

Rowan University

## Rowan Digital Works

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

5-4-1999

### A comparison of two methods for teaching art and their influences on students' creativity

Marilyn Ross Isaacs  
*Rowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the Art Education Commons

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

---

#### Recommended Citation

Isaacs, Marilyn Ross, "A comparison of two methods for teaching art and their influences on students' creativity" (1999). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1824.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1824>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact [LibraryTheses@rowan.edu](mailto:LibraryTheses@rowan.edu).

A COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS FOR TEACHING ART,  
AND THEIR INFLUENCES ON  
STUDENTS' CREATIVITY

by  
Marilyn Ross Isaacs

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the  
Master of Arts Degree  
of  
The Graduate School  
at  
Rowan University  
May, 1999

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_ Professor

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_ Professor

Date Approved May 4, 1999

## ABSTRACT

Marilyn Ross Isaacs

A Comparison of Two Methods for Teaching Art,  
and Their Influences on Students'  
Artistic Learning

1999

Thesis Advisors: Dr. Lili Levinowitz  
Dr. Jane Graziano

Master of Arts in Subject Matter Teaching: Art  
The Graduate School at  
Rowan University

In 1984, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts initiated a program called Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE), which offered new criteria for teaching art. The basic aim of DBAE was to introduce additional disciplines into an art education program, with an emphasis placed on the teaching of art history, art criticism and aesthetics. To date, no true supportive data has been found substantiating the effectiveness of the DBAE program.

The purpose of this thesis was to examine two different methods of teaching art and their impact on students' artistic learning. Two intact fifth grade classes participated in a three month study. Each class received one weekly forty-minute art class, during which time, a series of four projects were created. The experimental group received instruction with a child-centered, hands-on approach while the control group received instruction with a DBAE format. Pretests and posttests, which consisted of creating landscapes, were administered to determine growth in the students' artistic learning. Two art

teachers rated the students' pretests and posttests using a teacher-made rating scale. The researcher failed to find a statistical difference between the control and experimental groups.

MINI-ABSTRACT

Marilyn Ross Isaacs

A Comparison of Two Methods for Teaching Art,  
and Their Influences on Students'  
Artistic Learning

1999

Thesis Advisors: Dr. Lili Levinowitz  
Dr. Jane Graziano

Master of Arts in Subject Matter Teaching: Art  
The Graduate School at  
Rowan University

The purpose of this thesis was to examine two different methods of teaching art to determine whether a hands-on, child-centered approach to art education or a DBAE approach had more effect of students' artistic learning. The researcher failed to find a statistical difference between the control and experimental groups.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher is greatly appreciative to a number of people who have contributed significantly to the completion of this study. To begin with, a very special and personal expression of appreciation goes to my husband Jay for his help and support while I was working to obtain my Master's Degree. In addition, I would like to express a heart-felt note of gratitude to my friends and family who have been very understanding while I have unfortunately neglected them over the past two years. I would also like to thank Dr. Harold Kurtz and the Pennsauken Township Board of Education for granting me the Sabbatical Leave during the 1997-1998 school year, which became the impetus for my Master's Degree. A note of thanks goes to Carson School's fifth grade teachers, Julie Braswell and Theodora Kendig, who disrupted their schedules to accommodate my pretests and posttests, and all of the fifth grade students at Carson School who participated in the study. I would also like to recognize Estelle Kean and Karen Rossner who gave up part of their Easter Vacation to rate my students' pretests and posttests. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Jane Graziano, my art advisor, for her wonderful insights and guidance. Last but definitely not least, a very warm note of thanks goes to Dr. Lili Levinowitz, whose patience, expertise and caring made writing this thesis a true learning experience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THIS STUDY.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	11
Design of the Study.....	13
Instrumentation.....	15
Rating Procedure.....	15
Analysis.....	16
II. RELATED RESEARCH.....	17
Introduction.....	17
Mims/Lankford Study.....	17
Wolf Study.....	21
Brewer Study.....	26
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	32
Sample.....	32
Design.....	32
Instrumentation.....	33
Rating Procedure.....	33
Selection of Judges.....	34
Assignment of Classes to Experimental and Control Groups..	35
Pretests and Posttests.....	35
Treatment for Each Group.....	36
Lesson One.....	37
Lesson Two.....	40
Lesson Three.....	42
Lesson Four.....	45
IV. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS.....	48
Interjudge Reliabilities.....	48
Statistical Results - Table 1.....	48
Interpretations.....	49

## TABLE OF CONTENTS cont.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	51
Purpose and Problem .....	51
Design .....	51
Instrumentation.....	52
Rating Procedures .....	52
Analysis.....	53
Results .....	53
Conclusions .....	53
APPENDIX A.....	57
Parent Letter.....	57
Parent Consent Form .....	58
APPENDIX B.....	59
Rating Scale for Assessing Student Artwork .....	59
APPENDIX C.....	60
Lesson Plan: Still Life-Experimental Group .....	60
Lesson Plan: Still Life-Control Group .....	62
Lesson Plan: Portraiture-Experimental Group.....	64
Lesson Plan: Portraiture-Control Group .....	65
Lesson Plan: Perspective-Experimental Group .....	67
Lesson Plan: Perspective-Control Group.....	69
Lesson Plan: Nonrepresentational Art-Experimental Group....	71
Lesson Plan: Nonrepresentational Art-Control Group.....	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	75



## LIST OF TABLES

1. Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Summary Group for the DBAE and the Experimental groups .....	48
--	----

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION and PURPOSE

Art has a potentially vital role in the education of our children. The process of drawing, painting, or constructing is a complex one in which the child brings together diverse elements of his experience to make a new and meaningful whole. In the process of selecting, interpreting, and reforming these elements, he has given us more than a picture or a sculpture; he has given us a part of himself: how he thinks, how he feels, and how he sees. For the child, art is a dynamic and unifying activity.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout the history of art education in the United States, numerous changes have taken place concerning the purpose and structure of art curricula. These changes have mirrored societal needs, and concurrent with such changes have been educational philosophies which helped shape the curricular process. Eisner writes:

If society saw education as a means of creating an individual of culture, art was seen as a tool for developing cultured tastes and cultural accomplishments. If schools were to prepare citizens to contribute to the economic welfare of the nation, art was to be taught as an important vocational skill. If the schools' major task was to develop man's creative intelligence, art became a means for unlocking the child's potential creativity. Art education, inescapably, operates within the context of the school and within the context of society.<sup>2</sup>

A review of the literature reveals a direct relationship between historic societal needs, philosophies of education, and the implementation of art into public school curricula from the mid 1800's to the present time.

During the industrialization of America, the need for the preparation of

---

<sup>1</sup> Lowenfeld, Viktor, and W. Lambert Brittain. *The Meaning of Art for Education, 5th Edition*. (New York, NY: The Macmillan Company, 1970) 1.

<sup>2</sup> Eisner, Elliot W. and David W. Ecker. "Some Historical Developments in Art Education." *Concepts in Art Education - An Anthropology of Current Issues*. ed. Pappas, George. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), 21-22.

artists to enter the work force influenced the arts which were taught in school. For young men in the 1850's, the basis for art education was primarily drawing, with the intention of gaining skills for future employment , while for young women, “. . . art was seen as a cultural accomplishment, something to symbolize the finer things of life . . .”<sup>3</sup>

One of the first steps towards a curriculum in the visual arts came from Massachusetts:

In 1870, the legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed an act requiring that drawing be one of the subjects taught in public schools . . . to train artisans and designers for industries of the nation so that its industrial products might capture a larger share of sales in the international marketplace.<sup>4</sup>

In 1915 the first evidence of a true “art education” program appeared. The state of Idaho created an art curriculum which promoted the concept of students discovering the beauty of the world around them, fostering self expression and good taste.<sup>5</sup>

During the 1930's, art education in several states focused on teaching students to appreciate beauty in their environment, using aesthetic knowledge to furnish the home, select wearing apparel, landscape, and civic planning in addition to art appreciation and self-expression.<sup>6</sup> Gradually, boards of education were becoming aware that educating the unique child was important, and as the need for “industrial” artisans diminished, more emphasis was placed on developing the students' creativity.

By the 1940's, many states incorporated art education into the whole

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>4</sup> Kern, Dr. Evan J. “The Purposes of Art Education in the United States from 1870 to 1980.” *The History of Art Education- Proceedings from the Penn State Conference.* ed. Wilson, Brent and Harlan Hoffa, (State College, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University College of Arts and Architecture, School of Visual Arts, 1985), 40.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 43.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 45.

school curriculum, creating art programs which encouraged self-expression.<sup>7</sup> It was not until the 1950's that a child-centered art education movement actually began. States such as Florida and New York designed curricula that stressed the development of the students' self-expression.<sup>8</sup> Although creative growth was still the major thrust of art education in the 1960's, many school districts began to include the teaching of art history, criticism and visual perception.<sup>9</sup> Through the 1970's, these disciplines began gaining more importance in art curricula, relinquishing the position self-expression recently held.

In the early 1980's Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) emerged as a curriculum, incorporating art history, art criticism, aesthetics and art production, ". . . to produce educated adults who are knowledgeable about art and its production and responsive to the aesthetic properties of works of art and other objects."<sup>10</sup>

During the 1990's, goals and standards in the arts were created in conjunction with Goals 2000, a program initiated by the federal government to prepare students for competition on a global basis by the next millennia. "National Standards for Arts Education" introduced guidelines for arts education, defining the meaning of art, describing why arts are so important in our daily life, who benefits from an arts education program, and outlining the necessity for arts programs to be taught by qualified arts specialists.<sup>11</sup>

Philosophies of education since the mid 1800's have influenced trends in art education, as identified in a review of the literature. During the early 1900's

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 47

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>10</sup> Greer, W. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." *Studies in Art Education* (1984): 212.

<sup>11</sup> "What Every Young American Should Know and be able to Do in the Arts." *National Standards for Arts Education*. (Reston, Virginia: Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994), <http://artsedge.kennedy-center.org/forms/arts1.html>, 1-14.

the "Child Study Movement" was developing. Philosophers involved with the movement began to look at the child's physical and mental development, and came to realize that the nature of a child was unique, different than that of an adult.<sup>12</sup> Over the next several decades, an awareness of the child's educational needs and capabilities was addressed by people such as John Dewey, Viktor Lowenfeld, Rudolf Arnheim, and Jerome Bruner. The issue of passive learning versus active learning was one of the major topics addressed by these educational philosophers.

John Dewey's essay on the nature of the experience was written in 1916, about the time that various states began to recognize the value of art education as a means of self-expression for children. He realized that an actual experience, in addition to passive learning, was necessary for a child to grasp what was being taught. In a reprint from a 1916 article, Dewey cites:

The nature of experience can be understood only by noting that it includes an active and passive element peculiarly combined . . . In schools, those under instruction are too customarily looked upon as acquiring knowledge as theoretical spectators . . . Something which is called mind or consciousness is severed from the physical organs of activity. . . The intimate union of activity and undergoing its consequences which leads to recognition of meaning is broken . . . The failure arises in supposing that relationships can become perceptible without *experience* - without that conjoint of trying and undergoing of which we have spoken . . . An ounce of experience is better than a ton of theory simply because it is only in experience that any theory has vital and verifiable significance.<sup>13</sup>

Viktor Lowenfeld began writing on the subject of art education in the 1930's. He philosophized that the child's own art experience was unique and should be a totally active experience. He philosophized that passive learning is

---

<sup>12</sup> Eisner, Elliot and David W, Ecker, "Some Historical Developments in Art Education." 15.

<sup>13</sup> Dewey, John. "Experience and Thinking." *Concepts in Art Education - An Anthropology of Current Issues*. ed. Pappas, George. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), 62-66.

not necessary and that a child should be totally immersed in the experiential process of learning. Lowenfeld felt that the process of intellectualizing concepts and the use of passive learning do not give the child a true understanding of what is being taught. He writes:

It may be that one of the basic abilities that should be taught in our public schools is the ability to discover and search for answers, instead of passively waiting for answers and directions from the teacher . . . What a person knows or does not know may bear no relationship to creative action . . . Probably the best preparation for creating is the act of creation itself.<sup>14</sup>

Rudolf Arnheim, like Lowenfeld, professed the need for active learning through creating. He felt that too often, educators stressed the use of cognitive learning, and overlooked sensory learning as a means of comprehending a concept. Arnheim explains:

We have neglected the gift of comprehending things through our senses . . . Our eyes have been reduced to instruments with which to identify and to measure; hence we suffer a paucity of ideas that can be expressed in images and an incapacity to discover the meaning in what we see.<sup>15</sup>

During the 1960's, while the thrust of art education was evolving from primarily self-expression to include other disciplines, Jerome Bruner embraced a holistic process of education. He felt that a child could not comprehend a subject without a full understanding of it. Bruner's philosophy embraced:

Grasping the structure of a subject is understanding it in a way that permits many other things to be related to it meaningfully. To learn structure, in short, is to learn how things are related.<sup>16</sup>

According to Bruner, to learn holistically, a child must be taught to see the

---

<sup>14</sup> Lowenfeld, Viktor, and W. Lambert Brittain. *The Meaning of Art for Education*, 5th Edition, 3-4.

<sup>15</sup> Arnheim, Rudolf. *Art and Visual Perception - A Psychology of the Creative Eye, The New Vision*. (California: Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974) 1.

<sup>16</sup> Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996), 7.

interrelationships of the subject areas, rather than treat each subject as an entity unto itself. In order to grasp the concepts effectively, Bruner created the “discovery method” of learning, opposing the method of learning by rote. He identified two modes of education, the “expository mode” and the “hypothetical mode.”

In the former, the decisions concerning the mode and pace and style of exposition are principally determined by the teacher as expositor; the student is the listener . . . In the hypothetical mode, the teacher and the student are in a more cooperative position . . . The student is not a bench-bound learner, but is taking part in the formulation and at times may play the principal role in it.<sup>17</sup>

By being an active participant in the learning process, students learn to create hypotheses, problem solve, and organize their thinking skills, thus increasing their overall intellectual capacity.

DBAE, spearheaded by the Getty Foundation in 1983, incorporated four disciplines: art criticism, aesthetics, art history and art production. With its roots in Bruner's educational philosophies, DBAE embraced the concept of learning all aspects of a subject in order to better understand it.

The early part of the 1960's brought upon the American educational scene the work of Bruner and his book *The Process of Education* (1960). In this important volume of 97 pages, Bruner . . . provided a rationale for a discipline based approach to curriculum development and teaching.<sup>18</sup>

The basic theory of DBAE included the following disciplines in an art curriculum:

Aesthetics - the study of art appreciation. Students who learn to make aesthetic judgments of artwork may begin to develop an understanding of their

---

<sup>17</sup> Bruner, Jerome. “The Act of Discovery.” *Concepts in Art Education - An Anthropology of Current Issues*. ed. Pappas, George. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970), 92.

<sup>18</sup> Eisner, Elliot W. “Alternative Approaches to Curriculum Development in Art Education.” *Studies in Art Education* (1984), 25 (4) 261.

own preferences, formulating their own opinions concerning likes and dislikes when viewing art.

Art History - teaching art in conjunction with its historical and cultural context.

Art Criticism - creating and defending judgments about works of art.

Art Production - the actual creation of artwork in a classroom or studio.

According to DBAE standards, “. . .studio practice teaches that the artist skillfully uses various materials for something of human import . . . choosing appropriate adult examples to provide a sequence of instruction that leads to an understanding of depicting [art] similar to that of artists.”<sup>19</sup>

Although DBAE is intended for art education on all levels, it appears that the major thrust of the program is aimed at older students, hoping to churn out art-savvy adults, not necessarily creative children. Their prescriptive approach, which includes a large dose of art history, art criticism and aesthetics, may not adequately allow for spontaneity in the art class. Seemingly, this approach to art education supports the mandates of Goals 2000 and the National Standards for Arts Education.

The idea of discipline-based art education acknowledges and builds upon the recent developments in the field of art education. It asserts not only that content and procedures for teaching art should be derived from a number of key disciplines, but also that the understanding and appreciation of works of art are as educationally valuable as creating art . . . experiencing works of art aesthetically is as significant as producing them.<sup>20</sup>

Since its inception, DBAE has gone through several metamorphoses. In its early years, the major art works suggested for study reflected predominately a Western European aesthetic. Currently, advocates of DBAE recognize the

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Smith, Ralph. “The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education.” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (Summer, 1987): 70, 4.



value of folk art, multiculturalism in art, art created by women, and more contemporary art.<sup>21</sup>

Originally, the classroom time structure for a DBAE program was to be divided equally, allowing 25% of class time for each of the four disciplines. This did not allow adequate time for studio production, so DBAE softened their position, empowering the teachers to use their own judgment concerning the allocation of time for each of the disciplines.<sup>22</sup>

In addition, DBAE has modified several opinions about Viktor Lowenfeld. Original DBAE philosophy, as quoted by Elliot W. Eisner, disputed the theories of Viktor Lowenfeld's child-centered approach and endorsed the following opinion:

The leading spokesperson for this view [creative development] was Viktor Lowenfeld (1947). Also, closely associated with his orientation was the work of the child-centered progressive educators in the late 1920's and 1930's . . . The educational features that the progressive educators attempted to alter in the 1930's and 1940's are still prevalent today: a fragmented curriculum, neglect of the student's internal life, proliferation of tasks that have no intrinsic meaning to the child.<sup>23</sup>

Currently, the acceptance of a more child-centered approach is evident:

Early writings about DBAE, both pro and con, differentiated DBAE from Viktor Lowenfeld's notion of child-centered pedagogy. This is unfortunate, because DBAE should be seen as an extension and refinement of some of Lowenfeld's insights . . . Art educators still have a lot to learn from the work of Lowenfeld . . . In any case, we are all better teachers when we remember, after Lowenfeld, that knowledge alone does not make people happy; a balance of intellectual and emotional growth is necessary to adjust properly to this world.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Delacruz, Elizabeth Manley and Phillip C. Dunn. "The Evolution of Discipline-Based Art Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (Fall, 1996): 30, no. 3, 71-71.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 75-76.

<sup>23</sup> Eisner, Elliot W. "Alternative Approaches to Curriculum Development in Art Education," 260.

<sup>24</sup> Delacruz, Elizabeth Manley and Phillip C. Dunn. "The Evolution of Discipline-Based Art Education," 74-75.

Current art educators who are either pro-DBAE or anti-DBAE present viable criticism of each other's philosophies. Stephen Mark Dobbs, one of the original advocates of DBAE, contends:

In an art program dominated by studio production, students do not necessarily develop a vocabulary for sharing what they learn to perceive and respond to in works of art, nor do they customarily consider philosophical issues about the nature and consequence of art.<sup>25</sup>

Sandra Kay Mims and E. Louis Lankford conducted a study investigating the day-to-day situations most art educators encounter. With issues including DBAE, new mandates from the government which introduce ". . . programs with broader, more ambiguous goals than ever before . . .,"<sup>26</sup> poor funding or funding cuts, inadequate supplies, planning time, teaching time and workspaces, Mims and Lankford found that on the average, art teachers are very stressed and doing the best they can with what they have. Their research indicates that, on the average, art teachers allocate:

65% of class time to Studio Production  
16% of class time to Art History  
10% of class time to Art Criticism  
9% of class time to Aesthetics<sup>27</sup>

Peter Smith describes his experience visiting an exhibition of children's artwork. He was dismayed by the lack of true originality in the students' works.

More often you now see a recipe for DBAE-isms. Frequently, that is a Henri Rousseau done in markers or a Van Gogh in yarn . . . It is all homogenous and unevolved . . . What I missed in that February exhibit were works that showed that a child had been enabled to communicate through visual art his or her own experiences . . . The work in the February exhibit was third hand. The art education establishment, local art teachers' fashions, and the recent popularized, not-too-controversial art scene had contributed to a

---

<sup>25</sup> Dobbs, Stephen Mark. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Some Questions and Answers." *NASSP Bulletin* (May, 1989): 73, 8.

<sup>26</sup> Mims, Sandra Kay and E. Louis Lankford. "Time, Money and The New Art Education: A Nationwide Investigation." *Studies in Art Education*. (1995): 36, no. 2, 84.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 85-90.

framework for imagery choices, and the children had produced the latest orthodox images, complying with their art teacher's directions.<sup>28</sup>

Pearl Greenberg wrote a positive commentary on both the Smith article, and Mims and Lankford study, showing concern for some of the current trends in art education:

Mims and Lankford (1995) did us a good service by sharing the results of their survey of elementary art teachers . . . For one who has worried about DBAE taking over every nook and cranny of North America, it is a relief to see that most elementary art teachers continue to devote the major portion of their art time to the making of art . . . Peter Smith (1995), on the other hand, gives us some clues as to what is being taught in art classes . . . His observations are valid . . . What are the experiences of the children in this work? Yes, they are using art materials, being given the opportunity to create, but within what seems a strait-jacket of discipline . . . What in the world are we doing?<sup>29</sup>

There appears to be two opposing views of the current trends in art education. Advocates of DBAE contend that the structure of the disciplines will enable the student to become artistically literate, understand the meaning of art, and subsequently lead the student to creativity. Those who oppose the concepts of DBAE feel that the major thrust of an art program should primarily be art production, affording the students the time and opportunity to create art.

A review of the literature shows no studies have been conducted by the Getty Foundation, or any other major arts organization, demonstrating the effectiveness of DBAE, yet many art educators are considering the philosophy of DBAE to be the consummate method of teaching art. The Getty Foundation, with their financial resources, have swamped the world of art education with their philosophies, virtually uncontested. A small group of art educators resist the impetus towards DBAE, feeling that the program does not place enough

---

<sup>28</sup> Smith, Peter. "Art and Irrelevance." *Studies in Art Education* (1995): 36, no. 2, 123.

<sup>29</sup> Greenberg, Pearl. "Time, Money and the New Art Education versus Art and Irrelevance." *Studies in Art Education*. (1996): 37 no. 2, 115-116.

emphasis on the child's actual art-making. Those who oppose DBAE's concepts have done so on a very small scale, generally for financial reasons. Very few individuals or groups have the monetary resources of the Getty Foundation!

Several independent studies have compared the effects of DBAE's philosophy. Thomas M. Brewer examined two methods of teaching pottery to elementary students. One was with a DBAE format, and the other was child-centered, relying on the students' ". . . passive knowledge of details, objects, and events."<sup>30</sup> The results of his study demonstrated minimal differences between the discipline-based group versus the child-centered approach group.

Richard Wolf also did a study comparing the effects of DBAE. He was comparing the differences between DBAE instruction versus non-DBAE instruction of three elements of art: line, composition, and color analysis. In the results, he noted that "No significant difference was found between the two groups in the analysis of line and composition. For the color analysis, the control group (non-DBAE) performed better than the experimental group."<sup>31</sup>

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this thesis is to address the scant body of research done to examine the effects of a DBAE curriculum, specifically to compare the DBAE model with that of a child centered approach to teaching art. Two fifth grade classes will create the same projects. One of the classes will experiment with a hands-on, discovery method of artistic learning, and the other class will learn the same concepts using the DBAE model. The results of this thesis will

---

<sup>30</sup> Brewer, Thomas M. "An Examination of Two Approaches To Ceramic Instruction in Elementary Education." *Studies in Art Education*. (1991): 32, no. 4, 196.

<sup>31</sup> Wolf, Richard. *Using Audio-Visual Programs with Teaching Direction in Teaching Still Life Drawings to Fifth-Grade Students*. Glassboro, New Jersey: Glassboro State College, 1990, abstract.

demonstrate which approach has the greatest impact on students' artistic learning.

## DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study will be a quasi-experimental comparison conducted with 56 fifth grade art students from Carson Elementary School in Pennsauken, New Jersey. The 5th grade students for the study's sample population are from two intact homogenous classes, with 28 students per class. Letters explaining the study and permission slips (Appendix A) have been sent to the parents. For legal reasons, only the children who return signed permission slips will participate in the study. Each participating child will be appointed a "code" number in order to maintain their anonymity.

Each class has one weekly 40-minute art period. For the pretest and posttest, arrangements have been made for double art periods, enabling the students to have extended class time.

A pretest will be administered. The students will be asked to create a landscape, with various materials which will be at their disposal. No guidelines (other than behavioral) will be given to the students. They will be able to create landscapes in whatever style they desire, using whatever materials they prefer.

A timeline, barring any unforeseen circumstances (inclement weather, illness, school programs, etc.) will be the following:

January 5 - Pretest - Class A  
12 - Pretest - Class B  
19, 26 - Instruction  
February 2, 9, 16, 23 - Instruction  
March 2, 9, 16 - Instruction

23 - Posttest - Class A

30 - Posttest - Class B

Easter break begins the week of April 4, 1999. The researcher plans to complete the study by March 30th, leaving the second week of April available for rating the art work.

## INSTRUMENTATION

For this study, a teacher-made rating scale will be used (Appendix B). Other options were available, such as the "Clark's Drawing Abilities Test" and the "Torrence Test," but they did not meet the needs for this study.

The rating scale has a facet factorial format with a semantic differential option response; six option response categories will be addressed: selection of materials, balance, color, use of space, focal point, and overall composition. Within several of the categories are subcategories, further defining the concept. The categories will have a range of 1(lowest) through 5(highest), with semantic differential options precisely describing the criteria. A pretest of student artwork will be assessed by the rating scale, as well as a posttest.

## RATING PROCEDURE

Students' pretests and posttests will be rated by two art teachers. The judges will be in-serviced prior to the judging the data by using the rating scale and discussing its nuances. They will be instructed to look at the art work for approximately 15 seconds before rating each element. A correlation coefficient between the two judges' ratings for each option response and the total will be calculated from the results of the ratings to determine interjudge reliability.

After the completion of the students' posttests, the actual rating will begin. The two judges will use the teacher-made rating scale to determine whether or not a measure of growth has taken place, and which method of teaching promoted more growth. An attempt will be made for the entire rating process to be conducted at one time. The students' pretest and posttest art work will be displayed in random order. Each judge's paper will be a different color to expedite calculating the final results. In addition, a corner of the papers will be



clipped off (upper right for pretests, upper left for posttests) to once again expedite calculating the final results. Each student's rating sheets will be kept by the work to be rated, and rather than placing the child's name on the rating sheet, a corresponding code number will be used. The judges will once again be instructed to look at the artwork for approximately 15 seconds before rating each element. The combined scores from each judge, for both the pretest and posttest, will serve as data for this inquiry.

## ANALYSIS

These data will be organized into a one dimensional design for differences and a repeated measures anova will be calculated using the .05 level of confidence.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED RESEARCH

#### Introduction

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE), which was introduced by the Getty Foundation in the early 1980's, has been considered by many in the field of art education to be the consummate method of art instruction. To date, no major studies have challenged the effectiveness of DBAE, but several smaller studies have addressed the issue.

#### The Mims / Lankford Study<sup>1</sup>

Sandra Kay Mims of Learning Unlimited, Columbus Ohio, and E. Louis Lankford of Ohio State University conducted a joint study evaluating the working conditions of the average elementary school art teacher. The issues mentioned in their study included the apportionment of teaching time (as related to the mandates of DBAE), the sufficiency of the time allocated to art instruction, budget, new art education goals and teaching conditions (p. 86).

Mims and Lankford conducted their research through surveying elementary art teachers who were members of the Elementary Division of the National Art Education Association (NAEA) in 1993. They chose elementary school art teachers, since they are the ones responsible for helping children obtain many of their art fundamentals. Due to the large membership of NAEA's Elementary Division (3,508 members), as the researchers conducted their

---

<sup>1</sup> Mims, Sandra Kay and E. Louis Lankford. "Time, Money and The New Art Education: A Nationwide Investigation." *Studies in Art Education*. (1995): 36, no. 2, 84-95.

survey, they “. . . selected a total of 797 names by stratified random sampling as targeted participants” (p. 86). Although the quantity of the proposed targeted population far exceeded a sufficient amount, Mims and Lankford chose to do so to ensure an adequate number of responses. To gather a true geographical sampling, the researchers used a stratified sampling, so states with larger populations would receive a proportionate share of the questionnaires.

To collect their data, Mims and Lankford created a self-made 16-item questionnaire. “Thirteen of the items were in closed form, asking for specific, objective information pertaining to respondents’ teaching schedules, budgets and circumstances . . . a Likert-type continuum was used on two of the thirteen items . . . the three remaining items on the questionnaire, designated ‘optional,’ were open-ended and requested additional comments relative to time, money, and circumstantial variables in individual art programs” (pp. 86-7). Prior to administering the questionnaire, an independent specialist reviewed it for its overall effectiveness.

The surveys were assembled and sent out in May, 1993. Each packet included a cover letter, the questionnaire and a prepaid return envelope. A return deadline was set for six weeks from delivery date. To maintain anonymity, each of the 332 participants who returned the completed questionnaires was assigned a computer code number, and their results were computer analyzed by the SPSS-X Version 6 program.

The confidence level was calculated at 95%, with a  $\pm .05$  margin of error. The participants yielded a relatively well-rounded sampling of art teachers: “Eighty-five percent of the respondents were female, 15% were male: 50% taught in suburban schools, 27% urban and 23% rural” (p. 87). The art teachers who responded were quite open about the conditions under which

they taught, discussing their frustrations with inadequate art supplies and work spaces, insufficient time for the students to work, and little support from administration.

The results of the survey were broken down into several areas. The first area addressed by Mims and Lankford was the money variable. According to their statistics the mean for yearly spending per student was \$3.33, with a standard deviation of \$2.88, a median of \$2.50, and a mode of \$2.00. Forty-five percent of the teachers felt their budget was adequate, while 47% considered theirs very modest, and only 8% felt their budget was generous (pp. 87-8).

The second area discussed by the researchers was teacher planning time, which was demonstrated in hours per week. The mean planning time was 3.88, the standard deviation was 2.19, the median was 4.00, and the mode was 3.00 (p. 88). What planning time they had was often consumed by school art displays or other school duties. Many teachers' "planning time" was actually a 10 to 15 minute break between classes, which would be better referred to as "preparation time."

The third area addressed by Mims and Lankford was instructional time. They broke it down into hours per year, per class. According to their statistics, the mean class instructional time was 29.18, with a standard deviation of 11.74, both a median and mode of 27.00, and a range of 80.00. Only 25% felt that their class instructional time was adequate to achieve their programs' goals, while 75% felt that their instructional time allotment was insufficient (pp. 87-9).

The fourth area surveyed dealt with the breakdown of instructional time. With the average total instructional time broken down into DBAE's four disciplines, Mims and Lankford's research showed that the average teacher

had “. . . a total of 29 hours with a typical class during the school year. Of this time, approximately 65% of instructional time is devoted to studio production, 16% to art history, 10% to art criticism, and 9% to aesthetics. In clock hours, that amounts to about 19 hours per year devoted to studio production, 4.5 hours to art history, 3 to art criticism, and 2.5 to aesthetics” (p. 90).

The teachers surveyed were then asked to rate their *perception* of the importance of each of the four disciplines. In a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important), most of the teachers perceived each discipline's importance as relatively equal. Aesthetics was rated 3.94, art criticism 3.94, art history 4.42 and studio production 4.88. Although the teachers perceived the importance of each of the disciplines to be relatively high, in reality, studio production gained more importance than the other three disciplines (p. 91).

At the end of the study, Mims and Lankford offer a profile of the “typical” elementary art teacher:

The average elementary art teacher is a woman who teaches in a suburban public school system, where she may travel to more than one site. Her several hundred students see her once a week in classes about 50 minutes long. She has a high degree of freedom in the scope and sequence of what she teaches, and she probably designed her own art curriculum. She supplements her modest budget for art materials and supplies by creative recycling and scrounging donations . . . Planning time for the average art teacher amounts to 48 minutes spread throughout the day, and is consumed by setting up the classroom, gathering and preparing materials for student use, and caring for tools and equipment. Designing lesson plans and instructional units, ordering supplies, and completing student evaluations are done on her own time (p. 93).

This study has particular relevance to this researcher's study since the issue of DBAE versus the realities of the average working situation are not always synchronized. The Mims and Lankford study dealt with the situations particular to the teaching of elementary school art. Meager budgets, insufficient

teaching time and inadequate preparation time make the task of the elementary art teacher more difficult. In addition, although most of the art teachers deemed great and almost equal importance to teaching the four disciplines of DBAE, the realities of the job demanded more studio production time.

### The Wolf Study<sup>2</sup>

Richard Wolf conducted a study, entitled "Using Audio-Visual Programs With Teacher Direction In Teaching Still Life Drawing to Fifth-Grade Students," to determine whether teaching with a DBAE curriculum would effect fifth graders' use of line, color and composition when creating still life drawings. He recognized the ongoing debate concerning the effectiveness of DBAE, and elected to conduct his study with an experimental group (DBAE instruction) and a control group (non-DBAE instruction). The experimental group received instruction via commercial audio-visual programs which addressed art elements of line, color and composition within a DBAE format, while the control group did not.

As part of Wolf's related research, he introduced The National Art Education Association's (NAEA) 1965-66 study which examined the use of audio-visual programs in art education. This early study made recommendations for creating effective programs ". . . that would be aesthetically designed, incorporate contemporary art education theory, and be specifically planned for use with a 'specific school population'" (p. 6). Later studies, such as the 1971 Brouch Study, attempted to fine-tune the use of audio-visual materials, namely slides, in art education. This study was conducted to investigate the benefits of slide-tape presentations as a

---

<sup>2</sup> Wolf, Richard. *Using Audio-Visual Programs with Teaching Direction in Teaching Still Life Drawings to Fifth-Grade Students*. Glassboro, New Jersey: Glassboro State College, 1990, 1-41.

supplement in art education, and to determine whether the use of these presentations effected the outcome of student work. The artwork of the participating students was later rated by independent judges, who concluded that the use of audio visual materials did have a positive effect on the students' work, causing students to achieve greater comprehension and retention of the subject matter.

In addition, Wolf introduced the Othman study, which evaluated the use of computer interactive video and its effect on the instruction of college undergraduate students. Three groups of students were assigned various projects with varying amounts of computer interactive video instruction. Group one viewed a 15 minute video, and then answered questions on the computer. Group two viewed the 15 minute video, but answered no questions following the video session. Group three viewed slides which introduced the same concepts as the video, along with a narration by the same person who narrated the video. The fourth group, the control group, had no computer instruction at all. Pretests and posttest were administered to all four groups. Group One rated the highest, determining that students worked better when exposed to a mode of education which includes motion pictures along with sound (p. 12-13).

In Wolf's study, the subjects consisted of fifth grade students who attended six elementary schools in Sewell, New Jersey. He selected two elementary art teachers to conduct the study within their classes. Teacher A instructed the experimental DBAE formatted group, while Teacher B instructed the non-DBAE formatted control group. Through questionnaires, Wolf determined that the two teachers were both unfamiliar with DBAE and the five videos he planned to use in conjunction with his study. He in-serviced the two art teachers individually, since their participation in the study differed. After

selecting the teachers, Wolf trained them individually in single sessions.

Teacher A was given instructions and prepared examples to be used in conjunction with five audio-visual programs. Specific lesson plans, which were to be implemented over a seven-week period, were included.

Teacher B, who taught the control group, was given the same verbal instructions and prepared examples as Teacher A, but no audio-visual materials were to be used. Specific lesson plans were included, as well, to be implemented over a seven-week period of one class per week. Despite the differences of the methodology within the study, both teachers were to use the same drawing instructions with their students, so when in-serviced, Wolf gave each teacher the same information.

The assignment of groups was based on the two art teachers' classroom situations. Teacher A had her own classroom, so she was assigned the experimental group, which required the use of audio-visual equipment. Teacher B, who traveled from class to class on a cart, was assigned the control group, which did not require audio-visual equipment.

During the investigation, the control group received traditional instruction while the experimental group received the majority of their instruction by viewing five filmstrips with cassettes. The audio-visual materials were generally 13 to 17 minutes in length and incorporated a DBAE format. After each audio-visual presentation, ". . . the students reviewed the material using the same information provided for the control group (pre-drawn examples for drawing instruction and art elements charts)" (pp. 25-6). Students in both groups were instructed in the use line, color and composition to render still life drawings.

As a criterion measure, Wolf elected to use an existing fifteen-point additive scale developed by R. A. Salome, who used the measure in his study



"The Effects of Perceptual Training Upon the Two Dimensional Drawing of Children" in 1965. Salome's scale rates the art elements (line, color and composition) being investigated by Wolf. Pretests and posttests, which consisted of the still life drawings to be rated, were conducted to determine which teaching methodology was better.

Four judges were selected to rate the students' work. The judges were art teachers from the same district in which the study was conducted, but did not include the teachers involved with the implementation of the study. To ensure inter rater reliability, the four judges collectively rated nine pretests and nine posttests to establish a uniformity. The four judges then individually rated the remaining 20 pictures.

The use of Chatsworth Fastscore test cards, in which the judge marked "A" if the element being rated was absent, or "B" if it was present facilitated scoring and data collection. A mean score for each class' pretest and posttest was calculated and later analyzed.

To analyze the data, three one-dimensional designs were used: one design for line, one for color and one for composition. "Three t-tests for independent samples were calculated to determine the comparative effects of the treatments for each of the three designs. The .05 level of confidence was used" (p. 32).

In determining student performance for the use of line, the control group's mean score was .42, with a standard deviation of 3.11. The experimental group's mean score was 1.58, with a standard deviation of 3.01. The t-value was 1.288, rendering it not significant.

In determining student performance for the use of color, the control group's mean score was 1.67, and the standard deviation was 1.95. The

experimental group's mean score was .38, and the standard deviation was 1.60, creating a t-value of -2.255 ( $p < .05$ ). The analysis showed that the control group's artwork had rated higher (in the category of color) than the experimental group.

In determining student performance for the use of composition, the control group's mean score was 3.04, with a standard deviation of 2.95. The experimental group's mean score was 1.92, and the standard deviation was 4.50, creating a t-value of 1.000n.s.

Regarding the higher ratings with the control group (in the area of color), Wolf discounted the possibility of a Type I error, since he felt that ". . . the teacher demonstration may have provided a more direct and therefore transferable learning experience for students in the concept and application of color" (p. 35). Both teachers were instructed to use a color wheel to explain color mixing, but the control group teacher instructed his students in a more traditional manner. "The experimental teacher relied on the audio-visual programs to instruct the students in the nature of the use of color, and the effect of the [control group] teacher having more time to explain color theory in the traditional manner may have enabled the students to understand color relationships and application more thoroughly" (p. 35).

No significant mean score difference was found in the analysis of line when rated for the study. The experimental group received its audio-visual instruction early in the study, and Wolf felt that perhaps the effects of the presentation did not stay with the students throughout the course of the investigation. Within the control group, perhaps the teacher's explanation concerning the use of line promoted student growth.

In the analysis of composition, the control group's mean is larger than the

experimental group's. Once again, Wolf felt that the teacher's direct instruction had an impact on student growth.

In the overall analysis, Wolf felt that scores may have been different if ratings were done after each class session, demonstrating the skills obtained through the course of instruction of Teacher A versus Teacher B. Wolf theorized that the experimental group's interest in the audio-visual media may have waned after a while, creating diminished interest among the students.

It may be that at the fifth grade level, direct teacher instruction is more effective than the more impersonal use of audio-visual programs. It may be that while the students appear to comprehend the concepts introduced, transfer of that knowledge to drawing application was not as effective through the use of audio-visual programs as it was through a more direct teacher demonstration (pp. 37-8).

The Wolf study targeted the same grade level as this researcher's study. He investigated the differences in student performance when taught with a DBAE formatted curriculum using audio-visual materials versus a more traditional non-DBAE curriculum. The results of his study yielded no significant difference or improvement in student learning through the DBAE format.

### The Brewer Study<sup>3</sup>

Thomas M. Brewer, of The University of Arkansas at Little Rock, conducted his study, "An Examination of Two Approaches To Ceramic Instruction in Elementary Education" to help determine the benefits of a DBAE curriculum. Brewer began his study with background material comparing the educational philosophies of M. Barkan, Viktor Lowenfeld and W. L. Brittain, who endorsed a child-centered approach to art education, with those of Elliot Eisner,

---

<sup>3</sup> Brewer, Thomas M. "An Examination of Two Approaches To Ceramic Instruction in Elementary Education." *Studies in Art Education*. (1991): 32, no. 4, 196-206.

J. K. McFee, and Dwaine W. Greer, who feel that a discipline-based approach to art education is essential to the artistic growth of students. In 1984, Greer discussed a ceramic instruction program which incorporated DBAE philosophies:

According to Greer (1984), a discipline-based lesson in ceramic education would include the presentation of historical exemplars of ceramic objects, critical discussion and technical information focusing on the work, prior to student involvement with ceramic production (p. 197).

The researcher intended to test this philosophy by comparing a child-centered approach to Greer's DBAE approach:

A ceramic lesson using a child-centered approach would not expose the child to historical examples. Instead, it would expose them to ceramic material and motivate them by using questions that relate to their feelings and knowledge about clay and ceramic ware (p. 197).

A Nonequivalent Control Group Quasi Experimental Design was used for this study. Thirty one students within an intact classroom were used as test subjects, and pretests were given to establish equivalence. Sixteen students became the DBAE study group, and fifteen were in the child-centered group. No control group was selected, because ". . . the researcher hypothesized that the experimental treatments would yield significant differences on selected variables" (p. 198).

Three measures were used as pretests and posttests to evaluate the students: the Self-Concept as a Learner Scale (SCAL) (Waetjen, 1967), the Art and Me Scale (AMS) (Anttonen, 1975), and the Art Vocabulary Test (AV) (Silverman, Hoepfner, and Hendricks, 1969). In addition, the Gestalt Holistic Assessment (GHA) test was used on both study groups to rate the aesthetic qualities of students' ceramic vessels and modeled human figures.

Brewer conducted the study ". . . over six consecutive days using

one-hour sessions for each group” (p. 199):

Day 1 - SCAL, AMS, and AV tests administered as pretests.

Day 2 - students received handouts with ceramics’ terminology

“ . . . in an attempt to equate treatment groups and mitigate any individual differences in prior ceramic experience that might have been present in a ceramic pretest” (p. 199).

Day 3 - The DBAE group received a fifteen minute “ . . . researcher-designed treatment module. . . ” (p. 200), which included four slides of sculpture from different styles and historical periods in art. After the presentation, the students were instructed to model a sculpture of a person they knew. They were reminded of the slides they had just seen, and were encouraged to create their work in the style of one of the slides. In addition, the students were reminded about Day 2’s handout and the terminology used. After the students completed their work, they were asked to compare their sculptures with those in the slides.

The child-centered group was asked questions during the first 15 minutes of the class. Lowenfeld felt that this would “. . . activate passive knowledge” (p. 199) and stimulate the students’ memories about past experiences, therefore enabling the students to create artwork that came from within the realm of their own knowledge and experiences. The students did not view slides or discuss vocabulary; instead they were asked about their feelings when working with clay, what they were creating, and whether or not they could create a feeling (happiness, sadness) within their work. After the students completed their work, they were asked to express their feelings about what they had just created.

Day 4 - During a fifteen minute “. . . researcher-designed treatment module. . .”

(p. 200), the DBAE study group viewed four slides of ceramic vessels from historical periods similar to the previous day's sculpture. This was followed by discussions including vocabulary, such as “. . .color, shape, texture, line, surface, glaze, unglazed, vessel, foot, lip, neck, handles, elongated and symmetrical” (p. 200). The students were encouraged to create ceramic vessels in a style of one of the vessels viewed on the slides they had just seen. When completed, the students once again compared their work to those presented in the slides.

Once again, the child-centered group was asked questions during the first 15 minutes of the class to “. . . activate passive knowledge” (p. 199). They were asked about objects other than human models which could be rendered from clay, how to make clay hollow and change surface textures. In addition, the students were asked if they had pottery at home, how they might use pottery, if they ever held pottery. After the discussion, the students were instructed to create a ceramic vessel.

When completed, the students discussed their feeling about their work.

Day 5 - The DBAE group reviewed the slides from the previous two days and were questioned about the work shown on the slides. Did the students remember the periods or styles in which the sculpture or vessels were produced? The students were asked to make aesthetic judgments concerning similarities and differences in the artwork. Then the students were asked to look at their own artwork, and discuss whether or not their work looked like the ones in the slides, if they liked their work, and what they would do differently.

The child-centered group talked about their own work. They were

asked to express their feeling about what they had created. Each student was asked who they chose as the model for their human figure and why. Were the students satisfied with the results? They then discussed the vessels they had created. The students were asked if they were satisfied with the results, whether or not they liked the way it felt, and what they planned to use it for.

Day 6 - SCAL, AMS, and AV tests administered as posttests.

To assess the aesthetic quality of the students' work, five volunteer judges used the GHA at the conclusion of the study. During a training session, the judges were instructed to rate each piece of work ". . . on an immediate holistic aesthetic impression or response as opposed to a checklist-style analysis of discrete elements such as shape, line, or color" (p. 201). The judges were also instructed to use a criterion-reference rating. "The degree to which students were working above or below the norm for this group was a principle criterion for assigning a numerical value" (p. 201). Slides were used for the judges' training session, demonstrating levels of work from a level of 4 (outstanding), 3 (above average), 2 (average) and 1 (below average). A two-point difference in ratings was permitted. If the ratings would have been more than two points apart, the judges in question ". . . were asked to discuss the discrepancy, and, upon approval, either judge would change the rating to within one point of the other" (p. 201).

Interjudge reliability was analyzed by S.A.S. version 6.03 (trademark of S.A.S. Institute, Cary, North Carolina). Pairs of judges' scores were compared by the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, which measured the ". . . degree of association and . . . tendency towards agreement of discrimination on high (4) and low (1) ratings" (p. 202).

The analysis of the data revealed that judges 4 and 5 (J4, J5) had the four lowest correlations  $R = .685, p .003 < .05$  with 16 uncommon ratings, while J3 and J5 had  $R = .706, p .001 < .05$ , with 27 uncommon ratings. "All other interjudge correlations ( $r$ ) were closer to 1.0, leading to the conclusion that all aesthetic judgments on the quality of students' ceramics products were based on the same immediate holistic criterion-referenced response and general guidelines set for idea and execution" (202).

The pretests and posttests taken by all the students were analyzed by SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). A 2 X 2 factorial design, addressing each treatment group by gender as well as the study group factor (DBAE or child-centered) was answered by an F-Test (ANOVA). The results showed that there was no significant difference in the pretest results among the two study groups. On the pretest, females scored at a significant level in the area of attitude toward art, but not on the posttest.

The posttest revealed that neither the DBAE group nor the child-centered group was effected significantly during the study. The researcher felt that perhaps the time he spent with the students was inadequate to demonstrate differences in the two teaching strategies.

Brewer's study contained many similarities with this researcher's study. The focus group was fifth grade students, and he investigated the effects which a DBAE curriculum might have over a child-centered curriculum, in reference to an increase in students' artistic learning. His study, like Wolf's study, showed no significant differences between the two methodologies in question.



## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### Sample.

This study was a quasi-experimental comparison conducted with 51 fifth grade art students from Carson Elementary School in Pennsauken, New Jersey. The 5th grade students for the study's sample population were from two intact homogenous classes; one class had 25 students, the other 26. Letters explaining the study and permission slips (Appendix A) were sent to the parents. For legal reasons, only the children who returned signed permission slips participated in the study. Several students did not return the permission slips; two said they were planning to move within the next few months, two were leery of the study, and three were not interested. Each participating child was appointed a "code" number to maintain their anonymity.

#### Design.

Each class had one weekly 40-minute art period. For the pretest and posttest, arrangements were made for double art periods, which enabled the students to have extended class time.

A pretest was administered. The students were asked to create a landscape with various materials at their disposal. No guidelines (other than behavioral) were given to the students. They were able to create landscapes in whatever style they desired, using whatever materials they preferred.

A timeline was established:

January	5 -	Pretest - Class A
January	19, 26 -	Instruction - Still Life Paintings
February	2, 9 -	Instruction - Portraiture
	16, 23 -	Instruction - Perspective
March	2 -	Instruction - Perspective
	9, 16 -	Instruction - Nonrepresentational Abstract Art
	23 -	Posttest - Class A
	30 -	Posttest - Class B

Easter break began the week of April 4, 1999. The researcher completed the study by March 30th, which left the second week of April available for rating the art work.

### Instrumentation.

For this study, a teacher-made rating scale (Appendix B) was developed. Other options were available, such as the "Clark's Drawing Abilities Test" and the "Torrence Test," but they did not meet the needs for this study.

The rating scale was facet factorial format with a semantic differential option response; six option response categories were addressed: selection of materials, balance, color, use of space, focal point, and overall composition. Within several of the categories were subcategories, further defining the concept. The categories had a range of one (lowest) through five (highest), with semantic differential options precisely describing the criteria. A pretest of student artwork was assessed by the rating scale, as well as a posttest.

### Rating Procedures.

Students' pretests and posttests were rated by two art teachers. The judges were in-serviced prior to the judging the data by using the rating scale and discussing its nuances. They were instructed to look at the art work for

approximately 15 seconds before rating each element. A correlation coefficient between the two judges' ratings for each option response and the total was calculated from the results of the ratings to determine interjudge reliability.

After the completion of the students' posttests, the actual rating began. The two judges used the teacher-made rating scale to determine whether or not a measure of growth had taken place, and which method of teaching promoted more growth. The entire rating process was conducted at one time. The students' pretest and posttest art work was displayed in random order. Each judge's paper was a different color to expedite calculating the final results. In addition, a corner of the papers had been clipped off (upper right for pretests, upper left for posttests) to once again expedite calculating the final results. Each student's rating sheet was kept by the work to be rated, along with the child's corresponding identification number. The judges were once again instructed to look at the artwork for approximately 15 seconds before rating each element. The combined scores from each judge, for both the pretest and posttest, served as data for this inquiry.

#### Selection of Judges.

Two art teachers from the Pennsauken Public School System, in Camden County, New Jersey, were selected to rate the students' pretests and posttests. The criterion for selection was expertise in the area of elementary school art and availability during the week of Easter break to fit in the timeline of this researcher's study. Judge One has been with the Pennsauken School System for twenty seven years and Judge Two has been teaching art in Pennsauken for the past eighteen years. Both teachers have Bachelor of Arts Degrees in Art Education from Glassboro State College.

### Assignment of Classes to Experimental and Control Groups

Both classes contained approximately the same number of students. At the beginning of this study, there were twenty eight students in each class. After the study had begun, several students moved, creating a slight inequity in numbers. Both classes were seen on Tuesday mornings, during periods one and two. The art schedule allowed for only five minutes between class, which is used for clean up and setting up materials for the next class. The first period class was assigned to the experimental group (non-DBAE); the hands-on format of this teaching style required more time for preparation and setting up materials, and using the extra time for set up before the students arrived at school allowed the researcher adequate time to do so.

The second class was assigned to the control group (DBAE), since preparation and set up for this group took less time. Having only five minutes between classes would have made it difficult to set up all the extra supplies needed had they been assigned to the experimental group.

### Pretests and Posttests.

Arrangements had been made for each class to have a double period of art during the pretests and posttests, allowing them adequate time to finish their work. Landscapes by the following artists were displayed:

Vincent Van Gogh:	"Field With Thunder Clouds"
	"Starry Night"
	"Field at Arles"
Rene Magritte:	"The Natural Phenomenon"
Emile-Othon Friesz:	"Autumn"
George Seurat	"Banks of the Seine"
Andre Derain	"The Banks of the Seine"

The art class has six students' work tables. The researcher placed different materials at each table:

- Table 1 - oil pastels
- Table 2 - crayons and markers
- Table 3 - watercolors
- Table 4 - tempera paints and styrofoam palettes
- Table 5 - colored pencils
- Table 6 - collage materials, scissors and glue

The students were instructed to go wherever they like, but no more than six students at tables 1,2,5 and 6 (the tables cannot accommodate any more) and no more than seven students at tables 3 and 4, which are a little larger. The only table which was inadequate to accommodate the numbers of students who wanted to use it was table 4, so the students were timed with 20-minute "slots." If there were no students waiting to paint, the students who were there could remain. All of the students were able to complete the pretests and posttests in the time allotted.

There were several unforeseen factors which occurred during the pretest and posttest periods. One participating student from the experimental group was absent during the pretest. During the week the control group took their pretest, the classroom teacher was absent. The entire class arrived twenty minutes late and several students had to rush to complete the pretest. Two participating students from the control group were absent during their pretest. In addition, during the posttest, two students in the experimental group were absent.

#### Treatment for Each Group.

Both classes were assigned the same projects. The experimental group received introductions to their lessons with a hands-on approach (Appendix C), while the control group received much of their introduction to the lessons through a DBAE approach (Appendix C), including the discussion of art history,

art criticism and aesthetics. Each class viewed the same art reproductions appropriate for the particular lesson, but the students in the experimental group spent less time discussing the art work and more time actively being involved setting up their own parameters for the project.

One of the difficulties involved with teaching classes during the first period is student lateness. Many of the fifth students in that class, the experimental group, are on the safety patrol, and do not leave their posts until after the first bell has rung. Several students are bussed from other areas within the district, and if the busses are late, the children miss the beginning of first period instruction. On the average, sixty percent of the class enters on time, forty percent enters anywhere from five to ten minutes late. In addition, our regular principal has been ill, and the interim principal started each day with a lengthy message on the intercom. In short, the experimental group missed a portion of instruction time each week.

#### Lesson 1 - Still Life - Day 1

The experimental group received a brief discussion of still life painting when they arrived to class. The students viewed the following artwork:

Paul Cezanne:	"Pommes et Oranges"
Pablo Picasso:	"The Enamel Saucepan"
Henri Matisse:	"Interior, Flowers and Parrot"
	"The Purple Robe"

A brief discussion followed, concerning composition and overlapping forms. Six bags of pre-filled still life materials had been prepared ahead of time and were distributed to each of the tables in the classroom. Each bag contained some type of cloth (tablecloth, cloth napkin, cloth placemat), a basket, several pieces of plastic fruit, something tall and sculptural, something plush, and an assortment of other materials. The students at the table were given the

opportunity to create their own still life model. Once each table had its still life arranged, each student received an 8" x 10" piece of matboard, pencils and erasers and were instructed to draw what they saw. Students were encouraged to look at all angles of the still life, decide which they liked the best, sit down and draw it from that particular angle. The bags were given numbers which corresponded to the table's number. This was done to insure that each table would receive the same materials the following week. Students placed their still life materials in the bags before they left.

The control group viewed the same artwork as the experimental group, but more time was spent discussing the artists and their styles, the aesthetic properties of the paintings, and the students were given time to respond to the artwork. They were asked to describe what they saw, compare and contrast the different styles, and discuss their preferences. Toward the end of the discussion, the researcher began setting up one large still life model in the center of the classroom. This still life consisted of a silk flower centerpiece, a tall sculpture of a cardinal, one large stuffed white bear, tennis racket, telephone, a door draft-stopper in the form of a cow wearing a black and white pinafore, and several colorful boxes. A central table was used for the display. To add interest to the still life, the items were placed on a colorful tablecloth, which had a box underneath it, elevating one section. Once the still life had been arranged, each student received an 8" x 10" piece of matboard, pencils and erasers and were instructed to draw what they saw. While the students were drawing, the researcher drew the still life from different angles to recreate the same basic set up the following week.

## Lesson 1 - Day 2

Prior to the start of classes, the researcher prepared materials for the two groups. Each table was to receive fresh paint, which consisted of red, yellow, blue, black, brown and white in half of an egg carton. White styrofoam trays were piled for each table, along with brushes and paper towels. In addition, sharpened colored pencils were placed in trays for the students' use. It was necessary to prepare these materials ahead of time, since set-up time between the two classes was inadequate.

The students in the experimental group reviewed the concepts from the previous week, and were given brief instructions about adding color to their work. Originally, the researcher planned for all the students to paint their still life designs, but upon viewing their artwork, it was observed that some were so detailed that the use of paint may not have been the optimum medium for color, so the students were given the option of using colored pencils solely or in addition to paint. Brief instructions about color mixing were discussed with the students. If they wanted a color which was not in the egg carton, they were to figure out how to mix it themselves. If the students elected to paint, they were instructed to use the white styrofoam trays as palettes for mixing colors. A quick demonstration introduced the students to creating a painterly look to their still life objects, as opposed to coloring their objects flatly. Each table was given the bags of materials from the previous week and instructed to set their still life models up again to the best of their ability. Their artwork was returned, along with pencils and erasers to accommodate any students who had not finished drawing. The colored pencils, paint, brushes, trays, paper towels and water were then distributed. The students were instructed to add color.

The still life prepared by the researcher for the control group was set up



prior to the entrance of the students. A review of the concepts from the previous week were discussed in depth, and the students were given more detailed instructions about adding color to their work. The control group was also given the option of using colored pencils for their designs, since many of them created intricate images the week before. Instructions about color mixing were discussed with the students. If the students elected to paint, they were to use the white styrofoam trays as palettes for mixing colors. Like the experimental group, a demonstration about creating a painterly look to their work was given. The students' artwork was returned, along with pencils and erasers to accommodate any students who had not finished drawing, followed by the materials for adding color to their art work.

#### Lesson 2 - Portraiture - Day 1

Prior to the beginning of this lesson, the experimental group students were informed that portraiture would be the next project. During the previous class, the students had been instructed to select one model for each of the six tables; the models could dress as they desired, using any props (hats, glasses, outfits) that they desired. The day before class, the students were also reminded about the selection of models.

Both classes were introduced to portraits created by various artists:

Paul Klee: "Senecio, Head of a Man"

Mary Cassatt: "Woman with Dog"

William Hogarth: "The Shrimp Girl"

Pablo Picasso: "Woman With a Blue Veil"

"Head of a Harlequin"

Jeffrey Boles: "Drawing of a Girl"

(drawing by Jeffrey Boles, a 5th grade student at Carson School)

The experimental group received a brief discussion about the artists' and how their styles differed. Students were asked to observe the composition in

the paintings and the student's drawing. The students had the option of drawing a close-up of the model; the entire body of the model need not be drawn. Before the models began posing, the students were given the option of using white or gray 11" x 17" paper for their drawings. The researcher demonstrated the differences between both types of paper with respect to drawing, shading, and highlighting. Students would have the option of using white pencils to highlight the gray paper had they chosen that color. The students were instructed to pose their models and begin drawing. While they worked, the researcher talked to the students about observing details, such as how a hat sits on the forehead, hands overlapping other parts of the body, facial expressions, the way in which a necklace lays on the shoulders, folds and details of the clothing. Before leaving, the models were instructed to bring the same props and wear the same outfits the following week, if possible.

Students in the control group were introduced to the same artists as the experimental group. A more in depth discussion of the artists' backgrounds and styles was conducted with the students. Students were invited to express their opinions about the artwork, which styles they preferred, what was aesthetically pleasing to them. For the drawings, the control group students were also given the option of using white or gray 11" x 17" paper. Like the experimental group, the students had the option of drawing a close-up of the model. Once again, the researcher demonstrated the differences between both types of paper with respect to drawing, shading, and highlighting with the gray paper with the white pencils. Afterwards, two students were selected to be the models. Both were comfortably seated in the center of the classroom and offered a prop if they wanted. Only one student selected an umbrella, which he held like a cane. Students were instructed to begin drawing. While the control group students

were working, the researcher once again talked to the students about observing details of the models.

### Lesson 2 - Day 2

Students in the experimental class were reminded about the models' clothing and props the day before coming to class. Most of the models did come dressed as they had the week before.

The experimental group briefly reviewed the objectives of the lesson. Pencil shading and highlighting with white pencils were reviewed. The students' artwork was returned from the previous week, pencils (and white pencils) were distributed, the models were re-posed by the students at their tables, and the drawing continued.

Students in the control group also reviewed the objectives of the previous week. A more in depth demonstration about shading and highlighting was conducted with this group, after which, the two models were re-posed. The students received their drawings from the previous week, along with pencils and white pencils, and they were instructed to continue their drawings.

### Lesson 3 - Perspective - Day 1

Carson School has several long wings with doors at the end of each one. The wing leading to the art room includes an alcove, approximately twelve feet square. A length of hallway, approximately sixty feet long, leads to the door. A wonderful example of one-point perspective can be observed from that alcove. The experimental group was stopped at the alcove en route to art class and instructed to look down the long hallway at the door. A large red circle was placed in the center of the dark brown doors, and the students were asked to

look at the circle. This was the vanishing point, the place where all the lines from the ceiling and floor merged. Students were instructed to observe the lines of the walls, ceiling and floors as they converged towards the vanishing point, the appearance of the classroom entrances and the intersecting hallway. The students observed a quick demonstration of one-point perspective from the alcove, where the researcher, with an easel, paper and marker, showed them how to use the vanishing point (the dot) to visually become the furthest point.

Once the hallway demonstration was completed, the students entered the art room for a continuation of the lesson. A selection of artwork available for the students:

Andre Derain: "The Banks of the Seine"  
Philip Evergood: "Sunny Side of the Street"

Although both pictures differed in subject matter, style and palette, they both demonstrated the use of perspective with lines that merged towards a vanishing point. The researcher reviewed the concept of vanishing point with the students, using both paintings as examples. The materials used for this lesson were 11" x 17" white drawing paper, pencils, erasers and rulers. Once the students received their supplies, they were instructed to create a lightly drawn horizon line on their paper, and place the vanishing point on the horizon line. After the horizon line and vanishing point had been created, the researcher demonstrated how to create curbs and the outlines of buildings emanating from the vanishing point, as well as poles for street light which appear to recede into the distance. The students were instructed not to begin adding windows and other details, since that would be taught in the next lesson.

The control group began the lesson more traditionally in the classroom. The students were introduced to the same two paintings and their artists, and were asked to explain the differences they observed. They were encouraged to

describe the two works, comparing and contrasting the styles, subject matter and palettes. In addition, the students were asked their opinions about the two paintings. Once the initial discussion was finished, the students were given the same materials and instructions as the experimental group.

### Lesson 3 - Day 2

The experimental group reviewed the concepts from the previous week. They were asked to remember what they saw while standing in the alcove, the meaning of "perspective" and "vanishing point," and to relate what they saw to Philip Evergood's painting "Sunny Side of the Street." There was a direct relationship to the red dot "vanishing point" at the end of the hallway last week and the way in which Evergood used lines to create the illusion of perspective in his painting. The students' drawings were returned along with pencils, erasers and rulers. Before beginning, the researcher demonstrated the method of creating perspective with the windows and doors. In addition, a review of repeating designs was conducted with respect to the windows, window sills and treatments above the windows. While the students were working, the researcher discussed finishing touches, such as adding people, billboards, cars, etc.

Like the experimental group, the control group reviewed the concepts from the previous week, and their drawings were returned along with pencils, erasers and rulers. Before the students began, they were asked to look at Philip Evergood's painting "Sunny Side of the Street" to observe the details and formation of the windows and doors which receded towards the vanishing point. The researcher demonstrated the method of creating perspective with the windows and doors. In addition, a review of repeating designs was conducted

with respect to the windows, window sills and treatments above the windows. While the students were working, the researcher discussed finishing touches, such as adding people, billboards, cars, etc.

### Lesson 3 - Day 3

A brief review of the concepts learned in the previous lessons was conducted with both the experimental group and the control group, and the students were instructed to finish drawing. Fine line markers, crayons and colored pencils were made available for the students to use.

### Lesson 4 - Nonrepresentational Abstract Art - Day 1

Selected artwork was displayed when both the experimental and control groups entered the art room. The reproductions, plus a "PowerPoint" computer presentation focused on art work which compared the styles of representational (Andre Derain), abstract (Paul Klee), and nonrepresentational (the remaining) artists:

Andre Derain	"The Banks of the Seine"
Paul Klee	"Senecio, Head of a Man"
Piet Mondrian	"Boogie Woogie Broadway"
	"Composition #2"
Frank Stella	"Moultonville"
	"Double Gray Scramble"
	"Gur 1"
	"Flin Flon"
Viktor Vasarely	"Vonal KSZ"

The experimental group was introduced to the styles of the selected artists, and a brief description and comparison was given. Once the students understood the differences in the styles, the class focused on the work of the nonrepresentational artists. A brief discussion was held, comparing the differences in the styles of the selected nonrepresentational artists: we

discussed how the use of color, line and design was used to create depth, movement and balance. In addition, the titles of the art works were discussed, adding to the concept of “nonrepresentation” in the art.

After the brief discussion, the students were given the choice to create nonrepresentational art in the style of one of the selected artists, or to devise a method of their own. Due to the uniqueness of Frank Stella’s “circular” style, a brief demonstration was given showing the students how to achieve that type of design. In addition, a brief demonstration was given showing students how to measure and cut paper to create work in the style of Vasarely’s “Vonal KSZ” which takes on the appearance of op-art.

The students began working in the style of their choice. Several students decided to use the style of Frank Stella, while others experimented with the styles of Mondrian and Vasarely. Due to the shortness of the period, unfinished work was set aside to dry, and later put in trays for redistribution the following week.

Students in the control group viewed the same art work as the experimental group. A more in depth discussion concerning the differences in the styles of the representational, abstract and nonrepresentational artists was held, including a little background information about the artists. The students became very active participants in the discussion, offering insights, preferences and acknowledging the differences in the styles. After the three styles were discussed, the class focused on the nonrepresentational artists’ styles. Similarities and differences were discussed, as well as the use of color and line. Students discussed how color and line created movement and balance.

After the discussion, a demonstration was given showing the students

how to create “circular” art in the style of Frank Stella. The students were then instructed to begin working. As with the experimental group, the unfinished work was set aside to dry and later collected in trays for redistribution the following week.

#### Lesson 4 - Day 2

A brief review of the concepts learned in the previous lesson was conducted with both the experimental and the control group. The work which had been collected in trays was redistributed and the students were instructed to finish constructing their nonrepresentational art. Appropriate materials were made available for the students' use.



CHAPTER IV  
RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Interjudge Reliabilities.

The interjudge reliabilities between the two judges on the pretest and posttest were .610 and .703 respectively.

Statistical Results.

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Summary Data are presented in Table 1. The researcher failed to find statistically significant interaction of mail effects for type of instruction group. The observed mean for the experimental (hands-on, child-centered format) are larger than the control (DBAE) group.

TABLE 1 Means, S.D., and ANOVA Summary Group for the DBAE and the Experimental groups					
Group	N	Mean		S.D.	
		pre	post	pre	post
DBAE	21	68.905	66.619	12.128	17.727
Exp.	19	74.789	73.526	13.464	14.584
ANOVA SUMMARY					
Source		SS	DF	MS	F
Between					
Group		816.128	1	816.128	3.176n.s.
Error		9765.672	38	256.991	
Within					
test time		62.815	1	62.815	.364n.s.
test time X group		5.215	1	5.215	.863n.s.
Error		6552.985	38	172.447	

### Interpretations.

As demonstrated in Table 1 the interjudge reliabilities are respectable for a teacher-made criterion measure (Appendix B). During the rating session the judges questioned item number two on the rating scale. This criteria was meant to measure the quantity of materials chosen for application by the students. Their concern was valid, since several students elected to use one medium for their landscape, and used that medium quite effectively. According to the rating scale, it appeared that the students would have been penalized for not choosing to use a variety of materials.

A Type II error could have occurred, because the obtained probability level for the F ratio was .08, which is close to the criterion .05 level of confidence. There were several contributing factors which may have effected the results.

One contributing factor may have been item number two of the rating scale, since it contained a bias for students who chose to use more than one material while creating their landscapes.

A second factor may have been student absenteeism during the pretests and posttests. Initially, the DBAE Control Group had twenty-five participating students. Three were absent during the pretest which eliminated them from the study, and one moved to another district while the study was being conducted. The final number of participating students in the Control Group was reduced to twenty-one. At the beginning of the study, the hands-on Experimental Group contained twenty-three students. One participating student was absent during the pretest, two were absent during the posttest, and two students moved to other districts while the study was being conducted. The final number of students in the Experimental Group was reduced to nineteen. The absences

reduced the power to detect a difference if one was there.

A third contributing factor may have been a change in the students' behavior. The classroom teacher of the Control Group students had been absent for several days when her students had art. The students' behavior may have been effected by her absences. In addition, the classroom teacher of the Experimental Group students had a student teacher, so their behaviors may have been effected by that change as well.

Finally, perhaps there may not have been a difference in the two methods of teaching at all, which is confirmed by previous research. The Wolf Study targeted the same grade level as this researcher's study; Wolf failed to find a significant difference in student performance when art was taught with a DBAE formatted curriculum, using audio-visual materials, versus a more experimental hands-on format. In addition, the Brewer Study, which also targeted fifth grade students, failed to find a significant difference in the outcome of the students' ceramics projects when taught with a DBAE format versus a child-centered format.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

#### Purpose and Problem.

In 1984, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts initiated DBAE, which offered new criteria for teaching art. The basic aim of DBAE was to introduce additional disciplines into an art education program, with an emphasis placed on the teaching of art history, art criticism and aesthetics. To date, no true supportive data has been found substantiating the effectiveness of the DBAE program, yet many art educators are considering the philosophy of DBAE to be the consummate method of teaching art. A small group of art educators resisted the impetus towards DBAE, feeling that the program did not place enough emphasis on the child's actual artwork. The purpose of this thesis was to address the scant body of research written contrasting a DBAE and non-DBAE curriculum, and to investigate the effectiveness of a DBAE approach with that of a child centered approach to teaching art. The problem of this thesis was to determine whether a DBAE approach or child-centered, hands-on approach to art education had a greater impact on students' artistic learning.

#### Design.

This study was a quasi-experimental comparison conducted with 40 fifth grade art students from Carson Elementary School in Pennsauken, New Jersey. The 5th grade students were from two intact homogenous classes, with

21 students in one class, 19 in the other. For legal reasons, only the children who returned signed permission slips from their parents participated in the study. Each participating child was appointed a "code" number to maintain their anonymity. Originally, 51 students had agreed to participate, but due to several students moving and absenteeism, the number was reduced to 41.

Pretests and posttests were administered. The students were asked to create a landscape, having various materials at their disposal. No guidelines (other than behavioral) were given to the students. They were able to create landscapes in whatever style they desire, using whatever materials they prefer.

#### Instrumentation.

For this study, a teacher-made rating scale (Appendix B) was developed. The rating scale was a facet factorial format with a semantic differential option response whereby six option response categories were addressed: selection of materials, balance, color, use of space, focal point, and overall composition. Within several of the categories were subcategories, further defining the concepts. The categories had a range of one (lowest) through five (highest), with semantic differential options precisely describing the criteria. A pretest of student artwork was assessed by the rating scale, as well as a posttest.

#### Rating Procedures.

Students' pretests and posttests were rated by two art teachers. The judges were in-serviced prior to the judging the data by using the rating scale and discussing its nuances. They were instructed to look at the art work for approximately 15 seconds before rating each element. A correlation coefficient between the two judges' ratings for each option response and the total was

calculated from the results of the ratings to determine interjudge reliability.

### Analysis.

These data were organized into a two dimensional design for differences, group X test time. A two-way ANOVA with repeated measures on one factor was calculated using the .05 level of confidence.

### Results.

The researcher failed to find significant interaction or main effects between the two methods of teaching.

### Conclusions.

The purpose of this thesis was to address the scant body of research previously written to examine the effects of a DBAE curriculum, specifically to compare the DBAE model with that of a child-centered approach to teaching art. Two fifth grade classes created the same projects. One of the classes experimented with a hands-on, discovery method of artistic learning, and the other class learned the same concepts using the DBAE model. The results of this thesis failed to demonstrate any significant differences in the students' artistic learning between the two methods of teaching art.

The researcher did observe a difference in how each class reacted to the lessons incorporated during the study. Students in the hands-on, child-centered experimental class appeared to enjoy the projects more than the students in the DBAE control group. More freedom and choices were given to the experimental group. Students in the control group appeared to tire of the discussions after short period, and felt they were ready to begin working.

During the Still Life lesson, groups of students in the experimental group were given the materials to create their own still life models and find a vantage point from which to draw. The students had the freedom to set some of their own parameters and their finished projects reflected a more original style. More attention was given to subtleties and details. This was in contrast to students in the control group, who drew from a centrally-located, teacher-made still life. These students had no control over their subject matter or vantage point. When completed, their still life designs were fine, but they didn't have the extra personal touches, such as well-defined details and interesting placement of items included in the projects from the experimental group.

Similar guidelines were set for the Portraiture lesson, where the experimental group once again had more freedom to set their own parameters. They were allowed to select their own models, have the model dress as they choose, and draw the model from whichever vantage point they preferred. The finished drawings were more original and carefully rendered than the control group, which followed a DBAE format of critique, art history and aesthetics and finally art production. The students in the experimental group appeared to pay more attention to the model's details, such as buttons, clothing texture and the rendering of the models' hands. The researcher selected the models for the control group, and centrally located them before the students began to draw. The finished drawings were fine, but they appeared more rigid and less personalized than the drawings from the experimental group. The models, as portrayed in the drawings, appeared stiff, unnatural, mannequin-like.

At the beginning of the Perspective lesson, students in the experimental group appeared to readily grasp the concept of perspective by the observation of Carson School's hallway. The length of the hallway, the door at the end,

along with the converging lines of the ceiling and floor offered a great demonstration of perspective and the vanishing point. The control group learned the same concepts through a discussion while observing appropriate art reproductions. The results of the perspective drawings from both classes were similar, and in the end, both classes grasped the concept on approximately the same level.

The final project, Nonrepresentational Abstract Art, was greatly enjoyed by both classes. The experimental class was given the option of creating nonrepresentational abstract art in whatever style they chose. Extra time was needed to demonstrate ways of creating nonrepresentational art in the style of Piet Mondrian, Viktor Vasarely and Frank Stella. A more in-depth discussion was conducted with the control group, and due to time constraints, they were limited to creating art in the style of Frank Stella. The finished projects from both groups were equally colorful and balanced.

In general, the researcher feels that the students in the experimental group benefited from the hands-on experiences during class time. The structure of a DBAE curriculum requires a hefty portion of verbal exchanges with the students. The researcher does not deny that discussions about art are necessary; they are beneficial and set the tone for the lessons. Many elementary art teachers have the same situations where time is at a premium. This researcher feels that students should be given the maximum opportunity to learn, create and express themselves during art class, often keeping lofty art discussions to a minimum. The statistical results from the pretests and posttests demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the two methods of teaching. The observations of the researcher demonstrated that students who who instructed with a hands-on, child-centered approach experienced



more enjoyment in their art work.

As all art teacher do on a weekly basis, lesson plans had to be written. A double set was needed for the thesis study. Although both the experimental and control groups created the same projects, the methods of teaching the lessons were different. One lesson plan needed to be written in a DBAE format, and the other in a child-centered format (Appendix C). The researcher needed to look at writing lesson plans from two different perspectives. This process yielded many significantly sound lessons which will be used in years to come.

The impetus towards a DBAE approach to art education may have caused people to lose sight of the purpose of art education, especially with young children. Supporters of DBAE feel that “. . . experiencing works of art aesthetically is as significant as producing them.”<sup>1</sup> The researcher disagrees wholeheartedly with this concept. Students need to experience art on a hands-on level, not vicariously through discussion. Art history, aesthetics and art criticism do coexist with most art curriculum, but not to the extent mandated by DBAE. In addition, supporters of DBAE and Goals 2000 require measurability in art, which is subjective by nature. Perhaps the authors of DBAE and Goals 2000 feel it is tidy and easier to assess students' artistic learning in a written format, but this tends to defy the basic concepts of free artistic expression. As Pearl Greenberg states: “. . .Because art is now copying the other 'basic' disciplines and must be measurable, are we shortchanging our children, keeping them from experiencing the elegant moments of artistic creation which some might find difficult to explain in words?...What in the world are we doing?”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Smith, Ralph. “The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education.” *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (Summer, 1987): 70,4.

<sup>2</sup> Greenberg, Pearl. “*Time, Money, and the New Art Education versus Art and Irrelevance.*” *Studies in Art Education* (1996): 37, no. 2, 116.

## APPENDIX A

Marilyn Ross Isaacs  
Art Teacher  
Carson School  
Garfield Avenue  
Pennsauken, New Jersey 08109  
662-5751  
December 1, 1998

Dear ,

I am currently enrolled in a Master's Program at Rowan University, and in the process of writing my Master's Thesis. The basis for my thesis is to conduct a study comparing two different styles of teaching art.

After much consideration, I have selected the fifth grades at Carson School to be the subjects for my study. The two classes have an equal number of students, all of whom already exhibit a great deal of creativity. The actual work for my study will take place during the months of January, February, March and April.

In order for to participate in my study, I need your permission in writing. I am enclosing a permission slip with this letter, which needs to be returned as soon as possible! Please be assured that your child's identity will remain TOTALLY anonymous, and nowhere in the study will your child's name be mentioned. In addition, I will be using a "code" system, so that any reference made to your child's artwork will also maintain anonymity.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at Carson School, or make an appointment with me for a conference. When my thesis has been completed, a copy will be in my classroom for your inspection.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Sincerely,

To: Marilyn Ross Isaacs  
Art Teacher  
Carson School  
Garfield Avenue  
Pennsauken, New Jersey 08109  
662-5751  
December 1, 1998

I, \_\_\_\_\_,

give permission for my child:

\_\_\_\_\_

to be included in Ms. Isaacs' master's Thesis study.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

# **RATING SCALE FOR ASSESSING STUDENT ARTWORK**

**STUDENT** \_\_\_\_\_

**JUDGE** \_\_\_\_\_

**Selection of materials:**

not much thought given	1	2	3	4	5	thoughtful use of materials
few choices of materials	1	2	3	4	5	used a variety of materials

**Balance: (symmetrical or asymmetrical)**

not evident	1	2	3	4	5	evident
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------

**Color:**

unbalanced color	1	2	3	4	5	balanced color
nondescript (muddy/ not given much thought)	1	2	3	4	5	works well (ie: use of limited/unlimited palette warm/cool colors, etc.)

**Use of space:**

not well defined	1	2	3	4	5	well defined
no use of scale to demonstrate knowledge of perspective	1	2	3	4	5	size relationships demonstrate knowledge of perspective.
no overlapping elements	1	2	3	4	5	overlapping elements

**Focal point:**

not evident	1	2	3	4	5	evident
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------

**Overall composition:**

poor	1	2	3	4	5	good
------	---	---	---	---	---	------

## APPENDIX C

## STILL LIFE (Experimental Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Set up still life models within small groups
- Draw a chosen section of their own still life on matboard
- Color the still life with colored pencils and/or tempera paint

Activity - Day 1

1. Discuss the concept of still life drawings and paintings by viewing the artwork of selected still life painters.
2. Briefly discuss composition and overlapping of objects to achieve perspective.
3. Distribute bags of still life materials for each of the six tables in the classroom.

Bags can contain objects, such as;  
cloth napkins or placemats  
baskets  
fruit (real or plastic)  
something tall and sculptural  
something plush (teddy bear, action figure, etc)  
colorful boxes  
other interesting materials

Students will arrange the objects to create their own still life models.

4. Students will receive 8" x 10" matboard, and begin drawing their still life designs from the models they have created.
5. Still life materials will be replaced in the bags to be redistributed the following week.

Activity - Day 2

1. Briefly review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Return the bags to the tables, and have students recreate their still life models.
3. Hand out drawings from the previous week, along with pencils and erasers for students who need to finish drawing.
4. Students will view a brief demonstration about painting in a "painterly" fashion to achieve areas which do not appear flat. Instruct students about using white styrofoam trays as palettes to mix colors, since they will be receiving a limited palette of primary colors, plus white, black and brown.
5. Students will also have the option of using colored pencils for color, either solely or in combination with the paint. Students will begin working.



STILL LIFE  
(Experimental Group) cont.

Materials:

Art reproductions:

Paul Cezanne: "Pommes et Oranges"  
Pablo Picasso: "The Enamel Saucepan"  
Henri Matisse: "Interior, Flowers and Parrot"  
"The Purple Robe"

matboard - 8" x 10" sheets

pencils

erasers

still life materials:

cloth napkins or placemats

baskets

fruit (real or plastic)

something tall and sculptural

something plush (teddy bear, action figure, etc)

colorful boxes

other interesting materials

colored pencils

egg cartons for paint

tempera paint:

red

yellow

blue

black

brown

white

brushes

water

paper towels

styrofoam trays (palettes)

## STILL LIFE (Control Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Discuss the artists, their backgrounds and styles
- Discuss similarities and differences in the artwork, and their opinions about their differences.
- Draw a still life design from a model
- Color the still life with colored pencils and/or tempera paint

Activity - Day 1

1. Discuss the concept of still life drawings and paintings by viewing the artwork of selected still life painters.
2. Discuss the artists' backgrounds and the styles in which they work. Discuss the aesthetic properties involved with the artwork. Encourage students to offer their opinions and criticisms, likes and dislikes.
3. Discuss composition and overlapping of objects to achieve perspective.
4. While the discussion is winding down, the teacher will start constructing a still life in the center of the classroom. Included are objects such as:
  - tablecloth
  - large silk floral centerpiece
  - fruit (real or plastic)
  - tall sculpture of a cardinal
  - large plush teddy bear, and other animals
  - colorful boxes
  - tennis racket
  - telephone
5. Students will receive 8" x 10" matboard, and begin drawing their still life designs from the model in the center of the classroom.

Activity - Day 2

1. Recreate still life from the previous week.
2. Review the concepts learned the previous week.
3. Hand out drawings from the previous week, along with pencils and erasers for students who need to finish drawing.
4. Students will view a demonstration about color mixing and painting in a "painterly" fashion to achieve areas which do not appear flat. Instruct students about using white styrofoam trays as palettes to mix colors, since they will be receiving a limited palette of primary colors, plus white, black and brown.
5. Students will also have the option of using colored pencils, either solely or in combination with paint. Students will begin working.

STILL LIFE  
(Control Group) cont.

Materials:

Art reproductions:

Paul Cezanne: "Pommes et Oranges"  
Pablo Picasso: "The Enamel Saucepan"  
Henri Matisse: "Interior, Flowers and Parrot"  
"The Purple Robe"

matboard - 8" x 10" sheets

pencils

erasers

still life materials:

tablecloth

baskets

fruit (real or plastic)

tall sculptural cardinal

large teddy bear

colorful boxes

other interesting materials

colored pencils

egg cartons for paint

tempera paint:

red

yellow

blue

black

brown

white

brushes

water

paper towels

styrofoam trays (palettes)

## PORTRAITURE (Experimental Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Briefly discuss details, such as folds in clothing, hats, etc
- Select and pose models within small groups
- Draw the model on either white or gray paper
- Shade and highlight the drawing as desired

Activity - Day 1

1. Discuss the concept of portraiture by viewing the artwork of selected portrait painters, including a drawing by one of the fifth grade students.
2. Briefly discuss the differences in the artists' styles, and explain that styles may differ, a close-up portrait is acceptable and the entire body does not need to be included in the drawing.
3. Students from each table will pose the model they selected. Stress the importance of finding a comfortable pose.
4. Demonstrate the differences between the use of gray paper and white paper with respect to shading and highlighting. Show the students how shading can be achieved with a pencil, and on gray paper, highlighting can be achieved with a white pencil.
5. Students will select either white or gray 11" x 17" paper, pencils and erasers and begin drawing their model. While the students work, discuss drawing details, such as how a hat rests on the forehead, necklaces rest on the shoulders, folds of the clothing, etc.

Activity - Day 2

1. Briefly review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Briefly review shading and highlighting
3. Hand out drawing from the previous week, along with pencils, white pencils and erasers.
4. Instruct the students to re-pose the models.
5. Students will continue drawing, shading and highlighting.

Materials:

Art reproductions:

- |                  |                          |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| Paul Klee:       | "Senecio, Head of a Man" |
| Mary Cassatt:    | "Woman with Dog"         |
| William Hogarth: | "The Shrimp Girl"        |
| Pablo Picasso:   | "Woman With a Blue Veil" |
|                  | "Head of a Harlequin"    |
| Jeffrey Boles:   | "Drawing of a Girl"      |

pencils, white pencils, erasers  
white and gray 11" x 17" paper

## PORTRAITURE (Control Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Discuss the backgrounds of the artists and their styles.
- Discuss similarities and differences in the artwork, and their opinions about their differences.
- Discuss details, such as folds in clothing, hats, etc
- Draw one of two models on either white or gray paper
- Shade and highlight the drawing as desired

Activity - Day 1

1. Discuss the concept of portraiture by viewing the artwork of selected artists, including a drawing by a fifth grade student.
2. Discuss the artists' backgrounds and the styles in which they work.  
Discuss the aesthetic involved with the artwork.  
Encourage students to offer their opinions and criticisms, likes and dislikes.  
Compare and contrast how the artists' paintings incorporated the use of different styles and techniques to create the portraits.
3. Discuss the concept close-ups in portraiture. Inform the students that the model's entire body does not need to be drawn on the paper.
4. Demonstrate the differences between the use of gray paper and white paper with respect to shading and highlighting. Show the students how shading can be achieved with a pencil, and on gray paper, highlighting can be achieved with a white pencil.
5. Select the two models. Offer props to them, including hats, glasses, umbrellas, etc.
6. Students will select either white or gray 11" x 17" paper, pencils and erasers and begin drawing their model. While the students work, discuss drawing details, such as how a hat rests on the forehead, necklaces rest on the shoulders, folds of the clothing, etc.
7. Students will begin drawing. Stress the importance of drawing lightly since the students may need to erase errors.

Activity - Day 2

1. Review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Review shading and highlighting
3. Hand out drawing from the previous week, along with pencils, white pencils and erasers.
4. Re-pose the two models from the previous week.
5. Students will continue drawing, shading and highlighting.

PORTRAITURE  
(Control Group) cont.

Materials:

Art reproductions:

Paul Klee: "Senecio, Head of a Man"

Mary Cassatt: "Woman with Dog"

William Hogarth: "The Shrimp Girl"

Pablo Picasso: "Woman With a Blue Veil"

"Head of a Harlequin"

Jeffrey Boles: "Drawing of a Girl"

(Carson Student)

pencils

white pencils

white and gray 11" x 17" paper

erasers

## PERSPECTIVE (Experimental Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- Observe one-point perspective in a realistic, familiar setting
- View paintings of selected artists, briefly discuss the differences in the artists' styles
- Relate the artists' works to one-point perspective
- Review the concept of perspective, repeating designs and shapes, and horizon lines
- Discuss the use of line to create the illusion of perspective.
- Learn the term "vanishing point"
- Draw a cityscape in one-point perspective
- Color finished cityscapes with crayons, markers and/or colored pencils

Activity - Day 1

1. Students will congregate in an alcove en route to the art class. From this alcove, exit doors approximately sixty feet away can be view and used as a concrete example of one-point perspective. A large red circle will be placed on the door to illustrate the "vanishing point."
2. Discuss the concept of one-point perspective from the alcove.
3. Demonstrate the concept of drawing with one-point perspective by using the hallway and door as a model.
4. Proceed to the art room, and view the selected artwork, briefly discussing how the artists' paintings illustrate the illusion of perspective through the use of line.
5. Discuss the concept of the vanishing point in one-point perspective, and how all the lines in a one-point perspective image merge towards the vanishing point. Relate it to the hallway model. □
6. Students will be given white 11" x 17" paper, pencils and erasers and rulers. Once supplies have been distributed, instruct the students to lightly draw a horizon line on their papers. Add a vanishing point on the horizon line.
7. Demonstrate how to create the curbs of the street merging towards the vanishing point, the sides and facades of buildings on either side of the street and streetlight poles receding into the distance on the street.

Activity - Day 2

1. Review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Hand out drawing from the previous week, along with pencils, erasers, and rulers
3. Discuss details on the buildings, such as windows, doors, rooftops, and how they differ whether on the front of the building or the side, where the lines would merge toward the vanishing point. Discuss

## PERSPECTIVE (Experimental Group) cont.

the concept of window and door frames, repeating shapes for windows and window sills.

4. Demonstrate how to create the illusion of windows receding towards the distance.
5. While the students are working, discuss how to give the drawing details and finishing touches, such as people, cars, billboards, etc.

### Activity - Day 3

1. Review the concepts learned the previous week. Discuss the concept of doors, windows and other drawn items on the sides of the buildings receding towards the vanishing point.
2. Hand out drawings from the previous week, along with pencils, erasers, and rulers. Allow students to finish drawings.
3. Students will have the option of using markers, colored pencils and/or crayons to color their drawings. They may also shade with the pencil if desired.

### Materials:

Art reproductions:

“The Banks of the Seine” by Andre Derain

“Sunny Side of the Street” by Philip Evergood

pencils

white 11” x 17” paper

erasers

rulers

colored pencils

markers

crayons



## PERSPECTIVE (Control Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Discuss the backgrounds of the artists and their styles.
- Discuss similarities and differences in the artwork, and their opinions about their differences.
- Review the concept of perspective, repeating designs and shapes, and horizon lines
- Discuss the use of line to create the illusion of perspective.
- Learn the term "vanishing point"
- Draw a cityscape in one-point perspective
- Color finished cityscapes with crayons, markers and/or colored pencils

Activity - Day 1

1. Discuss the concept of one-point perspective by viewing the artwork of selected artists.
2. Discuss the artists' backgrounds and the styles in which they work.  
Discuss the aesthetic properties involved with the artwork.  
Encourage students to offer their opinions and criticisms, likes and dislikes.  
Compare and contrast how the artists in the two painting created the illusion of perspective with line.
3. Discuss the concept of the vanishing point in one-point perspective, and how all the lines in a one-point perspective image merge towards the vanishing point.
6. Students will be given white 11" x 17" paper, pencils and erasers and rulers. Once supplies have been distributed, instruct the students to lightly draw a horizon line on their papers. Add a vanishing point on the horizon line.
7. Demonstrate how to create the curbs of the street merging towards the vanishing point, the sides and facades of buildings on either side of the street and streetlight poles receding into the distance on the street.

Activity - Day 2

1. Review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Hand out drawing from the previous week, along with pencils, erasers, and rulers
3. Discuss details on the buildings, such as windows, doors, rooftops, and how they differ whether on the front of the building or the side, where the lines would merge toward the vanishing point. Discuss the concept of window and door frames, repeating shapes for windows and window sills.

## PERSPECTIVE (Control Group) cont.

4. Demonstrate how to create the illusion of windows receding towards the distance.
5. While the students are working, discuss how to give the drawing details and finishing touches, such as people, cars, billboards, etc.

### Activity - Day 3

1. Review the concepts learned the previous week. Discuss the concept of doors, windows and other drawn items on the sides of the buildings receding towards the vanishing point.
2. Hand out drawing from the previous week, along with pencils, erasers, and rulers. Allow students to finish drawings.
3. Students will have the option of using markers, colored pencils and/or crayons to color their drawings. They may also shade with the pencil if desired.

### Materials:

Art reproductions:

“The Banks of the Seine” by Andre Derain

“Sunny Side of the Street” by Philip Evergood

pencils

white 11" x 17" paper

erasers

rulers

colored pencils

markers

crayons

## NONREPRESENTATIONAL ABSTRACT ART (Experimental Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Compare the concepts of representational and abstract art versus nonrepresentational art
- Briefly discuss concepts of nonrepresentational abstract art
- Experiment with color to achieve balance through nonrepresentational expression
- Create nonrepresentational art in the style of their choice

Activity - Day 1

1. Introduce the students to work by representational, abstract and nonrepresentational artists. Reproductions of the selected artists plus a "PowerPoint" presentation will be available.
2. Briefly compare the artwork styles of the selected artists.
3. Briefly discuss the differences and similarities in the artists' styles.
4. Briefly discuss and demonstrate how color is used:
  - to create balance
  - to create foregrounds and backgrounds without representational images
5. Students from each table will receive various materials to experiment with nonrepresentational abstract art.
6. Students will be instructed to create nonrepresentational abstract art working in the style of any of the artists we discussed or in a style of their own. The only criterion is that the artwork must be nonrepresentational. They may choose to create nonrepresentational art in the style of a particular artists, or create their own style.
7. A demonstration for creating work in the style of Frank Stella will be given:
  - Students will trace and cut four 5 1/2", 4", 2 1/2" and 1" circles.
  - Students will glue the circles concentrically, creating four sets of circles descending from the largest to smallest in size.
  - Once circles have been glued, the students will be cut several in half and/or quarters.
  - Students will reposition the circles' halves and quarters (in the style of Frank Stella) on white paper, creating aesthetically balanced nonrepresentational designs.
  - Thin strips of colored paper will be available if students choose to use them in conjunction with the circular shapes
8. Work not completed during this class will be completed the following week.

## NONREPRESENTATIONAL ABSTRACT ART (Experimental Group) cont.

### Activity - Day 2

1. Briefly review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Hand out projects from the previous week, along with appropriate materials.
3. Instruct the students to continue working on their projects.

### Materials:

#### Art reproductions:

Andre Derain	"The Banks of the Seine"
Paul Klee	"Senecio, Head of a Man"
Piet Mondrian	"Boogie Woogie Broadway"
	"Composition #2"
Frank Stella	"Moultonville"
	"Double Gray Scramble"
	"Gur 1"
	"Flin Flon"
Viktor Vasarely	"Vonal KSZ"

construction paper

pencils

rulers

scissors

glue

poster board circular patterns:

5 1/2"

4"

2 1/2"

1"

## NONREPRESENTATIONAL ABSTRACT ART (Control Group)

Objectives - The students will:

- View paintings of selected artists
- Compare the concepts of representational and abstract art versus nonrepresentational art, offering opinions and critiques.
- Discuss several concepts of nonrepresentational abstract art in depth
- Experiment with color to achieve balance through nonrepresentational expression in the style of Frank Stella
- Create nonrepresentational art in the style of Frank Stella

Activity - Day 1

1. Introduce the students to work by representational, abstract and nonrepresentational artists. Reproductions of the selected artists plus a "PowerPoint" presentation will be available. Students will discuss, compare, offer opinions and critique the artwork.
2. Introduce the students to simple color theory, introducing the use of warm/cool colors and the "weight" colors carry.
3. Discuss and demonstrate how color is used:
  - to create balance
  - to create foregrounds and backgrounds without representational images
4. Students from each table will receive various materials to experiment with nonrepresentational abstract art in Frank Stella's "circular" style
5. Students will trace and cut four 5 1/2", 4", 2 1/2" and 1" circles.
6. Students will glue the circles concentrically, creating four sets of circles descending from the largest to smallest in size.
7. Once circles have been glued, the students will be cut several in half and/or quarters.
8. Students will reposition the circles' halves and quarters (in the style of Frank Stella) on white paper, creating aesthetically balanced nonrepresentational designs.
9. Thin strips of colored paper will be available if students choose to use them in conjunction with the circular shapes
10. Work not completed during this class will be completed the following week.

Activity - Day 2

1. Briefly review the concepts learned the previous week.
2. Hand out projects from the previous week, along with appropriate materials.
3. Instruct the students to continue working on their projects.

# NONREPRESENTATIONAL ABSTRACT ART (Control Group) cont.

## Materials:

### Art reproductions:

Andre Derain	"The Banks of the Seine"
Paul Klee	"Senecio, Head of a Man"
Piet Mondrian	"Boogie Woogie Broadway"
	"Composition #2"
Frank Stella	"Moultonville"
	"Double Gray Scramble"
	"Gur 1"
	"Flin Flon"
Viktor Vasarely	"Vonal KSZ"

construction paper

pencils

rulers

scissors

glue

poster board circular patterns:

5 1/2"

4"

2 1/2"

1"

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnheim, Rudolf. *Art and Visual Perception - A Psychology of the Creative Eye, The New Version.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974.
- Brewer, Thomas M. "An Examination of Two Approaches To Ceramic Instruction in Elementary School." *Studies in Art Education* 32, no. 4 (1991): 196-206.
- Bruner, Jerome. "The Act of Discovery." *Concepts in Art Education- An Anthology of Current Issues.* Edited by George Pappas. □New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970.
- Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- Burton, Judith. "Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice." *Beyond dbae - The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education .* Edited by Judith Burton, Arlene Lederman, Peter London . Sponsored by the University Council on Art Education, 1988.
- Clark, Gilbert. "Judging Children's Drawings as Measures of Art Abilities." *Studies in Art Education* 34, no. 2 (1993): 72-81.
- Cramond, Bonnie. "We Can Trust Creativity Tests." *Educational Leadership* 52, no. 2 (October 1994): 10-2.
- Delacruz, Elizabeth Manley and Phillip C. Dunn. "The Evolution of Discipline-Based Art Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 30, no. 3 (Fall 1996): 67-82.
- Dewey, John. *Art As Experience.* New York: Minton, Balch and Company, 1935.
- Dewey, John. "Experience and Thinking." *Concepts in Art Education- An Anthology of Current Issues.* Edited by George Pappas. □New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970; reprinted with permission of the Macmillan Company from *Democracy and Education* by John Dewey, 1944: 163-178.



- Dobbs, Stephen Mark. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Some Questions and Answers." *NASSP Bulletin* 73 (May, 1989) 7-13.
- Dorn, Charles M. "The Aesthetically Testable Object (Demonstrating the Value of Art Education)." *Arts Education Policy Review* 99, no. 6 (July-August 1998): 3-8.
- Eisner, Elliot W. "Alternative Approaches to Curriculum Development in Art Education." *Studies in Art Education* 25, no 4 (1984): 259-64.
- Eisner, Elliot W. and David W. Ecker. "Some Historical Developments in Art Education." *Concepts in Art Education- An Anthology of Current Issues*. Edited by George Pappas. □New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970; reprinted with permission of the Blaisdell Publishing Company, a division of Ginn and Company, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1966.
- Eisner, Elliot W. "The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education." *Art Education* 40, no. 5 (September 1987): 6-45.
- Freeman, N.H. "Identifying Resources from Which Children Advance into Pictorial Innovation." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 31, no. 4 (Winter 1997): 23-33.
- Ewens, Thomas. "Flawed Understanding: On Getty, Eisner and DBAE." "Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice." *Beyond dbae - The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education* . Edited by Judith Burton, Arlene Lederman, Peter London . Sponsored by the University Council on Art Education, 1988.
- Greenberg, Pearl. "Time, Money, and the New Art Education versus Art and Irrelevance." *Studies in Art Education* 37, no 2 (1996): 115-6.
- Greer, W. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." *Studies in Art Education* 24, no. 4 (1984) 212-18.
- Hoepfner, Ralph. "Measuring Student Achievement in Art." *Studies in Art Education* 25, no 4 (1984) 251-58.
- Holt, John. *How Children Learn*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1967.
- Jeffers, Carol S. "Professional Development in Art Education Today: A Survey of Kansas Art Teachers." *Studies in Art Education* 37, no. 2 (1996): 101-114.

- Kauppinen, Heta. "The Significant Others: An Application of Role Theory to Historical Analysis of Lowenfeld's Thought." *The History of Art Education, Proceedings from the Penn State Conference*. Edited by Brent Wilson and Harlan Hoffa. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University, College of Arts and Architecture, School of Visual Arts, 1985.
- Kern, Evan J. "The Purposes of Art Education in the United States from 1870-1980." *The History of Art Education, Proceedings from the Penn State Conference*. Edited by Brent Wilson and Harlan Hoffa. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University, College of Arts and Architecture, School of Visual Arts, 1985.
- Kleinbauer, Eugene w. "Art History in Discipline-based Art Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 205-15.
- Lanier, Vincent. "A\*R\*T\*, A Friendly Alternative to DBAE." *Art Education* 40, no. 5 (September 1987): 46-52.
- London, Peter. Letter to the Editor. *Art Education* 41, no. 2 (march 1988): 5.
- London, Peter. "To Gaze again at the Stars." "Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice." *Beyond dbae - The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education*. Edited by Judith Burton, Arlene Lederman, Peter London. Sponsored by the University Council on Art Education, 1988.
- Lowenfeld, Viktor, "The Meaning of Creative Activity in Elementary Education." *Concepts in Art Education- An Anthology of Current Issues*. Edited by George Pappas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970.
- Lowenfeld, Viktor and W. Lambert Brittain. *Creative and Mental Growth*, 5th ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1970.
- Mims, Sandra Kay, and E. Louis Lankford. "Time, Money, and The New Art Education: A Nationwide Investigation." *Studies in Art Education* 36, no. 2 (1995) 84-95.
- Pittard, Norma K. "The Romantic Legacy and Discipline-Based Art Education." *Art Education* 41, no. 2 (March 1988): 42-47.
- "Research Task Force Report: Priorities For Arts Education Research." *Arts Education Partnership*. U.S. Department of Education, the Getty Institute, et al., 1997 - [cited May 4, 1998]. Available from: <http://aep-arts.org:90/theadvoc/taskforces/paeres.html#WhyTeach>, 1-13.

- Smith, Peter. "Art and Irrelevance." *Studies in Art Education* 36, no. 2 (1995): 123-5.
- Smith, Ralph. "The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 3-34.
- Spratt, Frederick. "Art Production in Discipline-based Art Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 197-204.
- "What Every Young American Should Know and be able to Do in the Arts." *National Standards for Arts Education*. National Arts Education Associations, Kennedy Center for the Arts, 1994- [cited May 11, 1998]. Available from: <http://artsedge.kennedy-center.org/forms/arts1.html>, 1-14.
- Wilson, Brent. "Arts Standards and Fragmentation: A Strategy for Holistic Assessment." *Arts Education Policy Review* 98, no. 2 (November/December 1996): 2-9.
- Zessoules, Rieneke, Dennie Palmer Wolf and Howard Gardner. "A Better Balance: ARTS PROPEL as an Alternative to Discipline-Based Art Education." "Aesthetics in Art Education: Meaning and Value in Practice." *Beyond dbae - The Case for Multiple Visions of Art Education*. Edited by Judith Burton, Arlene Lederman, Peter London. Sponsored by the University Council on Art Education, 1988.