she did this, she mentioned the need to make more and better "connections" to improve the quality of the lessons toward DBAE goals. This re-evaluation definitely had an affect on her views as an adult learner as she referred to the "spark" in herself as a person and a teacher.

LEVELS OF USE DISTRIBUTION
TEACHER "D"

Level of Use		Emergent Categories						
Renewal	VI			***	***			***
				***	***			***
				***	***			***
Integration	V		***	***	***	***		***
			***	***	***	***		***
			***	***	***	***		***
Refinement	IVB	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Routine	IVA	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mechanical	III	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Preparation	II	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Orientation	I	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Non-Use	0	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		***	***	***	***	***	***	***
1		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2		DBAE						
3		INSTITUTE						
4		RESOURCES						
5		LESSON PLANS						
6		TEAMWORK						
7		ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION						
		ADULT LEARNER						

Figure 9. Teacher "D"'s Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories

LEVELS OF USE DISTRIBUTION CROSS-SITE

<u>Level of Use</u>		<u>Emergent Categories</u>						
Renewal	VI		B	B D	B D	B	B	B D
			B	B D	B D	B	B	B D
			B	B D	B D	B	B	B D
Inte- gration	V	B	AB D	B D	AB D	B D	B	AB D
		B	AB D	B D	AB D	B D	B	AB D
		B	AB D	B D	AB D	B D	B	AB D
Refine- ment	IVB	B D	AB D	B D	AB D	AB D	AB D	AB D
		B D	AB D	B D	AB D	AB D	AB D	AB D
		B D	AB D	B D	AB D	AB D	AB D	AB D
Routine	IVA	AB D	ABCD	ABCD	AB D	AB D	AB D	ABCD
		AB D	ABCD	ABCD	AB D	AB D	AB D	ABCD
		AB D	ABCD	ABCD	AB D	AB D	AB D	ABCD
Mechani- cal	III	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
Prepara- tion	II	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
Orienta- tion	I	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
Non-Use	0	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD	ABCD
1	DBAE							
2	INSTITUTE							
3	RESOURCES							
4	LESSON PLANS							
5	TEAMWORK							
6	ASSESSMENT/EVALUATION							
7	ADULT LEARNER							

Figure 10. Cross-Site Levels of Use of the Innovation Among the Categories.

Reflections on the Methodology and Results

The experience gained from this study has shown me many sides of qualitative research. Of these, what I believe to be the most prominent are those which deal with the application of the methodology and those with the results.

Methodologically speaking, I see both flaws and successes. One main drawback was my own temptation to apply the data from only one teacher to form generalizations representing the entire district. I also see the fourteen-month-plus process of data-gathering as having provided me with too much data from too many sources from which to sort, analyze, interpret...

However, as time went on, the data-gathering and sorting became easier (less to deal with) and better (more intense information) by focusing my time and energies primarily on the responses from the interviews. Also, the data-gathering seemed to be better and more focused by the end of the year as it served as a "reflective" portion for the teachers. I felt my researching efforts gave the teachers an opportunity to review the documents they themselves had written or collected during the year.

The beauty of the focused interview allowed for the responses to be, for the most part, directed by the teacher. Therefore, the nature of the responses seemed to be what was of most interest and concern to each of the teachers.

The results of the study yielded some surprises. First, I had not anticipated transcribing the tapes myself. I found it to be very tedious and time-consuming. But after all was done, I felt I had grown to know the data very well to proceed into analysis with more confidence and certainty. I was disappointed in the fact that I was not able to use the photographs or written documents in the presentation of data. This was because of the identifying (anonymity) factor promised to the teachers (at their request).

Some other surprises were in the teacher responses. I was amazed to find the teachers so insecure or uncertain about the definition of DBAE and/or how to apply criticism and aesthetics in the classroom. I was also surprised to find the teachers' main motivations of pursuing a project was through the availability of the resources. It seemed the better the resources, the better the teaching. I was disappointed in seeing little or no assessment/evaluation methods used by teacher that could be recorded. In this case, I offer some sympathy to the teachers. They felt they hadn't been given any practical application at the inservice to regularly monitor their student's progress. This meant anything other than what was found in the textbooks. The textbooks were prescribed only as resources-- not direct means of DBAE teaching-- as they were the best to be found at this time.

I must have been disillusioned in thinking the energies and enthusiasm empowered by the summer inservice would get the year off to a faster start. What I felt was a more intense DBAE implementation did not begin until after the first workshop (October). I also thought this "hype" would last longer throughout the year than it actually did. From my observations, I felt the interest fade in late April, early May.

Relationships of Findings With Previously-Written Work

Access to additional information about the implementation of DBAE by members of the Ohio Partnership was available through the writings by two outside evaluators. Relationships of my findings can be made to the findings presented in these two documents. On the national level, the evaluator was Brent Wilson (with the assistance of his graduate student, Anne Wolcott) who was hired by the Getty Trust to observe and analyze each of the six regional summer institutes. He has attended and observed a good portion of both Ohio summer institutes thus far and has submitted a completed evaluation of the 1988 inservice.

On a more local level, the Ohio Partnership sought the assistance and evaluation from Doris Pfeuffer-Guay. Through her work with the largest school district involved in the first year of implementation, Doris provided the institute with an observational report of grades kindergarten through

twelve during the school year 1988-89. Where applicable, excerpts from these reports will be offered in the emergent categories.

Institute

Observations and evaluations by the national expert in art education assigned to this project, Brent Wilson, seemed to concur with most of the teacher views concerning the institute. As seen in the following passages from what I believe to be an eloquently-written report (1988), Wilson praises the institute for its successful execution of a DBAE inservice. He also offers some notes of areas of weakness:

In the Ohio Institute there was both a fine balance among the components and an extremely successful interplay among the components throughout the institute. ...the only component that seems to be missing is the early presentation of coherent practice models for DBAE units and individual lessons. (p.3)

The participants received a variety of lectures on the content and the inquiry modes of the four disciplines, but inasmuch as those lectures were given by historians, critics, artists, and aestheticians who practice their disciplines separately, the connections among the disciplines had to be made by the participants. Most appeared not to make those connections. (p.3)

The sureness and clarity with which members of the institute staff were able to discuss the theoretical character of a discipline-based art program was not matched by coherent illustrations of what their conception of DBAE would look like in practice. And this is one of the most serious issues faced by the institutes and by all who hope to practice DBAE. The problem is one relating to

how well the theory has been translated into practice. (p.3)

In the Ohio Regional Institute as well as in the other Regional Institutes the absence of coherent practice models-- complete lessons and units of instruction that exemplify the best conceptions of DBAE is a serious problem. The theoretical aspects of DBAE were in place in the Ohio Institute; the translation of those theories into practice was problematic especially for the elementary classroom teachers-- but less so for the art teachers who could draw upon their more extensive background with the disciplines of art. (p.5)

The year-long follow-up report of one of the school districts by Doris Pfeuffer-Guay provides some amenities to the problems foreseen by Wilson during the inservice. She observed teachers making adjustments to their missing-out on receiving coherent practice models. This can be seen in the following:

At present teachers perceive themselves as being closer to reaching a comfort level for themselves. Most have made many adjustments and have thus been able to discover instructional routines which will meet their needs. (p.1)

More data were retrieved from the Pfeuffer-Guay report that also seemed to refer to the category about the institute. She observed the benefits of the institute's efforts in guiding teachers toward change. She explains:

Observations of teachers and teaching over eight months in nineteen school buildings have provided a view of the process of change. The (institute), 1988, began the process of learning to make works of art central to the visual art curriculum of

(this district) and to use textbooks to guide a sequential curriculum. (p.1)

Resources

Again, passages from the evaluators' documents were found applicable to the data gathered in this exploration. Just as the teachers commented in Chapter IV about following Arthur Efland's state curriculum guide and Chapman's Discover Art, Wilson wrote about their compatibility to DBAE. Wilson praises Ohio's ownership of an excellent framework of art education. He also commends the partnership's congruous selections of textbooks. Amidst these laudations, he notes the unfortunate observation of teachers failing to extend the connections between the fine features of the resources with the goals of the discipline experts. Such can be seen in the following:

Through its curriculum guides and especially through its Planning Art Education in the Middle/Secondary Schools of Ohio, the state of Ohio has developed and has in place for a number of years a curricular framework that seems compatible with DBAE in virtually every respect. Moreover, the framework places strong emphasis upon the societal dimensions of artistic inquiry that critics have argued are missing from some conceptions of DBAE. ...There is an excellent opportunity to begin to implement an outstanding art education program by building exemplary practice models based upon the best features of their current state guidelines and the best conceptions of DBAE. (p.4)

... the textbooks sanctioned by the Ohio Institute and the other institutes were either organized around or contained large doses of this familiar art educational content and apparently the

participants were not informed explicitly that art historians, critics, and aestheticians do not attend to these features as ends in themselves; that they attend to them as they related to larger social, historical, and aesthetic issues. (p.4)

Wilson adds the Institute facility to the list of resources:

The teachers in the Ohio Institute had the textbooks available for use during the planning and application sessions. Also, holding the institute at Fort Hayes-- the location of the Art Resource Center for the Columbus Schools-- allowed teachers to borrow from the entire collection. (p.8)

Wilson's observations of teacher resource decision-making sessions seemed to be enlightening for him. He was pleased to overhear feuding conversations concerning the selection of visuals to be used in the schools. This "healthy sign", as he puts it, supports my study's review of Sergiovanni and Starratt's professional view of teaching. It is hoped that this type of differentiated discussions will lead teachers to not only make good decisions, but increase their satisfaction, commitment, and efficacy.

The informal debates that occurred regarding the types of images that should be studied were heated. The frustration of at least some of the teachers because prints representing minority groups were neither available from commercial suppliers nor well represented in the textbooks, points to a problem faced by art educators. We note that this attention to the works of art that comprise the primary content of a discipline-based art education is a healthy sign. (p.6)

Pfeuffer-Guay's evaluation of resources use during the year is mixed. She notes that in the beginning, the texts were improperly applied to the practice of inquiry. However, as time passed and teachers became more familiar with the books' visuals and corresponding poster-size prints, they were put to better use. This resource passage follows:

Textbooks early in the year were frequently the focus of DBAE instruction. They were often used without inquiry discussion of works of art. As this instructional methodology became less favored, teachers began to use the photographs in the textbooks along with large reproductions of works of art as the core of their teaching. (p.2)

Teamwork

Brent Wilson's report includes portions about my emerged category of teamwork. His evaluation of the Ohio Partnership's efforts in this area during the summer inservice are both positive and negative. He found favor with the elementary teams. He also made accusations that these same teams seemed uncertain and unclear on what DBAE was really all about. Such accusations presented here can also relate to the data already seen in my first emergent category of Chapter IV. There, you may recall the teachers admitted they were uncertain about criticism and aesthetics. Quotes from Wilson's document are as follows:

We found that the elementary school teams of classroom teachers, art teachers, and administrators worked extremely well together. But

It was also among these elementary teachers and administrators that the definitions of DBAE were least coherent and the least accurate. (p.12)

One teacher-participant's comment about how her fellow teachers were convinced of the possible benefits from DBAE is also reflected in the national evaluation. In his report, Wilson noted that many teachers can become convinced. The data presented in Chapter IV offered evidence that some teachers now feel that art is important to everyone. The teaming efforts on the elementary level are needed to invoke this change for the better. The passage from Wilson is as such:

Elementary classroom teachers who may not have taught much art in the past, and even those who have, can quite easily become convinced that they ought to teach art more frequently, more sequentially, and from a broadened, discipline-based perspective. For them it means doing more of something of value with their students for an hour or so more a week than they have done in the past. (p.8)

The actions of teamwork were also noted on the local level during the first year. The project evaluator observed some very positive happenings in the largest district as a result from its involvement in the Ohio Partnership. Efforts by principals, classroom teachers, and art teachers alike were described as 'breeding enthusiasm' toward 'expertise' and 'new ideas'. This may be the sort of change Wilson was hoping for from the elementary group. The local evaluation

recognizes cases where classroom teachers are more competent in talking about art with their students. However, she adds, they still value the expertise of the art specialist to teach art production to their children. The report is as follows:

The Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts, Regional Institute for Educators has without a doubt had an extremely positive affect on many elementary classroom teachers. Most have shown enthusiasm or a new found interest in visual art education. Their principals have been supportive. As this observer has brought concerns to principals, they have generally provided the support needed. Meetings have been facilitated, equipment ordered, work orders signed, and storage found. It appears that enthusiasm breeds enthusiasm. Principals who brought DBAE enthusiasm back to their buildings have had a great effect on the implementation of DBAE. Teachers who generally were enthusiastic about art for students renewed this enthusiasm and brought a greater degree of expertise and new ideas back to their classrooms. (p.10)

Observation has revealed the competence of many classroom teachers in the areas of questioning and motivating student involvement. Classroom teachers however, continue to feel that they are not competent art teachers. They have not always been pleased with their student's work and usually have not displayed it. Work done in the art classroom is generally displayed in classrooms as well as hallways. (p.10)

Proper teaching preparation was neglected when the teams did not allow enough time to meet regularly. This factor affected resource use. In these cases, art was taught more independently. Textbooks were not applied to the lessons to gain their full benefit. This can be seen in parts of the local report:

The lack of team planning time has greatly hampered the efficacy of DBAE in elementary schools. Rather than classroom teachers preparing students for working with the art teacher on following up with historic, aesthetic or critically based art lessons, classroom teachers have become isolated in their approaches to DBAE. They have either followed the textbook lessons sequentially or they have used the text to plan art as an integral part of non-art learning. One deciding factor in this has been the method of work of the art teacher. In the building where the art teacher uses the textbook production activities sequentially, teachers are free to do more discussion and writing about works of art. Where the art teachers follow the concepts of the textbook and use many reproductions, classroom teachers are free to either follow the sequence of the textbook production and discussion activities or to choose lessons in art that are interesting to them or integral to other classroom learning. In the building where the art teacher works fairly isolated, the teachers have provided only infrequent or "isolated" DBAE involvement. (p.10)

Assessment and Evaluation

Brent Willson's report was similar to the teachers' in the use of assessment and evaluation of student ability and progress. He evaluated the Institute's ability to use assessment and evaluation during the course of the three week inservice. He then posed questions as to the application of these educational methods of measurement on the school level. Documentation in these two areas will be presented. First, Willson's comments about the institute:

At the beginning of the second and third weeks of the institute the evaluation team provided the organizers and instructional staff with reports of the conduct of the institute during the preceding week. The evaluation staff had compiled these

insightful reports from summaries of evaluator observations of institute sessions, data gathered from log-diaries kept by the participants, and weekly evaluation forms. This ongoing documentation and evaluation of both the presentations and procedures that functioned successfully and those that functioned less successfully were presented as quickly as possible so that they might be taken into account while the memories of the sessions were fresh in the minds of the institute staff. The assessment of the conduct of the institute was outstanding. (p.13)

The Wilson report posed two questions about the use of assessment on the school level:

Should the assessment of student progress be made more a part of the institute program?
Should student assessment be seen as the joint responsibility of an evaluator associated with the institute and evaluators and teachers in each of the school districts? (p.14)

The report also included some implications:

Perhaps evaluation will only become a joint project when teachers, principals, and supervisors are taught the rudiments of testing and assessment in DBAE programs and when they are given clear directives regarding their ongoing assessment and evaluation responsibilities. The addition of an assessment component would also have the effect of focusing the curricular planning on essential dimensions of content and method in DBAE. (p.14)

Adult Learner

Both of the evaluators' reports also indicated notions of teachers becoming adult learners during the implementation of DBAE. Wilson's document pinpoints the group of art teachers in need for change. He congratulates

the Ohio Partnership for empowering this group to professional satisfaction, commitment to DBAE, and efficacy:.

For specialist art teachers, the acceptance of DBAE may mean changing the values and practices of an entire professional career. It means discarding things with which they are familiar and comfortable, and beginning to teach differently every hour of every day of the school year. Obviously, it's much easier to add a small bit to one's repertoire than to change one's entire act. And yet the Ohio Institute was successful in bringing about enormous changes in the way art teachers planned to teach when school opened in the fall. (p.8)

Likewise, the district observation and evaluation also included areas of adult learning. The Pfeuffer-Guay report describes the series of changes in teachers that took place during the school year. It seems almost like a metamorphic change through an enormous amount of hard work on the teachers' parts. However, not all of the teachers put forth the needed hard work from the very beginning. She notes a glimmer of hope for change in those teachers as well. This, she writes, is through time and the use of available resources.

This process of learning has been characterized by an exploration and experimentation, assessment and adjustment, problem defining and problem resolving. Many art teachers have expressed the thought that they have often felt as though they are again first year teachers. They have struggled with the concerns of inadequate knowledge, time for planning and the research it has entailed, availability and the securing of material

resources, and classroom management in the presence of instructional practices that have been unfamiliar to both students and teachers. (p.1)

The teachers who have not explored but rather settled into a routine early in the year, or postponed becoming involved, are the least content with DBAE. There are however, recent indications that several of these teachers are discovering personal and material resources and will increase their involvement with DBAE practices next year. Elementary classroom teachers working with Discovering Art are finding correlations with their non-art curriculum which they will use in the future. (p.1)

More relationships can be made between my findings and other previously-written work. Some of these refer to issues presented in Chapter II concerning private versus public funding of educational institutions. Findings from this study and personal experience as a teacher makes me lean toward the position on private funding that agrees with Jerome Cramer's argument (Chapter II of this dissertation) which suggests the use of support from both the private and public sectors. Critics of educational foundation-forming and corporate-funding efforts believe many teachers would not want an outside source telling them how and what to teach, just because they have given money to support the program. However, findings from the study of DBAE implementation by the Ohio Partnership do not agree with this criticism. My findings show that the Partnership has covered a great deal of research and debate on the funding and ownership of the curriculum program. Also, with the Ohio

Partnership's program, who is to say that the Getty has such a strong handle on the plans developed by the teachers and their school teams during the three week inservice?

Research by Savage and Skolnik (1985), also described in Chapter II, concerning strategies to encourage change agree with my findings about the institute and its course of action toward change. Teacher views and observations indicate activities for research, development, diffusion, and adoption in DBAE's implementation. Parallels to Hall's (1975) work with that by Savage and Skolnik (1985) concerning activities for change (which have been noted in Chapter III) also agree with my findings about the institute. It appears that the institute has encouraged each of the teachers to engage in inventing, engineering, informing, demonstrating, testing, installing, and establishing activities.

I realize that DBAE has its critics from the field of art education on the matter of 'who controls what'. I feel that a new curriculum should be given a chance to be tried in the schools for some time to test its effectiveness. With the results, I think the whole field should be involved in considering its termination or continuation nationwide. Brent Wilson (1988) sums-up my feelings very well on this issue:

"I hold the opposite belief"...(from some members of the arts education community who believe that

the federal government has no business looking into arts curricula, standards, and the evaluation of arts programs)... Art education is the sole property of us art educators. It is a national resource; it belongs to the public; it belongs to students in schools. We should welcome a national discussion of what we are now doing, of what we reach the art educational goals that we all agree upon." (p.16).

Using the indicators and recommendations provided in the NAEA/Wilson report (1988) as a checklist, it could be said that the Ohio Partnership has covered just about every item over a great amount of time and effort. Matching the support of private funds by the J. Paul Getty Trust, the Ohio Partnership has already begun its advocacy of bringing the groups together for a worthwhile change. Art teachers, classroom teachers, teacher educators, administrators, and policy makers have all met in one way or another. Together, they have charted their courses for five years, incorporating the DBAE curriculum in the public schools with selections of texts and materials.

In the 1988 Ohio Partnership teacher inservice, participants noted that they learned more on how to utilize DBAE in teaching about art in their classrooms. Knowledge from the DBAE inservice gave them the opportunity to create text extensions and incorporate the support from arts advocacy groups. All of this activity is the initial stage of DBAE implementation, assisted and supported by the Getty Trust, a private foundation.

From the results of my study, I welcome financial support, both private and public. The "team-effort" implementation plans accomplished during the summer inservice may be carried-out and given a chance where finances are low. One critic, Carroll Johnson (1983), a school consultant and professor emeritus at Columbia University, said that foundations won't work without a large infusion of time and effort. In addition, the critic notes:

"At best, foundations are a supplement -- a holding action for financially troubled public school systems. But they are no substitute for broad-based support of public schools."

Actions by The Ohio Partnership agree with this view. It has contributed a great deal of both time and effort into the implementation of DBAE. Statistics show that public support is not going to suffice all educators, and art education has had a history of being "financially troubled", let alone, being mis-recognized as a "frill" in the schools.

Theoretical Implications

Understandings of my findings may offer implications to theory toward teacher, district, and institute development. From what I understand of the teachers involved in the implementation, DBAE was most mis-understood as a concept to find definition. What some of the teachers described as their doing "criticism", theoretically, they weren't. They

were merely talking about art, not making informed judgments.

Another point can be made about how teachers view the facilitator of the innovation. Facilitators should confirm their role to the participants. The teachers seemed to see the Institute in many ways. One could be as an entertainer, another as a resource, and another as a threatening reminder. The teachers found the Ohio Partnership to be very helpful and supportive as an advocate, recognizing the importance of art in the schools. But, they treated the benefits derived from the Ohio Partnership's Summer Inservice somewhat like one does the experiences at a camp-- as a very entertaining and learning experience-- but only while attending. The teachers allowed for most of the work and inspiration to drop after the month and a half vacation (before the new school year even began-- an explanation for the slow start...) or some time after the beginning wore-off. In the spring, they turned to the Ohio Partnership as one would turn to a mother for constant inspiration and "spoon-feeding" of information and encouragement (almost nagging/ threat of poor evaluation). They felt that if they didn't practice "Good DBAE techniques", or get something worthwhile together to be able to present at the "Success Stories" Workshop and as mentors at the following summer inservice, the Institute would "fail" them.

The use of textbooks as resources is still negotiable. The teaching was only as good as the available resources. Lesson plans were affected by the resources based on their availability. As to teamwork, the implementation offered greater opportunities for communication to meet educational goals. I believe such goals should already be in place through any other means, not just because they went to the visual arts inservice. The areas of assessment and evaluation also received a great amount of mis-understanding of what it is, how they can apply it to their classroom work in teaching about art, and gaining higher student achievement. Findings about the adult learner offered teachers a sense of reflection and self-evaluation. I believe this is only important if the teacher makes the decision to do something about this evaluation-- to continue with the actions that reap success, inquire about how to improve, and provide practice with that new knowledge.

Practical Implications

Implications for teacher, district, and institute development can be applied to practice. First, DBAE needs to be explained better (more thoroughly?), offer practical applications to the classroom/ art lessons, especially in the areas of criticism and aesthetics. The institute should continue to offer support and encouragement. According to prior research on change through innovation and the findings

from this study, it won't be much longer for the teachers to be able to make clearer decisions. Also perhaps they will be able to take on a stronger leadership role to govern their own teaching for the betterment of teaching.

Resources must continue to be an inspiration, but need to be more available, grow in numbers, and be more diverse. Lesson plans will benefit by the use of the resources, teamwork strategies, and possibly exemplars of model teaching. Teamworking efforts were off to a good start at the inservice. They continue to be a strength for some schools in planning and implementing throughout the year by being a source for increased communication. In other schools, teamworking efforts need to be encouraged and strengthened -- perhaps volunteered and/or assigned leadership roles need to rotate among each member. This approach may eliminate accusations of some who are not participating enough and to be more sympathetic and understanding of others' roles. A great deal of work needs to be done in the areas of assessment and evaluation for practical use. Praises were only in the areas of assessing and evaluating the institute, not in the area of classroom applications of DBAE. In the cases where there was no evidence of this, the institute should encourage teachers to apply the methods provided in the textbooks and practice evaluating peers' practice teaching sessions at the inservice.

As to the role of the adult learner, I speculate that after greater attempts are made to the above-mentioned activities, the enthusiasm for more learning in the teachers may take place. As it has been seen in other research mentioned in Chapters I and II, an implementation effort has the ability to promote teacher satisfaction, their commitment to new concepts, and expansion of professional views. Therefore, hopefully, changes may take place to increase the achievement levels of students, our future.

APPENDIX

DATA RELATIVE TO CHAPTER I

The
Ohio Partnership
 for the Visual Arts:

Regional Institute for Educators

Summer Institute
June 13 - July 1
1988

Monday, June 13, Week 1: An Overview of DBAE and the Institute

- 9:00-9:30 Coffee in the Gallery
- 9:30-10:00 Welcome; overview of DBAE and the next five years; meet
 (1.1.1) the participants
 Nancy MacGregor
- 10:00-10:15 An overview of the three week Institute; meet the faculty
 (1.1.2) (Kathleen Desmond, James Hutchens, Louis Lankford)
 Terry Barrett
- 10:15-11:00 "The Place of Art in The General Curriculum"
 (1.1.3) Michael Parsons, Department of Art Education, OSU
- 11:00-12:00 Introductory session in breakout groups:
 (1.1.4) K-5, Louis Lankford - PA 106
 6, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106A
 7-8, James Hutchens - PA 104
 H.S., Terry Barrett - PA 109
- 12:00-1:00 Lunch (complimentary) - Art Gallery
- 1:00-1:45 "Encountering Works of Art Through Aesthetic, Critical,
 (1.1.5) Historical, and Artistic Inquiry"
 Edmund Feldman
- 1:45-2:00 Break
- 2:00-3:00 "Needs Assessment: Moving the Present Curricula to DBAE"
 (1.1.6) Ayres D'Costa, College of Education, OSU
- Breakout groups: (Same as in the morning)
 P.M. (Policy Makers, superintendents & board members), Pat
 Smith, President of The Ohio Board of Education - Theater
- 3:00-4:00 Social Event: Forming the Partnership - Art Gallery
 (1.1.7)

Tuesday, June 14, Week 1: The Art Historian and The Art Critic

- 9:00-9:15 (1.2.1) Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
Nancy MacGregor
- 9:15-10:00 (1.2.2) "What Is Art History and What Does A Historian Do?"
Francis Richardson, History of Art, OSU
- 10:00-10:15 Break
- 10:15-12:00 (1.2.3) Breakout groups: Hands-on Historical Inquiry Activities with Reproductions

K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106
6, James Hutchens - PA 106A
7-8 & P.M., Louis Lankford - PA 104
H.S., Terry Barrett PA-105
- 12:00-1:00 Lunch (on your own)
- 1:00-1:45 (1.2.4) "What Is Art Criticism and What Does an Art Critic Do?"
Mathew Herban, History of Art, OSU, Former Art Critic for
The Columbus Citizen Journal
- 1:45-2:00 Break
- 2:00-4:00 (1.2.5) Breakout groups - Critical Inquiry Activities: describing,
interpreting, and evaluating art with reproductions

K-5 & P.M., Terry Barrett - PA 106
6, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106A
7-8, James Hutchens - PA 104
H.S., Louis Lankford - PA 109

Wednesday, June 15, Week 1: The Cleveland Museum of Art

- 10:00 Depart Columbus
- 1:00-1:15 (1.3.1) Welcome, Penny Buchanan, Coordinator of the Teacher
Resource Center
- 1:15-2:00 (1.3.2) "The Workings of an Art Museum: Who Does What and Why"
Katherine Solender, Associate Curator
- 2:00-2:45 (1.3.3) Breakout groups with Museum staff:

18th and 19th English and American Painting
Katherine Solender

Asian Art
Margerie Williams

Monet's Waterlilies
Andrea Harchar

Pre-Columbian Art
Gerald Karlovec
- 2:45-5:00 (1.3.4) Individual viewing of the museum collection and the Teacher
Resource Center
- 5:00-7:00 (1.3.5) Italian dining on the Hill
- 7:00 Depart Cleveland

Thursday, June 16, Week 1: The Aesthetician and Aesthetic Inquiry

- 9:00-9:15 (1.4.1) Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
Nancy MacGregor
- 9:15-10:00 (1.4.2) "What Is Aesthetics and What Does An Aesthetician Do?"
Margaret Brand, Department of Philosophy, OSU
- 10:00-10:15 Break
- 10:15-12:00 (1.4.3) Breakout groups: Sessions doing aesthetic inquiry
K-5, Louis Lankford - PA 106
6, Lee Brown, Department of Philosophy, OSU & Terry Barrett - PA 106A
7-8, Kathleen Desmond - PA 104
HS & P.M., James Hutchens - PA 109
- 12:00-1:00 Lunch (on your own)
- 1:00-1:45 (1.4.4) "Aesthetic Questions for Children"
Michael Parsons, OSU
- 2:00-4:00 (1.4.5) Identifying aesthetic issues in the textbooks for extending DBAE
K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106
6, Terry Barrett - PA 106A
7-8 & P.M., James Hutchens - PA 104
HS, Louis Lankford - PA 109

Friday, June 17, Week 1: The Artist and Artistic Inquiry

- 9:00-9:15 (1.5.1) Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
- 9:15-10:00 (1.5.2) "What I Do as An Artist"
Michael Chipperfield, Department of Art, OSU
- 10:00-10:15 Break
- 10:15-11:30 (1.5.3) Breakout groups: The Artist as a Resource for DBAE
K-5 & P.M., Terry Barrett - PA 106
6, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106A
7-8, James Hutchens - PA 104
HS, Louis Lankford & Michael Chipperfield - PA 109
- 11:30-1:00 Lunch and Travel
- 1:00-4:00 (1.5.4) Visits to Artists' Studios in the KAPAC Warehouse,
Columbus - 400 Dublin Road, opposite of the old penitentiary, 1 block west of Neil Avenue
- Breakout groups: visits to three artists in their studios
Peter Massing, Printmaker
Mike McEwan, Painter
Amy Ivanoff, Mixed media

Monday, June 20, Week 2: Teaching Historical Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (2.1.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
9:15-10:00 (2.1.2)	"Art History in The Classroom" Gerald Brommer, author of <u>Discovering Art History</u>
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-12:00 (2.1.3)	Breakout groups: Doing historical inquiry activities with reproductions K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - PA 106A 7-8, James Hutchens - PA 104 H.S., Gerald Brommer & Terry Barrett, using <u>Discovering Art History</u> - PA 109
12:00-1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-1:45 (2.1.4)	"Art Since 1945" Robert Arnold, artist, art critic, and Acting Dean, College of The Arts, OSU
1:45-2:00	Break
2:00-4:00 (2.1.5)	Breakout groups: Making contemporary art meaningful to students: K-5, Kathleen Desmond 6, Louis Lankford 7-8, James Hutchens H.S., Terry Barrett Examining resource materials for teaching art, Judith Hubble-Smith, Columbus Public Schools

Tuesday, June 21, Week 2: Teaching Critical Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (2.2.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
9:15-10:00 (2.2.2)	"Engaging Children in Critical Dialogue" David Lyman, Dance Critic for <u>Cincinnati Enquirer</u> and Critic-in-the-schools, Ohio Arts Council
9:45-10:00	Break
10:00-11:30 (2.2.3)	Breakout groups: Critical Inquiry with reproductions K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, James Hutchens - PA 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., Louis Lankford - PA 109
12:00-4:00	Gallery Hop in the Short North
1:30-4:00 (2.2.4)	Breakout groups: Guided critical inquiry in each of three galleries, 35 minutes each Fergus-Jean Gallery 694 North High by Elizabeth Fergus-Jean, owner Descriptive critical inquiry, James Hutchens Ace Gallery 772 North High Street Mission of ACE Gallery by Ricardo Davenport, Executive Director Interpretive critical inquiry, Terry Barrett Nicolae Gallery 718 North High Street Mission of the Nicolae Gallery by the Director Evaluative critical inquiry, Louis Lankford and Kathleen Desmond

Wednesday, June 22, Week 2: Columbus Museum of Art

2:00-2:15
(2.3.1) Welcome
 Merribell Parsons, Director, Columbus Museum of Art

2:15-3:00
(2.3.2) "The Importance of Understanding Historical Knowledge
 in Understanding Art"
 Craig McDaniel, Director of Programs, Columbus Museum
 of Art

3:00-3:15 Break

3:15-4:00
(2.3.3) Breakout groups: "Encountering Works of Art through
 Historical Inquiry"
 Susan Meyers
 Carole Genshaft
 Craig McDaniel and Columbus Museum of Art Staff

4:00-5:30
(2.3.4) Individual viewing of the museum collection

5:30-7:30
(2.3.5) Jazz in the Museum Courtyard - Bobby Floyd Trio
 (optional)
 (wine and beer bar)
 (spouses welcome)
 (\$2.50 admission fee)

Thursday, June 23, Week 2: Teaching Aesthetic Inquiry

9:00-9:15
(2.4.1) Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today

9:15-10:00
(2.4.2) "Aesthetics: When Children Can Do What"
 Michael Parsons, author of How We Understand Art, Art
 Education, OSU

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-12:00
(2.4.3) Breakout groups: art making issues in aesthetics

 K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106
 6, Louis Lankford - PA 106A
 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104
 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109

12:00-1:00 Lunch (on your own)

1:00-1:45
(2.4.4) "The Use of a Textbook Series in The Teaching of Art,"
 Laura Chapman

1:45-2:00 Break

2:00-4:00
(2.4.5) Breakout groups: Extending the textbooks for DBAE

 K-5, Laura Chapman, Discover Art - PA 106
 6, Louis Lankford, Our World: Lands and Cultures - PA
 106A
 7-8, Terry Barrett, Understanding and Creating Art - PA
 104
 H.S., James Hutchens, Discovering Art History - PA 109

Friday, June 24, Week 2: Teaching Artistic Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (2.5.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today
9:15-9:45 (2.5.2)	"Artists in the Schools" Sally Ford, Greater Columbus Arts Council
9:45-10:30 (2.5.3)	"Combining the Teaching of Studio with History, Criticism, and Aesthetics" Laura Chapman
10:30-10:45	Break
10:45-12:00 (2.5.4)	Breakout groups: Planning for 4 Peer Teaching sessions based in the different disciplines (each teacher will teach 1 lesson and receive 3) K-5, Kathy Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - PA 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109
12:00-2:00	Lunch on your own and Travel
2:00-4:00 (2.5.5)	Conversations with exhibiting artists at the Cultural Arts Center 139 West Main Street and Glenn Doell, painter and sculptor, exhibiting at Gallery 200 200 West Mound
4:00 (2.5.6)	Wine and cheese reception at Gallery 200 (spouses welcome) (complimentary)

Monday, June 27, Week 3: Implementing DBAE in the Districts

9:00 - 9:15 (3.1.1)	Review of Last two Weeks and Plans for This Week Nancy MacGregor
9:15-12:00 (3.1.2)	Team Planning Sessions for Institute Peer Teaching K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - PA 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109
(10:30-10:45)	Break
12:00-1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-1:45 (3.1.3)	"Whitehall's Experience with DBAE" Elizabeth Katz and Jan Plank, Whitehall Schools
1:45-2:30 (3.1.4)	"Assessing Student Learning" William Loadman, College of Education, OSU
2:30-2:45	Break
2:45-4:00 (3.1.5)	"Developing Leadership" William Dowling, College of Education, OSU Breakout groups: K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - PA 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109

Tuesday, June 28, Week 3: Implementing DBAE: Planning for Historical Inquiry

9:00 - 9:15 (3.2.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today Nancy MacGregor
9:15-10:30 (3.2.2)	"How Cultural Factors Influence Artistic Expression" Patricia Stuhr, Art Education, OSU
10:30-10:45	Break
10:45-12:00 (3.2.3)	Intensive team planning sessions for teaching art and historical inquiry in the next school year K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - Pa 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109
12:00-1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-1:45 (3.2.4)	Peer teaching centered around Historical Inquiry (3rd Floor Visual Arts Building) K-5, Kathleen Desmond 6, Louis Lankford 7-8, Terry Barrett H.S., James Hutchens
1:45-2:15 (3.2.5)	Discussion of Peer Teaching
2:15-2:30	Break
2:30-3:15 (3.2.6)	"DBAE and the Ohio Guidelines for Art Instruction: Theoretical Base" Arthur Efland, Art Education, OSU
3:15-4:00 (3.2.7)	"A Balanced Comprehensive Art Curriculum" Jerry Tollifson, Art Consultant, Ohio Department of Education

Wednesday, June 29, Week 3: Implementing DBAE: Planning for Critical Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (3.3.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today Nancy MacGregor
9:00 - 10:30 (3.3.2)	Intensive team planning sessions for teaching art and critical inquiry in the next school year K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - Pa 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 H.S., James Hutchens - PA 109
10:30-10:45	Break
10:45-12:00 (3.3.3)	"Sharing Leadership" Breakout groups William Dowling, College of Education, OSU
12:00-1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-1:45 (3.3.4)	Peer teaching centered around Critical Inquiry (3rd Floor Visual Arts Building) K-5, Kathleen Desmond 6, Louis Lankford 7-8, Terry Barrett H.S., James Hutchens
1:45-2:15 (3.3.5)	Discussion of Teach-Ins
2:15-2:30	Break
2:30-3:00 (3.3.6)	"The Five Year Plan" Nancy MacGregor
3:00-4:00 (3.3.7)	Breakout groups Developing "five years plans" in preparation for tomorrow's meeting with respective superintendents

Thursday, June 30, Week 3: Implementing DBAE, Planning for Aesthetic Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (3.4.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today Nancy MacGregor
9:15-10:00 (3.4.2)	"Evaluating the Implementation of DBAE" Ayres D'Costa, College of Education, OSU
10:15-10:30	Break
10:30-12:00 (3.4.3)	Intensive team planning sessions for teaching art and aesthetic inquiry K-5, Kathleen Desmond - PA 106 6, Louis Lankford - Pa 106A 7-8, Terry Barrett - PA 104 HS., James Hutchens - PA 109
12:00-1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-1:45 (3.4.4)	Peer teaching centered around Aesthetic Inquiry (3rd Floor Visual Arts Building) K-5, Kathleen Desmond 6, Louis Lankford 7-8, Terry Barrett HS., James Hutchens
1:45-2:15 (3.4.5)	Discussion of Peer Teaching
2:15-2:30	Break
2:30-4:00 (3.4.6)	District meetings with superintendents to present "5 year plans" K-5, PA 106 6, Pa 106A 7-8, PA 104 HS., PA 109

Friday, July 1, Week 3: Implementing DBAE, Planning for Artistic Inquiry

9:00-9:15 (3.5.1)	Review of Yesterday and Plans for Today Nancy MacGregor
9:15-10:00 (3.5.2)	"Artists in Education" Vonnle Sanford, Ohio Arts Council
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-11:00 (3.5.3)	Peer teaching centered around Artistic Inquiry (3rd Floor Visual Arts Building) K-5, Kathleen Desmond 6, Louis Lankford 7-8, Terry Barrett HS., James Hutchens
11:00-11:30 (3.5.4)	Discussion of peer teaching
11:30-12:15 (3.5.5)	Closing Summary Nancy MacGregor
1:00 (3.5.6)	Closing Festivities Heritage Village Sculpture Tour
2:00	Luncheon (complimentary)

REFERENCES

- Ashton, P. & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference-- teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1986). School reform policy: A call for reason. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Barkan, M. (1955). A foundation for art education. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Becker, H.S. (1970). Whose side are we on? In W.J. Flitstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Begeman, D. (1988). Gallup poll shows education to be front-running campaign issue. The Ohio State Lantern, August 8, (15). p.1.
- Bentley, R. & Balz, F. (1986). Trends in corporate voluntary gift and tax support to higher education. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX, February 20-23, 1986.
- Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change: Implements and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp. (referred to as the Rand Study)
- Bersson, R. (1988). Why art education is neither socially relevant nor culturally democratic; a contextual analysis. In D. Blandy, and K. G. Congdon, Art in a democracy. pp. 78-90. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bogdan, R. (1972). Participant observation in organizational settings. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

- Bogdan, R.C. & Bikien, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Boyer, E. L. (1985). Art as Language: Its place in the schools. In Beyond creating: The place for art in america's schools. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Bradford, D.D. & Gordon, M.B. (1984). The learning exchange: Making a difference in education through private/public partnerships. The Journal of Staff Development, 5, (1), 59-68.
- Broudy, H. S. (1968). Quality education and aesthetic education. In G. Pappas (Ed.), Concepts in art and education. pp. 280-290. London: MacMillan.
- Brown, H.I. (1987). Observation and objectivity. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruyn, S. (1966). The human perspective in sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Burton, J., Lederman, A., & London, P. (Eds.). (1988). Beyond dbae: The case for multiple visions of art education. Sponsored by the University Council on Art Education.
- Cavanagh, G. & Styles, K. (1983). The implementation of new curriculum guidelines and policies: Twenty frequently heard objections and responses to them. Education Canada, 23, (1), 9-15.
- Chapman, L. (1985). Discover art. Worcester, MASS: Davis Publications, Inc.
- Clark, G.A., Day, M.D., & Greer, W.D. (1987). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art, The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 129-197.
- Clark, G.A. & Zimmerman, E. (1978). Professional roles and activities as models for art education. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), H.F. and R.N. MacGregor (Asst. Eds.), Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 16-31). Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.

- Cohen, M., March, J., & Olsen, J. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, (1), 1-25.
- Congressional Budget Office. (1987). Educational achievement: Explanations and implications of recent trends. Congress of the United States.
- Cordes, C. (1987). Spending on r&d seen rising 3 pct. this year. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Nov.4, p. A1.
- Cramer, J. (1983). Foundations can add polish to your image and cash to the coffer... American School Board Journal, 170, (10), 36-37, 40-41.
- Crawford, D. (1987). Aesthetics in discipline-based art education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 227-242.
- Daresch, J. (1987). Research trends in staff development and inservice education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 13, (1), 3-11.
- Day, M.D. (1969). Art history and studio art in the junior high program. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), H.F. and R.N. MacGregor (Asst. Eds.), Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 16-31). Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.
- Degge, R.M. (1987). A descriptive study of community art teachers with implications for teacher preparation and cultural policy. Studies in Art Education, 28, (3), 164-176.
- Denzin, N.K. (1970). Sociological methods: A sourcebook. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Denzin, N.K. (1970). The research act. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Dexter, L. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Dobbs, S.M. (1986). Generalists and specialists: teaming for success. Design for Arts in Education, 87, (6), 39-42.

- Donmoyer, R. (1985). Cognitive anthropology and research on effective principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, (2), 31-57.
- Duke, L.L. (1988). A letter from the editor. In a special publication First impressions. presented by The J.Paul Getty Trust.
- Efland, A. (Ed.). (1970). Guidelines for planning art instruction in the elementary schools of Ohio. Columbus: State of Ohio Department of Education.
- Efland, A.D. (1984). Excellence in education: The role of the arts. Theory Into Practice, 23, (4), 267-272.
- Efland, A.D. (1987). Art education in the twentieth century: A history of ideas. A paper presented in a course at the Ohio State University.
- Efland, A.D. (1987). Curriculum antecedents of discipline-based art education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 57-95.
- Elsner, E. (1968). The kettering curriculum for elementary art. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), H.F. and R.N. MacGregor (Asst. Eds.), Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 16-31). Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.
- Elsner, E. (1972). Stanford's kettering project: A radical alternative in art education. In A. Hurwitz (Ed.), Programs of promise: Art in the schools (pp.5-14). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Elsner, E. W. (1985). The role of discipline-based art education in america's schools. Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Elsner, E. W. (1985). Why art in education and why art education. In Beyond creating: The place for art in america's schools. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Elsner, E. W. (1987). The role of discipline-based art: The arts and the mission of education. Art Education, 40, (3), 6-26, 43-45.
- Elsner, E. W. (1988). The principal's role in arts education. Principal, 67, (3), 6-10.

- Esselstein, L.S. (1987). A qualitative study exploring attitudinal and motivational factors influencing aerobic exercise as perceived by regular and inconsistent exercisers (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 51A.
- Ettlinger, L.F. (1987). Styles of on-site descriptive research: A taxonomy for art educators. Studies in Art Education, 28, (2), 79-75.
- Feldman, H.D. (1987). Developmental psychology and art education: Two fields at the crossroads. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 243-259.
- Filstead, W.J. (Ed.). (1970). Qualitative methodology. Chicago: Markham.
- Getty Center for Education in the Arts. (1985). Beyond creating: The place for art in america's schools. Los Angeles, CA: Author.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative resources. New York: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Greer, D.W. (1984). Discipline-based art education: approaching art as a subject of study. Studies in Art Education, 25, (4), 212-18.
- Greer, D.W. (1987). A structure of discipline concepts for dbae. Studies in Art Education, 28, (4), 227-234.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. ERIC/ECTJ Annual Review Paper, 29, (2), 75-91.
- Guttermann, S.S. (1983). A qualitative study of the physical therapy clinical affiliation (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 3292A.
- Hadley, G.B. (1982). A qualitative study of the developmental conditions in a human setting (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1516A.
- Hall, G. E. (1974). Implementation of CBTE-- Viewed as a development process. MICROFICHE: ED088863.

- Hall, G. E. (1975). Concerns of teachers about implementing the innovation of team teaching. Procedures for adopting educational innovations project. MICROFICHE: ED128930.
- Hall, G. E. (1979). Levels of use and extent of implementation of new programs in teacher education institutions: What do you do. MICROFICHE: ED189078.
- Hall, G. & Hord, S. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of N.Y. Press.
- Halpern, R. (1982). Surviving the competition: Economic skills and arguments for program directors. Young Children, 37, (5), 25-32, 49-50.
- Hopkins, D. (Ed.). (1987). Improving the quality of schooling: Lessons from the OECD international school improvement project. London: The Falmer Press: Education Policy Perspectives Series.
- Jaschik, S. (1987). State funds for higher education total \$34-billion, 11pct. biennial rise equals lowest in 29 years. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Nov.4, pp.A27, A30-31.
- Johnson, J.M. (1975). Doing field research. New York: The Free Press: A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Kern, E.J. (1987). Antecedents of discipline-based art education: State departments of education curriculum documents. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 35-56.
- Kidder, L. & Judd, C. (1986). Research methods in social relations: Fifth edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kieschnick, W. F. (1985). The signals of art to the workplace. In Beyond creating: The place for art in america's schools. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Center for Education in the Arts.
- Kimpston, R. D. (1985). Curriculum fidelity and the implementation tasks employed by teachers: a research study. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17, (2), 185-195.
- Kirk, J. & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Kleinbauer, W.E. (1987). Art history in discipline-based art education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 205-216.
- Krathwohl, D.R. (1985). Social and behavioral science research: A new framework for conceptualizing, implementing, and evaluating research studies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kridel, C. (1984). The performing arts in general education: A staff development perspective. Theory Into Practice, 23, (4), 303-308.
- Krueger, P.J. (1987). Ethnographic research methodology in music education. Journal of Music Education, 35, (2), 69-77.
- Lanier, V. (1980). Six items on the agenda for the 80's. Art Education, 33, (5), 16-23.
- Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1986). Rethinking school improvement. Research, craft, and concept. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Lofland, J. (1971). Analyzing social settings-- a guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- MacGregor, N. (1970). Criticism in the arts and art education. In S.M. Dobbs (Ed.), H.F. and R.N. MacGregor (Asst. Eds.), Research readings for discipline-based art education: A journey beyond creating (pp. 16-31). Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.
- McCutcheon, G.M. (1981). On the interpretation of classroom observation. Educational Researcher, 10, (5), 5-10.
- Mc Ginnis, M.W. (1988). Art students deserve more exposure to ideas and more guidance. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 10, pp. B1, B3.
- Mc Laughlin, M.W. & Thomas, M.A. (1984). Art history, art criticism, and art production. An examination of art education in selected school districts. Volume I: Comparing the process of change across districts. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation. (referred to as the Rand Study)

- Merton, R., Fliske, M., & Kendall, P. (1956). The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures. Glencoe, ILL: The Free Press.
- Miles, M. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Moorman, M. (1989). The great art education debate. Art News, 88, (6), 124-131.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: Author.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (1988). Toward civilization: A report on arts education. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Neuman, M.D. (1986). Learning disabilities and microcomputer courseware: A qualitative study of students' and teachers' interactions with instructional dimensions (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 1703A.
- Nightengale, P. W. (1986) An overview of the ontario provincial educational system, as it relates to the tension between centralized provincial direction and local school board implementation of curriculum standards. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20.
- Pfeuffer-Guay, D. (1989). Observational report of the columbus public schools of dbae initiative, 1988-89 school year. A report distributed to the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and the Ohio Regional Institute.
- Pressman, J. & A. Wildavsky (1984). Implementation. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Price, M.J. (1987). Forward. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), v-vii.
- Risatti, H. (1987). Art criticism in discipline-based art education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 217-226.

- Robertson, A. (1988). General examination in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Art Education, Ohio State University, August 16, 1988.
- Savage, E. & Skolnick, M. (1985). Curriculum politics methods for implementing new curriculum methods. Technology Teacher, 45, (3), 29-31.
- Schaub, R. (1982). Governmental and corporate funding of foreign language for business purposes. A paper presented at the Eastern Michigan University Conference on Spanish for Bilingual Careers in Business, Ypsilanti, MI, March 18-20, 1982.
- Schubert, W.H. (1986). Curriculum, Perspective, paradigm, and possibility. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Schwab, M. (1979). A qualitative study of educational program development (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 88.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1987). The theoretical basics for cultural leadership. In L.S. & M.B. Schoenholt (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the elusive (pp. 116-129). Alexandria, Virginia: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sergiovanni, T. & Starratt, R. (1988). Supervision: Human perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Smith, R.A. (1986). Excellence in art education: Ideas and initiatives. Reston, Virginia: National Art Education Association.
- Spratt, F. (1987). Art production in discipline-based art education. The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 21, (2), 197-204.
- Strassburger, J. (1988). Corporate thinking and the liberal arts. Liberal Education, 74, (1), 22-30.
- Van Den Akker, J. J. (1988). The teacher as learner in curriculum implementation. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 20, (1), 47-55.

- Weik, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, (2), 1-19.
- Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labor. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, B. (1988). Art education, civilization and the 21st century: A researcher's reflections on the national endowment for the arts' report to congress. A paper presented at the Third General Session at the National Art Education Association National Convention, Los Angeles, CA, April 10, 1988.
- Wilson, B. & Wolcott, A. (1988). An evaluation of the ohio partnership for the visual arts: Regional institute for educators, summer. A report distributed to the Getty Center for Education in the Arts and the Ohio Regional Institute.
- Wolf, D.P. (1987-88). Opening up assessment. Educational Leadership, 45, (4), 24-29.
- Woodside, W. (1984). The corporate role in public education. Social-Policy, 15, (2), 44-45.
- Zais, R.S. (1976). Curriculum: principles and foundations. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.